

this paragraph to pay 12 guineas to the Board, in addition to the sum paid to the solicitor on entering into articles, besides having to pay another 30 guineas after being admitted to practise. The 12 guineas might be dispensed with as an unnecessary payment to the Board.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the preliminary examination involved much trouble; the fee of 12 guineas went to the funds of the Law Library, where the student could consult books of reference without providing them for himself; and this payment was reasonably necessary.

MR. DEHAMEL said he preferred the provision in the clause as it stood.

The committee divided on the amendment, with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	5
Noes	...	...	...	9

Majority against ... 4

AYES.  
Mr. Molloy  
Mr. Quinlan  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. R. F. Sholl (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Burt  
Mr. DeHamel  
Sir J. Forrest  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Paterson  
Mr. Phillips  
Sir J. G. Lee Steere  
Mr. Traylen  
Mr. A. Forrest (Teller).

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 10, 11, and 12:

Agreed to without comment.

Clause 13.—“Articled clerks not to be engaged in other employment without consent of board:”

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved, as an amendment, to strike out the clause. He argued that this restriction would operate harshly in preventing the poorer class of clerks from earning any money by engaging in employment outside of their duties as clerks.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the clause would not prevent a clerk from taking casual employment after his day's duty was done, but would prevent him from engaging in any regular employment apart from his proper duties.

MR. DEHAMEL said the provision in this clause was more liberal than that which applied to clerks in England.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11 p.m.

### Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 22nd August, 1893.

Leave of absence to Hon. J. A. Wright—Real Estates Administration Bill: first reading—New Member—Criminal Law Appeal Bill: first reading—Public Depositors Relief Bill: first reading—Stock Tax Bill: third reading—Constitution Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at half-past two o'clock p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO HON.  
J. A. WRIGHT.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL moved, without notice, “That further leave of absence be granted to the Hon. J. A. Wright, on account of ill health.”

Question—put and passed.

#### REAL ESTATES ADMINISTRATION BILL.

This Bill was introduced, and was read a first time.

#### NEW MEMBER.

The Hon. H. Anstey, having been introduced, took and subscribed the oath as required by section 22 of the Constitution Act, 1889.

#### CRIMINAL LAW APPEAL BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

## PUBLIC DEPOSITORS RELIEF BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

## STOCK TAX BILL.

This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

## CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

## SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) : I am sure that hon. members of this House will welcome the re-introduction of a Bill which they had an opportunity of considering last session. I take it, sir, that as man is progressive it will be necessary from time to time to alter the Constitution of the country, whatever it may be, or however perfect it may have been considered at the time it was passed; in fact, it is necessary that the Constitution should progress with the country itself. When we first adopted Responsible Government we were satisfied to accept the terms imposed by the Secretary of State for the colonies, which contained, amongst other things, a property qualification for members of the Lower House, and a like qualification for members of this House so soon as it should become elected. The qualification for electors, as regards both Houses, was also very high indeed. Now we propose to alter that Constitution, principally by removing the qualification for members, and by reducing the franchise. We also propose to increase the number of members for this House from 15 to 21, making seven electoral districts, returning three members each. As to the Lower House, the number of members is increased from 30 to 33, thus giving three additional members for what are known as the mining districts, namely, Pilbarra, Nannine, and Yilgarn. Then every man who has resided in Western Australia for 12 months, is of the age of 21, and is either a natural born subject of Her Majesty, or who has been naturalised for five years, will be eligible for membership of the Lower House. The qualification for electors is that a man shall be 21 years of age, and is either a natural born subject, or has been naturalised, and has resided in the colony for 12 months,

so that every British subject, who has been resident in the colony for 12 months, provided he has been resident in the district for six months preceding the time he makes his claim to be registered, will be entitled to a vote. Then there are various other qualifications which attach to persons having property. A man who claims to register by merely being a resident can only have one vote, but the man with property may possibly have a vote in every constituency in the colony. By clause 21 of the Bill, it will thus be observed that the man in possession of no property, and who is only a resident in some district, will be entitled to one vote; while the man who owns property in any district, or who pays a single penny for rates to any Municipality or Roads Board, will be entitled to many votes. This Bill does not give what is known as manhood suffrage, although it entitles a man who has no property to a vote, and at the same time the man of property has been most carefully considered; in fact, he will be entitled to a vote in every district in which he has possessions. Therefore I am not sure that this is not rather a Conservative than a Radical measure, but at any rate it is, I think, ample to meet the present requirements of the colony. We cannot expect to have all the liberal, or as some would say, all the radical measures in force in the other colonies at once. We must go on slowly, and after all, perhaps, the more slowly we go, or rather the more time we take to consider, the better it will be for us. Among the other principles of this Bill is the giving of a lodger franchise so far as the Lower House is concerned, and as regards the Upper House there is a slight reduction in the franchise, although, perhaps, it is hardly worth mentioning at the present time. I have mentioned, I think, all the main principles, and I now move the second reading of the Bill.

THE HON. J. MORRISON : I cannot join with the Hon. the Colonial Secretary when he says that this House must welcome this old friend of ours; for I think, had the Government studied the feelings of members of this Chamber, on the eve of a dissolution as we are, they would, at least, have divided the Bill now before us into two, making one part applicable to this House and the other to

the Legislative Assembly. A measure dealing with the Upper House is an absolutely necessary piece of legislation, but it is not so with regard to the Assembly. For my part I should like to see this Bill sent back, and ask the Government to take off the objectionable part which has been tacked on to this Bill. There is no doubt that we are, to a certain extent, being cornered by having the Bill brought before us in its present shape; and although we are here to do the best we can for the country, we shall not be doing right, in my opinion, to allow the second reading to pass. I believe, however, that a majority of hon. members are against me in this respect, and therefore we must all do the best we can with the Bill as it is. When we go into committee I shall point out a great many things it contains which are not to my liking. In the first place, I see no reason why the number of members for this House should be raised from 15 to 21. Last session the Government thought an increase of two members would be sufficient, and now they suggest an increase of six. There is even now some difficulty in getting 15 members, and there will be still greater difficulty in getting 21. Then, as to the qualification for members of this House, I am certainly not in favour of making 12 months' residence sufficient. Anyone, to my mind, wishing to hold a seat in this House, should have at least three years' experience of the country. It is not reasonable to imagine that anyone who has only been here for 12 months can know very much about our requirements. I also think that 30 years is quite young enough an age to allow a person to become a member of this House. Another matter which strikes me as being bad in connection with this Bill is the enormous number of elections it will involve. Whether an Upper House is elective or nominated, when once a member takes his seat it should be for life. An Upper Chamber is supposed to act as a brake on hasty legislation, and I do not think that this object is likely to be fulfilled when it is provided that every two years there shall be an election of one-third of the members. It may be said that the elections bring the members in touch with their constituents; but members are quite as likely to know what is going on

as those outside the House. No great harm could arise from electing members for life. Of the fifteen members nominated two years and a half ago (and I refer to it with sorrow), eight of them have either passed away or have resigned. If members were elected for life they would be able to take a more independent stand than they otherwise might—they would feel that they had no necessity to talk to galleries, or to provide for the next election. This Bill provides for an election every two years, and I do not think that is good for the safe management of the country. Time will work all the elections that are necessary. Then again, it would be quite possible, under clause 8, for members to sit, although their re-election was pending, and this might lead to very bad results, and besides this, men might be sitting here one day upon some question, and others might come in in their places, and have to finish their work. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary has told us that this is a conservative measure. I find that the Government, when the Bill was in another place, urged that it was a very liberal and radical measure; but to my mind it is a kaleidoscopic Bill, which we may take in any way we please. If it is to be a liberal Bill, let it be so, and then we shall know what we are doing. There is no doubt, however, that this will never satisfy the Liberals. They will want a great deal more than is given here. When the matter was discussed a little while ago, one gentleman stated that it was not what he wanted. He was a Republican, and had been ten days in the colony, and of course felt quite competent to give an opinion upon the affairs of Western Australia. The Government seem to me to be legislating either to keep these people quiet, or to put them in possession. However good those that come here may be, I am quite certain that it is impossible for them to give an intelligent vote upon our political matters after a six months' residence. The other colonies have been temporarily wrecked, and the survivors are coming here; and although we are quite willing to carry them on to port, I object to allow our interests to be injured or our management capsized by people who have been brought up with extravagant ideas. It is not so many years ago that the other

colonies were in the same position as we are now in, and they went in for Liberal political measures, which brought about liberal borrowing and spending, the result of it all being that they obtained a population which did not know the value of money. We have not had this extravagant bringing up. We hear those who come from the other colonies tell us what we should do; but they do not seem to realise that our revenue is only £500,000, out of which over £100,000 has to go for interest on loans. I wonder the Government have tried to give votes to these people, who, after getting all they can, and putting the colony in a hole, as they have done elsewhere, will go away, and leave us to bear the burden. The Premier said the other evening that the total number of electors in the colony was about 6,000, and we know that fresh population is coming here at the rate of about 12,000 a year. It will be very easy, therefore, if only the residential qualification provided by the Bill is required, for the new comers to very shortly be in the position to out-vote those who are here now. I am not one of those who say we do not want strangers to come here, for I think the more that come the better; but I do say that a much longer residence is necessary than that stated in the Bill, before they can give an intelligent vote. I noticed with pleasure the movement in another place, in order to make the Bill thoroughly liberal, to give every woman of the age of 21, as well as every man, a vote; and I may say that if such a provision were to be found in this Bill I should be prepared to vote for it. Last session we threw out, on its second reading, a similar Bill to this, and, notwithstanding, the Government have failed to bring it in in any more acceptable form. I should like to know also why steps have not been taken to place the Bill before the constituencies? How many members, since last session, have stood before their constituents and asked them whether they wanted the Bill? For my part I do not think any change such as this should be allowed to become law without a reference to the electors first. As it stands, this Bill is neither one thing nor the other. If the electors want something liberal, let them go in for universal suffrage.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: And that means one man one vote.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: No.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: That is what universal suffrage means.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: Not to my idea. This Bill is as near one man one vote as you can get it, for if a man wishes to have another vote he has to buy it. If the Bill becomes law it will certainly not improve the standard of Western Australia, and it will, moreover, be the death of the Ministry which brought it in. Seventy-five per cent. of those who agree to its passing will never see their seats again, and for a Ministry to introduce such a measure is tantamount to the officers in charge of a besieged city opening the gates at night and letting the besiegers in.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am one of those, Mr. President, who respond to the appeal of my hon. friend opposite when he called for an expression of welcome, on the occasion of the re-introduction of this measure, which so unfortunately miscarried last session, and which has come before us again with renewed vitality, looking more healthy and more rosy, and certainly better dressed than on the previous occasion. The last remark of the speaker, who has just sat down, I should like to refer to first. He taunted the Government by saying that, if their affection for the Bill was as real as they pretended, they would have sent it to the constituencies.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: They should have gone before them, is what I said.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Is not that what I said?

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I meant they should have addressed their constituents.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I hardly understand the hon. member.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I say they might have asked their constituents whether they wished the Bill brought in.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: There is only one constitutional form of testing the wish of the constituencies, and that is by means of a dissolution. We have not yet come, in spite of what the hon. member may desire, to government by public meeting. There is only one way of constitutionally arriving at the wish of the people, and that is by a vote at the ballot box. To propose a Bill, and then address a chance meeting of electors and non-electors and take a vote upon it, is not under-

stood by our Constitution, and even if it were done, I believe it would have no weight or effect upon either House of Parliament. Let us, as long as we have a Constitution, work it. Even if we did adopt the means suggested by the hon. member, it would lead to the result he so deeply deplores—an excess of elections. If the Government had dissolved, there would first have had to be an election on the Bill, then immediately it was carried (and it certainly would be, for we know that by the long contest there was for Responsible Government, and when at last not an electorate was found to stand out), there would have to be another election, in order that the electors might declare what their wishes under it were. The present measure is only the corollary to the adoption of constitutional government. If this plethora of elections could be avoided, I think the Government took a judicious course in avoiding it. How does it lie with the hon. member to state that there was an imperative demand for any reconsideration or reconstruction or withdrawal of the Bill? It has now been before the country for six months. The constituencies have had ample time to familiarise themselves with all its provisions and details, and the result is that we find not one single meeting (which may be taken, in some way, to indicate the current of public feeling, although I do not think it in any way shows the voice of the constituency) has been held in opposition to it. Further, we have the entire press supporting it in all its main principles; and, most important of all, on this occasion the second and third readings were passed by a unanimous vote in another place. Surely, if that be not sufficient evidence that the country is almost at one upon this Bill, I do not know what more would be required. If I might state it in a sentence, all this indicates that the country has read and considered the Bill, and understands its provisions, and finds, as the hon. member sneeringly remarked, that it contains two qualifications which are perfectly compatible with both a liberal and a conservative measure. I do not like to deal in abstract statements, because, although they might have some weight with the philosopher or student, they are likely, at times, to be interpreted in unexpected ways; but certainly it is the right of

everyone, according to the tenets of the British Constitution, to have a vote in the representation of his country. In other words, every man who pays taxes has a right to vote for a representative. I always thought that this was commonly understood, but the hon. gentleman lays down a number of conditions which he urges should attach to the taxpayer before he is entitled to vote. I will not go into them, but I would ask whether, even as an abstract question, the granting of full political powers to every man is not of the greatest importance to the community and the State? Does it not tend to educate them politically, and does it not tend to attach them to the country and our Constitution? We all wish to attract capable and honest men to this country, and they certainly cannot be induced to add to their own material gain and to the material gain of the country if they are to be deprived, as the hon. gentleman desires, of the rights of citizenship, and are to be placed on the same level as the Chinaman or the wandering aboriginal. We must hold out all the inducements possible to the strong, honest, hardy men, and not strive, as my hon. friend would have us, to make them merely hewers of wood and drawers of water, and placed on the same level as the Chinaman or aboriginal.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I didn't say that.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I certainly understood that was what the hon. gentleman wished to convey, and if he will read the pages of *Hansard*, I believe he will find that his remarks bear out my impression. What we should do is to hold out every inducement we can to these people.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: Hear, hear.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Now he shares in the sentiment himself. Many people are coming here with considerable sums of money in their pockets, with strong arms, and, with what is better, honest minds and large intelligencies, and my hon. friend says to them, "You may come here; you may till the soil, and you may dig for gold, provided you do it for us."

THE HON. J. MORRISON: Who said that?

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Yes, according to the hon. member they may

come here and do all this, but he says the instant you do it, you abandon every political privilege you had, and sink to a lower degree of political privilege—if you work for our material gain and your own it must be at the expense of your citizenship. Such contentions as these I shall, as long as I stand on the floor of this House, endeavour to refute with all the energy I am possessed of. Let us rather say to these people, the doors of the country and the Constitution are open to you, and we shall most assuredly draw to our shores a better class than those who would be content to come simply for the sake of adding to their material wealth, and at the same time be content to be degraded to the political level of the aboriginal or the Chinaman. To my mind, what we are suffering from now is our not having given full political rights to the people long ago, and from not giving them a sufficient political education. To my mind, there can be no greater instrument for overcoming the insufficiency of political education which prevails than to admit the people to the very small modicum of franchise which this Bill holds out to them. My hon. friend the Colonial Secretary most truly says that this is a conservative measure, and my complaint is that it is too conservative; but surely that objection cannot lie in the mouth of the Hon. Mr. Morrison, or those who agree with him. Take the constitution of the Upper House under it. The number of members is to be increased to twenty-one. The only objection my hon. friend can find to that is that on another occasion seventeen was to be the number, and he now says that seventeen is a good suggestion, but that twenty-one is a bad suggestion.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I only said that the Government previously made it seventeen.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: And the hon. member asked why it was withdrawn. It seems to me that seventeen has been discarded because it is not divisible by the number three. It is provided by the old Constitution Act and by this Bill that there should be a periodic renewal of the Upper House, and that one-third of the members are to go out every two years. Now, how is it possible to carry that out if the number be seven-

teen; let it be eighteen or fifteen if you will, but I shall vote for twenty-one, and for the reason that I think the more members (I put it in the plainest way possible) we have, the more important will this House become. And, secondly, the larger it is the more representative must it be, and that not only representative of the country but representative of individuals. There will be more minds, more tastes, and more knowledge. And, thirdly, it is far too serious a matter to devolve on fourteen gentlemen the very large powers the Constitution proposes. We have found that in this House regrettable incidents have occurred. With a small House it is very easy, when the power of passing or rejecting the laws of the country devolve upon a small number, for the practice of lobbying (and I use the word in no offensive sense) to take place, and thus the efforts of two or three members may be sufficient to defeat that which may be necessary and of advantage to the colony. With a larger House the less chance is there of the success of any such tactics. And, lastly, sir, hon. members when speaking must surely desire a somewhat larger audience. We all must have experienced a sense of dreariness when addressing the House, and the almost impossibility of rising to any height of feeling, owing to the scanty numbers which occupy these benches. Then the hon. member has another objection. He says, and I think I caught his words aright—if not he will, no doubt, correct me—that members should be elected for life. A more astonishing, a more absurd proposition than this, I suppose, was never made in any House of Parliament since the days of the Plantagenets. This House should be elected for life, the hon. member says—

THE HON. J. MORRISON: Hear, hear.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Then my hon. friend says he did use these words. Does he, in the least degree, realise what he is saying? Does he really mean that a limited number of members are to be elected for life to follow out their own selfish dictates, or to be lobbied here and there, or to legislate in their own interests, without being asked to account to anyone except at the last day, when they have passed out of this life, and when what they think will matter very little to anyone? They are,

according to the hon. member, to be gods in their own eyes, and the power of deposing them shall rest with no human being either in this House or elsewhere. Such a thing was never heard of.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: If not here, it has been outside.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: No.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I think so, in the other colonies.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: This just shows that the hon. gentleman gets up and discusses this Bill—a Bill which we shall be judged by both in England and in the sister colonies—and he knows absolutely nothing of what he is talking about. There is nothing of the kind in Australia. There are three Houses nominated for life.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I said nominated or elected.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I asked the hon. member if I had caught aright what he said, and he interjected, "Hear, hear."

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I think we are having a very fine discourse on what I did not say.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I appealed to the hon. member as to whether I was not quoting the words he used.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I said nominated or elected for life.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I accept the correction. He says nominated for life. Does the hon. member suppose it conceivable that in case of a nominated House the numbers would be confined to 15, 18, or 21? I would ask the hon. member to read up the subject, and he will then find out how constantly he blunders. The excellence of a nominated House, in the opinion of Radicals, is that it has no power, and dare not assert itself, and for this reason the number of members is not limited by law. It rests with the Government to add as many members as they please, and it is in consequence of this power that the nominated Upper Houses of Queensland and New South Wales dare not assert themselves, and dare not exert their influence above a whisper. The Upper House of New Zealand, which did dare to call its soul its own, had a dozen new members forced in, with the result that the assertive majority was turned into a minority; and on appeal being made by the Governor, who would

not accept the advice of his Ministry, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, His Excellency was told that he must act on the advice of his Ministers and appoint the additional members, and, this being done, the House practically disappears from real politics. This is, shortly, the history of all nominated Houses such as the hon. member wishes to create here. Surely, therefore, before going into these matters as he does, it would be well if the hon. member read up the subject. Then the hon. member complains that two years is too short a period for members to hold their seats, and he says that we shall have a multiplicity of elections. Here again it is too bad for the time of the House to be taken up in this way and turned into a sort of upper class nursery.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: Sit down then.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I say it is really wasting the time of the House to have to explain to the hon. member what he should be aware of but for his unexhaustible store of prejudice. The hon. member will see, if he looks at the Bill, that the tenure of each member is six years; but as there is to be a periodic renewal, it is essential at the start that one-third shall go out at the end of two years, another third at the end of four years, and after that every member will sit for six years. What the hon. member would like, no doubt, is that the first seats should be held for six years, the next for eight years, and the last for ten years. This would be most unfair. Under this Bill each member is to have a six years' tenure, but of course at the first there must be shorter terms in order to work in the periodic renewal. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary says this is a conservative measure; and my complaint about it is that it is too conservative. I say we have a right to give every one a vote who pays taxes, although I agree, of course, that there should be certain safeguards provided. But if ever there was a Bill which was safeguarded, and safeguarded and hedged round and round with protections, it is this one. Firstly, the very representation under it is conceived in what I may call the interests of the country constituencies. If representation were to go according to the basis of population, we should have six and a half members for Perth instead of

three; but by this Bill this quantity is taken away and handed over to the country districts, which are supposed to be less progressive, or more cautious, than the towns.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY: I do not like that.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: What keeps the towns?

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: My hon. friend the Colonial Secretary, when he stated it was not good to go too fast, was cheered all round, so that I understood progressing slowly was a good thing, and I am now saying that if the towns go too quickly and the country goes slowly, this Bill gives a far greater preponderance to those who go slowly; so that between them we get what is desired.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY: It is to be hoped so.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Further, there is the plural vote; that is that every member in this House could have thirty-three votes, and I will undertake to say that there will be very few members who will not have five or six votes. Further, and this is a most important point, not only is there plural voting, but there is absent voting. All a man has to do, who cannot reach the polling place, is to go before a magistrate and sign a proxy, and the post office does the rest.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: That is not in the Act.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: It is in the present Electoral Act, and I do not think that that provision is likely to be altered. Then again, this Bill will altogether change the face of the constituency in more than one electorate, for it not only gives votes to the ratepayers, but also provides that they shall be placed on the roll without their personal intervention. And with regard to other persons—those dreadful gentlemen who come from the other colonies with nothing but honesty and brain and muscle to recommend them—they will have to walk up to the Registrar, and probably pay a small fee, before being entitled to vote, and they must renew their application should they change their district, whereas the ratepayer has everything done for him. The most important sections of the community will, therefore, be put on the electoral lists without their knowledge or any trouble on their part. Under

these circumstances we may concur with my hon. friend the Colonial Secretary, that this is a conservative measure; but it is also a liberal measure in that it brings the entire male community within the pale of the franchise. For my part, I would rather not call it either conservative or radical, but rather a safe and useful measure, and one which will be of untold benefit to the country. It is the minimum we can give, and it is what the country desires. Since a similar Bill was rejected last session we have had no expressions of public opinion levelled against it, and the Press, which are the organs supposed to indicate public opinion, is found to be unanimously in favour of it. I would point out, in conclusion, that we cannot go back—we must go forward, or at least we must follow, even at some little distance behind—in the wake of political movement in the sister colonies if we do not wish to invite their wholesale contempt and scorn. I do not believe that our system is perfect, or that any steps we are taking will make it so; but there is something far better and higher we are making our way to, and that is the promotion of the development of the country, and not the arrest of it. On these grounds I shall cordially give the Government my support to this measure.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: It is certainly my intention to support the Government on this Bill. Last session, when a similar measure was introduced, I supported it, and I think there is still more inducement now to assist in passing this one. I do not know whether it would be possible to introduce a clause which would allow a man registered in one district to still retain his vote if he removed to another district; but we can discuss this matter in committee. However, at the present, I am prepared to support the Bill, and I hope to see it passed through all its stages in a very short time.

THE HON. G. RANDELL: I think, sir, this Bill has been rightly described as a liberal-conservative measure. I have carefully looked through it, and I have received considerable instruction from the speech of the Hon. Mr. Hackett, and in the main I must say I agree with it. There are some points of the hon. member's speech I am scarcely prepared to concur in, although I do not entertain



reasons strong enough against them to warrant me in offering any opposition. In the first place I thought that twelve months was rather too short a time for any person to be resident in the colony before being eligible for election as a member of the Legislative Council; but, after considering the matter, I do not think there is so much in the objection that presented itself to me, for perhaps it is better that the choice of selection should be made as wide as possible, leaving the onus on the electors. I quite agree with the principle that every citizen should be entitled to vote. That is certainly so theoretically; but practically, I do not know that we can give effect to it. The publichouse loafer is rather repugnant to one, and we cannot well place him in the same position as the honest and right thinking man. A distinction in such a case underlies both the British Constitution and our own, and the only thing to do is to educate the people and bring such influence to bear upon them as will enable them to discharge the duties which devolve upon them. I should have been glad had the Bill permitted women's suffrage, because then we should have had the voting power of a valuable number of people who would not sell their votes for beer or money, besides which it would have infused a good tone and a healthy element into the voting power of the colony. With the Hon. Mr. Morrison, I was inclined to think it was strange to incorporate a provision in the Bill by which a member might hold his seat in this House until the day he was defeated at the election; but, after considering the matter, I have come to the conclusion that the provision is a wise one, inasmuch as it will prevent the Council being deprived of one or several of its members. I also at first sight thought it was exceedingly strange that a person might be elected a member of the Council and not be a voter; but as against this it might be said that the intention is not to limit the electors, and even if a man is not a voter and is elected, not much harm will be done, for it will show that the man must have had sufficient ability to warrant the electors in placing him in his position. The qualification for electors for the Council should be higher than that for the Assembly; but I do not think it is placed on too high a scale to prevent

many from obtaining votes. I trust all who do obtain votes will endeavour to send the best men they can to Parliament, and I am sure they will. We have many coming here with most earnest purposes—men who are willing to spend their strength and intelligence in our midst, and some of them the very best men the other colonies can send, and we should all welcome them. They are accustomed to certain privileges where they came from, and they should not be deprived of them here. Some of those who come will, no doubt, be able to instruct us in many matters political and social, and at all events we may reasonably expect that they will exercise the privileges we give them intelligently, wisely, and well. On the whole I am prepared to give the measure my most cordial support, and I trust it will soon become the law of the land.

THE HON. H. ANSTEY: I think it only right for me to say, as the latest addition to this House, that I have carefully considered the Bill, and I cordially agree with it. There is only one thing I should like to say, and that is that the population our goldfields are attracting will comprise some of the very best men of the other colonies—men who are desirable additions to any country, and they should not be deprived of privileges they have been used to. These this Bill gives to them, although they are sufficiently safeguarded in the interests of this colony. I shall support the Bill.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 4.15 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 24th August, at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

---