

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could stop all night if he liked.

MR. GEORGE said he wished to speak to a question of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question to report progress would be put first.

MR. GEORGE said he claimed privilege. Before the question to report progress was put, he had risen to address the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for North Fremantle had caught his eye first.

MR. GEORGE: As a question of privilege, he wished to refer to the statement made by the member for West Kimberley. Under the Standing Orders of the House he (Mr. George) was entitled to give an explanation. If the Chairman refused him, he would appeal to the Speaker.

Motion (progress) put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave asked to sit again.

MR. GEORGE: Have I not a right to be now heard?

THE SPEAKER: I do not know on what point.

Question—that the Committee have leave to sit again—put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at twelve minutes past 11 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 13th November, 1900.

Papers presented—Petition: Patent Bill—Question: Hospitals and Government Funds—Question: Printing Office and Monotype Machines—Question: Locomotive Workshops, Timekeeper degraded—Question: Sparks from Railway Engines—Fremantle Tramways Bill, recommittal, third reading—Payment of Members Bill, second reading, in Committee, Suggestions (2) to Assembly—Land Act Amendment Bill, Recommittal, progress—Noxious Weeds Bill, in Committee, Clause 7 to end, reported—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **COLONIAL SECRETARY:** 1, Plan of proposed loop line of railway, Kalgoorlie-Gnamballa; 2, Coolgardie Water Scheme Cement Supplies, return as ordered; 3, Statistical Office, Registrar General's Report; 4, Loan Estimates. Ordered to lie on the table.

PETITION—PATENT BILL.

HON. C. SOMMERS presented a petition from the Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie Chamber of Mines, in favour of the Patent Acts Amendment Bill.

Petition received and read.

QUESTION—HOSPITALS AND GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

HON. A. JAMESON asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, The manner in which assisted hospitals obtain funds from the Government. 2, How have such funds been distributed. 3, If any correspondence in connection with the subject has passed between the Government and the recipients during the past three years.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—1 and 2, A £ for £ subsidy is given on all subscriptions or donations; the Government reserving to itself the right to limit the total amount according to the importance and needs of each institution, such needs being ascertained from a monthly return made by the hospital committee upon the accompanying printed forms. The sum of £1 5s. paid for each indigent patient treated at the hospital, such patient to be properly certified to as being in destitute circumstances; no subscriber to the hospital

being treated as an "indigent patient." The medical officer of each hospital is in receipt of a subsidy-in-aid of £100 per annum, and is required to visit prisoners in gaol or under remand, when in custody, if called upon to do so; and to attend professionally, at his residence or at the hospital, such Government servants as are entitled to medical advice. If, however, the medical officer is required to visit them at their homes, he is entitled to a fee of 5s. The accompanying printed forms are used in connection with all payments made under the foregoing. Applications for assistance in addition to the above are considered separately and dealt with on their merits. 3. Yes. The terms and conditions mentioned in reply to 1 and 2 were the result of such correspondence. In this reply, I am not quite sure whether I have covered the mover's intention correctly in regard to the last question. I take it he means the committees of private hospitals. The correspondence between the Colonial Secretary and the Medical Department is most voluminous, and I do not know whether the hon. member wishes to have any particular portion of it. It is too voluminous, at any rate, to place on the table of this House; and it has been going on for years; ever since this system has been adopted. Gradually we have been able to bring this matter more into line with what we desire. Every application for a special grant given (and it is sometimes for buildings), is carefully criticised, and I think almost invariably submitted to the warden for him to express his opinion upon it, so that every care is taken to see that the Government are not imposed upon.

QUESTION—PRINTING OFFICE AND MONOTYPE MACHINES.

HON. J. M. SPEED asked the Colonial Secretary, whether the Government intended introducing monotype machines into the Government Printing Office, and, if so, how many, and upon what terms were they being introduced.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—Yes. Two complete machines with extra keyboards, matrices, moulds, etc., have been procured and are now being installed. It is anticipated that the introduction of this plant will suffice to afford a trial of the process, which,

with such other additions as further acquaintance therewith may indicate as advisable, will eventuate in much convenience and economy when brought fully into operation. The primary cost of each machine is about £600, but with expenses of putting up and the purchase of extra portions, etc., the total cost, it is estimated, will be about £900 when everything is in working order.

QUESTION—LOCOMOTIVE WORKSHOPS, TIMEKEEPER DEGRADED.

HON. A. B. KIDSON asked the Colonial Secretary the reason why Charles John, who until lately held the position of timekeeper in the Locomotive Workshops, Fremantle, for seven consecutive years, was suddenly and without warning degraded by Mr. Trigg, the chief clerk, from the position of timekeeper to that of telephone boy, although a married man and aged 30 years.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—It was found necessary to place an adult in charge of the Telephone Exchange, and Mr. John was considered most suitable for that duty, and was appointed at the same rate of pay. Mr. John stated that he would take up the duties "under appeal," but a few minutes afterwards he refused. He was then suspended pending inquiry. Mr. John has not appealed to the Chief Mechanical Engineer.

QUESTION—SPARKS FROM RAILWAY ENGINES.

HON. R. G. BURGESS asked the Colonial Secretary, If the Government were aware that their engines were setting the country alight every day in the Eastern Districts, to the loss and annoyance of all the settlers in those districts.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—A number of fires in the Eastern Districts have been reported, which have been attributed to sparks from engines. The Railway Department is adopting every means to minimise such fires by the removal as far as possible of all inflammable substances from the railway reserves. Improved spark-arresters are being fitted to the locomotives as quickly as possible, with a view of preventing the emission of sparks, but, owing to the lack of appliances at the Fremantle Work-

shops, this work cannot be executed as rapidly as might be desired.

FREMANTLE TRAMWAYS BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

Consideration resumed from 8th November. At the last sitting an amendment was moved to strike out Clause 6, with a view of inserting another clause.

HON. M. L. MOSS now asked leave to withdraw the amendment, with a view of moving further.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added as a proviso to Clause 6:

Provided, however, that the promoter and his assigns shall not be liable to pay more than £1,000 in respect thereof.

When this clause was previously before the Committee, he mentioned that it was very drastic. It provided that:

Whenever any telephone service is erected prior to the construction of the tramways, and is prejudicially affected by the construction or working of the tramways, the Postmaster General may, at the cost of the promoter and his assigns, do all such things as may be necessary to protect the telephone service from being so affected, either by placing the same on a metallic circuit system or otherwise.

That clause left a large power in the hands of the Postmaster General, and if it were passed as it stood it might have a very serious effect upon any promoter who would carry out a very desirable work in Fremantle. It was said the other day when the Kalgoorlie Tramways Bill was going through Committee, that mention of this should have been made at the time, so that Kalgoorlie might have had the protection of this proviso, or some similar provision. He was informed, however, that Kalgoorlie already had a metallic system in connection with the telephone service, therefore such a proviso to their Bill would be of no avail.

A MEMBER: What about Leederville?

HON. M. L. MOSS: One was not there to look specially after Leederville, but if someone had moved such a proviso in regard to Leederville, he (Mr. Moss) would have been pleased to give it his support. The object of the proviso was that the liability of the promoters should be limited to £1,000. The Under Secre-

tary for Public Works, after having made inquiry, was satisfied that the total cost of having a metallic circuit system for the Fremantle telephone service would not exceed £1,500. The proviso was a very fair one. It threw upon the promoter the liability of bearing at any rate more than two-thirds of the cost of providing this metallic circuit system, and he hoped the Committee would see their way to agree to it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: On behalf of the Government, he could not assent to the amendment. The promoters were informed when they were entering into the negotiations that a clause of this nature would be inserted in the Bill. To say that £1,000 would be the cost was not right. He did not know what the work would cost in Fremantle, but in Perth similar work amounted to £4,000; still he believed the telephone system in Perth was larger than that at Fremantle. The matter should be left in the hands of the Government, who would not oppress the promoters.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The present Government would not always be in power.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The telephone system was an up-to-date one. There was not a metallic circuit, but an earth return system. People had complained of interruption, especially when trams were passing along in the vicinity of the telephone wires. He had no doubt the company had made allowance for this work in their arrangement with the Town Council of Fremantle. The Leederville Tramway Bill had already been passed, and it would be invidious now to allow one Bill to pass without a provision which the other measure contained. He did not suppose the hon. member would consent to withdraw his amendment, but if he did so no injustice would be done. The sum of £1,000 was an arbitrary amount, and the hon. member stated that the work was estimated to cost £1,500 to remedy the injury which would be done by the erection of poles and wires.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It would make the telephone system up to date, which it was not at present.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was an up-to-date system at the present time.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It was not a metallic circuit.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:

There was no necessity to have a metallic circuit, only when one current interfered with another electric current.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The telephone system would soon be under the Federal Government.

Amendment put and negatived, and the clause passed.

Bill further reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell), in moving the second reading, said: I feel in a somewhat peculiar position to-day, inasmuch as I have always opposed payment of members, having held the opinion very strongly that capable persons can be found who will represent their constituents in Parliament without payment. That has been the law of the land as long as we have had responsible government here, and it was the law under the old constitution. However, we have passed many Acts which are entirely opposed to the spirit of old legislation, and which would have been entirely unacceptable years ago to a majority of the people. There is a general feeling, and it is apparently growing, that members of Parliament should be paid, therefore there is some justification for the Bill if one goes into the question a little below the surface. There is no doubt the idea of payment is one that has received the support of the labour bodies of the colony to a considerable extent, and I believe the principle is supported by many of those not associated with such bodies. The object, no doubt, is that Parliament will be thrown open to those who have to depend on themselves for a livelihood, and who cannot represent constituents in Parliament without receiving some payment. I believe that is the motive, and I believe some members desire to respect that motive and not to limit the choice of the selection of representatives. I think members should carefully consider the position in regard to this House. We are elected on a different basis from that of the Lower House: there is a property qualification here. We are called upon to be the conservatives, if I may say so,

in regard to legislation, and to exercise careful supervision over Bills which are passed by another place.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What is the property qualification?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: For the electors, not for representatives, there is a £25 qualification.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Ten pounds.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is to some extent a property qualification. I believe I am right in saying that in Victoria a Bill for the payment of members was introduced into the Lower House of that colony on three or four separate occasions, and as often it was rejected by the Upper House; at last, I believe, there was an intimation, either privately or publicly, that if a Bill was introduced for payment of members of the Lower House only, the Upper House would pass it; but the members of the Legislative Council of Victoria, from high motives, decided that payment was somewhat lowering to the dignity of the Upper House, and refused to accept payment. So that I believe at the present time in Victoria, there is no payment, as the Act only provides for payment of members of the Lower House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Senators in the Federal Parliament are to be paid.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In one Upper House of the Australian colonies there is payment of members, that is in South Australia.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In Tasmania.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is not in Australia: it is in Australasia. A sum of £100 is paid to members of the Upper House in Tasmania, and I believe the members of the Upper House in New Zealand are paid also.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Members of the Upper House are nominated in New Zealand.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Are they nominated?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The question members have to consider is whether it is in accordance with the dignity of the House to demand payment or to vote for the payment of members of this Upper House. I should have been glad if it had fallen to the lot of some other member to have moved the second reading of this Bill.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: One who believes in it.

HON. M. L. MOSS: That is one of the nuisances of party government.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have always objected to payment of members when a member of the Lower House as well as since I have been in the Upper House. I think there is a good deal in the argument which I am using, that it is below the dignity of this House to accept payment for services rendered to the State. Men are supposed to be in a position—

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What about Ministers?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Ministers will not get the £200 a year in addition to their salaries.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But they are paid.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think I answered hon. members on that point the other day, and I understood members were perfectly satisfied with the answer. The two cases are not parallel, and I think members generally agree to that. I am not objecting to the Bill as regards the other House. I think there is perhaps some foundation now for thinking that payment of members of the Lower House is a step in the right direction. We suppose members of the Assembly represent the advanced thought and aspirations of the working classes, if I am allowed to use that term, some of whom are capable of filling seats to the advantage of the country, in the Lower House of Parliament. We look on the other House as standing on a different platform entirely. I am not going to argue the question very much: I shall leave it to the members to say whether it is in accordance with the principles that prevail and regulate the conservative House of Parliament that members should be paid.

HON. D. M. MCKAY: Would you debar one from entering the Upper House?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would not debar anyone who could get a seat in it. If a man is elected to this House, he ought to be received with due consideration by the other members, no matter what class he comes from or what position in society he may occupy. It is entirely a matter for the constituents. If

they choose to elect Mr. Jones, Mr. Brown, Mr. Smith, or whoever the person may be, it is not for this House to object, and certainly not for me to do so. I am sure hon. members would not object. At the same time, I have no doubt the effect of this Bill will be to open membership to the Upper House to a larger number of persons than are at present able to seek seats in the Legislative Council. I do not think I need say anything more with regard to the Bill, for the measure is so very simple and plain. I do not want to refer to the difference which has been made in the Bill between the two Houses of Parliament. I dare say some members will deal with that phase of the question, but the £100 would of course be a sort of honorarium to enable members to pay certain expenses they have to incur, and it would be in addition to their free passes on the railways. I do not think I need labour this question. I am afraid members are inclined to treat the Bill a little jocosely, but I ask them to consider the importance to the revenue of this colony, the sum involved being about £16,000 a year.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It will not cost so much as that.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It will cost £12,000, will it not?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Yes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member seems to have carefully considered the expense to the country. The only question we have to consider is whether it will be to the advantage of the country or not that members of Parliament shall be paid for their services as representatives of the people.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West): Unlike the Colonial Secretary, I hail with a very great deal of satisfaction the introduction of this Bill, for I have always been a strong supporter of the principle of payment of members. My hon. friend the Colonial Secretary says he has been opposed to the principle. I thought that possibly at this time, and in view of the fact that the representatives of this colony in the Commonwealth Parliament are to be paid £400 a year alike in both Houses of that Parliament, Western Australia unanimously would wipe out the very anomalous position it occupies, and have its Parliament paid like the Federal Parliament, and like all the State Parlia-

ments in Australia. The Colonial Secretary has made some reference to the Upper House in Victoria. I think those persons who have taken the trouble to read of the doings of the Legislative Council of Victoria will agree with me in saying that the Legislative Council in Victoria is the greatest barrier in Australia to any kind of reform.

A MEMBER: No.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I say emphatically, yes. The Upper House, with its huge property qualification, has been the greatest barrier to any kind of reform in that colony. In Western Australia the members of the Legislative Council have no qualification, or, to be perfectly precise, they have the qualification that members must be at least 30 years of age. They are elected practically, I may say, from the same body of electors as are the representatives in the other branch of the Legislature of this colony; and to my way of thinking it is absolutely necessary for the system of Government under which we live that the members of the Legislative Council shall be paid, not the petty honorarium of £100 a year which this Bill provides, but an amount equal to that received by the members of another place. One gentleman connected with politics in this country said the fact that the members of the Legislative Council have the prefix of "Honourable" to their names is a strong argument why they should be paid a lesser amount than the members of the Legislative Assembly. I think, to carry that argument to its logical conclusion, he should have gone "one better," and have said that the gentleman in politics who has the privilege of using the prefix "Right Honourable" to his name should have nothing at all for his services. However, I am not of that opinion. When we look at this colony and at the constitution of Parliament, I think it is wrong that so many members of both branches of the Legislature should be drawn from Perth and Fremantle, and unless adequate payment is given—I may say in passing that I do not think even £200 a year an adequate payment for services that members of Parliament render—unless adequate payment is made we shall still have in the future the bulk of the representatives coming from Perth and Fremantle. Take, for instance, my hon.

friend Mr. Drew, and the other gentlemen representing his province. I think there are six electoral districts in the province.

HON. J. M. DREW: Eight.

HON. M. L. MOSS: They extend from the west coast of Australia to the South Australian border, and any gentleman who has run a contested election in this colony, particularly in a district of those dimensions, must know what a large proportion of the honorarium will be eaten up in travelling and election expenses before he has gone very far. It has been said that the Legislative Council does not take such a long time in its deliberations, and has not so much work to do as another place; but I would point out that members of this House who have to come a great distance are obliged to travel that distance, although this branch of the Legislature may not be sitting such long hours as the Legislative Assembly. Those gentlemen are away from their homes and are bound to neglect their own affairs. If there should be any payment at all it should be an adequate payment. £100 a year is not sufficient for the purpose, and I hope that if the Bill gets into Committee, members will be prepared to move that a suggestion be sent to the other House that we should be put upon the same footing as the members of the Legislative Assembly. However, there is one aspect of this Bill that certainly does not meet with my approval, and that is the provision to make the Bill retrospective. I am prepared to cast my vote so that this Bill shall only apply from the first day of the sitting of the next Parliament. I do not think it is decent for members of Parliament to vote money for themselves, and particularly in view of the fact that the other branch of the Legislature is going before the country in a very few months: I do not think it is a proper thing that we should vote money practically for past services. In Committee I shall move an amendment, which is too lengthy to read at the present time, and no doubt hon. members have already seen it. It provides that members of Parliament shall do their duty in the future. I mean, do their duty in the sense of attending the sittings of the House. I do not wish to suggest for one moment that members of Parliament have not done their duty in the past.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You mean the other place.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I mean this. My Parliamentary experience in this colony has taught me that many important measures, and measures concerning tremendous sums of money, have been dealt with when there has been but a bare quorum in the House. To my mind that is a scandal which we ought to obviate, if possible. The clauses I propose to move are intended to provide that after ten days' absence from attendance during a session of Parliament, a member shall be penalized to the extent of £1 per day. This is not a new provision with reference to payment of members. The clause finds a place in the New Zealand Act. I am aware that the suggestion of legislation from New Zealand does not always meet with very great favour in this Chamber. Still, I think the principles contained in these two clauses I propose to move as an amendment will, if adopted, ensure that members of Parliament will attend to the duties they are sent here to perform. As members are to be paid, they should not expect to receive payment for services that they do not render. I am certain that this Bill will receive at the hands of the members of the Legislative Council a unanimous support, and I hope that the two or three little matters to which I have referred will have due attention paid to them in Committee. The retrospective action of the Bill to my mind is bad. The provision whereby members of this Chamber shall be paid half that to be received by members of another place is also bad. The principle the Bill itself contains is a good one, and, as I said before, I hail with great satisfaction the introduction of this measure.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): For a long time I was opposed to the principle of payment of members, and it was only after I found there was a universal wish by all the electors throughout the colony that the principle should be introduced, I gave way. I have my own doubt as to whether it will have the desired effect of bringing better members into the House; but inasmuch as we see the principle throughout the whole of the Australian colonies, and I think throughout the Australasian colonies, and in the Federal Senate, I think it would be unwise to oppose the adoption of this

principle in Western Australia any further. The only objection I had to it was that, if it could be found that a certain number of intelligent citizens were willing to devote their time to the service of the country, the country ought to avail itself of their gratuitous services; but the people think otherwise, and that those services should be paid for. I cannot accept the argument of the Colonial Secretary that there ought to be persons found in this House and in the Legislative Assembly who would be willing to sacrifice their time and devote their energies to the good of the country. We are not a wealthy people, and we are not a leisured class; but I ask the Colonial Secretary, who is a wealthy man, a man of means, and who is a member of this House, why he does not return his salary? Why does he not receive the same salary as Ministers in another place?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If the hon. gentleman admits that the same payment ought to be given to the leader of this House as is given to the leader of the other House, surely it is a sound argument that members of this House should be paid the same as members of the other House. Why should they make a distinction in the salaries of the Executive? If we come to the bed rock, there is no reason why Ministers should be paid, if members are not to be paid. A Minister gives up a vast deal more of his time than members do, but there are little invitations here and there, and a certain right to bestow patronage which is worth money and is a recompense.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No recompense.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Supposing the Colonial Secretary, instead of receiving £1,000 a year, were only paid the same as a private member of this House, he would still be on the same footing in the Ministry and as leader of this House. In other words, there are more ways of killing a pig than hanging it. On the other hand, the principle of payment of members has been recognised, and as we are going to adopt it, the question arises, what system shall we adopt? Shall we make a difference between the two Houses of Parliament? It is suggested that there is a difference in Victoria: that, in itself, to my mind is no argument. The fact that

for many years the Victorian Upper House protested against payment for either House, and then changed their minds and adopted the principle for one House, seems to me to show that if the members of that Upper House had the chance of changing their mind again and adopting the principle of payment for both Houses they would do so. In New South Wales I admit the members of the Upper House are nominated and receive no payment whatever.

HON. J. M. SPEED: They are thinking of turning them out altogether now.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They are striving as hard as they can to have an elective Upper House in New South Wales. South Australia, which is nearest to us, and the colony whose ideas have in the past been most favoured here, adopted the principle on the basis of members of both Houses being treated alike. Members of both Houses in South Australia are elected, and both are paid. Why should we adopt a principle which is not consonant with reason, and not accept the principle adopted in South Australia, which seems to be consonant with reason? Mr. Moss has spoken about an amendment to Clause 2, which I do not think will receive much support. It seems to me it is an attempt to obtain advantages for members in Perth against those who live in the country. Why did not the hon. member go further and say that members who sit on committees, and devote many hours of the day to work on committees, should be entitled to absent themselves from certain sittings of the House? I cannot admit the principle that a member who comes here and says nothing and does nothing, who sits on no committees, but who comes here and simply puts his head inside the door, should be paid while those members who do work on committees and who may not be able to be present in the House should not be paid. If country members come down here they are down for the week, and have nowhere else to go to; probably that is one of the reasons why they sit here. This House may possibly sit only for a few hours, and why should, for instance, Mr. Drew come down from Geraldton to attend a sitting of the House which may only last a few hours, and then have to go back again? Is it right that members, when there is no important matter coming before the

House, should have to travel down here to put in a record? The hon. member was very diffident in speaking to his amendment; in fact he rather blushed because he was driven to say that the only justification for the amendment was that it had been passed in New Zealand, and he was obliged to admit that that was no reason at all. In no part of Australia is there any suggestion that if members do not attend they shall not be paid; in other words, that they shall be fined for non-attendance. In New Zealand it is so, but it is not so in any of the federated colonies, and we want to assimilate our laws as far as possible. Is there such a principle included in the Commonwealth Bill? No. If it was necessary that members should have to attend before they were paid, why was not such a principle embodied in the Commonwealth Bill? The fact was that no man ever thought of it. If a member will not attend to his duties, his electors will soon find it out and not return him. I do not think a member is attending to the wants of his constituents by sitting here regularly, putting up a record of attendances, and then neglecting the interests of his constituents in the recess. When Parliament is not sitting, that is the time when members can do good for their constituents. To say that members should only be paid according to the days of attendance is contrary to the principle of the Bill, and I hope the House will reject any such amendment. Why should we add a disqualification to a principle that has been asked for for years? If this principle is recognised and adopted, why should one House be more fortunate than another? If you adopt the principle that one House is to be remunerated for services, why should not members be remunerated for their services in the present session? This Bill ought to have been introduced some months ago, and it is only brought forward now in consequence of certain pressure used during the passage of the Estimates. The Government were then forced to introduce the Bill. Members in another place have the right to complain of the Bill being kept back. I do not see any objection, as the Bill has been kept back, to the retrospective idea being inserted in the Bill.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Better date it back two or three years.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That would be as reasonable as to fix the date to a future Parliament.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The principle is no different.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The principle has only been recognised this session; it was never recognised in both Houses until this Parliament. I do not know on what grounds members oppose the retrospective principle. This question has been discussed fully in another place, and the Bill has been adopted as a compromise between two parties. It is not brought forward so much for the benefit of members in the Upper House, and any amendment in the direction of striking out the retrospective clause will probably reject the Bill.

A MEMBER: A good job, too.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If any member does not want his money he can give it to the poor, and no doubt that hon. member will head the list; or at the beginning of next session I will move that a poor-box be erected so that the money which is not wanted can be put in by hon. members. I object to a certain amount of "playing to the gallery" which has been adopted by certain members. Some members have practically said "I am taking this money, but I do not want it;" and I am sorry that my friend Mr. Moss, who generally speaks out straight, has said: "Excuse my taking the money, but it has been voted by Parliament."

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): I follow early in the debate in order that I may give expression, at this period, to what have always been my views on the question of payment of members. The Colonial Secretary and Mr. R. S. Haynes apparently have had a new conversion to the principle. As long as I can remember I have claimed to be democratic, but from my earliest days I have not been able to gather how democratic institutions could be successfully worked unless the members who are admitted to do the people's work in Parliament are paid for their services. I will not follow the Colonial Secretary in his remarks.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The work has been done hitherto very well.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I cannot go into that question. The hon. member

found when he entered the Ministry his salary was paid to him, and if he had asked why he was paid that salary he would have answered his own interjection. Probably we should have got the hon. member, who is an excellent Minister, if there had been no salary attached to the position.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Perhaps you would.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Therefore the hon. member's argument falls to the ground altogether. What is sauce in the one case may not be sauce for the other party. The hon. member speaks comparatively, from a position of affluence; he is not dependent on his Ministerial income, and, if members of the House were paid, on his private salary; he could serve the country and the Parliament without remuneration, and no doubt he would do so as he has done in the past, handsomely and well. But the hon. member must remember that he is one of those fortunate persons, fortunate I mean in a deserving sense, who has been given fortune because he deserved it: there are others who have not that faculty.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: On this side of the House?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: On this side of the House; I dare not say on the other side. There are those who have not that faculty and who remain as poor men and not amongst the least deserving of the community. I shall not pursue the arguments of the Colonial Secretary, because I gather that ten minutes before he moved the motion he was practically convinced that his arguments were erroneous, and I shall not be surprised to hear that ten minutes afterwards his mind reverted to its prior condition. We have to deal with persons who want payment of members, not merely in the House, but outside people who may become candidates. It is simply impossible for us to set the clock of time backwards. The latest achievement in political science is the Bill formulating the Commonwealth of Australia, and that Bill has, if I may carry on my illustration, set the time of day for all the constitutions of Australia. Already there is an earnest movement in more than one colony for the constitution to be founded on the basis of the Commonwealth Bill. Amongst

the provisions of that Bill, made everlasting as it were, is that it cannot be altered by a mere act of the Commonwealth Parliament or by the people, but it must be done by taking the manifold steps and the cautious steps provided for its alteration; therefore we have to assume this fact, that the highest constitution of Australia which it should be our aim to emulate for future time, is provided for in a way which prevents it being tampered with, and that constitution provides that payment of members shall be the rule for both Houses of the Commonwealth Parliament. In response to more than one interjection, I may say that in the various Australian colonies, by which I include Tasmania, in spite of the remark which was made a little while back, because Tasmania is included by a clause of the Commonwealth Act, there are three nominated and three elected Upper Houses; of the three nominated Houses none are paid, of the three elective Houses all are paid with one exception, and that exception finds its portals are barred to the poor man by a property qualification, the severest known in the British dominions. All over the wide Empire of England there is no property qualification so stringent or fatal as that which bars the door of the Victorian Legislative Council. It bars the door against any but a few favoured individuals who happen to comply with the provisions. It is provided—and that clause has never been altered, and is not likely to be altered until the Commonwealth meets—that no man can become a candidate for the Upper House in Victoria unless he has £100 a year, not from property consisting of various kinds of investment, but from freehold land, over and above all encumbrances on that land, and I am informed that this limits the choice of the electors to something like between 7,000 and 8,000 persons. What has been the result? An hon. member said the Upper House of Victoria was the great barrier to all legislative reform in that colony, and somebody contradicted this, that hon. member who contradicted it not knowing anything about the history of Victoria. That House stands like, if I may use a simile, an angel guarding the gates of Paradise with a sword of flame, to prevent any democratic

measure passing into law, unless such pressure is brought to bear upon those members individually that they see there is a prospect of a conflict ending, goodness knows how. If we want an instance of an undemocratic body, a body which simply bars advance and progress from a political point of view, let us go to the Upper House of Victoria, and adopt the provisions which in days long gone by were adopted to keep the portals of that Chamber as immaculate as possible from the democrat or the reformer. In regard to one other colony I would like to say a word, and that is South Australia. Not once, but twice and oftener a gentleman, whom I may call the leading democrat of that colony, the Right Hon. Charles Kingston, expressed his opinion to me that the great democratic measure of South Australia was payment of members of the Upper House, on the same footing as the members of the lower House. As a matter of fact, the moment that was introduced a complete change came over the personnel of that Chamber. The poor man, the democrat, had looked at the Chamber and sighed to get in, but he had always failed, purely because the leading democrats of the province could not afford it; but the moment payment of members was introduced on the same footing as in the Legislative Assembly, the House was full of democrats. At one time the democrats had an absolute majority. Now they are about equal, and the next election of that House is looked upon as being likely to give the balance to the progressive party, to that party which will lead to reforms that have been demanded for so many years past. I am to a certain extent in accord with my friend Mr. Moss, about payment for services already rendered, and if he moves—I do not agree with his motion about fining members for being absent, for many reasons which may be given, and which Mr. Haynes has anticipated—if he moves that payment shall only commence from the next Parliament I shall be prepared to follow him.

HON. J. M. DREW: That would wreck the Bill.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It may be so, but we shall see whether that change is palatable to another place. At all events, with regard to that matter I am prepared to put myself in the hands of another place, and if they still insist on this claim

that payment should be for services already rendered and done with, I shall not stand any further in the way; but I shall certainly adjure this House to take a stand, a stand that should be absolutely immovable, that the members of the two Houses should be paid an equal amount of remuneration for their services.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Or nothing at all.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Or nothing at all. That really would be the true alternative, for that would give us a House of the character the Colonial Secretary desires, which I anticipate he does not expect will be secured in a few years time; that is, a House of perfectly upright and honourable men, men who perhaps come purely from a public spirit, and not to work a job of their own for which they will get a salary more than commensurate with that which they surrender. The idea of offering £100 as an adequate remuneration for the services of a member of this House, and contrasting with it the £200 given a member of another place, is something very much more than an insult. It is meant as an insidious blow at the power and influence of this Chamber—[SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear]—and it will certainly prove successful unless this House detects the poison lurking in it in time, and says that in that respect at all events this Bill shall be put right. The whole question hinges upon this: Why are members paid? Why is the Colonial Secretary paid £1,000 a year? Why were the Ministers first paid £600 a year? They grumbled, and we paid them £800 a year. Still they grumbled, and said it was not enough; and then they were paid £1,000 a year. I do not know whether they are still grumbling. I know the hon. gentleman came in on £1,000 a year. All this time, whilst the salaries of Ministers were mounting up, the members of Parliament were compelled to work for nothing, and some of them to go bankrupt because their businesses were ruined; yet the hon. member still stands up and urges, against I think his own convictions of a short half hour ago, that members should not be paid in the Council, or should get just enough—I think the phrase has been used—for

pocket money. The first reason for payment of members is that they do duties to the State. We have passed the day when members of sufficient ability—I will put it in a stronger sense, and say men of sufficient ability and honesty—can be expected to give up their private business and devote their lives to the work of the country without payment. Such gentlemen are always found to take wings to themselves and fly off to another country, mostly to England, to spend their money there, where they find life more enjoyable. We have not that class here, and I am afraid that for many years we must not expect to have it, and the main reason for payment of members—and one on which this House should take its stand—is that only by means of payment of members is the door of this House thrown open to all comers. It is the only plan by which we can permit anyone in this country who is of the age of 30 years and upwards to become a candidate. We are told, forsooth, that men can obtain means and qualify themselves for this House; or, to use the words of the Colonial Secretary, that the constituents of the Legislative Council can choose whom they like to elect, and that such men have a right to step in here. What a hollow farce it is to tell the electors they can choose whom they please, when perhaps half-a-dozen men who are the men of their choice may be excluded from this House, owing to want of means. The argument will not hold water for a moment. If this door is open to the whole country, then I say we must take steps to show that the man who seeks election, and is elected, shall not be penalised even to the ruin of all his property and of his livelihood by taking a seat in the Legislative Council of Western Australia. The insulting reference of £100 per year is thrown to members here as one throws a piece of meat to a lion at a garden not far from this place, hoping that it will keep him quiet for a little while; giving him a little provender, not perhaps as much as he wants, but at all events while he is eating it he will hold his tongue. To my mind, this is in opposition to the Constitution Act, the Act under which we sit. They were careful when they gave us our Constitution Act to provide that there should be no property qualification

required for a member of the Lower House or the Upper House; that the doors of this place should be as open as the doors of the Legislative Assembly, always providing that the candidate obtained sufficient suffrages.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The officers of Parliament are paid the same in both Houses.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Yes, of course. The hon. member points that out, and it goes so far to show that members should be on the same footing. It is specially provided in the Constitution Act that the officers of both Houses of Parliament shall receive similar remuneration. But the point I want to make is this, that our Constitution Act specially provides that there shall be no property qualification. The words are, that any man who has lived two years in Western Australia and is 30 years old and upwards shall be eligible for election, and I assert that it is a hollow mockery to say that you may elect whom you like to serve in Parliament and to give that man only £100 a year or nothing. That is to say that a man who seeks election in this Chamber must be possessed of some means, and therefore of a property qualification. Absolutely the proposal goes to the destruction of what I have always considered one of the most valued privileges of this House, that any man in the colony over 30 years of age, no matter if he be the poorest man and the most honest who can be found within its bounds, shall be able to enter the Legislative Council. Any abolition of the money payment or any reduction of it as compared with the other House certainly places a man at a disadvantage. It amounts virtually to a repeal of the Constitution Act, which declares that there shall be no property qualification standing in the way of entrance to this Chamber. It has been stated by gentlemen (whose names I am afraid I am forbidden to state, whether I remember them or not) that the payment of members is solely a question of the franchise: that is, that £200 a year is a right thing for those elected on a lower franchise, and £100 a year is a fair thing, I presume, for those elected on the higher franchise. I see that was made a great deal of, but to my mind it is absolute nonsense. We all know that it is incorrect. It is not a

question of the franchise, but a question of a candidate elected by the people to serve them in one of the Houses of Parliament. Assuming that the franchise is to be the turning point, assuming that these questions are to be decided on the point whether there is household franchise or manhood suffrage, will the hon. member work it out a little more, and say that members of the lower House in Victoria or New South Wales should receive half of what they get, because half of their adult population is disfranchised? If the franchise is to be the test, then, where the women have not the franchise, the members should be paid less. The argument which follows is obvious. Then again, what are we to say to the plural vote, or where there is one man one vote. If we say it is a question of the franchise then we shall have to amend the constitution. Where we have women voting, where in other cases there is plural voting and in others absentee voting, how can that be regulated according to the franchise? The other amendment—although to a certain extent that is absurd—makes a difference between town and country members. We must all see that the position will lead us into absurdities, the ideas have no basis in the constitution, they are in the imagination of gentlemen who thought it would be best to cut down the payment of members of the Upper House. I have not much more to say, but what I wish to urge on the House is this, if we allow the principle to be established that this is a body of well-to-do men, in which a poor man however skilled and competent will not be allowed entrance; if it is to be assumed on any ground that there is a difference in the class of persons who enter the two Houses, then the House may bid good-bye to its day of influence and interest. There are two ways of bringing the Upper House into accord with the people of the country: one way is by making the Upper House obnoxious to the community at large, that is in a large measure to be achieved by seeing men get in here who will have the curse of property attached to them. It would be understood that these men came into a well-to-do House where means are an essential qualification, they come in here to a nice little club of a House and are opposed to all liberal reform. There is a

large class of persons, who are not true liberals or democrats, who would like to see the House in that position. How is the House to be brought into accord with the views of the people? There are methods of piling on members showers of abuse and calumny; members are threatened with popular indignation, with discredit in high places, and as we know by that famous saying which has not yet been forgotten: "By broken heads and flaming houses." That is one course, the other is surely wiser and better, to popularise the Upper House, to keep its doors free to everybody, to make its franchise as wide as possible with fair discrimination between the electors to the Lower and the Upper Houses, and to get above all, the voice of the people represented in the Houses by men of their own choice. God forbid we shall ever go through the experience of Victoria. In South Australia freedom has gradually broadened down from precedent to precedent by the wise statesmanlike actions of one man who has insisted on payment to the Upper House being equal to that of the Lower Chamber. I implore the House to stand firm on the point, for if the payment is not made equal, and I say without egotism, because personally it will not make much difference to me, but if a difference is made, I should cease to care to belong to a Chamber whose usefulness and best work were over.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Go to the other House.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That would be it. After the honour, the usefulness and the work of the Chamber are menaced, the next thing to be attacked would be the life of the House itself.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central): I do not intend to speak at any length on this measure, but I rise to support the second reading and also the retrospective clauses, as I sincerely wish to see the Bill become law. I believe from conversations I have had with members of another place that if the retrospective clauses are not passed the Bill will be wrecked. The Bill is a compromise. There is a large majority of conservative members who strongly oppose the measure, and I think it will be wise for members who sincerely desire to see payment of members introduced into Western Australia to overlook scruples and support the Bill with the

few amendments which are about to be suggested. It is said that a great many members of the Legislative Assembly may not get back after the next general election: they have worked this session, and they consider they should be paid for the work they have done. There is a large amount of reason in that contention, and it is the wish of a majority in this House—this is the first House that has passed a motion in favour of payment—that the Bill shall become law. I warn hon. members that if any attempt is made to interfere with the retrospective provision it may endanger the measure seriously.

HON. C. SOMMERS (North-East): As one member who has recently been elected I say that I was returned pledged to support payment of members. It has been pointed out that no property qualification exists, only that of age, for this Chamber. If that be so, it cannot be said as it has been stated in another place, and I believe it has been stated by the leader of the House here, that we are representatives of property. For myself, I do not represent much property, I am sorry to say, and there are others equally unfortunate who do not represent property. The Colonial Secretary says that we shall have an honorarium of £100 a year and a free pass: a great many of us although we have a free pass very seldom use it, it is no great interest to us personally, it is very little use to me. I want to point out that at all recent elections people have manifested themselves in favour of payment of members, and candidates have pledged themselves to the principle. If payment of members is desired by the people, why should we take on ourselves to say that the Bill shall be thrown out? All admit that payment is required, therefore the next question we have to consider is why there should be any distinction made between members of another place and members of this House? It is said we do not give as much time to the consideration of matters as members in another place do, but one would think that it was proposed to pay £2,000 a year to members in another place, and not a paltry £200. The Premier in introducing the Bill called the payment an honorarium, and he was quite right, as no member can say that £200 is

sufficient payment for services which he renders to the country; why £200 to a country member will scarcely pay his hotel bill. I am sorry to see that the amount proposed is not more than £200. As to making the Bill retrospective I agree to that. If the principle is right the payment should be made to apply to the beginning of the present session. I shall not take up the time of the House further, but I shall have something to say in Committee. I shall support the principle, and I shall support any amendment to increase the sum to be paid to members of this House, to the same amount as that to be paid to members of another place.

HON. A. JAMESON (Metropolitan-Suburban): I should like to add a word or two to the discussion in regard to the question of retrospection. I am thoroughly opposed to any law being made retrospective, especially in a Bill by which we are going to pay ourselves. I cannot support the retrospective clause in the Bill. I should like to say that we should not allow this to be a red-herring across the trail, so to speak. This House has already passed a motion in favour of payment of members and we are the constant factor in the situation. We are the factor that will be here after the other House has passed away and is not in existence. It is not a matter of great importance whether we pass the Bill immediately or in the near future. We know the House supports this measure and it is simply a matter for the electors to demand that candidates who make their appearance, and who are sent to the next Parliament, shall pass a Bill for payment. If the Bill is rejected this session there will be no great loss of time; the mere fact of the Bill being rejected, although I do not believe it will be, on the ground of the retrospection, will mean actually no loss to the country, for the members who go into the future Parliament can pass a Bill that the Parliament shall be paid. It is not necessary to bring forward arguments in favour of payment because this matter has already been discussed and it has been acknowledged that we are going to have payment of members. As to the payment being small for this House, after listening to the arguments of Mr. Hackett, everyone is convinced that it is a monstrous thing to make a difference

between the two Houses. We are elected according to the Constitution; our electors may not be so numerous as the electors for another place, still they pay taxes and we represent them and probably the electors for this House pay a larger share of the taxation of the colony than the electors for the Lower House, therefore it is a monstrous thing, that on the grounds of franchise, this House should be excluded from payment. If there is any House that should be paid it is this House, where there is an age qualification of thirty years, which is an acknowledgment that the men who sit in this House are men of greater experience than members of another place, therefore it is wrong not to make the payment equal. It is equally wrong to make the Bill retrospective, to go back to a time over which we have no control. I hope hon. members will keep up the honour and dignity of the House and not allow the Bill to pass.

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS (Central): I wish on the second reading to make a few remarks, as I may not have an opportunity otherwise. I am perfectly in accord with the remarks of Dr. Jameson and Mr. Hackett. I think Mr. Hackett gave a clear statement as to the effects of the Bill, and I am much in accord with him. I do not think that when the electors of this colony got candidates to pledge themselves to the principle of payment of members, they had any idea that the measure was to be a retrospective one. Dr. Jameson has expressed the views of the electors in regard to this matter, and I would like to point out that Mr. Hackett has explained exactly why the members of the Upper House in Victoria, which is an elective House, are paid *nil* for their services. I would also like to point out that as far as South Australia and Tasmania are concerned, where both Houses are elected, the payments to members of the Upper House and those of the lower House are exactly equal. In the case of South Australia it is £200 per annum, and in that of Tasmania it is £100 each. I am quite in accord with Mr. Hackett that to offer us £100 a year when we give our services to the country the same as members of another place, is an insult to this House, and, so far as I am concerned, I shall support any amendment made in

this Bill, whether it wrecks the measure or whether it does not, to put us on an equality with members of another place with regard to payment of members. I shall also support any amendment to make this Bill start from the next session of Parliament.

HON. A. P. MATHESON (North-East): I did not intend to speak on the second reading of this Bill, because my views on the matter of payment of members are perfectly well known. I did not feel there was any necessity, but I do want just to touch upon a point raised by Mr. Drew, and that is the question of whether the Bill will be jeopardised or not by any action taken in this House. I do not think that the argument of the hon. member is a proper argument to bring up in dealing with a Bill of this sort. We sit here to deal with Bills in accordance with the dictates of our consciences, and if we think any portion of a Bill should not be passed, we ought to vote, and I am sure other members agree with me, against such portion of the Bill, quite irrespective of whether the Bill will pass in another place. That is the first argument I would bring forward in dealing with this matter. The next one is this: When Mr. Drew says members of another place would reject this measure because we object, or we may object, to the payment being retrospective, it seems to me that the argument is not a nice one or a pleasant one for the members of another place to listen to, or rather read when they see it in the paper. And for this reason, because the implication—which I submit is not a proper one—is that those gentlemen have—

HON. J. M. DREW: They have said so themselves.

THE PRESIDENT: I will call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Drew) to the fact that he must not refer to any debates which have taken place in another place. That is distinctly laid down.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The suggestion is that a certain number of members in another place, who are really at heart opposed to this measure, have voted in favour of it on the undertaking or the suggestion that they will be themselves allowed to participate in what I may call the plunder. That is the obvious suggestion; that unless they are able to participate in this £200, a

number of gentlemen will vote against the measure when it is returned to them. I differ from the hon. gentleman. I do not think that when it came to the point a single member who was found voting in favour of the Bill as it stands at present, with this retrospective clause, would dare, because that retrospective clause was struck out, to vote against the Bill. Such a member in any Legislative Assembly of any colony, or in any place in the world, would find himself a marked man, and a man upon whom public abuse would follow in unmeasured quantities. It is impossible to suppose that any member would dare to vote in that direction, and therefore I ask hon. members to put any question of that sort quite aside, and dismiss it from their minds. I do not think it is a thing we should even consider possible.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I do not intend to say much upon this occasion, because perhaps I have not sufficiently considered the matter. I will say this honestly and frankly, that from the very first time I ever thought of entering Parliament I was opposed to payment of members, because I thought the representation of the colony ought to be by those who are independent and of mature intelligence and experience, vested interests and all men's rights being in the hands of those who would be careful to administer affairs in the best way they possibly could for the colony. There always was the feeling that those who had a large stake in the country, and who had many friends here, would be more likely to administer to the careful keeping of the rights of the colonists generally, than those who have little or no interest here. Upon these grounds it must be evident to everybody that, under the system of government which has hitherto existed, the colony would be better off in the hands of those who could afford to represent the different parts of the colony without payment, than it would be in the hands of those who would simply enter Parliament in order to receive a salary every year. But the circumstances of the colony now are very different from those which have hitherto prevailed. Throughout the colony the principle of federation has been accepted. The people would have federation, and we know that one of the principles of federation is that of

payment of members, therefore I hardly see that we can expect not to have to accept this principle. I do not profess to have the ability which some in this House possess, but I have the good sense generally to support those measures which are desirable; and I would be willing and ready to do the best I can for the country without being paid for it. I think there are many in the House who still hold these views. I will, however, bow to the decision of the House on the matter, and if they consider under the new *régime* resulting from federation the principle of payment of members is so confirmed that we must adopt it, I suppose we shall all have to fall in with that principle. If we are not to be paid the same proportion as members of the other House, we ought to say we will receive nothing at all, and will continue our services for the benefit of the country in the best way we possibly can gratuitously. I certainly do not consider it comes well from the other place to suggest that this House should receive a lower rate of payment than that which they themselves will have.

At 6.25, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.

At 7.45, Chair resumed.

HON. E. McLARTY (South-West): It is my intention to support the second reading, knowing as I do that the Bill is demanded throughout the country. For reasons that have been given by previous speakers it is necessary that a Bill should be passed to enable men, who are perhaps not in a position otherwise, to contest an election. I am not one of those who believe in payment of members under the present conditions. I think a man who will give up his time, who is sufficiently interested in the country and desires to see it prosper, is just as likely to give valuable services to the country as any man who may seek election for the sake of the £200 a year. I am not in accord with Mr. Sommers that £200 is not sufficient remuneration, taking into consideration the conditions of this country and that there are 70 members to be paid—

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Eighty.

HON. E. McLARTY: If we deduct the Ministers and the Speaker, that will

reduce the number to 70, therefore I think £7,000 is quite as much as the country can afford to pay. As to the retrospective clause, I regret that such a provision has been inserted. I do not think it will add to the dignity of this House or another place for members to vote this payment, and I should much prefer to have seen the Bill provide payment for the future and not for the past. The clause on which I desire to express my dissent before I agree to it is that dealing with the amount suggested to be paid to members of this House. I take it as an insult to members of this House that we should be offered £100, while for members of another place it is suggested that £200 a year shall be given. I am not going, so long as I have the honour of a seat in this House, to say that members in this place have not as much ability and honesty as members of another place, and I should prefer, personally, if members of this House are not to receive the same pay as members of another place, to see the Bill thrown out altogether, and to do as we have done in the past. We are sufficiently remunerated by the position in which we are placed, and the dignity of being a member of the Chamber. I most emphatically enter my protest against the unequal payment, and I hope members of this House will also protest against it. I shall be satisfied if the amount suggested for members in another place be reduced to £100, but I am not willing for members here to accept half the amount to be awarded to members of another Chamber. I enter my protest against that clause of the Bill.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): I am one of those who, up to the present time, have not been converted to the principle of payment of members; I never did believe in it, and I do not believe in it at the present time. The arguments adduced—and very able ones, too—have not in any way convinced me that if we get payment of members that the people will be any better represented.

HON. J. M. SPEED: They will not be worse, at any rate.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: They will not be better represented than at the present time. That being so, I think it will be better for the country, and much more beneficial, that this payment should be

devoted by the country to public purposes. The honour of serving in either House ought to be sufficient for any man. From my own observations in the other colonies, and I refer particularly to Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales, I do not think that payment of members has raised the tone of the Parliaments there, or their standard. I think the representatives in the Parliaments of the other colonies in the past were superior to the men they have today.

HON. M. L. MOSS: What was the legislation like, though?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: As time has gone on, legislation has grown more democratic; but, in the past, before there was payment of members, the Parliament gave as much attention to liberal measures, and went, as I may say, with the times. Whilst I do not believe in payment of members, I believe the majority in this land do believe in it, and that it will come, so that it would be futile on my part to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months, especially in face of the resolution so recently passed in this Chamber. Remarks have been made—I refer to those by Mr. Hackett—with respect to the Upper House in Victoria. He referred to the Upper House of that great colony in anything but flattering terms. I think the Upper House in Victoria has done remarkably good work; it has frequently prevented legislation of a bad type being passed, and on many occasions it has been the true backbone in the welfare of Victoria. In looking round at the *personnel* of the members of the Upper House—some of whom many members here know personally—I may say they are men of ability and wish well for their country; better men could not be found anywhere. The qualification for the Upper House of Victoria, I admit, seems somewhat high, being £100 a year; but, only a few years back, it was somewhat lower. I think the country would be quite as well served, and money saved to the State, if there were no payment of members; but if that does not meet with the wishes of the majority of members, and it is desired that payment shall be made, I do think the payment to both Houses should be made equal. Members who have pre-

viously spoken have mentioned that the £100, which was inserted in the Bill, should be considered as an insult; I agree with that view. If payment has to be made why should members of one House be paid less than those of another? This House devotes directly, and indirectly, quite as much time to public affairs and the affairs of Parliament, as a majority of members in another place do. Certainly our sittings are not so long, and the reason for that is that Bills are thrashed out before they come to us, and members here have more time to peruse the Bills than members of another place have; consequently it does not take so much time to deal with them here. I shall support any motion brought forward to make the payment to members of both Houses equal. With respect to the retrospective clause, I cannot see how any right-thinking man can support it. It is payment for past services, and in addition to that it is payment that members could not possibly have expected when they were elected as representatives of the various provinces or constituencies. Members were elected on the understanding that their services would be gratuitous, and it seems to me it would be only in the very worst taste to now vote money in payment for those services. If payment is to take place, let it be from the beginning of next session, not for the present session. It has been said that if the Bill is not passed in its present form it will be rejected in another place. So far as we are concerned, I think the answer should be let it be wrecked. The country will not suffer if we do not have the Bill. If those who support payment of members support it in a conscientious manner in another place they will not wreck the Bill because they are debarred from receiving money for past services. I hope hon. members will either strike out the clause, providing for £100 payment for the Upper House altogether, or make the payment equal. I would rather see no payment for the Upper House. I do not think the system has worked badly in Victoria, and I do not think it will work badly here, but if payment is insisted on by a majority of members of the House, I do hope members will see that each member here will receive equal payment with members of another place.

If a suggestion is sent back to that effect, I hope this House will, whether the Bill be wrecked or not, stick to its guns and insist on that. Of course, so far as payment is concerned, I am speaking of the future. It rests entirely with members themselves. If they disapprove of payment, they can expend the money in some form so that it will not be on their personal matters. If they are conscientiously opposed to payment, they can get themselves out of the difficulty, whilst those who believe in payment can receive the money conscientiously. As I said in opening, it is futile of me to oppose the Bill. I think the trend of feeling throughout the country is in favour of payment of members. I do not think the people are deciding wisely in taking that view, but we are ruled by majorities, and we have to bow to public opinion. There is one thing that struck me with reference to this House: there is no qualification required except that of age and residence, and I think the franchise exceedingly low. We may say that practically it is a householder's franchise. Having regard to that, it seems to me that this House practically represents the public generally quite as much as the Lower House. Surely this Council has been quite as liberal as the members of another place, and I do not think the payment of members will make public matters more democratic. Personally I protest against payment. I object to it, and I have ever done so, and none of the arguments used to-night have convinced me. I should be very pleased to see the Bill thrown out, but I do not think there is much opportunity of that being done; and if the Bill be not thrown out, I trust that the amendments urged by almost all the previous speakers will be insisted upon.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY (South): I intend to support the second reading of this Bill, and I feel sure that when the Bill is before the Committee such amendments will be introduced as will make it acceptable to all parties. I must confess that up to the present time I have not heard one single argument advanced against payment of members. We are now living in advanced times, and this colony is moving along rapidly. People are no doubt anxious to keep pace with the times, and to see Western Australia take her place politically amongst the more

advanced colonies. The people of this colony are desirous of securing this Bill. It appears to me that there are really only two differences at the present time. One is with regard to the amount proposed to be paid to members of this Chamber, which is a difficulty that I think might easily be got over; whilst the next is with regard to making the Bill retrospective, and I think that this difficulty might be easily surmounted by a compromise.

HON. F. T. O. BRIMAGE (South): I support the second reading of this Bill, but I think we should receive the same amount of payment as members of the Lower House. I also hold the opinion that the franchise for the Upper House should be somewhat reduced.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not before the House, the question before the House being payment of members, and not a reduction of the franchise.

HON. F. T. O. BRIMAGE: I beg your pardon. Anyhow, I think the time has arrived when members should be paid for their services. Work which is done for nothing is no good at all. All labourers are worthy of their hire; therefore I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill. I am hopeful that we shall send the Bill back with a suggestion that the same payment shall be given to members of this House as members of another place have voted for themselves. Payment of members will provide means for good men to come into Parliament, and I am quite in accord with Mr. Hackett when he says that the legislation of the eastern colonies is proof of the benefit resulting from the adoption of this principle. Although we can pass very good laws in both Houses of Parliament in Western Australia, I think the legislation will be still improved by payment of members.

HON. A. B. KIDSON (West): I take it that this very important matter has perhaps been debated to its limits. But, before the motion for the second reading is put, I should like to say a few words in connection with the Bill, and also in regard to some of the remarks that have fallen from hon. members in relation to it. It seems to me that a debate of this kind is at all events very instructive from many points of view, because it brings forward publicly the views which are

held by individual members in connection with a subject of this kind, which otherwise, perhaps, we might not be possessed of. In the first place, the attitude taken up by the Colonial Secretary in connection with this matter is an extraordinary one. He seemed to me, in the course of his speech (and I listened to him carefully), to uphold views first in one direction and then in another, with the result that it was almost impossible to come to a conclusion as to what views the hon. gentleman held in connection with the matter. With regard also to Mr. R. S. Haynes, that hon. member declared himself to be a convert to the principle of payment of members, and yet at the same time he referred to the principle as a vicious one. That was rather an extraordinary position to take up in connection with the matter, because, to my mind, it is always well to make a virtue of a necessity, and one is led to think rather that those hon. members who adopt that attitude in relation to this very important matter have been somewhat forced into the position they are taking up. There is not a shadow of doubt with regard to payment of members, that the country has absolutely decided the point, and will insist that not only shall payment of members take place, but that payment shall be made forthwith, and not, as suggested by one hon. member in the course of his speech, be deferred to the next Parliament. People wish the Bill to be passed by the present Parliament, so that when the next general election takes place, that principle shall be the law.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: That is not retrospective.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I am not talking of the retrospective part of it; but I am urging that the principle shall be made law so that the electorates shall have an opportunity of sending as their representatives men whom they would not otherwise have an opportunity of sending. There are one or two members who, if I may be permitted to refer to them in such a strain, seem to me to be somewhat like relics of the past. I refer to the Hon. S. J. Haynes, who, in the course of his remarks, struck me as belonging to an era long gone by. The principles of to-day are not such as were put forward by that hon. member this

evening; but they have, I may point out to that hon. member, if he does not know it, advanced very considerably beyond that stage. There is no doubt that the principles he put forward to-night will no longer hold water in this colony or in any other part of Australia. I do not know that it is necessary for me to refer very much to the principle of payment of members, because it has been absolutely decided in this House that the principle shall be adopted. There was a resolution passed in this House some time ago to that effect. Therefore it is almost idle and a waste of time to debate the question of the principle. There are one or two points in the Bill I would like to allude to which have been referred to at some length by previous hon. members, and the first is the difference which has been made to exist between the honorarium to hon. members in another place and that to members of this House. I do not like to endeavour to find reasons why that difference was made, but it seems to me that in putting forward such a difference, very like an insult has been directed towards the members of this House. With regard to retrospective payment, I certainly set my face against that. I do not think it is necessary, nor do I believe it would be correct, to make the payment or honorarium commence from the beginning of this session, and particularly for this reason. I would point out that payment is not to be made to hon. members simply during the time the Houses of Parliament are sitting, but from month to month, as I understand it, during the time they remain members of Parliament, and therefore to my mind the honorarium should be made to commence at the time the Bill is made law, or at a time to be made or fixed in the Bill itself. It would be carrying out the principle properly and correctly if the payment were to be made, say, from the time the Bill is assented to, and becomes law, because there can be no reason why that should not be so. I hope some hon. member will move in the direction I have suggested and do away with the idea of retrospective payment. I do not think one member here could honestly uphold retrospective payment to any members of the House. I think that is an idea that renders the pro-

posal objectionable to all of us, and would not commend itself to right-thinking persons. It does not do away with the idea that it is quite within the bounds of what is correct, if payment of the honorarium be made from the time—I should suggest—when the Bill is passed into law. I do not know that there is anything objectionable in that, but I should like to hear what other hon. members have to say on the point. I hope nothing will be done in this House by way of amendment if it will have the effect of endangering the passage of the measure into law. There is not the shadow of a doubt the country wishes the measure passed into law, and I think it would be wrong if the House did anything that would have the effect of stopping the passage of the Bill.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): I do not intend to say much on this occasion with reference to this Bill, but I do not consider £100 a year sufficient payment for members of the Legislative Council; still I say I would rather sit in this House for £100 a year than in the other chamber for £200 a year, and have to listen to what takes place there.

HON. H. LUKIN (East): It was not my intention to have said anything on this Bill to-night, but as there has been a general debate I feel it my duty to say what I think about the Bill. On the principle, I am with the Colonial Secretary, as I always have been. I am opposed in principle to payment of members, but, recognising as I do that we have arrived at a time when the consensus of opinion evidently is in favour of the measure, we can only accept the inevitable. As far as democratic views go, I will not give way, even to Mr. Hackett, in that respect. I always have contended that legislation should be of the greatest good for the greatest number, and whatever else happens I always go on those lines.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: You do not call £100 the greatest good.

HON. H. LUKIN: We are not considering that view. It has always grated on me since I came into the House how we always follow the other colonies in legislative matters. It always seems to be a conclusive argument to say that a measure obtains in another colony; I think that is a mistake. The other

colonies may be ahead of us in many matters, but we should accept the good and reject the evil of the legislation which is passed elsewhere. A member has only to advance the argument that a similar Bill has been passed in the other colonies and it seems that we should go in the same direction. If we are to have payment of members, we should have it on better lines than that in vogue elsewhere. If we pass the Bill as it is it opens the way for the political agitator—men after “the loaves and the fishes.” In this colony I admit there may be many good men who would be, by payment, enabled to come into this House, because they have not the means at present to give their time to Parliamentary matters. But could not a sum of money be set aside for persons who are not able to pay their expenses, and not make the payment, as a salary, to every member.

HON. J. M. SPEED: That would be making paupers of some members.

HON. H. LUKIN: No; it would be an amount set apart for that purpose. If we provide a stated salary we make the House the place for unscrupulous political agitators who make a scramble for “the loaves and fishes.” That is my objection to payment of members as a principle. I think there should be payment to allow good men, who cannot afford to waste their time, or rather give up their time, for the sake of their constituencies, to have an opportunity of doing so.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: You would not be able to go away for harvest time then.

HON. H. LUKIN: Such a system as I suggest would not injure anyone. If we take payment of members as it obtains in the other colonies, we must recognise that it is only on trial there.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It has been on trial a long time.

HON. H. LUKIN: What is 20 or 30 years in a matter of this sort, and only last week, I daresay members may have seen it, in the *Australasian* there was a leading article—and all must recognise that the *Australasian* does not print leading articles at random—which stated that payment of members in Victoria had had the effect of lowering the status of the House.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The *Australasian* is a generation old.

HON. H. LUKIN: The *Australasian* is one of the leading papers of Australia.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Do not say that. It is most inaccurate; it attacks this colony on most unjust grounds.

HON. H. LUKIN: Take the English House of Commons, the greatest legislative body in the world. Members there have never received payment, and that body has remained sound and good to this day.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It is coming there, though.

HON. H. LUKIN: We may say it is coming, but the House has been in existence a good many hundred years, and payment has not come there yet.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: They pay themselves in a dozen ways.

HON. H. LUKIN: If we are to have payment of members here we certainly will be making a great mistake if we accept anything lower than the sum suggested to be given to members of another place. It will certainly be derogatory if we accept the Bill as it is; but, if we are to accept the measure at all, we should have the same payment for both Houses. I only hope, when a division takes place, that this provision will be insisted upon, or that the Bill will be thrown out altogether.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN (Metropolitan-Suburban): I have listened with considerable attention to the addresses or speeches that have been made during the afternoon in connection with the Bill, and I am here to say distinctly that I cannot for a moment approve of the Bill being passed by the Chamber in its present form. Of course we know, those who are acquainted with the history of Australia or Australasia, that payment of members obtains in the other colonies; therefore we have to a certain extent to follow in the footsteps of legislators who have gone before us. Those politicians have been to a certain extent, and probably still are, more experienced than we who are resident in Western Australia, in regard to the legislation of the different colonies which they represent; therefore I think we should do perfectly right, and will not be making a mistake, in following in the lines of the arguments they have made use of. The legislators of the various colonies which have been enumerated, particularly by Mr. Hackett,

must have known what they were talking about at the time they agreed to payment of members of both Houses. I cannot for a moment see any reason whatever why members of the Upper House should be asked to accept a lower rate than the members of the Legislative Assembly. Is it possible for any member of the community to say that the members comprised in this House have not the same business acumen or the same legislative ability as members of the Lower House? and to ask us to accept half the sum which members in another House are asked to accept is an insult to members of this Chamber. I say that members of the Lower House should have considered this Bill in a more able and more artistic manner than they have done, and not to have offered us, as they have, this insult which is contained in the Bill, and to ask us to sit down as a lot of schoolboys and pass the measure. I am sorry beyond all measure of expression to have heard Mr. Moss address the House as he did this afternoon, and make the proposition that members of this House who are not here on certain occasions should be fined for their non-attendance. I say it is trumpery.

HON. C. SOMMERS: Make them write a hundred lines.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN: It is two-penny-halfpenny and undignified, and should not have been brought before the consideration of hon. members. We have other duties to perform; we have not only to sit in this House, but we have other things to do. It may have been said that because we engaged in duties for the service of the country and our fellow-men, that because we are not able to take our seats at a certain time, black marks should be put against our names. I say that is a monstrosity, a most absurd proposition to make, and I for my part will not agree to it. If members are against me and say it shall be the law of the land, I shall never enter this Chamber again. I now come to the pertinent question about the payment to members, and I am agreed that members of both Houses should be paid. If I were not here occupying the position I do, but were only a voter, I should say that any man who serves his country is entitled to be paid in a fair manner. We have no right to ask gentlemen of position, whether

they own property or whether they are supposed to own it, to give up hours of precious time for the service of the country without being rewarded in a fair and equitable manner. Although our time may not be occupied as long as that of members of the Lower House, unmistakably more work is accomplished here than in the other House; therefore I say most distinctly I shall not take part in having the Bill before the House passed unless the Lower House is prepared to pay the members of this Council on the same footing as members of another place wish to stand themselves. In regard to members voting money to themselves, dating from the time when this session started, I say most distinctly that this should not be. The members of this Council are the representatives of the people; they are put here because they are supposed, or are believed, to be honest straightforward gentlemen. They are put here as the guardians or custodians of the finances of the country generally, and it ill behoves any member in this Chamber to advance or advocate for one moment that members, individually or collectively, should vote to themselves money out of the public exchequer. Before I sit down I want to say most distinctly that I will not be a party, directly or indirectly, to any member of this Council voting to himself money out of the public purse, to which he has no claim or title, because when members joined this Chamber or the Lower House they did so on their own responsibility. Privately and individually they had no thought whatever that such a Bill would be brought forward as that providing for payment of members. They took the obligation on their own hands, and I say it is mean, contemptible, and dishonest for members to ask the country at the present time to pass this Bill, and to pay to themselves this money for 12 months back.

HON. J. M. DREW: Four months back.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: Four months; not twelve months.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN: Well, four months. I say that no member has any right to vote to himself money he is not entitled to. I am in accord with the Bill to a certain extent, for I think the people who represent the masses in both Houses should be paid, and they should receive an equivalent sum, which should not be

a paltry £100 a year. But no payment whatever should be made to any member of either House until the Bill, if passed, becomes the law of the land.

HON. J. M. SPEED (Metropolitan-Suburban): Like many others, I did not intend to say anything upon this Bill; but there is one point on which I think I may say a few words, that being with respect to the £200 a year which members of this House require. I think they should have that amount. If we are going to have any amount at all, we should have such a sum as will allow a man, however poor he may be, to come into this Chamber, if the constituents of his province send him there. That is the point on which we have to take our stand, in my opinion, with regard to payment of members. With regard to the retrospective clause, I am afraid that this House is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. Members object to our having this small amount of money for four months, whilst knowing that the people of the colony have for the last three years decidedly been in favour of payment of members; and the people are quite satisfied that their members should get that money whether it be for four months or not. I do not think there is the slightest doubt about it, my belief being that if a referendum were taken to-morrow or next week, you would find a greater majority in favour of the principle than there was for federation.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: We are not hard up.

HON. J. M. SPEED: It is not a question of whether members are hard up, but what the people think members ought to get. Any member is at perfect liberty to leave that money in the Treasury, if he chooses to.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Will you do it?

HON. J. M. SPEED: If I do not leave it in the Treasury, I will devote it to a public purpose, and I shall have the disposal of it myself; that is the only difference. Mr. S. J. Haynes was good enough to say he did not believe in payment of members. He does not need to take the money out of the public treasury, but he may leave it there, and I trust that his idea on the question of payment of members is not the reason why Albany is stationary and Fremantle is going ahead. I come back to the point

I was trying to get at before, and it is this: We give payment of members in order that the people may get the best choice of members. Take all the members in this House. There is not one member here who has been elected in that way. They were elected without payment of members being in force at that time, and consequently, if this House is going to say this retrospective amount is not to be given, the whole number of those members should, to be consistent, resign before the next election, and then allow other men, who will perhaps come forward in the event of payment of members, to enter into open competition with them.

A MEMBER: Will you do it?

HON. J. M. SPEED: I will certainly do it, if the other members of the House will do so. I do not think you will find them prepared to do it, more especially if payment of members be in force.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not think you would do it.

HON. J. M. SPEED: That is the position I take up. If those members are to be logical, they should receive no salary, no honorarium, or whatever you like to call it, until they have been before their electors and allowed other men to come into competition with them on the hustings. That, I say, is the logical conclusion. Otherwise, I think they had better not risk this Bill, as they may probably do, over a small matter like that.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE (Central): It seems to me that there is rather a difficulty in regard to this Bill. If the Council at present decide that they should not vote money to themselves this session, the same difficulty will arise next session. Although there will be a newly-elected House elsewhere, which will be inclined to pass payment to members of Parliament, the same objection will arise here, because the identical members here at present will still be sitting in the House, and they will find themselves blocked from appropriating, so to speak, public funds. That, in my opinion, is a very small difficulty. If this principle is to be adopted at all, it will be just as well to adopt it this year as next, and it might just as well have been adopted last year. If there is a difficulty about dating back to the 15th of August, let us start when the Bill comes into force. For my own

part, I say that the amount should take the form of an honorarium instead of a monthly payment. That is the only difficulty in the way. So far as the principle is concerned, it has been affirmed in the country for the last three years.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Not before the last election.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: The earliest election I remember at which the question was brought forward was as far back as eight years ago: that being an occasion of an election of members of the Legislative Council. At the election of members of this Council three years ago, the question was brought forward, and candidates had to pledge themselves one way or the other. Most of those who pledged themselves in favour of payment of members received the greatest amount of support from their constituents.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Question.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: I am not prepared to give the figures showing the number of votes recorded for members of the Council, nor the names of the candidates. I daresay that in the district represented by Mr. Burgess, the question was not dealt with at all, because we know that the majority of his province are opposed to the principle of payment of members. Where the subject has been debated at all before the electors, it has been the question of payment of members, and not the payment of one of the two Houses. Therefore I take it the Bill must provide for payment of members of both Houses; and while it provides for payment of both Houses, there is no logical reason why there should not be equal payment for members of both Houses. It is not a question of there being more work in one House than in the other, or of there being greater responsibility in regard to finance in one House than in the other. It seems to me that the responsibility is equal in both respects. If there is no responsibility on this House in regard to financial matters, why should the Bills come before us? We have the power to deal with them by way of suggestion or rejection. We have to take the responsibility of legislation, and so long as the responsibility is cast upon us, we shall come under the ordinary category of members of the Legislature, and as such we should come under the Bill for pay-

ment of members, and there should be no distinction made between the remuneration, if you like to call it so, paid to this House and that paid to members of another place. I do not like it in the form of remuneration or monthly payment, but would rather see it in the form of an honorarium, because if we establish the fact of monthly payments in the form of salaried remuneration, we shall probably get further, and make payment of members a personal perquisite free of the claim of all creditors. They put their members elsewhere in a distinct position, whereby creditors cannot deal with the money members receive for their legislative duties. I should like to see not only the second reading of this Bill go through, but to see the Bill with one alteration passed through Committee.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (South): I have some diffidence in speaking after the able speeches delivered in this matter. I do not think members have considered the retrospective clause, which I intend to speak on. This matter was hardly before the constituencies at all when the other House was elected. That was nearly four years ago, and the subject was hardly thought of then. I do not think members expected when they were elected that they would receive payment at all. In my opinion our finances are not in such a good position that we can be so lavish in expenditure. In fact I think that the very Government we are under would have retired long ago and have allowed this matter to go to the country, if they had done their duty. Speaking in reference to this subject, other matters crop up, and Mr. Hackett has particularly referred to the question of federation. We know that only last year the representation of both Houses in this colony was increased, and as far as that increase is concerned, we have it in this House already. I am sorry to say the other House has not had that increase yet. There is a total addition in the two houses of ten members, and that at £200 a year each gives a total of £2,000 for them. If the present Government intended to support federation, they ought never to have increased the representation of these two Houses. People can read the papers, and see what is going on in other parts of the world, and they must be well aware that all the

other Australian States are trying to reduce the expenditure already. We are running into extravagance, although we have adopted federation, and have to submit to the consequence, which means that we shall have a lesser revenue.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: What is the extravagance?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The extravagance of increasing the number of members in our Parliament, and the very Government introducing this measure were the means of that, because they would not stand by their policy. They were afraid to stand by the policy which they took up. I moved the recommittal of the Bill to give additional representation for satisfying our goldfields friends who were everlastingly crying out for additional representation. If that additional representation had not been given, the six extra members would not be in the House now. If we had not given that additional representation we should not have had this Bill, and we should not lose revenue. I do not think the retrospective clauses are satisfactory. I think members of Parliament should not expect to be paid until the next session, but I will go so far as to agree to payment being made as soon as the Bill is passed, or the first of January. If we pass the Bill as it is we are voting money to ourselves, and I do not think we should be too lavish with the money of the country in that respect. Now I come to the matter of the payment to the two Houses. It is suggested that the members of the Assembly shall receive £200 a year, and the members of this House £100. If any hon. member think we are not worth as much as members in another place are and will vote for such a proposal, then I say the sooner he leaves this House the better. He will lower himself in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of members of this House if he will vote for the Bill as it stands.

HON. H. LUKIN: You must have a very poor opinion of members.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It is said that we do not do as much work as members in the other House, but members in the Assembly make work for themselves; there is a great deal of talk and very little work done. We must not forget that the responsibility of passing Bills rests with us. We cannot pass important

measures and loan works, unless we look into them very carefully. Very often measures are passed by the Assembly in a slipshod manner, the members of another place knowing that this House will block the measures when they come before us. That is why members of this House should be paid equal to the members of another place. If we are not to receive the same amount we had better not have anything at all. Some members have thrown out a threat, which I do not think altogether Parliamentary, that if we do not pass this clause it will wreck the Bill. I do not think we ought to consider that at all; we ought not to give up our independence.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN: Certainly not.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I hope hon. members will not forget themselves. If the House is to be of any use at all, members should not say that if we pass this measure it will jeopardise the Bill in another place. If hon. members take up that position then the sooner we are "wiped out" the better. I do not want the Bill or the money, but I do not think I am so dull of comprehension or take so little notice of what is going on as not to know what public opinion is like. We know that public opinion has said that payment of members must be passed. It is just like federation; if we do not give it to the people we shall get something worse perhaps. We may get what we have got already, and which we have no business to have.

HON. C. SOMMERS: The rabbit pest.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: We shall have to submit to payment of members whether we like it or not. My opinion is that we do not want payment of members. I do not want payment for myself, and I do not care whether I am in Parliament or not. But every man should be paid for his work. It is unreasonable to expect members to come long distances if they cannot afford to do so. It has been pointed out by Mr. Lukin that we could make provision for those men who could not afford the expense. I do not like a provision such as that. I believe there is one member in another place whose constituents offered to pay his expenses, but he said that he could not accept the money as it would make him look like a pauper. This matter has already been thrashed out, therefore it is unnecessary

to continue to debate the Bill longer. I am surprised that members in another place only voted £100 a year for members here; but in doing that they were only putting a thorn in their own path. If it was passed that members in this place were to have £100 a year, and members in another place £200, as soon as the next general election came, I should contest one of the seats for another place. I certainly would do so; that would be the proper test to see if we are not as good as members in another place are. We should find that every man of any ability or independence, would contest seats for another place. I would be glad to see the Bill passed if for that reason alone, still I think the proposal is an insult. I shall vote for the second reading and when the Bill goes into Committee I shall oppose the retrospective clause. I do not mind meeting hon. members, by making the date for the Bill to come into operation, the 1st of January, or the passing of the measure, because that will not make much difference, as the Bill will not be passed for some little time now, and I do not think members in another place will quarrel over such a suggestion. If we make the date the 1st of January, that will mean only half a year's revenue, and no doubt the Government will have to make some provision on the Estimates for the amount. There will have to be Supplementary Estimates to provide this money, and people will have to be further taxed. Before the next financial year is at an end, we may have other things to meet which we are unaware of now. With these remarks I shall support the Bill, but in Committee I shall challenge one or two clauses.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Members to be paid:

HON. M. L. MOSS: In accordance with the suggestion made on the second reading, he moved that in line 1 the word "present" be struck out, and "next" inserted in lieu. That would get rid of the retrospective provision of the Bill. He might assure Mr. R. S. Haynes that he had no desire to pose before the public as one who was anxious to see the

Bill not made retrospective but yet willing to take the payment. If the clause passed in its present form, he (Mr. Moss) did not desire to do different from any other member; he would take the payment. He had no desire to pose before the public as a particularly philanthropic member, although he opposed the retrospective action of the clause. It was improper to include any retrospective provision in the Bill. He moved: "That a suggestion be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly that in line 1 the word 'present' be struck out and 'next' inserted in lieu.

HON. C. SOMMERS: It was his intention to move that the words "first day of the present session of Parliament" be struck out, and "as and from the passing of this Act" be inserted in lieu.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It was possible we should be acting irregularly if we amended the Bill even by a word. He thought the whole thing would have to go as a suggestion.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would be understood as a suggestion.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The question was whether the Committee had the right to make suggestions at all; whether the suggestions, if made, should not be made by the Council sitting as a House.

HON. C. SOMMERS: The Council would approve the recommendation of the Committee.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would be all right.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: On former occasions we made proposals in Committee, and the House adopted the proposals of the Committee, and directed them to be sent to another place.

HON. M. L. MOSS: An amended clause?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Yes; we made a suggestion, and the House adopted it.

HON. R. G. BURGESS drew attention to Standing Order No. 169, which stated that "Amendments may be proposed to a proposed amendment as if such proposed amendment were an original question."

HON. C. SOMMERS moved that the Legislative Assembly be requested to strike out "first day of the present session of Parliament," and to insert the words, "passing of this Act," in lieu. That would get rid of a good many objections which had been raised, and do

away with the slur, he might so call it, about members voting money for past services. This would be a compromise.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The only thing he saw about Mr. Sommers' proposed amendment was that it proposed to pay members for no services at all, because after the passing of this Bill the Parliament would absolutely cease to exist, so far as the other House was concerned, and no member of this House would render any services before the next session.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We were liable to be called upon at any moment.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Then we got to the next session, which was exactly the point. He certainly thought that if we accepted the proposal now before us, we should make ourselves absolutely ridiculous in the eyes of the country. The proposal of Mr. Moss that payment should date from the next session of Parliament was a logical proposal, and one that could be defended, but the proposal by Mr. Sommers had no logic about it. If it was wrong to vote money for past services, it surely was equally wrong to vote money for no services at all, and under the circumstances he (Mr. Matheson) would support Mr. Moss.

THE CHAIRMAN: We were putting the proposal as a suggestion.

Amendment (Mr. Sommers's) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	16

Majority against ... 8

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. W. G. Brookman
Hon. T. F. Brimage	Hon. B. G. Burgess
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. W. Maley	Hon. A. Jameson
Hon. C. Sommers	Hon. H. Lukin
Hon. J. M. Speed	Hon. A. P. Matheson
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. D. McKay
(Teller).	Hon. E. McLarty
	Hon. M. L. Moss
	Hon. G. Randall
	Hon. J. E. Richardson
	Hon. H. J. Saunders
	Hon. Sir George Shenton
	Hon. W. Spencer
	Hon. F. Whitcombe
	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Moss's) put, and passed on the voices.

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the Legislative Assembly be requested to

strike out the word "one," in line 5, and insert "two" in lieu.

Put and passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Bill be returned to the Legislative Assembly, with a Message recommending the amendments which had been suggested, and that on the receipt of a Message in reply the Committee have leave to sit again.

HON. M. L. MOSS: There was a proposed new clause standing on the Notice Paper in his name, and if that was not dealt with now it would be necessary to send the Bill to the Legislative Assembly a second time. If the Colonial Secretary would postpone the motion until the proposed new clause was dealt with, then it would obviate the necessity of sending the Bill backwards and forwards.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill could be returned as often as we liked.

HON. J. W. HACKETT suggested that the motion be withdrawn, and that Mr. Moss be allowed to move the proposed new clause as an addition to Clause 3.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY asked leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

New clause:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that a suggestion be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly that the following be added:—

All payments to be made under the last preceding section shall be subject to the provisions following, that is to say,—

- (1.) If during any session any member shall absent himself for any number of sitting days exceeding ten, there shall be deducted from the payment to be made to such member for every sitting day (exclusive of such ten sitting days) during which he may be absent, the sum of One pound.

The exemption from penalty in respect of absence for 10 sitting days during any session shall be reckoned from the commencement of such session and allowed accordingly, after which all deductions in respect of the absence of a member shall be made from the monthly payment to be made to such member next ensuing after the occurrence of such absences respectively.

- (2.) The preceding provision as to the deduction to be made in the case of absence of any member in attendance on Parliament shall not apply where such absence is caused by reason of illness, or from any other cause which shall, by the certificate of the President of the Legislative Council, or the Speaker of the

Legislative Assembly, be therein stated to be unavoidable.

The object of the clause was to penalise members of either branch of the Legislature who absented themselves for a longer period than ten days, to the extent of £1 for every sitting-day on which a member absented himself. There was a proviso that the penalty should not be deducted if the President or the Speaker gave a certificate that the absence of the member was attributable to unavoidable cause. Mr. Brookman's observations in regard to the proposal appeared to be extremely out of place. The hon. member had stated that the proposed new clause was a monstrosity, and he had threatened that if the clause was passed he would never sit again in this House. That was rather strong language for a member of the Legislative Council to use, and no doubt members would regret very much if Mr. Brookman thought fit to take such a drastic step, still that did not deter him (Mr. Moss) from moving in the direction because he thought the principle a good one. From some experience in the other branch of the Legislature he might say that there were numerous occasions on which, with a bare quorum present, important business was transacted.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN: It would bring the House into contempt.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Such a provision was in force in New Zealand.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Then we should drop it at once.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The clause would be useless. Often the business of the House was carried on with a bare quorum; would such a provision alter the state of affairs. The absence of members from the House was not because they were not in Perth, for often members were within call of the House, but would not take the trouble to come into the House. It was not right for members to have to come 300 or 400 miles to sit for a quarter of an hour, or an hour in a week.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It would be unfair to country members to pass such a clause. Country members had to journey long distances to sit, perhaps, for a few hours, and it was not reasonable to ask them to do this if no important business was to be brought

forward. It was very easy for town members to put in an appearance.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member was taking an extreme view.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That was a view that was justified, but it was on behalf of country members that he spoke so that they should not be penalised.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The second sub-clause of the proposed new clause contained ample provision for country members. In case of illness, or any other unavoidable cause, in the opinion of the President, which conduced to the absence of members, a certificate could be procured and no deduction would then be made. If the absence of a country member was avoidable, he should be penalised. Members of both branches should be prepared to give their time to carry out their duties.

HON. C. SOMMERS: There was an old saying that legal members made suggestions so that a coach and four could be driven through an Act of Parliament, and the hon. member was endeavouring to do that now. Town members seemed to think that country members had nothing to do but to rush down long distances from the country to save a black mark, to the extent of £1 fine being placed against their names. This payment was not intended as a remuneration for services rendered, but as an honorarium to reimburse members. The hon. member who had just spoken said it was easy to get an excuse. That reminded one of a child playing truant.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER said he had no wish to defend any member's absence from the House, particularly when there was business of great importance to transact, but the amendment would have come better from one who resided a considerable distance from this Chamber, than from one who lived close to it. Very often there was business which was not of great importance, and which hardly necessitated the attendance of members from great distances.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: In opposing this it would be hardly necessary to do more than refer to the transactions of last session. During the whole of that and the preceding session he was living at Geraldton, and he was brought down four times at least during the session to

find that there was nothing to be done except half an hour's work, and he could have been stopped by telegram. If he had come a journey of 300 miles each way to attend a sitting of two hours' duration, with nothing to be done, he would have exhausted something like 15 or 16 sitting days, during which no good could possibly have been accomplished by his attendance, as the business consisted of no good work, but purely formal matters. He could not have given any reasons for unavoidable absence, yet at the same time, had this proposal been in force, he would have been penalised some £5 or more.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: One had a great deal of sympathy with the amendment by Mr. Moss, but at the same time that suggestion would not meet the circumstances of the case, for the reasons adduced by several members. If members would carry their minds back they would remember that some very exceptional cases of non-attendance had occurred, and such cases occurred also in another place as well; therefore, one was not surprised to find that a member objected to this sort of thing, and, at any rate, drew the serious attention of members to the necessity of discharging the duties entrusted to them by their constituents. If this amendment would have any effect in that direction he would be inclined to support it, but in his opinion it would not, and, as hon. members had shown, it could be defeated in many ways. A member could come to the House and have his name registered on the clerk's list, and then go out and not appear again during the sitting. We had in the Standing Orders sufficient power to inflict a penalty upon any member who was guilty of a contempt of the House by absenting himself during a session fourteen days in succession.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Anybody could get leave of absence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That rested with the House. If the House would not carry that order into effect the House had itself to blame. Mr. Hackett spoke very strongly on this subject two or three years ago, and the House was with him, but at the same time a tenderness of feeling towards absentee members induced the House still to excuse one

from attendance. Standing Order 17 said :

No member, during the session, shall absent himself for more than a fortnight at a time without express leave of absence from the Council; and any member wilfully infringing this order may be declared guilty of contempt.

Standing Order 38 said :

If any member shall misconduct himself in the Council, or interrupt the orderly conduct of business, or wilfully disobey any order of the Council, he may be declared guilty of contempt.

Then there were certain pains and penalties.

HON. J. W. HACKETT : If a member was absent from a session for two consecutive months without leave he ceased to be a member.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY suggested to Mr. Moss that the amendment should be withdrawn.

SIR G. SHENTON : This was a matter on which he might exercise his right to speak as a private member. While fully agreeing with many of the remarks of the mover of this amendment, he was of opinion that the amendment was almost too drastic for it to be passed at the present time, although he agreed that the rules of the House had been evaded by some members, and town members too, coming here and getting their names recorded as being present, and then absenting themselves from the rest of the sitting. During this session more than once we had had a difficulty to keep a quorum of members, and this was a state of affairs hardly creditable to the members of the House. Of course, as the Colonial Secretary, the leader of the House, had stated, the House had the power in its own hands by the standing rules and orders, and if a member was absent more than 14 days without leave he subjected himself to a fine of £50. Still, there was a way of getting over this contempt by a member coming in and having his name put down and then absenting himself for the remainder of that session. Mr. Moss would be wise in withdrawing his amendment at the present time. If the hon. member found next session, after payment of members had come into force, that members absented themselves, he would have just reason for bringing in the amendment he had now introduced. There was one thing about payment of members, and that was that when this

principle was in operation the constituents would doubtless look more sharply after the attendance of members than they did at the present time.

HON. M. L. MOSS : In view of the strong expression of opinion which had fallen from several members, he asked leave to withdraw the clause, particularly in view of the fact that if it were passed—and he did not think there was much chance of that, judging from the tenor of the debate—there might be a possibility of its complicating the issue we had with the other Chamber.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY,

The Chairman reported that the Committee recommended the Bill to be returned to the Legislative Assembly, with a request that the Assembly should make the two amendments suggested by the Committee.

Leave given for the Committee to sit again, on receipt of Message in reply from the Assembly.

Bill returned to the Assembly with Message accordingly.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL. RECOMMITTAL.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Bill be read a third time.

On motion by Hon. R. G. BURGESS, Bill recommitted for certain amendments.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 9—Amendment of 62 Vict., No. 37, Section 148:

HON. R. G. BURGESS : This Bill had been brought in to meet one or two cases in certain districts, but we should remember that we were not dealing with Land Regulations now, but with a Land Act, which people had to abide by. A leaseholder, say, in the south-western portion of the colony, might take up 20,000 or 30,000 acres of land. The leaseholder would make improvements by erecting shearing sheds, buildings, putting down wells and dams, and he could spend £3,000 or £4,000 in one dam alone. The settler might extend his holding by taking up three or four blocks connected with his homestead. A few years afterwards a selector could come along and take up three of the blocks at once as a selection, and the pastoral lessee was deprived of

the improvements; all he got was the value of the fence. On one occasion he (Mr. Burges) was fool enough to fence in a lot of land in the eastern district; it was sand-plain country which he had taken up with other land. A few years afterwards the goldfields were discovered, and the Government ran a railway through the land, cutting off five or six miles of his fence—rendering the land useless. It was no use fighting the Government in those days, because it only meant robbery. He (Mr. Burges) went to the Commissioner of Railways, who passed him on to the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and the Commissioner of Crown Lands passed him out. He (Mr. Burges) had to employ men to put up another fence, and he never got a penny compensation to this day. That was an injustice which should not occur under the British law; it was a disgrace. The same thing might occur in regard to the pastoral leases in the north-western or south-eastern portions of the colony. Instead of the Government ignoring the rights of the leaseholders, the Government should value the improvements and give the leaseholder just value for the improvements which had been made. No leaseholders had spoken to him about this Bill. The measure referred to the whole of the colony, not to any one particular place, and he had received legal advice on the matter. If the Bill was passed it would cause a great deal of injustice in the future. He moved that Clause 9 be struck out.

On motion by HON. J. M. DREW, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

NOXIOUS WEEDS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration resumed from previous sitting at Clause 7, on which the Hon. R. G. Burges had moved an amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In reference to this Bill, he had on the Notice Paper a new clause in place of Clause 4, which had been struck out. He had endeavoured to meet the expressions of opinion by Mr. Lukin, Mr. Burges, and others, and he thought he was now able to do so. The new clause had reference to providing that a municipal council, roads board, or the Advisory

Board of the Department of Agriculture might advise the Governor as to what weeds should be declared noxious.

HON. R. G. BURGESS said he would like his amendment to stand after that of the Colonial Secretary.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The new clause could not be moved till the end, and he did not think the hon. member would want his amendment now.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Settlers in the South-West Province and the East Province, the two chief districts in Western Australia, did not want all this power put into the hands of the inspectors. The general opinion was that a municipal council or roads board would not altogether meet the case, but we wanted some other board, and if this power were put into the hands of inspectors who know nothing whatever about the work to be performed, there would be a general howl throughout the country. That was the reason why he moved this amendment. He did not mind withdrawing the amendment, however, till we saw how the new clause would meet the views held.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that after "notice," in line 3, the words "a copy of which shall be delivered to the local authority of the district in which the land is situated," be inserted. This would enable a local authority to intervene for protection of the landowner.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: "Local authority" must be defined, or otherwise the authorities would clash.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The authority would be the municipal council or the roads board, and not the Advisory Board. If the land were within a municipality, the authority would be the municipal council, and if within a roads board district, the authority would be the roads board of that district.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Would the decision of the roads board be final?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The object of this amendment was only to give an opportunity of intervening. Clause 4 made it imperative for the local boards to move in the first instance. Nothing could be done until the boards had recommended to the Governor, and an inspector could do nothing until the Governor proclaimed.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The municipal council must not have the power to say whether a weed was noxious or not. If that was the object of the amendment, the Bill would, if the amendment were carried, be worthless.

HON. H. LUKIN: The local authorities were the proper bodies to say whether a weed was noxious or not.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 13, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

HON. H. LUKIN moved that the following clause be added to the Bill:

The Minister may, on report being made to him by any municipal council or roads board, or the Advisory Board of the Department of Agriculture, that any noxious weed is growing upon any unoccupied Crown land adjacent to any freehold or leasehold estate, clear such land of such noxious weed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY accepted the amendment.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The clause would be useless. The Crown could not be compelled to do this work.

HON. H. LUKIN: The clause was permissive, and we could bring pressure to bear on the Government.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It was absurd to insert such an amendment, because it would be practically useless. The Crown could not be compelled to do anything.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not proposed to compel the Government to do anything. There was no reason why the Government should not be asked to do certain things, and no doubt the Government would respect representations made to them.

HON. E. McLARTY: The amendment would do no harm if it was inserted in the Bill, and we should trust to the good sense of Ministers to carry out recommendations.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: If a person selected 500 acres of land on which there were noxious weeds, that land would be almost valueless, and the Government should assist the selector to clear the land; no doubt the Government would do that. Anyone holding land in the district of Guildford, if required to clear the nobby grass which had taken possession of the ground in that locality, would find a heavy tax upon him. This grass might be prevented from spreading

throughout the eastern districts; there were many weeds on the runs and in paddocks which were not a serious inconvenience, and if landholders studied their interests they would eradicate the weeds from the cultivated land. Still there might be officious inspectors appointed to carry out the provisions of the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following be inserted as Clause 4:

The Governor may, at any time, on the recommendation of a municipal council, roads board, or of the Advisory Board of the Department of Agriculture, by proclamation published in the *Government Gazette*, declare any plants to be noxious weeds, either generally or in any particular locality, and may from time to time, on the like recommendation, revoke any such declaration.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule:

HON. J. M. DREW moved that "nut grass" (*Cyperus rotundus*) be added to the schedule. He had been asked by Mr. Harper, president of the Agricultural Advisory Board, to move this amendment. Nut grass was introduced six years ago as part of the packing of a consignment of trees from New South Wales, and so far as the Department of Agriculture knew, that weed was completely eradicated from the country. That was a strong argument in favour of adding the weed to the schedule of the Bill; it could do no harm. The Hon. Joseph Cook, M.L.A., Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales, in an article said that nut grass was the most pernicious weed of the southern States of America. It had great tenacity of life and potatoes were frequently riddled by the weed. If nut grass was covered with 3ft. of soil, the weed would make its appearance on the surface and flourish. Nut grass has made its appearance through two inches of asphalt which contained no visible crack. The roots had been found 30 feet below ground where well-sinking was being carried on. The manure from cattle and horses distributed the seeds about. Nut grass was not now in the colony, and if it should appear there would be the necessary means to prevent it spreading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member was apparently referring to

Java grass which would quickly spread. In a very short time this grass covered the ground, and it was with great difficulty that it was eradicated. He had had some experience with Java grass, and he thought it was the same weed that the hon. member referred to. It had been suggested that "Spanish Radish" should be added to the Schedule.

HON. J. M. DREW: The very fact that nut grass was not in the country was a good argument for it being included in the schedule, as no injustice would be done. If the grass appeared prompt measures could be taken to eradicate it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It could be declared a noxious weed at any time.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It was a strange thing if nut grass was in the colony that the Department of Agriculture had not made it known. Had the department introduced this weed? The Bill provided that any weeds might be declared noxious weeds at any time and be eradicated. If many weeds were added to the schedule, the Bill might be thrown out in another place.

Amendment put and passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 13th November, 1900.

Papers presented—Brown Hill Loop Kalgoorlie-Gnumballa Lake Railway Bill, first reading—Returns ordered: Coolgardie Water Scheme, (1) Railway ticket orders, (2) Wages pay-sheets—Roads and Streets Closure Bill, Council's Amendment—Annual Estimates, Committee of Supply; Railways vote and Public Buildings vote passed; Lands vote postponed—Loan Estimate, Committee of Supply, Premier's statement, debate adjourned—Goldfields Act Amendment Bill, in Committee to Clause 14, Division, progress—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Audit of railway accounts, further Telegrams from Eastern Australia; 2, Statistical Office, Report by Registrar General on the working.

Ordered to lie on the table.

BROWN HILL LOOP KALGOORLIE-GNUMBALLA LAKE RAILWAY BILL.

Introduced by the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS, and read a first time.

RETURNS (2)—COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME.

RAILWAY TICKET ORDERS.

On motion by MR. KINGSMILL, ordered (1) that there be laid on the table a return showing full particulars of all railway ticket orders and railway freight cash vouchers issued by officers of the Coolgardie Water Scheme Branch for fares and freights between Perth and Cunderdin, and *vice versa*, during the first four months of this year (1900).

WAGES PAY-SHEETS.

MR. KINGSMILL also moved that there be laid on the table exact copies of all pay-sheets for wages, countersigned by Messrs. H. W. Hargrave, A. F. Smith, and R. Formby, either collectively or individually, in connection with work carried out by the Coolgardie Water Scheme Branch at Midland Junction and Falkirk during the first four months of this year (1900).

THE PREMIER: There would be very little chance of getting the information in reasonable time, and it was difficult to know exactly what the hon.