

**BILL—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT.**

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

**BILL—CITY OF PERTH.**

*In Committee.*

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Borrowing powers:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is considered that the clause may need some slight alteration. I would ask the Minister to report progress so that the position may be further considered.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We should pass the Bill as promptly as possible because it is a matter of urgency. The object is to enable the Council, among other things, to acquire land that will allow the municipal authorities to extend Forrest Place through to St. George's-terrace. It is well known to hon. members that at the present time the Congregational Church authorities are erecting a building and until the Bill is passed the City Council cannot step in and acquire the land. The more that is spent in connection with the building operations, the more the citizens will have to pay. No objection was taken to the Bill in another place where it was scrutinised very carefully by the Minister for Lands (Hon. W. C. Angwin). This clause provides additional borrowing powers to enable the City Council to acquire land and so on, but the exercise of those powers will be subject to the consent of the ratepayers. There is a lot to be done before the municipal council can act, and if we hang up the Bill, it will mean more expense for the citizens.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is exceeding the limit that should be imposed on such a discussion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask the hon. member if he wishes, in these circumstances, to press for progress being reported.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood that the hon. member was doing so but it is contrary

to our Standing Orders to discuss a motion such as that before the Chair.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: By way of personal explanation, I would like to point out that the request I have made comes from the city solicitors as representing those concerned. I am in agreement with what Mr. Lovekin has said in view of the building operations that are going on.

Hon. T. Moore: Cannot we pass the Bill and then recommit it, if necessary?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, we could do that, if the Minister withdraws his motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8 and 9—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Do I understand that the report has been adopted?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Can I move for the recommitment of the Bill at the third reading stage?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

*House adjourned at 4.51 p.m.*

---

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 17th September, 1925.*

---

	PAGE
Bills: Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, Report	935
Electoral Act Amendment, Com.	936
Supply (No. 2) £1,232,000, returned	954

---

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

# **BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMEND- MENT.**

*In Committee.*

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Power of Governor-in-Council as to subdivisions of districts:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause, of course, does not mean that the Government will be able to alter the boundaries of an electorate by proclamation; but will the State electorates forming subdivisions of a Federal electorate have to be arranged with the Federal Government? The Minister should explain exactly what is meant by the reference to subdivisions.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The clause gives power to divide an electorate into subdivisions. For example, in the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie and in the State division of Kimberley there are three distinct subdivisions—Derby, Wyndham, and Broome. The subdivisions could remain, and those three would still form our division of Kimberley. While originally the boundaries of State and Federal divisions were co-terminous, we have since passed a Redistribution of Seats Act. There was no necessity for the Commonwealth to alter its subdivisions on that account, and it was not done. Thus at present the Federal subdivisions are not in conformity with our subdivisions. Again, the subdivision of Geraldton, of which naturally I know most, is utterly different from the division of Geraldton on the Assembly rolls. In that instance, too, our Redistribution of Seats Act of about 11 years ago altered the boundaries. The same position obtains in regard to many other subdivisions. The Federal division of Kalgoorlie still retains the old subdivisions of Ivanhoe and Brownhill, although the State electoral law has amalgamated them. The Commonwealth has decided to make its subdivisions co-terminous with ours. I think that position is pretty well understood now.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—Changes to be made in rolls on subdivision of districts or alteration of boundaries:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause provides that rolls shall be made in accordance with redistributions. Shall we have absolute freedom to do as we like?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, absolute freedom. Taking again the case of Geraldton, I may point out that in the existing State division of Geraldton there is a portion of the Federal subdivision of Greenough. This clause gives power to take out of Greenough in the Federal subdivision the portion which belongs to the Geraldton subdivision.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Claims for enrolment or transfer of enrolment:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause provides that any Western Australian senator can, if he so desires, have his name retained upon the roll of any subdivision; and there is a corresponding provision for members of this State Parliament.

The Minister for Justice: A senator represents Western Australia.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The clause also refers to members of the House of Representatives. If the electorate of a member of the House of Representatives covers half a dozen of our electorates—

The Minister for Justice: He could be on only one roll.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He could take his choice?

The Minister for Justice: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope he will make a wise choice.

Mr. MARSHALL: Subclause 3 reads—

No person is entitled to have his name placed upon any Assembly roll other than the roll for the district or subdivision in which he lives.

This subclause is the point upon which I dwelt when speaking on the second reading. If it is passed, it will place numerous persons who really have the qualifications necessary for enrolment below even the level of a half-blood. It will debar them from being enrolled. A great number of people, notably stock drovers, do not live anywhere in particular. They have no permanent place of abode. The subclause will prevent their getting on the roll.

Mr. Sampson: Do they ever claim to be enrolled?

Mr. MARSHALL: Having no specific domicile, they are not qualified. I am speaking of the single men amongst them.

Mr. Sampson: What is their postal address?

Mr. MARSHALL: Probably the railroad, with instructions to send correspondence after them wherever they have gone.

Hon. G. Taylor: They are domiciled somewhere; they are not always on the road.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, sometimes they are on the beer. Under this subclause they must have a permanent dwelling place, which for them is an impossible qualification. Unless they live in a certain electorate they are not entitled to be enrolled. Recently I met a team of men who were 18 weeks on the road, with another two weeks to go. Under the subclause they would not be entitled to be on the roll, because they had come all the way down from Kimberley to Leonora, traversing several electorates.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They would be on the Kimberley roll.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, they went from Leonora to Kimberley for the stock.

Mr. Teesdale: They must have a home somewhere; they are not living in a hollow log.

Hon. G. Taylor: If they were, that would be their domicile.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister himself must admit that under this subclause, unless those people have a permanent place of abode they would be debarred from getting on the roll.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I think the hon. member is right in his contention. All law is designed to cover ordinary cases. It is exceptional to have a man living nowhere in particular and wandering all over the various electorates in the earning of his livelihood. Even stock drovers usually have a domicile somewhere, a place to which their letters can be sent, but I can well believe that the single men amongst them have no fixed address. I know a drover whose wife lives at Geraldton and who is on the Geraldton roll, although he spends not more than five or six weeks in Geraldton in each year. There is an arrangement for nomadic people, who can elect to be domiciled at a given place. I suppose an officious registrar could object to the name of such a man being on the roll. He would send an objection notice to that man's registered address. That would be forwarded on to him, and he could reply to the objection. If he did that his name would be allowed to

remain on the roll. So, if these drovers elect to make a certain place their domicile, they will not be struck off the roll before a notice reaches them from the registrar, stating that objection has been taken to their being on the roll.

Mr. North: Does the subclause cover members of the Seamen's Union?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Men working on the "Bambra" and the "Kangaroo" travel up and down the coast, but their domicile is at Fremantle. They are not denied their votes.

Mr. Teesdale: They send down postal votes from the nearest port.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We cannot in the Act specifically provide for drovers but, as I have explained, there is no reason why they should not be on the roll and remain there.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The disability pointed to by the member for Murchison is a very real one. I cannot suggest any way out of the difficulty, but I know that in the past men have been systematically pushed off the roll. There should be closer examination before a man's name is removed from the roll. I know of two men who were enrolled for Kimberley. In each year they spent six or seven months at the Wyndham Meat Works. As soon as they got on the boat to come south the Electoral Department was notified and their names were removed from the roll. The circumstances were explained to the Chief Electoral Officer, and he agreed that the names of those men should remain on the Kimberley roll. That was all right, but how many men would have opportunity for getting before the Chief Electoral Officer with their protest?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But if they left the district they must come off the roll.

Mr. MILLINGTON: They have no permanent domicile. They desire to remain on the roll for the district in which they are earning their living, not for some other district in which, perhaps, they remain only for a few weeks in each year. Generally it may be said that in the North and North-West every opportunity is taken to purge the roll. In the Gascoyne electorate last year, as soon as a man got on the boat his name was removed from the roll. This was on the eve of an election.

Mr. Sleeman: Who acted up there?

Mr. MILLINGTON: It is hard to say. There is a very close scrutiny of the State roll—those men's names were not removed from the Federal roll—and it is the practice to remove them from the State roll.

Mr. Teesdale: On the part of whom?

Mr. MILLINGTON: Officials, though I do not know who influences them. There were men who were entitled to remain on that roll for an impending election and, when they came to Perth, they could not qualify for another electorate as they had not lived there for a month. Thus, through being removed from the North-West roll, they had no vote in any electorate. These men are continually harassed over their electoral claims. Considerably more sympathy could be shown them and, before their names are removed, greater care should be taken to ensure that they receive notices.

Mr. Teesdale: You are talking of only two men, not of the meatworks employees.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I am talking of men who gain their livelihood in a given district and desire to be enrolled for that district. All sorts of busybodies seem to take it upon themselves to declare that such men are not residents of a particular district, whereas they are more entitled to be on that roll than on any other. The manner in which those men were pushed off the roll was a scandal. I had dozens of complaints, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that insufficient inquiry was made before the names were removed from the roll. I hope the department will insist upon having proper evidence before removing names in future. I cannot suggest any alteration to the clause but the department should wake up and protect men who cannot protect themselves. The difficulty is that they do not receive a notice and cannot lodge an objection. If they could lodge an objection, they would be able to submit a good claim to remain on the roll.

Mr. TEESDALE: I do not take a back place to either of the two previous speakers in my consideration for the people outback, and I do not want any metropolitan member to call my attention to the position, either. I am not accustomed to throwing bouquets at Government departments, but I have been to the Electoral Department on numerous occasions with a grievance and, after having heard a clear explanation, have been perfectly satisfied. I have not known

the department to do anything unjust. The two men mentioned by the member for Leederville may be exceptions, and it is useless for him to discuss the meatworks employees, because the majority of those men are domiciled somewhere and do not wish to vote in the Kimberley electorate. It is not fair to bring up isolated instances of men who apparently received no notice. I am satisfied that notices were posted by the department and that every care was taken to see that such men did not suffer injustice. If those men did not leave any intimation as to where their correspondence was to be forwarded, we cannot legislate for such cases. I would be loth to do an injustice to the outback people. I know their lives as well as does any member, and I would not dare to face them with an admission that I had helped to perpetrate an injustice on them. I do not think the cases mentioned by the member for Leederville are general; I think he has cited an isolated case.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What would you do with an isolated case?

Mr. TEESDALE. The departmental officials know nothing of party and care less, and they exercise the greatest possible care. Every objection lodged is carefully investigated by the electoral officer, and every opportunity is given to an elector to show why he should not be struck off the roll. There must be some limit to which the department can go and a time is appointed under the Act for the receipt of claims. The statement that numbers of men have been pushed off the roll lately is a little unfair to the department.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not complaining of the department or the officers. Subclause 3 does not aim at striking names off the roll. My grievance is that people cannot be put on the roll. Under this provision no departmental officer could put people on the roll. I am not particular about an elector who can qualify for any district. So long as he can get on the roll, I have no grievance, but I do object to a provision that will deprive of the vote a larger number of good citizens who are developing the outer parts of the State. The Bill proposes to give a vote to half bloods, and yet would deny the vote to our own people who have no permanent place of abode by reason of their avocations necessitating their moving from one district to another.

Mr. Teesdale: But such a man has an address.

Mr. MARSHALL: This does not deal with addresses. Why does not the hon. member read the subclause? Men lifting cattle from the Kimberleys live on the road and have no permanent place of abode. They travel through the Murchison, Pilbara, and probably Roebourne districts into the Kimberleys and then back through the same electorates to Leonora via Cue. Because they are continually travelling the measure would debar them from enrolling.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Minister has explained that.

The Minister for Justice: Of course I have.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then, if I were a departmental officer, I would contend that I was justified in striking such a man off the roll because he was not living in the electorate for which he was originally enrolled.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: My district is one of the outer mining areas and on the roll will be found the names of men supposed to be domiciled at Linden. These men have probably gone 30 miles away prospecting for five or six months and then moved on to another place and not returned to Linden for 18 months. Yet their names remain on the Mt. Margaret roll.

The Premier: There are men on my roll who do not live in the district for a month in the year. They are out prospecting.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: And the Act does not inconvenience them one iota. The registrar knows them and there is no difficulty whatever. It is idle for the member for Leederville to bring in the Wyndham Meatworks employees. They go North about April and complete the season in September or October and they are mostly domiciled in Perth. I have tried to get work there for dozens of men and have found that they have to be engaged at the Trades Hall. Dozens of the Wyndham Meatworks employees are married men domiciled in the suburbs of Perth. What interest have they in Wyndham that they should be put on the roll for that centre? They know nothing about the North West, and it is absurd for them to call themselves Kimberley electors. A drover may camp somewhere for weeks and months in order to spell his horses, and would be domiciled there for that period. There is too big

a desire to locate men where they can be most valuable at election time. Governments have sent men to work in doubtful electorates, and spent Government money there just before an election. That sort of thing has been done in this State.

Mr. Sleeman: By the previous Government?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Let sleeping dogs lie. It would be absurd to give a roving commission in the case of these men. A man may go to the Kimberleys and shear for 11 weeks, and then seek to get his name put on the roll for that electorate. He then may come south into another electorate and ask to have his name put on there. A man must have a domicile, and when he has one the department does not strike the name off the roll. The electoral officers desire to keep people on the roll, and to keep the rolls clean. Perhaps clean rolls do not always appeal to people, with the result that the Electoral Department is brought to book.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There is a good deal of heat about this matter. The member for Leederville gave a practical illustration of where an injustice had been done. Certain men went to Wyndham. According to the Electoral Act they had the right to transfer their names after residing at Wyndham for a month, and they exercised it. They were put on the Kimberley roll with their domicile at Wyndham. Some months later they came south. When they had left, notices were sent to them at Wyndham stating that they had been struck off the roll. They did not receive those notices.

Mr. Teesdale: Their letters did not follow them because they left no address.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It takes a long time for letters to go to Wyndham. The notices could not be returned in the case of the single men, because when they left they did not know where their domicile would be in the south. When they came south they were not down long enough to be qualified for a new domicile. These men were, therefore, deliberately disfranchised. The department must have known that if the names were struck off the Kimberley roll those people would not be qualified to get upon another roll. Why should men be persecuted, because they choose to earn their living at Wyndham, where they are giving special services to the State? It was unfair of the department to strike the names off the roll, and no member representing that part of the State should stand such treatment.

The Minister for Justice: The men contributed to the difficulty by not stating that their domicile was in the south.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister is questioning their veracity.

The Minister for Justice: I am not doing that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They said Wyndham was their domicile and their claims were recognised. Until they had permanently left Wyndham their names should not have been interfered with.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The member for Guildford can be very forgetful. The Wyndham season is closed. The elections are held in March and these men go up in April. One would imagine that they come back just before an election.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: They came back too late to get on any new roll.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: You are saying what the member for Leederville and I have stated is untrue. We thank you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am glad the hon. member is gratified over something.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: When the men arrived in the south on that occasion the Federal elections were too close to permit them to secure enrolment.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do not quibble. Stand up to it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I can stand up to anything you can say.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask members to keep order.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I apologise to the member for Guildford and the member for Leederville. I thought we were discussing our own rolls. Some of the men go to Wyndham for only one season.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Mostly the same men go up every season.

Mr. Panton: Eighty per cent. of them go up every year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then 20 per cent. remain in the south. Everyone should be correctly on the roll, and the law says how people should get on the roll. If members are not satisfied with the position, they should alter it. If we pass the clause into law it will be obeyed. If the department is so anxious to strike names off the roll why is it that the State roll has more names on it than has the Federal roll. No one takes a delight in striking names off the roll.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Lots of people take a delight in lodging objections.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know of anyone who has done so. I hope the Electoral Department will do their duty fearlessly and thoroughly; indeed, I know they will.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But they should not take directions from objectors.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: An objector has to put up a fee when he lodges an objection. I know that names sometimes remain on the roll when they should not be there. I hope no one in this Chamber wants to put names on irregularly, or keep names on when they should be off. Subclause 7 provides—

The validity of any enrolment shall not in any case be questioned on the ground that the person enrolled has not in fact lived in the district or subdivision for a period of one month.

Does not that subclause meet the case brought forward by the member for Murchison?

Mr. Marshall: No. I was speaking about people who are continually travelling.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But surely men must belong to some centre. If they do not, we cannot get over the difficulty. When the Premier went to England for six months, his name was not struck off the roll. The Electoral Department do what is reasonable, and refrain from striking off the roll people who are only temporarily absent. The Minister should explain exactly what Subclause 7 means.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The subclause means that the validity of an enrolment is not to be questioned in the case of an elector who is absent on a visit for, say, two or three months. Similarly, if a man leaves this State to represent Western Australia in the Federal Parliament, his enrolment is not to be questioned. Absence from the place of residence for one month is not of itself sufficient to invalidate enrolment; there must be other reasons.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We hear many arguments in favour of isolated cases, but if we were honest to ourselves on occasions like this we might make more progress. There are in this State men who have no desire to be on the roll, so that the tax-gatherer may not catch them. I know that personally. They have sufficient income to bring them within the reach of the income tax, and therefore do not want votes. They have no

addresses because they do not want addresses. As regards the employees of the Wyndham Meat Works, we know that the works close up at the latest in November. The last two or three general elections have come on in March, and a supplementary roll is compiled just before the elections. I have had names placed on my roll in February for an election to be held in March. Men returning from Wyndham to Perth in November should be able to get on the roll in time for an election in March. Otherwise, they should make arrangements with the Electoral Department.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But if a man is in Wyndham for seven months in the year—

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That does not apply to any of the Wyndham Meat Works employees.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Yes. They are there from April to November.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We have had complaints from the member for the district that local men cannot get employment at the Wyndham Meat Works. These employees go up from here in April and come back in September or October.

Mr. Chesson: Or November.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: When they come down here, they get employment in October or November on the sewerage works and other public works. Dozens of them do that.

Mr. Panton: What are you growling about?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Such men are not entitled to vote in the Kimberley electorate at all. They get a first-class passage to Wyndham, and half-wages while on the water.

Mr. Panton: I thought you did not know what you were talking about. These men sleep where the bullocks sleep coming down.

Mr. Teesdale: The men have first-class stretchers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Compare the case of those men with that of a man seeking employment in my electorate. He has to travel 700 or 800 miles and cart his labour to the door. He has to carry his swag on his back. Compared with that, what is the hardship of a passage on the "Kangaroo" with half-wages on the voyage up and half-wages on the voyage back?

Mr. Teesdale: And care less.

Mr. PANTON: The member for Mt. Margaret, every time he speaks, casts three

times as many innuendoes as any other member of the Chamber. The Wyndham employees do not go up first class. They go up in the same place as the bullocks come down in.

The CHAIRMAN: This discussion relative to conditions of employment at the Wyndham Meat Works must stop.

Mr. PANTON: I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will allow a little more discussion after all the innuendoes that have been cast. Members opposite have made all kinds of allegations, and now do not want to be answered. As regards the Wyndham employees returning in September, they came back early this year for the sole reason that the big cattle owners thought there was a chance of making a pot out of the metropolitan meat market. For that reason they engaged the "Moir" for four or five trips, and the Wyndham Meat Works in consequence did not get the usual number of cattle.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is not an innuendo; it is a straight-out charge.

Mr. PANTON: It has been published in the Press. Certain firms, whom I do not blame, judged that the metropolitan market was going to be a lean market, and therefore chartered the "Moir" to bring their cattle down here.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not refer to the cattle trade. References to the shortness or length of the Wyndham season are quite in order, but all the ramifications of the meat trade cannot be discussed on this clause.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What will be the position of electors in the metropolitan area if we delete Subclause 3? We have an ever-changing population in those electorates and there is a change-over of quite 50 per cent. of the electors on the roll between one election and another. If there were no provision in the legislation making it compulsory for people to enrol in the districts where they live, the electoral office would be faced with a chaotic state of affairs. If we delete the subclause, an elector can move from one electorate to another and there will be no necessity for him to change his enrolment.

The Minister for Justice: That will not happen; the subclause will not be deleted.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Without the subclause the Act will contain nothing to permit the electoral office to compel an elector to

notify his change of address and there will be chaos on election day.

Mr. TEESDALE: I wish to correct one remark made by the member for Menzies. I did not say that employees for the meat works went North on first class passages. That statement was made by the member for Mt. Margaret.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I stopped the discussion on the meat trade. I allowed members to refer to the short season at the meat works this year, as against a long season, but I will not allow any discussion on the question of accommodation for men on the boats.

Mr. Panton: At any rate, I did not make that statement.

Mr. TEESDALE: Will you permit me to refer—

The CHAIRMAN: No, you must keep to the clause.

Mr. TEESDALE: We were dealing with the treatment of men on the "Bambra"—

The CHAIRMAN: I stopped that discussion and I will not allow you to proceed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 19—Compulsory enrolment:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I take exception to Subclause 4, which provides that "a boundary rider, commercial traveller, farm hand, kangaroo hunter, prospector, relieving officer, seaman, shearer, station bookkeeper, station hand, teamster, wool classer, surveyor, survey hand, or chainman, shall not, by reason only that each has changed his place of living from one address in the electoral district or subdivision to another address therein," shall be required to notify the department of his new address.

The Minister for Justice: That applies only when the change is in one division.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is important that no one shall be exempt from the necessity for notifying change of address, otherwise how can the Electoral Department keep the rolls in order if the officers do not know where to find the electors? As it is, it will be necessary for the elector to notify the Federal Electoral Department of his change of address, so that, from that standpoint, it will not matter if the clause is deleted. Apart from prospectors and kangaroo hunters, there is no necessity for any such provision, because adequate protection is given under Subclause 7 of Clause 18 to most, if not all, of the other

electors mentioned. In any case, how can the Minister justify the inclusion of seamen, because they do not change their address from one part of an electorate to another, but go aboard their ships and proceed to other parts. A commercial traveller, as well as many of the others mentioned, must have a domicile and the registration of their proper addresses should be insisted upon. The same applies to teamsters, although some who may be carting for people in the North-West may require protection, but that is afforded by Subclause 7.

The Minister for Justice: Those men carry their tents with them and the tent is their home.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But a teamster must start from somewhere, and that place would be his home. The inclusion of the subclause will not make for pure rolls. These people must have a domicile somewhere. I do not wish anyone to be disfranchised because he happens to be away for a few months. The Minister, however, should not make it easy for people to evade their duty, particularly as the notification will have to be made under the Federal Act. I move an amendment—

That Subclause (4) be struck out.

Mr. TEESDALE: I call attention to one or two extraordinary exemptions amongst this list. Take commercial travellers: Why should the Minister be sympathetic towards them? They are quite able to look after themselves. They seldom go outback beyond the coastal towns, and so are never out of touch with civilisation and the post office. Then take relieving officers: Generally they are men who go about distributing charity.

The Minister for Justice: Nothing of the sort. They might be relieving officers of the Railway Department, or the Post Office, or the Telegraph Department.

Mr. TEESDALE: We have no railways up there, so the exemption would not apply to the North.

The Minister for Justice: But the Bill is not exclusively for the North-West.

Mr. TEESDALE: No, of course not. We do not get up there much that is not shared by the State as a whole. Then there is to be exemption for teamsters. Teamsters today get about quickly in powerful motor cars, so the difficulty in regard to them is scarcely as pronounced now as it was in the days of the donkey wago.



Mr. SAMPSON: The enormous distances of the North-West justify the deletion of the subclause. Up North it is possible for a man to be lost to his friends for years. Therefore, men of nomadic calling in the North should be required to register their changes of address. With electorates of such tremendous distances, the subclause would open the door to all manner of abuses. In the interests of pure rolls, it should be struck out. If a man moving about in the North failed to notify the electoral officer of his change of address, he could no longer receive the electoral notices intended for him. If there be any electors who should notify changes of address, surely it is those located in sparsely settled districts. Under this proviso not infrequently there would be retained on the rolls names of men who had left the country altogether. Again, why should there be exemption for survey hands and chain men, who are perfectly capable of notifying their changes of address? If this provision remains in the Bill, we can never hope to get accurate rolls for the Northern and North-Western electorates. I hope the Minister will agree to its deletion.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. SAMPSON: The retention on the roll of names of people who no longer live in the district, or whose addresses are unknown, means that the percentage of votes recorded will necessarily be lower. That conveys the impression that the public do not use the right they possess to get on the roll. We can never have a good percentage if the rolls are not clean, or are encumbered with the names of those who have left the district or have perhaps passed away.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the clause is passed as printed I am afraid the Electoral Department will not be striking out any of the names of the casual workers unless their whereabouts in another electorate is known. If the department does not know where those people are it must assume that they are somewhere else in the same electorate, and will not remove the names.

The Minister for Lands: They should not be struck off without some proof that they have left.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the department knows where they are it is a simple matter to have the addresses altered. It would be quite easy to have an inflated roll

if names were left upon it that should not be there. If the clause is going to be passed I do not see why it should not be extended to all classes of the community. In the metropolitan area people who can only rent houses for a little while are constantly moving. On the other hand, if the clause were struck out everyone would be placed on the same footing.

Mr. COVERLEY: I am surprised at the objection that has been raised to this clause. It merely gives people living outback the right to change their addresses from one part of a district to another. From Derby to Fitzroy Crossing there is a monthly mail for half the year, and a fortnightly mail for the rest of the year. This means 18 mails in the year. From Fitzroy Crossing to Hall's Creek the service is monthly. Most of the persons mentioned in this clause follow occupations that take them far away from the mail service. I know of half a dozen blade shearers who may be in West Kimberley for three or four months and for the rest of the year may be engaged in prospecting near Hall's Creek. If such a man were obliged to notify his change of address it would take him six months to do it, and by that time he may have gone back to his old address. A drover may have to go to Wyndham with one lot of cattle and to the Northern Territory with another. He is continually on the move. The same thing applies to kangaroo hunters, who are often 20 miles from the mail route. While these men are travelling about they cannot possibly notify their addresses.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member has put up a case for a few people, but not for the clause.

The Minister for Justice: Members from other districts could put up cases.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They have not done so yet. Does the Minister mean to stand by every word of the clause? If not, I might withdraw my amendment and join with other members, who desire the retention of parts of the clause, in striking out its most objectionable features. If a man called himself a shearer and lived in Perth—

Mr. Coverley: This clause would not protect him then.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would; and, similarly, a man calling himself a surveyor or a surveyor's assistant and living in Perth would be protected. Con-

sideration might be given to the kangaroo hunter and the prospector, but not to any other person in the list. All the others could conveniently notify a change of address. The Minister wants this clause to apply to the scattered North, where mails are infrequent; but it actually applies to the whole State.

The Minister for Justice: I do not want to make a law for one part of the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister would never propose this clause for the benefit of metropolitan residents, or farmers, or timber workers. Is the Minister prepared to limit the operation of the clause to those parts of the State where consideration is necessary?

The Minister for Justice: I said this portion of the Bill was non-party.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Really the clause will not help anyone very much, because the people intended to benefit from it are not struck off the rolls now. However, who is going to say that the people enrolled for Kimberley are not in the Northern Territory? I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: This clause is intended to apply in scattered communities with an infrequent mail service. It is for the benefit of people who are nomadic by reason of their occupations. However, the proposal is not cast-iron, and I am prepared to accept reasonable amendments.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (4), line three, "boundary rider" be struck out.

The boundary rider does not need the privilege, because he is permanently on the station. I do not know whether in the North-West men are employed as boundary riders for all time, or only spasmodically.

Mr. Coverley: They are boundary riders all the time.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That is all the more reason why my amendment should be carried. If a boundary rider leaves the station, he must go to another station to get work as a boundary rider. After being on the other station for a certain time, he could fill in another claim card. Such conditions would tend to keep the rolls clean. Some of the

exemptions proposed by the subclause are justified, according to my experience of the back country. I may point out that a boundary rider would not need to fill in another claim card because of a change of location on a large station.

Mr. COVERLEY: I hope the amendment will be rejected. I have already tried to explain the difficulties involved in the mail service. Under existing postal conditions, a man in the North-West is liable to be off the roll for six months out of the 12 while registering a change of address.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: What about the manager of the station?

Mr. COVERLEY: The manager never leaves the station. This amendment would inflict great hardship on boundary riders.

Mr. LAMOND: I oppose the amendment. A boundary rider is often 60 or 70 miles away from the head station. I know of cases where a boundary rider gets only two or three mails in a year.

Mr. Thomson: If he remained on the station he would be all right.

Mr. LAMOND: He might leave for another station where there was no mail service at all. The member for Roebourne gave members the impression that because of the aerial mail service the North-West was well catered for. Our worst service is along that part over which the aeroplanes fly. I refer to the 90-Mile Beach. Some of the stations, such as De Grey, Ettrick and Shaw River, have no mail service. Mails are collected only when it pleases the station owner to send for them. The station owners are appointed returning officers, only when elections are being held. In the Roebourne electorate there are boundary riders living 60 miles away from the station.

Mr. Teesdale: That is not so.

Mr. LAMOND: What about Rockleigh?

Mr. Teesdale: Someone rides over from there.

Mr. LAMOND: I have worked there and know that they do not get a mail for six weeks at a time.

Mr. Teesdale: Someone rides over every fortnight.

Mr. LAMOND: That is a wrong statement, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Teesdale: On a point of order, I may have made a mistake, although I flatly deny having done so, but the hon. member has no right to say that I told a deliberate untruth.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Pilbara must withdraw the statement.

Mr. LAMOND: I withdraw. Unfortunately, we have to withdraw facts very often. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. BROWN: If there is one man in the North-West who, judging by the debate, is in a permanent position, it is the boundary rider.

Member: The boss does not see him often enough to give him the sack.

Mr. BROWN: There is nothing to prevent boundary riders being enrolled.

Mr. THOMSON: If we accept the statements of members representing northern constituencies, there is no need to worry about boundary riders, particularly if, as some member interjected, the boss does not see them often enough to give them the sack. No reason has been advanced why boundary riders should be singled out for preference. If the mail services are so infrequent, as suggested, one might imagine that elections pass without the people in the North knowing about them. I do not think they are so illiterate that they cannot attend to their electoral requirements.

Mr. Teesdale: They all get the "Worker."

Hon. S. W. Munsie: They don't get mails, but they can get the "Worker."

Mr. THOMSON: This provision is dangerous and I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. TEESDALE: Since my remarks on the second reading debate, I have refreshed my memory regarding mail services in the North and I have the assurance of the Deputy Postmaster General that there is a fortnightly mail along the coast, and that the mailmen from inland meet the boats. The only exception is in the Kimberleys, where there is a 60-day mail service only. The mail goes from Turkey Creek down to Wyndham regularly, and the linesmen often take the mails from Hall's Creek to Turkey Creek. I do not wish to misrepresent the member for Pilbara, but I take exception to his statement that there are boundary riders in the Roebourne electorate who reside more than 60 miles from the station. I know of two and they go to a station within 60 miles of Rockleigh, and every time the mail reaches Hamersley's, a boy rides over for the mail.

Mr. Lamond: What about Mulga Downs?

Mr. TEESDALE: The aerial mail service has provided wonderful facilities and we are now in a better position in the North

than we have been for 40 years past. If any member has a longer experience of the North than that, I shall be pleased to know of it. In my enthusiasm I do not wish my personal feelings to cause me to make mistakes, but I object to the suggestion that I told a deliberate lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That statement was withdrawn and I cannot allow the hon. member to refer to it again.

Mr. TEESDALE: I am sorry I referred to it. I wish to make it clear that I did not deliberately mislead the Committee.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	14
Noes	..	..	..	17

Majority against .. 3

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Mann	Mr. Teesdale
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Thomson
Mr. North	Mr. Richardson
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Collier	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Miss Holman	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Withers
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)

#### PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Davy	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Denton	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Panton
Mr. Latham	Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Troy
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough	Mr. Millington

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in lines three and four the words "commercial traveller, farm hand" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in lines four and five the words "relieving officer" be struck out.

Later on I will move an amendment limiting the clause to areas outside the South-West division. That will make it apply to station properties only.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That in line five the word "seaman" be struck out.

Why should seamen be included in the exempted list? The average seaman has his domicile at the port where he resides. I can scarcely imagine any seaman living away out in the backblocks.

The Premier: Are there not any seamen navigating the waters of Turkey Creek?

Mr. THOMSON: There may be; I do not know.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	14
Noes	..	..	..	16

Majority against .. 2

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. George  
Mr. E. B. Johnston  
Mr. Maon  
Sir James Mitchell  
Mr. North

Mr. Sampson  
Mr. J. M. Smith  
Mr. J. H. Smith  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Teesdale  
Mr. Thomson  
Mr. Richardson

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Chesson  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Coverley  
Mr. Cunningham  
Mr. Heron  
Miss Holman  
Mr. Hughes  
Mr. W. D. Johnson

Mr. Lamond  
Mr. Marshall  
Mr. Munro  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. A. Wansbrough  
Mr. Willcock  
Mr. Withers  
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

#### PAIRS.

##### AYES.

Mr. Barnard  
Mr. Davy  
Mr. Deaton  
Mr. Latham  
Mr. Stubbs  
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough

##### NOES.

Mr. Pantou  
Mr. McCallum  
Mr. Corbooy  
Mr. Kennedy  
Mr. Troy  
Mr. Millington

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the Minister will agree to restrict the subclause to the pastoral lands of the State. That will alter the whole position.

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That in line five the word "shearer" be struck out.

Conditions under which shearing is done to-day are totally different from those of the past. Most of the shearing in the North is done under contract, and the shearers are provided with motor trucks and transported from station to station without loss of time. Under the subclause it would be very difficult for the electoral officers to keep track of the shearers. The principle is altogether wrong and might easily lead to abuse.

Mr. ANGELO: In relation to the subclause the shearers are on all-fours with commercial travellers and seamen, for most of the shearers working up North have their homes in the metropolitan area or in the South-West. Nearly all of them are engaged for shearing through the bureau in Perth. Their homes are down here, and this is where they ought to be registered. Of course there are exceptions, such as the unmarried shearers, and I would have no objection to their registering wherever they desire. Moreover, a large number of the shearers engaged in the North come from the Eastern States. Many of them have been registered in the northern electorates.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They have to be here six months before they are eligible.

Mr. ANGELO: Nevertheless some of their names have appeared on the rolls. The local shearers, of course, are enrolled in the districts in which they live. Too much is made of the alleged difficulty in notifying changes of address. On every station in my electorate there is an ample supply of claim cards.

The Minister for Justice: How often do they get a mail?

Mr. ANGELO: At least once a fortnight. If the Electoral Department were asked to see to it that every station in the North-West is kept well supplied with claim cards, and if the workers' representatives at each station see to it that the men's names are kept on the rolls, I cannot conceive of hardship resulting from insisting upon changes of address being notified.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am opposed to the amendment. The subclause has nothing to do with individuals moving about in one district, or from district to district, but applies merely to persons who may reside at, say, Meekatharra, and take on contracts as

shearers. The subclause merely provides that such persons shall remain on the roll for Meekatharra while away shearing.

Mr. MANN: Apparently very few shearers would be affected by this amendment. I had expected the member for Kimberley and the member for Murchison to show that hundreds would be involved. Most of the shearing is done through contracting companies. The largest of these is Doyle's. All his shearers sign on in Perth, and 95 per cent. of them live in the southern districts. The next biggest employer is Young, whose men also sign on in Perth. Then there are Day and McGinnity, who are the other two contractors. All these shearers are back in their homes in the metropolitan district or in the south by December. Some of these men went away in the early part of March; others left in April, and others as late as June for the South-West shearing. If one of these men put himself on the roll for a particular electorate, say in the North, who would then have to inform the department that he had left for, say, the Gascoyne? I do not believe 5 per cent. of the shearers stay in one electorate all the year.

The Minister for Justice: That is what I said.

Mr. MANN: Then where is the necessity for the amendment?

The Minister for Justice: No one said that hundreds would be affected.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Why deprive the few of the benefits of the clause?

Mr. MANN: We have heard of only about a dozen blade shearers in the North.

Mr. Marshall: Of course they have no right to a vote!

Mr. MANN: They ought to be sufficiently experienced to know how to keep on the roll when they want their names there. If a shearer, who is domiciled at Meekatharra, left for a few weeks with the intention of returning, he would not have to notify any change of address.

Mr. LAMOND: In place of the word "shearer" I should like to see inserted the words "casual pastoral worker." This Bill will affect shed hands, who are as numerous as shearers, as well as wool pressers. In the Pilbara electorate a shearer would have to change his address at least six times.

Mr. Angelo: Where is his permanent home?

Mr. LAMOND: He has none, if he is a single man. From 300 to 500 men would be affected under this clause.

Mr. Mann: But the shed hands go up from the city.

Mr. LAMOND: They would have to change their addresses just the same. The member for Katanning said there was an obligation on the shearing contractor to return the shearer to the metropolitan area. That is not so. The shearer pays his own fare wherever he goes.

Mr. COVERLEY: The member for Perth in his argument made a feature of my remark that I knew of six shearers who were affected. He suggested that the clause was intended for the benefit of those six shearers. I was merely pointing out that I knew of six blade shearers who also followed the occupation of miners or prospectors, and who had great difficulty in keeping their names on the roll.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Not much harm will be done if the shearer is left in, because only the electorate in which the shearer first registers will be affected. However, very conflicting statements have been made by members representing shearing electorates. Some of them said they knew of two or three shearers who were affected by this clause, but the member for Pilbara said he knew of between 300 and 500 shearers in the Pilbara electorate who were affected. The Pilbara roll contains only some 600 names.

Mr. Lamond: I said there were between 300 and 500 shearers affected altogether in the State.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not suggest for a moment that the member for Pilbara wished to mislead the Chamber, but his enthusiasm for his constituents led him too far. However, shearers do move about a bit.

Mr. LAMOND: The member for Mt. Margaret has misrepresented me. I did not say there were between 300 and 500 men in Pilbara whom this clause would affect. I said it would affect from 300 to 500 shearers altogether, meaning throughout the State.

Mr. NORTH: The argument might be shortened if the Minister were prepared to accept in the defining clause a definition of "residence." The whole argument seems to turn on that word.

The Premier: The matter of residence does not apply to the shearer, because he has no residence.

Mr. NORTH: If the interpretation clause provided that the word "residence" meant the first address given by the elector, that would meet the difficulty.

Mr. THOMSON: If, as suggested, a shearer must notify a change of address to the Electoral Department every time he moves from one station to another, the law should be amended. The suggestion of the member for Claremont is thoroughly reasonable. If a man is domiciled in, say, Kataning and goes to Kojonup for three weeks, then, according to the construction of the law, he must notify the Electoral Department that he has changed his address.

Mr. North: Because the word "residence" is not defined.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes. Due consideration has not been given to this measure, and we are rushing it through.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must deal with the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: The whole difficulty could be overcome by a definition of "residence," as suggested by the member for Claremont.

The CHAIRMAN: That suggestion has been made, and I do not think the hon. member is in order in referring to it.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not see why shearers or any other section should have the special privilege of exemption from the requirement to notify the Electoral Department of changes of address. Many settlers go North shearing to get a cheque, and then spend the money in the development of their land.

Mr. Chesson: They will not be affected.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, they will. The exemption, if granted, should be broad enough to cover all sections meriting it.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	..	19

Majority against .. 8

AYES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Brown	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Richardson
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	(Teller.)

# PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Panton
Mr. Davy	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Denton	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Latham	Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Troy
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough	Mr. Millington

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in lines five and six the words "station bookkeeper, station hand, teamster" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in lines six and seven the words "wool classer, surveyor, survey hand or chainman" be struck out.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I do not agree with the amendment. Surveyors and their assistants have no fixed place of abode and if they are struck out of the subclause, an injustice will be done to the men in the bush.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	..	..	16

Majority against .. 3

AYES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Brown	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Richardson
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Miss Holman	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Withers
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)
Mr. Lamond	

PAIRS.	
AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Davy	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Denton	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Latham	Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Troy
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough	Mr. Millington

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Subclause (4):—"Provided that this subsection shall apply to that portion of the State situated outside the South-West division."

That will make the subclause apply only to pastoral lands.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Does the proviso apply to the whole clause or only Subclause 4?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: To Subclause 4 only.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Where will the member for Nelson be if the amendment be carried? It will nullify his vote on the last amendment. It will mean that the surveyors and chainmen will not be exempted, because they are practically all in the South-West. There are very few surveyors working in the North.

Mr. Teesdale: I wish there were more.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Committee have decided that where postal facilities are few, and distances may create difficulties, certain people will be afforded relief, but that elsewhere, where the conditions are altogether dissimilar, the exemptions shall not apply.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: What about some parts of the South-West that are quite isolated?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is no difficulty in those parts since the people are on the roll. If a surveyor lives in Perth he will be registered there, although his work may be in the South-West.

Mr. HUGHES: In view of the fact that we are to have a joint electoral roll, do the decisions of the Committee on this subclause mean that under the Commonwealth electoral law people will be struck off the rolls if they change their addresses without notifying the department, whereas the amendment will prevent their being struck off the State rolls. The object of the Bill is that we shall have the one uniform joint roll. But the Commonwealth law provides that the electoral

officer can delete a certain name from the roll, while the State law will lay it down that he cannot delete the name. What will be the position?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There will be confusion, of course.

Mr. HUGHES: The very basis of a joint roll is uniform enrolment. The only thing that would make me consider giving the half-caste a vote would be the keeping of the roll uniform. Nothing will be gained if the amendment be agreed to, for the Federal officer will strike off the names under his Federal authority. I hesitate to vote for anything that will destroy uniformity in the joint roll.

Mr. THOMSON: The argument put up by the hon. member is like a great many others that he inflicts upon us. As a matter of fact, under the Commonwealth Act there are no exemptions.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is what he said.

Mr. HUGHES: This man often shows us what a fool he is.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Thomson: I want that remark withdrawn.

Mr. HUGHES: I withdraw.

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

(Clauses 20 to 41—agreed to.)

Clause 42—Amendment of Sections 17 and 18:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This proposal to substitute three months for six months means that a man who comes here from another State can be enrolled when he has been six months in Australia. To-day he must have lived in this State for six months before applying for enrolment. Under the clause a man who has been three months in another State can, at the expiration of three months in this State, apply to be enrolled. It will mean that people who come over here to do temporary work will be eligible for enrolment after being here for three months, though they have no interest in the country and do not intend to stay in it. I do not think that desirable.

The Premier: The old, conservative West Australian, who used to call us "tother-siders."

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know why a person who has been here only

three months should be eligible for enrolment.

The Premier: This will induce a number of people to come over here and get enrolled.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know why we should give them full citizen rights after three months.

The Premier: Tell us why we should not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: All the years I have been in Parliament with the Premier we have agreed, and the House has agreed, that six months is the right time. Now a change has come over the Premier.

The Premier: That is what you old, conservative West Australians dislike—a change.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier is no longer a Victorian. He is now an old West Australian.

The Premier: I am in favour of change.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Well, come over here.

The Premier: No, I was long enough over there.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That the paragraph reading "the words 'three months' are substituted for 'six months' in paragraph (b) of Subsection (1)" be struck out.

Mr. HUGHES: Under the State law it takes longer for a man to get on the roll than it does under the Federal law. For a time, therefore, a man may be eligible to be on one roll but not on the other. When joint claim cards are used a man may make all kinds of excuses for not being enrolled. Once a person has resided for a month in Western Australia he should be entitled to get on the roll. Under the system proposed there is a danger of the electoral officers being obliged to resort to asterisks or indicators to show how a voter stands with regard to his State or Federal obligations. It would be better to strike out the word "three" and insert "one," with the object of bringing our law into conformity with the Federal law. Later I shall move in that direction.

*[Mr. Lambert took the Chair.]*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There is not as much objection to the clause as might be suggested by the remarks of the Leader of

the Opposition. I am glad to say that many farmers from the Eastern States are purchasing properties in this State, and settling on the land here. These are all Australians, and we ought to take the Australian view of this matter and permit these people to be enrolled when they have been here three months. People who come here do not make the journey in order to get a vote, but to work and stay here.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The only danger I can see is that of an influx of people coming here for a few months, being enrolled, and then leaving the State again.

Mr. HUGHES: During my term in the Perth Electoral Office, by means of asterisks and other indicators an effort was made to show on a copy roll those persons who were liable for enrolment but were not liable for prosecution. Endless confusion arose, and the system had to be abandoned. During the three years 1,500 persons were prosecuted. If we are going to set up another system of indicators the same sort of chaos will ensue.

Mr. THOMSON: I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. Many people in the Eastern States have very little sympathy for Western Australia, so that the argument about good Australians does not altogether appeal to me. If people who come from Great Britain are obliged to reside here for a certain time before getting a vote, the same principle should apply to other people. We should have some idea that men will reside permanently in the State before we extend the franchise to them. We are widening our franchise altogether too much for the sake of effecting a small saving. I support the six-months period.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will temporarily withdraw his amendment, to allow the member for East Perth to move his suggested amendment.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If I withdraw my amendment, the member for East Perth can move to make the period one month instead of three, and if that is carried the position will be worse than what the Bill proposes.

Mr. Hughes: If the Opposition Leader's amendment is defeated, can I then move my amendment?

Hon. G. Taylor: No, because the question will be that the words proposed to be struck out shall stand.



Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If "three" is struck out, it will be a matter for the Committee to decide whether "one" or "six" shall be inserted. On the other hand, if the Committee retain the word "three," that will settle the amendments of both the Opposition Leader and the member for East Perth.

Mr. HUGHES: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That the words "three months" are substituted for "six months" in paragraph (b) of Subsection (1)" be struck out.

If my amendment on the Opposition Leader's amendment is carried, the effect will be to leave only "The words" standing in the paragraph of the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause.

Amendment on amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	5
Noes	..	..	..	24

Majority against .. 19

#### AYES.

Mr. Hughes  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. Wilson

Mr. Withers  
Mr. Coverley  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo  
Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Chesson  
Mr. Clydesdale  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Cunningham  
Mr. Heron  
Miss Holman  
Mr. W. D. Johnson  
Mr. E. D. Johnston  
Mr. Mann

Mr. Marshall  
Sir James Mitchell  
Mr. Munsie  
Mr. North  
Mr. Sampson  
Mr. J. M. Smith  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Teesdale  
Mr. Thomson  
Mr. A. Wan-brough  
Mr. Willcock  
Mr. Richardson

(Teller.)

Amendment on amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee having decided that the words of the paragraph shall stand, the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition lapses.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I intend to move for the deletion of Subclause 2. I would like the Minister to explain exactly what it means.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The words sought to be deleted appear in our Act and are unnecessary. We want them deleted so as to have uniformity in connection with the Federal Act. Paragraph (b) of Section 18 of the principal Act refers to people wholly dependent upon the State. Under that Act they are deprived of exercis-

ing the franchise. In the Old Men's Home, for instance, there are many inmates who receive the invalid pension, or old age pension, from the Federal authorities. They are not wholly dependent upon the State and therefore they are allowed to vote. There are a few, however, who through sickness or misfortune, have lost their money, health and everything in life and they are wholly dependent upon the State. Those people are deprived of the right to vote.

Hon. G. Taylor: There are some who are ill in hospitals and yet they are allowed to vote and that narrows the number down still further.

The CHAIRMAN: The subclause really contains three amendments to the Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have not moved any amendment.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I move an amendment—

That the words "and the words 'or a person of the half-blood' in paragraph (d) thereof" be struck out.

I do not think we should deprive those few people who are covered by the other amendments contained in the subclause, of the right to vote. I do not think there are more than 70 people concerned. My amendment will deal purely with the half-bloods.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In speaking on this particular part of the Bill the other evening, I hurt the feelings of the Minister. When referring to the political aspect, I said that apparently hon. members sitting opposite were more concerned with self-preservation than with race preservation. I confess that when I made the remark, I thought the Bill was a caucus, and not a Government measure. I know now that I misjudged hon. members and I withdraw the reflection that my words cast upon them. I hope the Minister will be no longer hurt by what I said.

Mr. HUGHES: The deletion of this again puts us at variance with the Commonwealth.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Commonwealth is at variance with us.

Mr. HUGHES: The half-blood is to have his name on the Commonwealth roll, but not on the State roll. It means another asterisk on the roll.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Having said so much on the second reading, I repeat that a number of these half-castes

are fully justified in asking to be put on the roll. If the amendment be carried, it will mean that Asiatics born in Australia will have a vote, while the person of half-blood, though one of his parents be an Australian, will not have a vote.

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

Clause 43—agreed to.

Clause 44—Amendment of Section 44 (a):

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We shall have to amend this in accordance with the amendments made to Clause 19.

The CHAIRMAN: Those amendments can be made consequentially.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is not actually consequential, although I take it the earlier decision of the Committee will stand.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suggest you get the clause re-drafted and then re-commit it.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We could do that. I move—

That the clause be postponed.

Motion passed; the clause postponed.

Clauses 45 to 53—agreed to.

Clause 54—Amendment of Section 89:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If we pass this, no postal vote can be taken on election day. The Minister said the system was sometimes abused; but that could be corrected by more careful selection of postal vote officers. When a postal vote officer does anything wrong he ought to be punished. We ought not to disfranchise people because on the day of election they happen to be too ill to go to the poll.

The Minister for Justice: It is not that; they do not want to be bothered going to the poll.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yet we hear so much about the anxiety of people to get on the roll. If the postal vote system be abused on the day of election, probably it is abused on the day before.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: In my experience it is always on the day of election that people send along from hospitals and maternity homes asking to vote by post. There is a lot of bona-fide voting by post done on that day.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They could vote the day before.

Hon. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, but they do not.

The Premier: They will when they know that they cannot vote by post on election day.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Federal law encourages people to vote on the day of election, not before; and it will be most confusing to find that at a State election there can be no postal voting on election day. Under the Federal law we have people from Collie and the Eastern States voting at Narrogin. They can vote at any booth in Australia on election day.

The Premier: I think that has been amended.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: While that obtains under the Federal law, the State law is going to prescribe that there shall be no postal voting on the day of election. I hope the Minister will not press this clause.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: As I explained on the second reading, there have been a lot of abuses and nearly all have occurred on the day of election. On that day, enthusiastic canvassers find out the people who have not voted and then send along the postal vote officer to take those votes.

Mr. Thomson: I have never heard of such a thing.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Then you have a lot to learn.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We have just as much experience as you have. You know what happened at Northampton last year.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, and I know that someone ought to have been struck off the list of postal vote officers for doing it. It is apparent to many that the privilege of postal voting has been abused. People have alleged that they were too sick to go to the poll, but whilst they have recorded their votes through a postal vote officer they have been seen out in the street later in the day.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Some have recorded their postal votes in the morning, and have voted again in the afternoon.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is time the law was altered to prevent these abuses.

Mr. MARSHALL: Will it do away with these abuses if we shift the right to the taking of a postal vote to the day before an election? We fix the day and the time when votes shall be cast at the polling places, and we may penalise many electors if we rob

them of one of the days on which they may record postal votes. In effect, we may do more harm than good. If the Minister can show that there is any great advantage about the clause I will support it, but if nothing more substantial is put up in its favour than we have heard I will vote against it.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is generally believed that polling day is the day on which postal votes may be recorded.

The Minister for Lands: That is the reason why the privilege has been abused.

Mr. SAMPSON: People who abuse the privilege on polling day will do so on other days. This clause will deprive many worthy electors of their privilege, and will constitute an innovation that should not be passed without good reason. I should like to see all methods of voting made as uniform as possible. In municipal and road board elections people may record postal votes on the day of election. On that day there is less chance of the privilege being abused than on any other day.

Hon. G. Taylor: You have not had your eyes open.

Mr. SAMPSON: I shall vote against the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister should waive this clause and let the matter stand as it is, especially having regard to compulsory voting. In many country towns there are hospitals, and those in charge of the hospitals will be subjected to much worry and anxiety if the proposed alteration is made. Sick people, if this clause is carried, will be pestered for postal votes at least a week prior to polling day. Abuses will not be prevented by abolishing postal votes given on the day of election. I appeal to outback members to oppose the clause.

The Premier: The outback man has no hope of getting in a postal vote.

Mr. THOMSON: In small country centres it is usual to hold a picnic on polling day in order to ensure a good poll.

The Minister for Lands: If the candidate takes any part in the picnic, he takes a risk.

Mr. THOMSON: I will not say he takes part in the picnic. If a voter falls ill on polling day, the postal vote officer can, under existing conditions, go out to the man's residence and take the vote. I really have no knowledge of the abuses alleged.

The Premier: Some members who have no knowledge of abuses on election day are expressing themselves with a considerable

degree of mental reservation, or want of frankness; that is, unless they represent extremely virtuous electors. Every member of this Chamber, if he is perfectly frank, will admit that polling day is, above all others, the day of abuses. Polling day is the day when postal vote officers scout around collecting every possible vote from persons who are not sick but are unwilling to go to the polling booth. It is argued that if the clause is passed this abuse will merely be put back a day. That is not so. The reason why so many abuses occur on polling day is that great difficulty is frequently experienced in getting people to exercise the franchise. The canvasser calls on voters and they say, "It's all right, I'll be there on polling day." A postal vote is not taken because the canvasser relies upon that promise. On polling day, through the check kept by those who record votes it is discovered in the afternoon that dozens of supporters on the list have not recorded their votes. Then a canvasser immediately gets a motor car and a postal vote officer and goes out to get postal votes from those who really are not entitled to record them. I have seen men walking down the street on polling day whose postal votes had come in that day, and every other member has seen the same thing. In an election I contested, a postal vote officer took postal votes from more than 40 women who were unwilling to leave their homes, but who ought not to have been allowed to record postal votes. As I was the successful candidate, I was not going to prosecute a number of people who had been misled by canvassers. In the metropolitan area on polling day there are probably thousands of illegal and improper postal votes cast. It is admitted that this clause will mean that a limited number of people will be disfranchised, but the number will be practically confined to those who are taken ill on the day of the election. People who are in hospital can have their votes taken several days before polling day. It would be a disadvantage to the hospitals themselves if frantic canvassers were rushing about on polling day trying to get votes from patients. This is a part of the electoral law that has led to great abuse, and even though injustice may be done to a small number, it is better so than to allow those abuses to continue. On polling day opponents cannot keep their eyes on each other and it is then that postal officers, in some instances, have

been known to lend themselves to this sort of thing. Particularly in thickly populated parts are abuses likely to take place, not on the part of candidates, but on the part of enthusiastic supporters.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The postal voting system has lent itself to abuse from the very inception. The argument put in favour of people in hospitals will not hold water for a moment. The votes of patients in the Perth Hospital can be taken days before the poll closes.

Mr. Sampson: What difference does it make if the vote is taken on a Friday or a Saturday?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The difference comes in when the collection of the votes is left to the last day.

The Minister for Lands: And if the postal votes taken are contrary to the views of those collecting them, they are not put in until too late. You know that, too.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, the hon. member showed me a clear proof of that many years ago, the facts having been clearly proved in the Court of Disputed Returns.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: It happened at the last election, too.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No doubt postal vote officers have been appointed who should not have been entrusted with any such powers.

Mr. Sampson: Will this clause make them honest?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It will stop this business on polling day.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We are asked to believe that a man will be honest on Friday and dishonest on Saturday. Of course awful things are done from time to time and people have been known to force their way into houses for votes even before election day. I do not accuse my political opponents of anything, for I want the right thing to be done by both sides on election day. I do not know that we need worry so much about postal votes being taken from people who could have gone to the poll, so long as the votes were recorded as they would have been had the electors gone to the poll. If there is so much that is rotten, corrupt and wrong with the system, why not wipe out postal voting altogether?

The Minister for Lands: And a jolly good job, too.

Mr. Heron: If you do that, you will require some better provision to replace postal voting in the back country.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There will always be wrong doing even on the part of the people who go to the poll. The people who give postal votes have a bigger opportunity.

Mr. Heron: Make the penalty for postal vote offences more severe.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But who is going to prosecute?

The Premier: There is wholesale abuse of postal voting, and every member knows it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have known of abuses, but not wholesale abuses. They happen on Fridays and even on Thursdays.

The Premier: But mostly on Saturdays.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have much more keenly contested elections than has the Premier, who seldom has a contest; yet I have not known of wholesale abuses of the law.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: If you acted as scrutineer you would soon find out.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am surprised to hear of wholesale wrong doing. Still, if it happens on Saturday, it will happen on Friday also.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: In some electorates the returning officers are very chary of granting polling booths. They say, "You can use the postal votes." It is a serious thing if people are not to be able to record their postal votes on election day. So long as the vote is honestly recorded, it should be accepted on election day. In my view the department should be a little freer in granting polling booths.

Mr. BROWN: I have been a postal vote officer, yet I have never seen any of the abuses alluded to by the Premier. It is wrong that we should deprive the inmate of a maternity hospital of her vote.

The Premier: She can vote long before polling day.

Mr. BROWN: Why are not those who indulge in these abuses prosecuted? Generally the prosecution is left to the candidate.

The Minister for Lands: It is not his duty.

Mr. BROWN: Everyone should have the right to record his vote up to the last hour.

Progress reported.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,232,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 11.13 p.m.*