

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 31st August, 1893.

Search Lights at Albany Forts—Sandalwood Cutting:  
Prohibition of—Gold Declaration Bill: second reading—Constitution Act Amendment Bill: committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

## PRAYERS.

## SEARCH LIGHTS AT ALBANY FORTS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I notice that the Hon. Mr. Wright has a question on the paper, as follows:—"To ask the Colonial Secretary if it is the intention of the Government to provide search lights for the Albany forts, without which they are practically useless against night attack." Before the hon. gentleman asks it, I would suggest to him the inadvisability of putting such a question. The hon. member will, no doubt, see the reason why. I may say, however, that I shall be happy to give him, privately, any information on the subject he may desire; but I do not think it wise that I should be asked to answer the question here.

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT: I beg to withdraw the question.

Question, by leave, withdrawn.

## SANDALWOOD CUTTING—PROHIBITION OF.

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT moved,—  
"That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the cutting of sandalwood should be prohibited, within the colony, for a period of three years." He said: Hon. members may recollect that I put forward a similar resolution to this last session, and that, although it was passed by this House, when it went to another place it did not meet with that reception we had hoped for. It seems to me that the question is as important now as it was then, if not more so. We have something like £200,000 locked up completely in sandalwood, which is unavailable for use in the colony, and holders of the wood have to pay interest and charges upon the money. It must certainly be to the advantage of the colony that this

large sum should be released and expended in other ways. Another point is, that although sandalwood is one product, we are not masters of the situation, for it is well known that the astute Chinese have formed a ring, and are now dictating to us what they will pay for the wood. In the olden days the people of this colony used to sell the wood at a fair and profitable price, but now, owing to indiscriminate cutting, we have shifted the saddle on to the wrong horse, and have allowed the Chinese to dictate the terms on which they will purchase. In the interests of the colony this state of things is altogether wrong, and I think we may well withdraw all petty jealousies and stop the cutting of this valuable product for a time. There will then be a demand for it, and we shall be able to sell it at a profit, instead of at a dead loss. The Government have already prohibited the cutting within a certain area, but this is having very little effect, inasmuch as the already enormous stocks are continually being added to, and large sums of money consequently locked up, which might be expended to far greater advantage to the colony. I trust, therefore, that this House will accept the resolution, not in the interests of any particular persons, but for the advantage of the whole colony.

THE HON. E. HAMERSLEY seconded the motion.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY: I can endorse every word that has fallen from my hon. friend Mr. Wright. It must be well known to everyone who has travelled up and down the Great Southern Railway that large stocks of sandalwood have accumulated, and in which large sums of money are locked up, and are lying idle. Of course, this condition of things is well known to the astute Chinaman, and he is not slow to take advantage of the position. There is sufficient wood already cut to supply the Chinese market for three years, and if we prohibit the cutting during that time the young wood will mature, and sandalwood cutting will then become a remunerative operation, instead of a losing one, as at present.

THE HON. G. GLYDE: I have much pleasure in supporting this resolution, and I think the prohibition, in the interests of the colony, should be given effect to without delay.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I regret I cannot join with my hon. friends in supporting this resolution. The Government took all these matters into consideration when they proclaimed the large area over which sandalwood should not be cut, which area includes the whole of the sandalwood country south of a line drawn from Northam to Yilgarn. This included the Southern portion of the colony, but excluded the Northern portion. As far as I can understand the arguments, it appears that certain persons have acquired a large quantity of sandalwood, which they are unable to sell to advantage. Their money is locked up, and the Chinese, knowing that the supply exceeds the demand, are enabled to impose their own terms. In consequence of this, it is asked that everyone shall be prohibited from cutting until these gentlemen have disposed of their wood at a reasonable price. Now, I ask hon. members whether they think it is proper for the Legislature to interfere in a matter like this. Is it right that because people have over-traded, the Legislature should step in and say that no one shall cut sandalwood until those having large stocks have disposed of them? It seems to me like asking Parliament to give certain persons a monopoly for a term of years. We know that monopolies are odious, and I may point out, further, that if the trade is not profitable, people will cease to carry it on. I hope my hon. friend will not press this resolution, because if it goes to the Lower House, I am sure it will not be passed.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: It gives me extreme pleasure to see the decided attitude of the Government on this subject. When the matter was brought forward last session, I objected to it, for the same reasons that the Government now oppose it. I have an immense amount of respect for the Hon. Mr. Wright, and I cannot understand how it is he cannot see the gross injustice that will be done to the general public by assisting persons who have over bought a particular article by letting them unload. If we once begin this method of legislation, there is no telling where we shall end. I looked on the passing of a similar resolution last session, and its rejection by another place, as one of the greatest censures we have been subjected to during our existence.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: I rise to support the motion. If it is advisable to prohibit the cutting of this wood in the Southern portions of the colony, I cannot see why it should not also be prohibited in the North. It appears to me that the course taken by the Government is like legislating for one part of the colony in opposition to another part. If we find this particular export is increased so as to be almost valueless, I cannot see why we should not take some steps to check the increase until the industry becomes profitable again. We all know that sandalwood has been the backbone of the colony for many years past, and I do think some stoppage should be put on the wasting of one of the colony's most valuable exports.

THE HON. J. G. H. AMHERST: I do not think it will be wise for us to pass this resolution at the present time. We know that many people are being attracted to our goldfields, and if they are not successful, they will have to turn their attention to other things, and sandalwood cutting would probably become their only means of obtaining a livelihood. I shall, therefore, oppose the motion.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I think the Hon. Mr. Hassell is entitled to press the argument, that the Government has no right, having made fish of one part of the colony, to make fowl of another part, but I will not go further than that. I consider that in shutting up the Southern portion of the colony the Government has done wrong, but I am not prepared to extend the mistake. A number of people at Sharks Bay are dependent almost entirely for their livelihood upon sandalwood cutting.

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT: For how long?

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: For years. For my part I cannot understand why there should be this interference with the ordinary course of trade. We might just as well say that if we were overstocked with meat no more sheep or cattle should be bred in the colony. I do hope the resolution will be withdrawn.

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT: I have no intention of withdrawing it, for all the arguments I have heard against it have simply convinced me the more that the resolution I now propose is a right and a proper one. My object in bringing for-

ward this resolution is simply to make available a large amount of capital which we can ill afford to have locked up. All those who are cutting sandalwood to-day are doing is to keep prices down. They are doing themselves harm, and are doing considerable injury to the whole colony. There are large stocks at Champion Bay, for which no market can be found, and yet we still continue the cutting, and thereby kill the goose that lays the golden egg, as fast as possible. Sandalwood has been our staple and most important export for many years, and it now seems to me that we are doing our best to kill it. I trust that the resolution will meet with the support of the right-minded portion of the House.

Question—That the resolution be agreed to—put.

Council divided.

Ayes	...	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	...	7

Majority against	...	1
------------------	-----	---

#### AYES.

The Hon. G. Glyde  
The Hon. E. Hamersley  
The Hon. J. F. T. Hassell  
The Hon. E. T. Hooley  
The Hon. G. W. Leake  
The Hon. J. A. Wright  
(Teller).

#### NOES.

The Hon. J. G. H. Amherst  
The Hon. H. Anstey  
The Hon. J. W. Hackett  
The Hon. R. W. Hardey  
The Hon. J. Morrison  
The Hon. G. Randell  
The Hon. S. H. Parker  
(Teller).

Motion negatived.

### GOLD DECLARATION BILL.

#### SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): The object of this Bill, sir, is to enable the Customs Department to ascertain the total amount of gold exported. At the present time it is well known that considerably more gold is taken out of the colony than is declared, and this Bill provides that any banker or other person exporting from the colony any uncoined gold, if such has been procured from the soil of the colony, shall declare its value at the Customs at the time of export. It is further provided that any gold found in the possession of any person on board any vessel about to leave any port shall be deemed to have procured it from the soil of the colony, unless the contrary is proved. Then power is given to any police officer to apprehend any person, without a war-

rant, whom he finds not complying with the Act. By Clause 6, it is provided that any person failing to comply with the provisions of this Act shall be punishable summarily upon conviction before one or more justices of the peace in petty sessions, and made liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds nor less than fifty pounds, and the justice or justices of the peace imposing such penalty may order the gold, gold ore, gold dust, or gold bullion in respect of which the offence is committed, or such portion of the same as is sufficient to realise the amount of such penalty, together with any costs adjudged, to be sold by an officer of the court, and the amount of such penalty and costs to be retained out of the proceeds of such sale. The object of the whole Bill is simply to enforce the making of declarations by persons who export gold, so that we shall know what is really taken from the soil of the colony. I move the second reading of the Bill.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: As one who has been long anxious that some amendment in this direction should take place, I welcome the introduction of this Bill. I am sure it will be read a second time without a division, and I feel certain that something like it will be equally acceptable, in another place. I would point out, however, that the Bill is likely to be nugatory, if one of its provisions is not amended. When in committee I intend to move an amendment raising the penalty, on the ground that the one provided is altogether insufficient to put a stop to the practice, which there can be no doubt exists, of carrying gold out of the country contraband. Gold is our most important export, and our most valuable advertisement—it is that to which we look to attract population and raise our credit, and at present what is raised here goes rather to swell the returns of the other colonies than our own. It seems to me, therefore, that a penalty of £50 is altogether insufficient. Half of it is to go to the informer, and unless we make the sum a large one no man will incur the obloquy which attaches to acting as such. When in committee I shall move to make the minimum penalty £100 and the maximum £200.

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

## CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

## IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 12.—Qualification of Electors:

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: I do not think twelve months sufficient time to qualify a man to vote for this House, and I therefore move to make the period two years.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): It does not follow that because a man has to be here twelve months before being qualified, he will be able to vote as soon as he is registered. Under the electoral law, as it now stands, it takes a period of about six months for a man to be registered. Besides this, even under this clause, before a man can get on the roll and become qualified to vote, it will take 18 months. We must also bear in mind that elections for the Legislative Council will, as the Bill now stands, only take place once every three years. Striking the average and allowing that elections will take place every eighteen months, it will be then three years, in most cases, from the time a man arrives in the colony, becomes registered, and exercises his vote. Surely that is ample. Again, in the case of a contested election the candidates will, no doubt, address the electors and express their views, and any man of average intelligence, even if he has not been long in the colony, will be able to gather what those views are worth. I trust my hon. friend will not press this amendment, for I may say it seems to me that we should be treating those who come to us from other parts in a not altogether generous way, if we carry it.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am sure my hon. friend will withdraw this amendment. If he will read the section he will see that except in regard to one qualification a man must have been qualified for twelve months before being entitled to make his claim. If he claims under a freehold, he must have held it for twelve months; if under the householder clause, he must have occupied for twelve months; if a leaseholder, the lease must have eighteen months to run. Practically the whole of the periods provided will mean at least two years.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I omitted to mention that where a man becomes a voter by virtue

of being on the Municipal roll, it will be found that he is unable to get on to that roll unless he has been a ratepayer since the 1st January in any year. And again a man can only be placed on a Roads Board list once a year, so that the periods are really considerably extended beyond those provided by the sub-sections of this clause.

THE HON. H. ANSTEY: I do not feel disposed to support the amendment. I have done all I can to assist in ensuring that the qualification for the Council shall be as substantial as possible, and, having done that, I feel I have done all that is necessary. I should rather now make the electorates as wide as possible, and throw the burden of returning proper members upon them.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: After what has fallen from the Colonial Secretary and other hon. members, I beg to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.—“Qualification of electors for Legislative Assembly:”

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT moved that the following sub-clause be struck out:—“Is resident in the electoral district at “the time of making his claim to be “registered, and during the six months “then next preceding has then resided “in.” I do this in order to test the feeling of this House on the subject. I have little to say on the question, except that it seems to me that the way this Act has been brought in shows the astuteness of the Government. The Bill is divided into two parts, one of which the Government knew would be accepted with alterations, and the other they thought they could force with it. If I were not thought guilty of making a joke, I would compare the Bill to the flaming posters one sees in London advertising Batty’s Pickles, showing the Great Mogul pouring sauce into the fish’s mouth, with an inscription: “If you like the pickles try the sauce.” We have tried the pickles and are now asked to try the sauce. If the amendment I move be carried, of course the rest of this Part will go with it.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY: This clause deals with manhood suffrage. I may say that I have been opposed to it all my life, and I do not think that at

this stage of my life I shall alter my views. I have had considerable experience of manhood suffrage, but I maintain that if a man cannot qualify himself under the following sub-sections, he does not deserve a vote at all. The Hon. Mr. Hackett has more than once quoted Graham Berry, who is, I suppose, the most notorious reformer Australia ever knew. He was going to make Victoria a paradise for the working man. A fine mess has been made, and if we follow in the steps of that colony we shall get into a worse mess. People are flocking here, and the Hon. Mr. Hackett contends that we should receive them with open arms. We are told by the newspapers that unless we extend the privileges of the franchise to them, they will not remain. But I say they are quite aware of our form of government before they come, and no matter what privileges may be accorded to them, they will not induce another individual to come to us. If we can promise them nuggets of gold, and good land on easy terms, they will come, irrespective of what the form of government is. I hope this sub-section will be struck out, for I have no wish for Western Australia to become a paradise for working men in the sense that Victoria has.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: I shall have much pleasure in supporting the amendment, for I think the sub-section quite unnecessary. The object of the clause is to give the rush of people (and I may say I do not despise them as has been said) the franchise; but after a time we shall discover that they are not all that we expected them to be. If the Government mean to have manhood suffrage, or universal suffrage, then they should give to every man and every woman of the age of 21 years a vote. This clause, however, means nothing, for almost any man in the colony can qualify under any of the other clauses. I should like to see this part of the Bill thrown out altogether, as being useless.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I hope the Hon. the Colonial Secretary will keep the flag flying, even though the ship founders, for I contend that we should give to those who come here to make this their home at least the same political rights they have been accustomed to in the other colonies. We want to attract

the best men, and we may be sure that the best men will not be attracted if they have to sink to a lower political level than that which they have been accustomed to. It is altogether out of the question that the best men of the other colonies will come here if they are not to enjoy all the rights of citizenship until they have amassed a certain amount of property, and it is the best men that we desire to see attracted to our shores. I would also point out that the striking out of this sub-section will also have a material influence on another part of this Bill. There are three more constituencies added in order to give the goldfields representation, and the electors for these will be largely drawn from the mining population, and who, in the majority of instances, will not possess a property qualification. If this sub-section be struck out, I cannot see how the Government will deal with these constituencies, for, practically, there will be no voters. The Hon. Mr. Hooley holds up Victoria as a dreadful example, yet she has some advantages; she has population, wealth, and material and commercial prosperity considerably over and above that of this colony. I know some families who find it a more desirable place to live in than here—families who derive their incomes from this colony. The Hon. Mr. Hooley says we do not want to be reduced to the level of Victoria. I hope Victorians will take note of this.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY: Those are not my words.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: The hon. member said he did not wish to see us come down to the level of Victoria. At all events, even in Victoria, if we look closely into the matter, we find that those who have been most guilty of the wilful and criminal extravagance which has brought the colony to its present position, are the large capitalists, who stimulated the smaller capitalists to follow their example. There is no danger such as is apprehended by the enemies of universal suffrage, for the man who seeks to be enrolled must be 12 months in the colony, and, secondly, he must be six months in a district. That is, he must have a fixed abode for that time. Those who will be enrolled under this sub-section, in my opinion, will not number

ten per cent. of the voters, and hence the influence of the remaining nine-tenths can be exercised against them to the fullest extent. Then there is the plural vote and the absent vote, which is a great advantage conceded to property holders, inasmuch as it is possible for them to have no less than 33 votes each. The claim of those who would vote under the sub-section my hon. friend wishes to strike out, is nothing but one of simple justice, and, at the same time, it seems to me that it has been so safeguarded as to be reduced to the smallest, and what is sometimes called the irreducible, minimum.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): My hon. friend Mr. Morrison has told us that this was not asked for, but I should be sorry for the House to think that the Government had brought this matter forward without pressure. As a matter of fact, the Lower House, since its very first session, has demanded what is now proposed, and a number of members of that House were returned pledged to support it. I occupied a seat in that House for two years, and I know I was pledged to my electorate to support it. I might also remind the House that, although the delegates who went to England did not exactly pledge the colony to extend the franchise, a representation was made to the select committee of the House of Commons to the effect that at the earliest possible moment, after the granting of the new Constitution, the question would be taken into consideration, with a view to extending it. I have been assured that that representation had great weight with many members who composed that committee, and that in consequence of it they did not oppose the Bill in its passage through the House of Commons. It was pointed out to the delegates that it was ridiculous to limit the franchise to those who possessed property, in these enlightened days. The Hon. Mr. Morrison has also pointed out that almost anyone might qualify under the other conditions of the Bill, but I would point out that in the country districts particularly, there are many deserving young men living with their parents who are neither leaseholders nor freeholders, and who, in fact, possess no property. There are the farm servants, none of whom can qualify except under

the section which is now proposed to be struck out. Many of these are intelligent and worthy men, and many of them, no doubt, when they have saved sufficient money, will acquire land for themselves and become farmers. When I stood for York I went out to a farm where there were three or four men who had been living there for years. Not one of them had a vote, neither could they get one if this amendment is carried, and I am told that this was no isolated case among such people. Surely my hon. friends, Mr. Wright, Mr. Hooley, and Mr. Hassell, would not say that such men as these should not be entitled to a vote. We know that in Perth a great many young, but intelligent men, live in lodgings, and these could not vote if we take away this sub-section. Exclusive of the lodgers, I do not think the sub-section will add more than ten per cent. to the voters' lists, and besides this, the extension of the franchise as proposed will afford to property-holders a considerably greater voting power. It will be observed that the man of property may have 33 votes. It may be said, so also can those I have alluded to; but the man who is struggling to maintain his family, and who, perhaps, has sufficient money to go on a farm, will not care about spending the money he wants to improve his holding, in buying property in various places simply to obtain votes. Bearing all these things in mind, I hope hon. members will support the retention of the sub-section.

THE HON. G. RANDELL: I had intended to refer to some of the points so ably put forward by the Colonial Secretary; but I may say that, to my knowledge, there are many men who are justly entitled to vote, and who are excluded, even under the present lodger franchise. The number of such men is considerable, and I should be within the mark if I said I knew one hundred, who are intelligent, cultured, and able to form their own opinions, but who have not been able to obtain a vote under the lodger franchise. A still greater injustice will be done to them if this clause be struck out, because they will not, therefore, be able to even qualify as lodgers, inasmuch as, by repealing the 39th section of the principal Act, as this Bill does, we shall be repealing the means of qualifying. I do not entertain the fears expressed by some,

that, by giving the franchise to these men under the clause it is proposed to eliminate, they will be adding a danger to the interests of property-holders, and a danger to the best interests of the colony.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: There are six other sub-sections, providing different qualifications, and it has struck me that if this one is allowed to stand, what is the use of the others?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (HON. S. H. PARKER): To give property-holders a vote in all other districts than the one in which they reside.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: At all events my opinion is that six months is too short a time to allow a man to vote.

THE HON. G. RANDELL: It is eighteen months.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: It says he has to be resident for six months.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (HON. S. H. PARKER): He has first to be in the colony twelve months, and it will take him some time to get registered.

THE HON. G. RANDELL: It will be two years before he gets a vote.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (HON. S. H. PARKER): He will be lucky if he exercises one in two years.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: Under these circumstances I shall vote for the sub-section.

THE HON. H. ANSTEY: Another man who has been forgotten by hon. members is the miner. Such persons as these go into the heart of the country, and endure great privations; and if this sub-section be struck out, they will have no vote. I shall, therefore, vote against the amendment.

THE HON. G. W. LEAKE: I shall cast in my vote with the Hons. Mr. Wright, Mr. Hooley, and others, and I shall give my reasons. Some time ago there was a very celebrated man in New South Wales, whose name was Robert Lowe. He came to the conclusion that the franchise is not a right but a privilege, which is not to be degraded by being thrust into the hands of every one, but to be extended as the reward of thrift. What reward have we to offer if we give the franchise indiscriminately? Last night, on the subject of extending the franchise to women, the Colonial Secretary stated that no demand had been made for it, and in the same way I may

urge to-night that no demand has been made for this. No petitions have been addressed to either House; no public meetings have been held, and in spite of this, the franchise is to be given away as a thing of no value. The Colonial Secretary has told us that the extension was implied when the delegates were before the select committee of the House of Commons, but, at any rate, it was not expressed—it was something like Montgomery's definition of prayer—

*The soul's sincere desire uttered, but not expressed.*

We have the advantage of the experience of the other colonies on the subject. They have this wide franchise, and do we find the people there who possess it so reasonable and so amenable to law and order that no violence is done? On the contrary, they have shown us the way the suffrage will be used. Runs have been burnt, wool has been prevented from being shipped, sheep from being shorn, wharves deserted, and produce unsold. Did we not see, during the late strike, families starving, and houses stripped of furniture because the bread-winner, as he is called, was not allowed to labour? These men formed unions, and we all know what that means.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: A sort of caucus.

THE HON. J. MORRISON: What is that?

THE HON. G. W. LEAKE: A thing for fools to comment on, sir. The heads of these unions earn from four to five pounds a week, at the expense of the people they try to ruin. The empty windbag of the pot-house is the ruler, and he gives the men plenty of gas as reasons for his falsity and cruelty. Let me ask whether the people in the other colonies, to whom the franchise has been extended, have behaved reasonably, and with a view to the well-being of the various communities? Have they not rather degraded labour than ennobled it? Has no warning been given to those gentlemen of our Legislature who went to the other colonies as to what they might expect from an extension of the franchise? In Victoria, Queensland, New South Wales, and South Australia they have given the franchise to those who do not know how to use it, and who, when they do use it, use it to the detriment of their fellow men. By giving this

franchise, power will no longer be vested in the soundest thinkers, but in those who make the most lavish promises. To my mind, the right to vote should be the reward of temperance and hard work. I shall say no more. I have given an imperfect explanation of the motives which guide me in this matter, but it will be seen that I do not vote without having good reasons for the course I am taking.

THE HON. R. W. HARDEY: I shall support this Clause as it stands, for I consider that a man who has been in the colony twelve months, and who has been in a district six months, has quite sufficient qualification. There are many men in this colony at the present time, well qualified to vote, but who are disfranchised under the law as it stands, and as it will stand, if this sub-section be struck out.

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT: We have listened to the very cogent and good reasoning of the Colonial Secretary; we have listened to the election speech of the Hon. Mr. Hackett, and the usual things said on these occasions by those who believe in manhood suffrage, and also to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Anstey, whose sympathy seems to be with the miners, which to me appears to be the chief blot on the whole business. The miner comes here for the purpose of getting what he can out of the colony. He digs for gold, and if he finds a reef or an alluvial patch, the better; but as soon as he gets hold of his gold, he leaves for the other colonies, only too glad to shake off the dust of Western Australia from his feet, and, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, he abuses us into the bargain. The whole thing is most unjust. The giving of universal suffrage is unjust to the man who by his thrift can pay ten pounds a year for his house, and to my mind if a man cannot do that, he is not worthy of having a vote. I quite agree with the Hon. Mr. Randell, that if we strike out this sub-section many of those who should have a vote will be excluded. There is no reason why we should not pass a further amendment to enable lodgers to vote. The stipulation in the principal Act, by which only lodgers who pay ten pounds a year for an unfurnished room, seems to me absurd, but we need not reenact it in that form. The Hon. Mr.

Hackett says that he does not see what is to be done with the mining electorates, if this amendment is carried; but I see no difficulty, because it seems to me those electorates are not required. The interests of these men are not interests in common with those of the people of Western Australia. Their interests lie in the gold, which they procure as soon as possible and get away with it. There is only one other argument used by the Colonial Secretary that I will refer to. He said that one of the chief reasons why we should vote for this was because the delegates, when in London, pledged the colony.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I did not say pledge.

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT: They would have exceeded their powers if they had done so. It appears to me that it would be to the benefit of this colony if this Bill were thrown out. We threw it out last year, and are we going to stultify ourselves by allowing it to pass now? Has there been a single objection made to the course we took, except by certain newspapers, which have made the greatest possible capital out of it. The colony has been perfectly quiescent, and I believe that, outside municipalities, the people have rejoiced that manhood suffrage has been rejected, inasmuch as it is an insult to those who hold the franchise.

THE HON. J. F. T. HASSELL: I was under the impression that a man had to reside twelve months in the colony, and after that six months in a district—eighteen months altogether—before he could be registered. I am now informed that that is not the case.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): If a man resides say twelve months in Perth, he will of course have been six months in a district, and will be entitled to be put on the roll. The hon. member must bear in mind that it will take six months to get on the roll, so that really it will be eighteen months before a man can be registered as a voter. We do not have elections every year, and we must take the average time on which a man will have a chance of exercising his vote, and this seems to me to be about once in every three and a half years. I understand the Hon. Mr. Wright's principal objection is to miners having a vote.



Now, I do think that men who come here and risk their lives, and spend a considerable amount of money in developing the resources of this country, should have some representation. It must be borne in mind that they can only exercise an influence in mining districts, and this seems to me to take the sting out of my hon. friend's remarks. We are going to provide three mining districts—Nannine, Pilbarra, and Yilgarn—and if we strike out this sub-section there will be no voters for them. Then my hon. friend says he would give a lodger franchise. Now, I tried to draw up a clause to give lodgers a vote, which would also include such as lived with their parents on farms, but I found it impossible to do it. Then the Hon. Mr. Leake has drawn a dreadful picture of the other colonies in times of strikes. I am sure he does not mean to connect these with manhood suffrage.

THE HON. G. W. LEAKE: Yes, I do.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): Surely these strikes arose from men having combined by unions to try and strengthen the cause of labour against capital. They have had no connection whatever with manhood suffrage. Is there not a proof of it in the disgraceful scenes which have occurred in the mother country, where manhood suffrage does not prevail? Could there have been a greater struggle than the dockyard strike which took place two or three years ago? In England they have a £7 franchise, and yet these strikes occur there, and, therefore, I think I am justified in saying they have no connection with manhood suffrage. This sub-section is really the great principle of this Bill. The Government are of opinion that every man who pays taxes is entitled to representation, and they therefore press that this clause shall be allowed to stand as it is.

THE HON. J. G. H. AMHERST: I have been listening to the arguments on both sides, and I have come to the conclusion that those in favour of retaining this clause outweigh those in favour of striking it out. I think if a man takes sufficient interest in the matter to personally come forward and register himself, he should be entitled to a vote. I am not in favour of men being brought up like sheep, to obtain votes, and I hope when the Electoral Act comes before us we shall

be able to so hedge round this provision that even the villainous miner, as the Hon. Mr. Wright says—

THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT: I did not say villainous.

THE HON. J. G. H. AMHERST: I will accept the correction and say that we shall be able to so hedge it round that not even the roving miner will be able to become a source of political danger.

Question—That the sub-clause proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause—put.

Committee divided.

Ayes	...	...	...	7
Noes	...	...	...	6

Majority for ... 1

AYES.	NOES.
The Hon. J. G. H. Amherst	The Hon. G. Glyde
The Hon. H. Anstey	The Hon. E. Hamersley
The Hon. J. W. Hackett	The Hon. E. T. Hooley
The Hon. R. W. Hardey	The Hon. G. W. Leake
The Hon. J. F. T. Hassell	The Hon. J. Morrison
The Hon. G. Randell	The Hon. J. A. Wright
The Hon. S. H. Parker (Teller).	(Teller).

Amendment negatived.

Clause passed.

The remaining clauses were agreed to.

Postponed Clause 4.—“Constitution of Council”:

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY moved, as a consequential amendment, that the word “twenty-one,” in the first line, be struck out, and that the word “eighteen” be inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment put and passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) moved that progress be reported, and leave asked to sit again.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 6.40 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Monday, 4th September, at 8 o'clock p.m.