called a halt and reviewed the financial position of Western Australia before we go into anything like this railway proposal. With regard to the line paying or not, that does not enter into the question from my standpoint, because my experience is that up to several years ago there were only two spur agricultural railways paying working expenses with anything left to the good. But I would support railways notwithstanding that, because it is obvious that although these short lines do not pay they swell the amount of traffic on the trunk lines, and they are absolutely necessary as feeders. And if we wait until such time as it is proved that a spur line will pay we should get very few more railways constructed in Western Australia. I think we should pause and consider our position, the position of the money market, and our present liabilities, and I am sure if I was running the show my ambition would be to give proper railway facilities to the people who have been induced to go on the land with the promise of a railway. I would carry out my obligation to them, and have the whole thing complete before undertaking any other railway. I adopt the suggestion thrown out by no less a person than the Minister for Works, that I would rather defer the passage of the Bill until such time as there is a possibility of the people at Esperance getting the railway within reasonable time. I have nothing more to say. I simply spoke with a view to letting my reasons be known for opposing the line at this stage, that I would not induce people to go on the land with the hope of a railway when at the same time I am satisfied it cannot be built for some years to come.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 3rd December, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ELECTION RETURN, CUE.

The Speaker announced the return to a writ issued for the election of a member for Cue, showing that Mr. Thomas Chesson had been duly elected.

Mr. Chesson took the oath and subscribed the roll.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: Health by-law of the municipality of Boulder.

By Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Report of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries for the year ended 31st December, 1912.

QUESTION—STATE ENTERPRISES BALANCE SHEETS.

Mr. MONGER (*without notice*) asked the Minister for Lands in the absence of the Premier: When do the Government intend to furnish balance sheets in connection with the operations of the State steamships and other State enterprises?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: I will be glad if the hon. member will give notice of the question.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Roads Act Continuation (introduced by the Minister for Works).

2, Illicit Sale of Liquor (introduced by the Attorney General).

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Point of Order.

Order of the Day read for the further consideration of the Bill in Committee.

The Attorney General (Hon. T. Walker): Before we go into Committee on this Bill I would like to submit the point that the amendment which appears on the Notice Paper in the name of the member for Northam is not one that legitimately can be considered by the Committee. It is altogether outside the scope and the purposes of the Bill and is not relevant to the subject-matter thereof. The measure which I have charge of is a Bills of Sale Act Amendment Bill, and it deals simply with registration matters, neither more nor less. The hon. member's amendment would be a perfectly relevant amendment to the Sale of Goods Act where hire agreements are dealt with. But this is no more cogent than any other matter remote and distant, if it at all affects a bill of sale, hire agreement or anything else. It is no more relevant than any kind of security that may be accepted as part and parcel of a transaction in the exchange or sale of goods. But this is not to amend the law relating to the sale or exchange of goods in any form. The object is only registration or non-registration, nothing more nor less. In fact I think I told the hon. member that I am heartily in accord with what he aims at in this amendment if it were introduced in its proper place. But here it is spoiling the legislation, it is absolutely inconsistent, it makes the Bill an absurdity. Under the plea of dealing with registrations we are changing the law relating to hire agreements, which has its proper place under the Sale of Goods Act. The substance of the Bill, its whole beginning and middle and end, deals with the purpose of effecting registration and nothing more. This being an amendment in the direction of amending the actual law now existing covered by the Sale of Goods Act, is not proper to this Bill, is incongruous to this Bill and is therefore out of order by the old established, well recognised rules of procedure in the House of Commons and in this Assembly.

Hon. J. Mitchell (Northam): I contend that the argument of the Attorney General is not in accord with the position as we find it. The Attorney General first says this Bill is merely a Bill providing for registration. But the Bill provides for other things besides registration; more than registration is sought even in the Bill. Clause 7 refers to every bill of sale registered or unregistered and provides that such bill of sale shall be void against the sheriff, all sheriff's officers and all bailiffs in certain cases.

The Attorney General: That is the effect of non-registration, and is absolutely consistent.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It is a new provision. The Attorney General contends that a hire agreement is properly a matter to come under the Sale of Goods Act. I have looked through the Sale of Goods Act and I can find no reference there which would justify the Attorney General's contention. The Sale of Goods Act regulates the sale of goods from one person to another, whether a direct sale or a sale by agent, and matters of that kind. It refers to carriers and, naturally, provides for the method of sale, retaining to the buyer when the purchase is not completed the right to inspect, and matters of that sort. It is essentially a Bill that deals with the actual sale, and has nothing to do with security. The Sale of Goods Act does not in any way refer to goods being retained as security. Under the Bills of Sale Act as under a hire agreement something is retained as security. The Bills of Sale Act could be made the cover for all goods if it were thought desirable that it should be so; but, wisely I think, the hire agreement has been substituted for bills of sale in many cases. I would like to point out the difference between an ordinary bill of sale and a hire agreement, and where it is of advantage to the purchaser. Under the Bills of Sale Act certain goods are secured to cover specified payment. That payment may be a debt incurred quite apart from the goods referred to in the bill of sale, or a debt in-

curred in connection with the purchase of the goods. A hire agreement, however, deals only with the actual purchase of some specified goods. Under the Bills of Sale Act the owner has the right to claim against the debtor, sell the goods, and to further proceed for any amount owing. Under a hire agreement, however, the hirer returns the goods if he makes failure in regard to payments, the difference being that under the hire agreement the hirer is relieved of further responsibility. That, of course, marks some considerable difference. But it does not separate the two documents; each document is used to secure a certain payment, and each document may refer to exactly the same kind of goods. Whilst it is true that the Bill we are discussing is called an Act to amend the Bills of Sale Act, 1899, the Bills of Sale Act, 1899, is an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to bills of sale, liens, and bailments. I would like the Attorney General to note this. The Act we are amending refers to payments, and assuredly a hire agreement refers to payments also. In order that the Attorney General might more readily understand that my contention is right in this regard, may I tell him what "bailment" means. Here is the definition—

> The contract or legal relation which is constituted by the delivery of goods without transference of ownership on an agreement expressed or implied that they be returned or accounted for as a loan; a consignment and delivery to a carrier; a pledge; a deposit for safe keeping, or a letting on hire.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I think that puts you out of court.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not at all. We have a Bills of Sale Act, but we have not any Act dealing specially with hire agreements. My contention is that both documents are intended to cover the same purpose. It will be seen in my amendment that I propose that the man who hires goods shall be protected. Under another amendment we propose to extend the goods over which hire agreements may be given. Under the present law the hirer may buy from an owner a machine worth, say, £200. He may pay in instalments spread over, perhaps, a couple of years, £180 or £190; he may make failure in regard to the last payment, and if he should do so the owner has the right to confiscate the machine, to take it away and sell it to his own advantage without refunding any of the money paid. I wish to make this practically impossible. My contention is that when the goods are seized they should be sold and the surplus, if any, returned to the hirer, the man who has paid so much on account. It will be seen the amendment provides that upon seizure as the result of failure to pay, the hirer may demand that the goods be sold, and, upon payment of 5 per cent. of the amount actually owing, the goods must be submitted to auction within 14 days. If the bid received be greater than the amount owing by the hirer then the surplus realised by the sale, together with any portion of the deposit unused to cover the actual expenses of the sale, has to be returned to the hirer. I provide further that if the goods are not so auctioned then the owner is liable to repay to the hirer the full amount of the money that has been paid on account of the purchase. I contend that this Bill is the proper place in which to insert this provision to bring to law what I desire. The Attorney General has been good enough to say that some law ought to be so amended. I believe it will be impossible to introduce this amendment into the Sale of Goods Act, because it would be foreign to that Act. There is nothing in the Sale of Goods Act to lead us to suppose that it may be introduced there. I contend the title of the original Act justifies the amendment and justifies me in saying that I disagree with my learned friend's contention. Further than that, it will be seen that the Act we are amending refers to the same subject-matter. Subclause 2 of Clause 6 refers to hire, and reads as follows:—

> If any agreement for the hire, with or without the right of purchase, of chattels becomes void, as herein provided, such chattels shall for the purpose of this section be deemed the property of the hirer.

Thus it will be seen that in his own amend-

ing measure the Attorney General brings in this subject-matter of a hire agreement. Therefore, I am entitled to ask you, Sir, to rule that my amendment is in order.

Mr. Dwyer (Perth): I feel sorry that at this stage I have to agree with the Attorney General; sorry because there is no doubt our law requires amending in the direction indicated by the member for Northam, and I think the Attorney General himself is sorry he cannot include it in the Bill now before the House. It is true that these things referred to in the proposed amendment are bailments; but the Bills of Sale Act simply has to do with registration or non-registration, with the effects of registration or the effects of non-registration, prescribing also certain instances where registration is not required, and the effects of a seizure of goods by the bailiff as regards the rights of the mortgagee under the bill of sale. I would suggest to the member for Northam that he introduces a Bill dealing with the provisions which he has here on the Notice Paper. I feel sure that if he does that he will have the assistance of every member on this side of the House. In my experience I have known people who have paid large sums of money on goods which they were to acquire on the payment of a certain amount and, notwithstanding that they have almost covered the payment, yet the goods have been taken from them and all payments made have been actually forfeited. Of course the usual agreement in these cases is that all instalments shall be paid by way of rent, that the hirer shall have no right to the property or chattel until the last penny is paid, and on payment of the last penny he becomes the owner. It will be seen that registration is not referred to at all in this amendment. All that is referred to is the conditions which should obtain between the purchaser and seller of goods purchased and sold under a hire purchase agreement, and I exceedingly regret, therefore, that I cannot see how it comes within the purview of the Act, because, although it is a bailment, the amendment has no reference to the effects of the registration or non-registration; it is purely an addition to the law as it now stands on the purchase and sale of goods.

Mr. Speaker: Both hon. members were good enough to discuss this matter with me before the House met, and therefore, I was able to give it some consideration. I am obliged to the hon. members for having given me the opportunity of looking into the matter, and as I understand the member for Northam intends to pursue the subject further, I think it advisable that I should give my decision now in order to give him the opportunity he desires. I intend to rule that the amendment cannot be allowed, that whilst it is within the title, it is not relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill and, therefore, cannot be dealt with in a measure of this character.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I regret to have to move—

> *That Mr. Speaker's ruling be dissented from on the grounds, (1), that the title of the original Act is an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to bills of sale, liens, and bailments, and (2), the Bill contains amongst its provisions some of the same subject-matter as is raised by the amendment.*

I am very anxious indeed that this amendment shall become law, and as soon as possible. It is suggested that I can introduce a Bill, but I do not think the responsibility of doing that belongs to me. I have no desire to do more than enter my protest against the rejection of the amendment, not against Mr. Speaker, because I realise that he has gone carefully into the matter, but I do think some mistake has been made. The original title of the Act clearly sets out what the Bills of Sale Act intends to do, and it undoubtedly covers all bailments. This is a bailment. The Attorney General says it is to deal with the sale of goods. There is no difference between a hire agreement and a bill of sale, and it is because there is no real difference that the title of the original Act is made so broad. That is the reason for calling the original Act

"An Act to consolidate and amend the law referring to bills of sale, liens and bailments." Why should we agree to a title that meant nothing? The title of an Act is an important part, and one cannot introduce into a measure matter that is not covered by the title. The original Act is to cover all bailments, a hire purchase agreement is a bailment, and if it be a bailment my contention is right. If we disagree to Mr. Speaker's ruling it will be clear to everyone that we do so on this ground, that a hire agreement is a bailment and all bailments are covered by the Bills of Sale Act. The Attorney General will, of course, combat my argument, and I have no doubt he will succeed, but I should like him to agree that my amendment is not only justified but necessary, that the people I seek to protect ought to be protected, and, further, that he will amend the law —whatever law he likes—or provide an Act which will give protection to those people whom I seek to protect, and I believe rightly, under the Bills of Sale Act. If the vote is against me I can do no more. I have done my duty and the House can take the responsibility of rejecting this amendment, which is all important to every class of the community. The hirer of a piano, of a sewing machine, of agricultural implements, or of furniture—all people who buy goods on the hire purchase system are affected. It is not a credit to the Parliament of the country that the Bills of Sale Act has remained so long without a provision of this kind. I do hope members will agree with my contention that a hire agreement is a bailment and that we are amending an Act to cover bills of sale, liens and bailments. If my contention is right on those two points, I am certainly entitled to succeed in the motion I have moved.

The Attorney General: Let me first of all say that I am heartily with the hon. member in his proposed legislation to alter the law relating to hire agreements. I told the hon. member so when he first moved his motion and I asked him to submit it in another form, and I would support it, and, moreover, if I am permitted by the exigencies of business I will undertake to deal with the matter myself. But it is not necessary and it would be wrongful to insert the amendment here. The hon. member in his argument says that a bill of sale "includes any document or agreement whatsoever whether by deed or by parole, and whether by way of sale, security, gift, or bailment," and upon that word bailment he argues that a hire agreement is of the nature of a bailment and, therefore, a hire agreement coming under the term of agreement, his amendment is in order. First of all let me say this does not deal with the creation of the intrinsic elements of a bailment. This Bill has nothing to do with the elements of the substantive law relating to bailments or hire agreements, or any other elements of a bill of sale. What it has to do with solely is the effect of registration or non-registration. Registration gives a certain security, non-registration makes properly formulated documents absolutely void or void in certain circumstances. It is of the nature of a demand for registration, and non-compliance with that demand carries with it certain penalties.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You are referring to your own amending Bill.

The Attorney General: I am speaking of my amending Bill which deals only with registration and the effects of registration, and all the clauses referred to by the hon. member are of that nature. Even Clause 6, where we mention a hire agreement, is nothing but explanatory of what is meant when a Bill becomes void for non-registration. Clause 6 deals with the voidance of an unregistered bill of sale and in that voidance there is a certain incidence in Clause 2 referred to. The other clauses throughout the Bill are of the same character and they are all relative to registration, or to the consequence of non-registration. We create no law in this Bill as to the substance, the quality, or the elements of a bill of sale. We only deal with a phase of registration. The hon. member's whole amendment is a draft as to the constituent elements and the effects, not of registration of a bailment or hire agreement, but of the docu-

ment itself. The hon. member told us that it was in no way relevant to the Sale of Goods Act. The Sale of Goods Act precisely deals with these things.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Where is that?

The Attorney General: The very first clause—

> (1.) A contract of sale of goods is a contract whereby the seller transfers or agrees to transfer, the property in goods to the buyer for a money consideration, called the price. There may be a contract of sale between one part owner and another. (2.) A contract of sale may be absolute or conditional.

Very well, these are matters that affect a hire agreement. It is a conditional contract to sell, neither more nor less. It has a specific name, it is true, but it is covered precisely by Subsection 3 of Section 1—

> (3.) Where under a contract of sale the property in the goods is transferred from the seller to the buyer, the contract is called a sale; but where the transfer of the property in the goods is to take place at a future time—

which is the matter of a hire agreement—

> or subject to some condition thereafter to be fulfilled—

which is the case with a hire agreement—

> the contract is called an agreement to sell.

That precisely covers the matter dealt with by the hon. member in this amendment. It is the framing of new conditions, altering or suggesting the terms under which agreements to transfer at some future time shall be made, and, therefore, it belongs properly to the Sale of Goods Act, and not a Bill such as I have before the House for the purpose merely of showing the effects of registration or the penalties for non-registration. That being the subject-matter of my Bill I refer you to Standing Order 391 which reads—

> It is an instruction to all Committees of the whole House to whom Bills may be committed that they have power to make such amendments therein as they shall think fit—

and this is the point I am taking—

> provided that they be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill.

not relevant to the title, because that can be amended, but relevant to the subject-matter. The subject-matter of my Bill is neither more nor less than registration. It enacts no amending law as to the elements of a bill of sale or payment of a hire-agreement. That is a substantive law of another kind, and is covered by the Sale of Goods Act, but is in no way relevant to the Bills of Sale Bill. Therefore, much as I desire to see the reforms proposed by the hon. member effected, much as I regret that we cannot admit it here, it would be absolute stupidity to do so, and would make Parliament ridiculous if we had these incongrous elements mixed together and thus amended the Bill irrelevantly. Therefore I contend that Mr. Speaker's ruling is in accordance with sound sense and precedent, and that to rule otherwise would make our legislation ridiculous.

Hon. J. Mitchell: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if it it not competent in an amending Bill to move an amendment to any section in the parent Act?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking a question.

Hon. J. Mitchell: May I ask the Attorney General through you. If we are not amending the principal Act, which most assuredly refers to——

Mr. Speaker: No amendment is permissible unless it is relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill under discussion.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is to say there must be some reference in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: It must be the subject-matter which is being amended. The Bill is introduced with certain principles, and when the Bill passes its second reading all the amendments in Committee must be relevant to the subject-matter.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I always understood that when an amending Bill was brought down we could amend any section in the original Act, and that a new clause could be added.

The Attorney General: So long as it is relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill before the Committee.

Hon. J. Mitchell: So long as it is relevant in any way to the Act I think it should be permissible. I think my contention is right, because we would not add a new clause to an amending Bill if we merely sought to amend a clause in the Bill before the House.

The Minister for Lands: The new clause could be added if it were in keeping with the subject-matter of the amending Bill.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I had no idea that that was so. It restricts the opportunity of Parliament if one is not permitted to add a new clause when it is relevant certainly to the title of the Act which we are amending. I have no desire to dispute your ruling, Sir, and I admit that if your contention is right in regard to the Bill under discusson my amendment cannot be added. I therefore desire to withdraw my dissent.

Mr. Speaker: Before the House concurs in the withdrawal of the hon. member's dissent, I would like to make a few remarks because I think the question has been raised opportunely. There is a tendency in this House to introduce amendments into Bills which ought properly to be introduced into other Bills, and that practice is becoming an abuse. If the question had not been raised by the hon. member, and I am obliged to him and to the Attorney General for raising it, we might have continued in that practice and our legislation would have had a tendency to become ridiculous. When the matter was mentioned I looked up the precedents of the British House of Commons, and I intend to make a few remarks in regard to the distinction as between the title and the scope or subject-matter of a Bill. The second point raised by the hon. member for Northam was that the present Bill includes among its provisions the same subject-matter as is raised by his amendment, see Subclause (2) of Clause 6. As regards this contention I would like to direct attention to page 480 of *May*, which states—

> An attempt to engraft novel principles into a Bill, which would be irrelevant, foreign, or contradictory to the decision of the House taken on the introduction and second reading of the Bill, is not within the due province of an instruction.

Standing Order 391, which has been quoted by the Attorney General, governs the procedure in this House. This Standing Order provides that all amendments must be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. I admit that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northam is within the title of the Bill, but the amendment is not relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. I shall give two examples of the application of this rule, showing the distinction between the title and the subject-matter or scope of the Bill. A Bill to enable municipalities to establish fish markets is introduced with a title for an Act to amend the Municipalities Act. A new clause is moved to alter the mode of election of mayor. The new clause is well within the title, but foreign to the subject-matter of the Bill as introduced, and is therefore disallowed. On the other hand a Bill to license motor cars in Perth is introduced with the title of an Act to regulate the licensing of Perth motor cars. A new clause is moved to extend the provisions to Fremantle. The new clause is outside the title, but relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill and may therefore be allowed, the title afterwards being amended to cover it. These examples show the distinction clearly. Recently the point was raised in the British House of Commons, on the introduction of an amendment to the Franchise Bill to provide the franchise for women. The question was raised by Mr. Bonar Law, the leader of the Opposition, and the Speaker ruled that whilst the amendment was within the title of the Bill it was not relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill; it introduced novel principles and therefore could not be allowed. The amendment desired to be introduced by the hon. member for Northam into this Bill has a similar objection, and whilst I am glad he is not pressing his dissent, I think it necessary to give this instruction to the House so that the tendency to create abuses in legislation will be checked.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is it permissible for me to introduce an amending Bills of Sale Bill to include what I desire in the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may discuss that with the Attorney General and the Government. It is not within my province to advise.

Motion (dissent) by leave withdrawn.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 14:—Section 54 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words "Agricultural machinery and implements" and inserting "Machines, machinery, implements, engines, vehicles, and appliances used wholly or in part for agricultural or pastoral purposes."

Mr. DWYER: The hon. member would be amending the wrong Act. Section 54 of the principal Act which this amendment sought to effect contained no reference to agricultural machinery and implements.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You have not got the principal Act.

Mr. DWYER: The Act of 1899 was the principal Act, those prior to it having been repealed. The proper place to insert the amendment was in the Act of 1900. The Bill before the Committee at the present time was not amending the Act of 1900, but was amending the original Act, and if it became law and we looked at Section 54 of the principal Act it would be found that those words did not agree with that Act, because the words appeared only in the amending Act of 1900. If the amendment of the member for Northam were dropped and his (Mr. Dwyer's) were agreed to in its place, the difficulty would be overcome. The amendments amounted to the same thing.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: As the amendment of the member for Perth would have the same effect as his, he would agree with the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

New clause:

Mr. DWYER moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 14:—"Section two of 'The Bills of Sale Act Amendment Act, 1900,' is amended by striking out the words 'agricultural machinery and implements' and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:—'Implements, machinery, engines, vehicles, and appliances used wholly or in part for agricultural or pastoral purposes.'"

New clause put and passed.

Schedules 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Fourth Schedule:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That the following be inserted to stand as the Fourth Schedule—

FEES.

On presentation of a Bill of Sale for Registration or for the renewal of registration—

	£	s.	d.
Where the amount or value of the consideration or the sum secured does not exceed £30 ..	0	2	6
Exceeds £30, but does not exceed £250	0	5	0
Exceeds £250, but does not exceed £500	0	10	0
Exceeds £500, but does not exceed £750	0	15	0
Exceeds £750, but does not exceed £3,000 ..	1	0	0
Exceeds £1,000, for every additional £1,000 or fraction thereof	0	5	0
Maximum fee	3	0	0
(Note.—The above fees include the filing of the affidavit of execution or renewal)			
On lodging notice of intention to register a Bill of Sale	0	1	0
Of withdrawal thereof	0	1	0
On entering a caveat	0	2	0
On withdrawal of a caveat	0	1	0
For every search	0	1	0
On entering satisfaction (including fee for filing the affidavit of execution)—			
Where the amount of value of the consideration or the sum secured does not exceed £30	0	1	0
In any other case	0	5	0
Office copy of any document—			
For the certificate	0	2	6
For every folio of 72 words or part thereof, unless the copy is made by the applicant	0	0	4

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Would the Attorney General explain how the proposed charges for registration compared with the existing charges. There were many people who had to resort to these means of security and we should not want to unduly add to the cost.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The increment would be very little indeed. As a matter of fact the cost had been

lessened considerably. For bills of sale under £30 a nominal fee of 2s. 6d. was charged, for £30, but not exceeding £250 the fee was 5s. Then for £250, but not exceeding £500 the charge was 10s. which it would be admitted was not exorbitant, and so on the fees increased until the maximum fee of £3 was charged where the value exceeded £1,000. If the value was £5,000 or £10,000 the same maximum fee would be charged. That was not objectionable.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We were adopting the principle of getting revenue from every Act of Parliament which was introduced.

The Attorney General: Not a bad idea.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But it did not always follow that a man having large transactions could afford to pay large fees. The department already made money out of the misfortunes of some people and the House should not agree to any further impositions.

The Attorney General: If we want the sliding scale we must pass this schedule.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: It was not always the man who was well off who had to resort to bills of sale. In most cases it was the man of small means and if we were now going to double the tax for amounts over £250 and not exceeding £500 and then go on increasing the amount we would impose a heavy burden. In these times of stress we should hesitate to put further disabilities on the people who were not able to pay.

The Attorney General: How is the Government to get money then to help the farmer?

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: How was the farmer going to exist if he had to pay all these additional taxes. We would soon have the air which the farmer breathed taxed. Thank goodness, however, that was one of the things which the Government could not tax. The Attorney General ought to agree to the elimination of the schedule altogether. One could understand the Attorney General endeavouring to get revenue wherever possible.

Mr. Dwyer: Why do you prevent us from getting revenue from the people who can afford to pay it?

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: There was a reasonable and fair way of getting revenue instead of imposing these fees, which were an annoyance to the people who had to pay them.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was doubtful whether there had ever been a proposal more unfair than this one to increase the fees of registration of bills of sale. We were to tax the people who were unfortunate enough to be obliged to raise money to pay debts incurred. Would the needs of the Treasurer be satisfied to the smallest extent by collecting fees of this kind? He entered his protest against the flippant manner in which Ministers on every possible occasion raised money, a threepence here and a sixpence there under every Act of Parliament. Even the unfortunate farmer was to be penalised because of his misfortune. As the member for Katanning had pointed out, where a bill of sale continued over more than one crop the farmer would have to pay an annual charge. The Attorney General should have told the Treasurer that he would have no hand in taxing people who, above all others, should be relieved of burdens instead of having fresh burdens imposed upon them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was no need for any *ad misericordiam* appeal. This was simply a charge for services rendered, and it was within the means of everybody. The State had to maintain expensive institutions for the rendering of these services, and if there was one way we could legitimately tax the people it was by charging them for some service rendered.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: A fresh bill of sale will require to be given every year over the crop and it will be an annual charge.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: An annual charge of £3 for a £2,000 bill of sale!

Hon. J. MITCHELL: This registration was not for the benefit of either party to the bill of sale, but for the protection of other people, and yet the par-

ties to the bill of sale were to be required to pay the cost of registration. It seemed utterly wrong to tax a man who was compelled to register a bill of sale for the protection of the public.

New schedule put and a division taken with the following result :—

Ayes	20
Noes	12
Majority for ..	8

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lander	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood (*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Monger
Mr. Elliott	Mr. Moore
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Male	Mr. Layman (*Teller*).

New Schedule thus passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by the ATTORNEY GENERAL Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 12 and 13. Mr. McDowall in the Chair.

Clause 12—Registration fee:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved an amendment—

That the clause be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—(1) The fees set out in the Fourth Schedule to this Act shall be payable to the Registrar for the registration of every bill of sale, and in respect of the several other matters therein mentioned. (2) Section twelve of the principal Act and section sixteen of the Bills of Sale Amendment Act, 1906, are hereby repealed.

Amendment passed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved a further amendment—

That the following be added to the clause as amended:—"or to any bill of sale of growing crops granted before or after the commencement of this Act to the Minister for Agriculture or any officer of the Department of Agriculture."

This would confer on the Agricultural Department the same benefits as citizens generally would receive under the amendment to the clause proposed by the member for Katanning and carried.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: The amendment which was carried on his motion provided that it was not necessary to give notice of registration of a bill of sale for a specific advance. The effect of the amendment now proposed would be that it would not be necessary for the Minister for Agriculture or any officer of the Department of Agriculture to give notice of the registration of any bill of sale over a growing crop. The Government would thus be in a better position so far as taking the security was concerned, because they would be able to take a bill of sale over a crop which could be given at any time, although the crop was not actually growing, but about to be sown. Should the department have that advantage over the ordinary trader? If the Government wished to protect themselves for seed wheat, fertilisers and bags supplied they could already do that under the clause as amended, but the proposed amendment gave the Government undoubted preference. If the amendment was carried, was it not possible for the Minister for Agriculture to take a bill of sale over a growing crop for money owing to him for rent? That would not be fair to other traders.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Government were doing every year a vast amount of business in supplying fertilisers, seed wheat and other materials essential to the production of a crop and the Government could not take security. It was not altogether the Agricultural Bank that did this work, but the Department of Agriculture, and the department required authority to act in the way permitted by

the amendment which had been carried at the instigation of the hon. member for Katanning. The Agricultural Department would be placed on the same footing as the ordinary trader.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: While agreeing to an amendment placing the Minister for Agriculture on the same footing as a private individual still the security was given for no specified advance.

The Attorney General: It is adding to the amended clause certain words.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Was it to be understood that it would apply only to the special advance?

The Attorney General: Yes. It added the proposed words to the amendment which was carried previously.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: If the Attorney General had pointed out in the first instance that some legal technicality was in the way of the clause as amended applying to the Agricultural Department, that would have overcome the difficulty.

Amendment put and passed.

Bill again reported with further amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—MINES REGULATION.

Returned from the Legislative Council with requested amendments.

BILL—PEARLING ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BILL—FACTORIES AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 76—Bakehouses:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: During the day, in accordance with a promise made last night, he had the pleasure of being instructed by two deputations, one from the master pastrycooks, and the other from the union representing the baking industry, and he must say their views were exceedingly conflicting, diametrically opposite in some particulars. The masters put up an exceedingly good case for night work, particularly with regard to pastrycooks' work, and the men were equally positive that the work could be done without night work. He suggested that the clause should be passed now with such amendments as the member for West Perth and the member for Subiaco might have to propose and then allow a conference to take place between those who were parties to this dispute, and if they could come to some agreement we could reconsider this clause either here or in another place.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: It was his intention to move an amendment. From the secretary of the bakers' union he understood that members of that organisation were willing to meet the employers in the pastry-cooking trade with a view to try and arrive at some amicable arrangement in connection with the hours at which the baking of pastry should be carried on. That conference would very likely take place to-morrow. With regard to the baking of bread in the day time, the contention put forward by the operatives was that no hardship would be placed on anyone, that it would not interfere with the employer carrying on his business, and would not interfere with the consumer in the matter of getting fresh bread. The bread which would be served to the public would be, if anything, fresher than what was served at the present time. Under present arrangements the bakers started work on ordinary days at five o'clock in the evening. The first batch of bread was out three hours later, and the last bread was taken out between 12 midnight and one a.m. That bread did not leave the yard until 6 o'clock the next morning. Under the Bill if day baking was instituted actual baking would start at 6 o'clock in the morning. The first batch would be out at 9 o'clock, and ready for delivery an hour later. The men had gone carefully into the matter and told him five per cent. of those engaged in the baking trade were engaged in what was known as dough

setting. Those particular men at present worked during the daytime. If baking took place in the daytime they would have to work at night, and the other 95 per cent. would work in the daytime. The dough would be all ready when the men arrived at 6 o'clock in the morning. Day baking would make a material difference to the men employed. Under the present system if the night was cold they were compelled to close all the windows and doors, because they could only work the dough at a certain temperature, and when they knocked off in the middle of the night they had to go out into the cold air, which had a deleterious effect on the health of the individual. With regard to baking on Sundays, the position would be that the men would work until 10 o'clock on Friday and also bake again on the Saturday, a short day of course. In the case of a holiday they would work until 10 o'clock on the night immediately preceding the day before the holiday, that was if the holiday were to come on Thursday they would work until 10 o'clock on Thursday so that the bread could be delivered on Wednesday, the day before the holiday. It had been contended in this Chamber that there would be no baking between the Thursday before Good Friday and Easter Tuesday; that was not so, as the men would go in again on the Saturday, and in a case like that in connection with holidays they would have no ojection to go on working until 6 o'clock on the Saturday.

Mr. Male: The dough would not be ready.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Yes. The five per cent. who did the dough setting would have to go in the night before. The men were not asking for something that was going to upset or be oppressive to the employers engaged in the trade; all they wanted to do was to get what they recognised as a legitimate reform, and something that would not interfere in any way with the business carried on, nor would it be putting the consumers to any inconvenience or hardship whatever. Day baking operated practically throughout New Zealand, in a number of country towns in New South Wales, and also over a large part of Queensland, and had been found to work well. He moved an amendment—

That paragraph (g) be struck out.

A concession was being made in that to the pastry cooks, but if it was proved at the conference that pastry baking could not be carried on reasonably within the hours prescribed here he was sure the parties would agree to any reasonable compromise, and a further amendment could be made in another place.

Mr. ALLEN: The amendment submitted by the hon. member for Subiaco did not altogether get over the difficulty which arose last evening when the Attorney General agreed to report progress in order that he might see some of the representatives of the pastry trade. This morning the Attorney General had an opportunity of meeting some of these gentlemen, and it was pointed out that while the journeyman pastrycook bakers contended that it was quite possible to carry on the baking in the day time they had never suggested how it was to be done, while the master bakers said they did not know how it was to be done. If the journeymen bakers stated definitely that it could be done, surely it was a fair thing for the men to suggest on what lines the change could be made. The baking of bread was a very different thing from the baking of small goods or pastry. In the baking of bread, as soon as the first batch was baked they could immediately get to work to deliver it. It was not so with pastry. In regard to pastry he was given to understand different varieties had to be put into the oven in rotation, according to the particular variety being baked, and the degree of heat in the oven. This made it impossible to start the delivery of pastry as soon as the first batch was taken out of the oven. It was essential that small goods should be delivered to customers absolutely fresh, and be in the shops before lunch time. In connection with the rush of the Saturday trade, a start had to be made sometimes now at midnight, or at 2 o'clock a.m., and one was given to understand it would be absolutely impossible to start at 4 a.m. in rush

periods, get the pastry out, and deliver it in time for the public to purchase it. This applied to Saturdays at any rate. Most pastry was sold on Saturday mornings and it would be absolutely necessary for it to be in the shops not later than 10 o'clock. If the bakers were confined to starting at 4 a.m. during the rush period it would be absolutely impossible for them to get done. One wholesale firm supplied about 30 smaller shops, which necessitated the proprietor baking practically all the night long to get the goods baked and orders completed by 11 or 11.30 a.m. This gentleman had stated that in his case it was imperative that he should start at any rate by 12 o'clock at night. Not any of the employers would work at night time just for the sake of doing so; they much preferred day work when they could get better supervision over their men. They would welcome a change to day labour if they could see where they could carry on the business successfully for themselves and also give the public the goods they wanted. Most of the pastrycooks did not know how the change could be made, and they held that it was only fair that those who wished for it should suggest the means by which it could be done. He could not agree with the amendment so far as it applied to pastrycooks. Under present conditions these pastrycook shops every morning gave away to charitable institutions certain classes of pastry left over from the previous day. The trade fluctuated somewhat, as for instance, on a hot day there was not so great a demand for pastry, and these fluctuations involved baking for rush periods. There was also the holiday trade, in regard to which the baking had to be finished by 7 a.m. in order that the pastry might be ready for picnic parties. Even if the amendment were carried he would still hope that wiser counsels would prevail at the proposed conference, otherwise the wholesale pastrycook would be heavily penalised under the amendment. Undoubtedly the Attorney General was not desirous of inflicting any hardship, but merely of passing such legislation as would benefit the majority without penalising the minority. He would vote against the amendment.

Amendment (that the words proposed to be struck out be struck out) put and passed.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS moved an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (g) in place of the words struck out:—"Except as hereinafter provided no bread shall be baked in the bakehouse between the hours of six o'clock in the evening and six o'clock in the morning and no pastry or other food shall be baked in the bakehouse between the hours of six o'clock in the evening and four o'clock in the morning: provided that it shall be lawful to bake bread, pastry or other food till the hour of ten o'clock in the evening of any Friday, or the evening immediately preceding the day before a holiday. For the purposes of this paragraph "holiday" means Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Eight Hours Day, or the birthday of the reigning Sovereign or any other day prescribed as a holiday for persons engaged in bakehouses."

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It seemed that a section of the bakers' operatives would have to work at night. Under present conditions 5 per cent. of the operatives were engaged in day work and 95 per cent. in night work. Under the proposed change the 95 per cent. would work by day and the 5 per cent. by night, in order to prepare for the 95 per cent. It was a pity that the hon. member had not informed the Committee of that position earlier.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I was not in the Chamber at the time.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: At all events, it relieved the situation somewhat. If the Bill were passed as it now stood, how could the apprentices learn dough-making and setting, seeing that it was provided that they should do no night work? The dough-setting would be carried out at night time, and this would prevent apprentices from learning the trade thoroughly, because they would not be al-

lowed to go into the factory at night when the dough-making was in progress.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: There is no necessity to do any dough-setting for pastry during the night.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Was the hon. member satisfied that the work could be done within the specified hours? It was not a question only of the people who sold the bread, but the public also had to be considered. We should be convinced that the work would be satisfactory to the consumer.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: In regard to the hours of pastrycooks, the operatives claimed that they could do the work within the specified hours, while, as the member for West Perth (Mr. Allen) had pointed out, the employers said it could not be done. However, if a conference were held, this question could be argued out in detail. If the work could not be carried out within the specified hours the operatives would agree to an amendment being inserted in another place. In regard to apprentices and the learning of dough-setting, dough-setting constituted but a small part of the baking trade, and the boys would easily learn it. Under the present arrangements 95 per cent. of the operatives did the work at night. They got no chance of a change, but under the proposed new arrangements the dough-setters, being competent bakers, would be able to enjoy a change of shift and perhaps would only get a week of night-shift in every three or four months. There was nothing at all in the amendment to prevent a boy from learning the trade thoroughly in all its branches.

Mr. ALLEN: So far as pastry was concerned, he could not agree to the amendment. He was fully seized with the fact that if he moved an amendment on the amendment he had but little chance of having it carried, and therefore he thought it better to leave it to the conference.

The Attorney General: It might be made here.

Mr. ALLEN: Under the circumstances he would not move his proposed amendment.

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

Clause 77—The furniture trade:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Were the inspectors actively engaged? He understood that the Chinese had secured a hold on the furniture trade. The inspection under this clause should be very thorough.

Mr. MALE: An importer would be required to stamp his furniture within 48 hours of unpacking it and it would be impossible to brand it with the name and address of the maker in the time. The name and address would not convey so much to the buyer as a brand "Asiatic make" which would be much easier to affix.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was nothing exceptional in the proposal. In the present Act there was provision for stamping furniture with the name of the maker. In Victoria furniture either wholly or partly prepared in that State had to be stamped with the name and address of the manufacturer.

Mr. Male: We will agree to that if you strike out the other.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The imported furniture is the most important. That is done at the request of the manufacturers' association.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was so. What objection could there be to stamping imported articles if we stamped locally made furniture?

Mr. Wisdom: You cannot get the particulars.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The particulars could be ascertained. It was necessary to distinguish between goods manufactured by white and other races.

Mr. Male: There is no objection to that.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was desirable to know who the manufacturer was.

Hon. J. Mitchell: If it is made in Adelaide it need not be stamped.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, it must be. The clause was practically an adaptation of the law in Victoria with a little extension in order to protect local manufacturers.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If furniture was imported from the old country it might be impossible to say who the maker was.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): If it came from China you would know.

Mr. Lewis: The Chinese are adopting English names to overcome the trouble.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was doubtful if any very great good would be achieved by the clause.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The clause was very important. Furniture had been imported from Singapore and other places in competition against local manufacturers. If he was not mistaken a firm in which the hon. member had been interested had imported ship loads, though he would not say the hon. member was aware of it. It was agreed that if their stock was purchased they would not import any more. The local manufacturers thereupon bought it out but it was tried a second time and representations were made by the secretary of the Chamber of Manufactures pointing out the unfairness of the position. There were several wicker factories in this State.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why do not you put on the duty?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The State had no power to deal with that. There was a danger of these wicker factories being wiped out of existence through unfair competition. This Bill provided for the branding of European as well as Asiatic furniture. Strong representations had been made both to the Federal and State authorities to deal with this question.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Would it not be wise to add to the clause the words "for sale"; then it would be made clear that the branding would be applied to the furniture that was for sale.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): That is already provided for in Clause 80.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It ought to be in the clause under discussion, and then private people who brought in furniture for their own use would be exempt.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was a question of local manufacture *versus* imported. Why was the importer to be immune? Why should he have liberty to bring in goods unstamped?

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not the importer.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The principle had to be applied all round. It had to be general and exception could not be made. In a later clause it was made an offence to sell an article which was not branded.

Mr. WISDOM: The objection he saw to the clause was the absolute impossibility of being able to carry it out. There was no objection to a distinction being made between Australian and foreign manufactured furniture, but how would the Attorney General insist on people importing furniture from England, bought at an auction sale, branding that furniture. That furniture would not carry any stamp. It might have been furniture made in the time of some of the Attorney General's old friends the feudal barons. He (Mr. Wisdom) had brought out some furniture recently.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Did you bring it out for sale?

Mr. WISDOM: No.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Then it would be no offence under this Act.

The Attorney General: Look at Clause 80.

Mr. WISDOM: Another point was that the importer of furniture from the Eastern States was exempt; therefore it would be possible to import from New South Wales or Victoria furniture which perhaps had been made by Chinese and which did not bear a stamp.

The Attorney General: It has to be stamped in New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. Wisdom: Was it the law in all the Eastern States and New Zealand?

The Attorney General: Yes.

Mr. WISDOM: Then with that assurance from the Attorney General the position was made all right.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The information required by the clause was as to whether furniture had been manufactured by

white or coloured labour, but it was immaterial to have stamped on it the name and address of the maker as was provided in the Bill. It should be sufficient to know whether it was made by white or coloured labour. In England the law was that goods had to be merely stamped "Made in Germany" or "Made in France." There they did not ask for the street or the house in which the article was manufactured. All that we required was to know by what nationality it was made. We did not want to do what was done in connection with Timor ponies. Whenever one of these ponies was disposed of he was branded, and in due course the pony became a mass of brands from one end to the other, and when one became tired of riding that pony he got off and read it. It would be the same with regard to the furniture if we did not take care.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The hon. member could not have read the clause, otherwise he would not have made the reference he did to the necessity for branding the furniture with the address of the manufacturer. We were dealing at the present time with Clause 77, and that did not provide anything of the nature suggested by the hon. member. In the interests of the local manufacturer, and because of what had taken place recently in Western Australia, it was imperative that furniture should be stamped when imported.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What has taken place?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The firm the hon. member was connected with had been bringing in furniture in ship loads.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I am not connected with any such firm.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I am glad to hear it.

Mr. Male: And why should they not do so?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Any furniture which was imported should be branded just as the furniture which was made here was branded.

Mr. Wisdom: We do not object to that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): That was all that the clause provided.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 78—Manner of stamping furniture:

Mr. MALE: There was no need for Subclause 1. It did not matter by whom the furniture was manufactured; what was required was that it should be stamped with the words "European Labour" or "Asiatic Labour" or "European and other Labour." He failed to see what purpose the name and address of the manufacturer was going to serve. He moved an amendment—

That Subclause (1) be struck out.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There would be no difficulty in having the name of the manufacturer stamped on any imported furniture, no matter from what part of the world it might come. It was already done in the case of matches imported into the Commonwealth, and in regard to furniture manufactured in Victoria. If it could be done in respect to furniture manufactured in other parts of the Commonwealth, it could be done in respect to furniture manufactured in England, in Germany, or in Hong Kong, and therefore there was no validity in the objection. Without the subclause, furniture manufactured by aliens could be brought in by ship loads to the detriment of the local manufacturer. If the imported article was to come into competition with our own manufactures it must be placed on a par with the locally manufactured article. This was only bare justice.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: All that was necessary was to have the furniture stamped in such a way as to show what class of labour had been engaged in its manufacture: to show whether it was made by white labour or coloured labour was all that was required. The name of the manufacturer would not convey anything in regard to the class

of labour employed in the manufacture of the article.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Under such a system as that proposed by the hon. member, there would be no reliability whatever. It was necessary to be able to trace any fraud, and for that purpose the name of the manufacturer was essential. If it was merely provided that the stamp should show the class of labour employed, there would be no safeguard whatever against fraud.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 79—agreed to.

Clause 80—Selling or offering for sale unstamped furniture prohibited:

Mr. WISDOM: The words contained in the clause, "or lets on hire any furniture which is required by this Act to be stamped," constituted a very drastic provision. It meant that any person letting his house furnished would be guilty of an offence if it was found that any of the furniture was unstamped.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): There was no reason whatever in the hon. member's objection. Lots of furniture sold on the time payment system was let out on hire. If the words objected to were struck out the whole of that furniture would be exempt. The words referred to goods sold on the hire purchase system. The clause was very necessary, and the hon. member should know that it would not apply to the letting of a furnished house.

Mr. WISDOM: All the necessary safeguards were contained in the earlier part of the clause. Furniture offered for sale, whether for cash or under the hire purchase system, had to be stamped. That was right enough: but the clause would apply to the case of a person who let his house furnished. It was merely double-banking the provision.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The case referred to by the hon. member was one of letting a house with furniture in it and the element of sale did not enter into the question. The Bill provided for the method of selling known as the time payment system.

Mr. Wisdom: It is not made clear.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was clear. Furniture let on hire until it was paid for must be stamped because this was only another method of selling. But for this provision the law could be evaded.

Mr. ALLEN: Would the Attorney General explain how the clause would affect secondhand dealers and auction marts which dealt with secondhand, as well as new furniture. Would both of these be affected?

The Attorney General: Yes.

Mr. ALLEN: If a man had furniture which he had owned for a number of years no one would know who had made it or where it had come from.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Furniture in the possession of a person before the passing of this measure would be exempt. The qualifying words were "furniture required by this Act to be stamped."

Mr. ALLEN: Even so it might be difficult to ascertain who had manufactured it.

The Attorney General: If it was proved that he knowingly does so, he would be guilty.

Mr. ALLEN: But the man might know it was not stamped and might not be able to ascertain the manufacturer's name.

Mr. MALE: This clause like the whole measure ought to be struck out. It might be impossible to secure the necessary knowledge to enable imported furniture to be stamped.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It is not impossible to those who will.

Mr. MALE: Both here and in England he had possessed furniture and he would defy anyone to say who had manufactured it. It would be impossible to stamp that furniture. He would vote against the clause.

Mr. ALLEN: Complications would arise in regard to furniture sent into an auction mart. The auctioneer would be liable for selling unstamped furniture. Would he have to refuse to take in unstamped furniture for sale?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary

Minister): The clause specified any person who knownigly sold or offered for sale. Did members of the Opposition desire that Chinese furniture should be sold in preference to that of local manufacture? If the clause was not given the effect of law local manufacturers would be wiped out of existence. That statement had been made to him by the secretary of the Chamber of Manufacturers.

Mr. Wisdom: What about furniture on the water?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): That could be stamped within 48 hours of its arrival. If furniture was sent here from China after the passing of the measure the importer would know who had manufactured it. Furniture sent into an auction mart might have been manufactured before the passing of the measure, otherwise it would be for the inspector to see that it was stamped.

Mr. Allen: Then the auctioneer would not be liable.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No.

Mr. DWYER: In order to get a conviction it would be necessary to prove a guilty mind existing in the person who sold the furniture or offered it for sale. No one could say that because an auctioneer sold unstamped furniture he had a guilty mind, because the auctioneer was entitled to believe that the law had been complied with. On the other hand, a person who imported furniture and knew whence it came must have a guilty mind if he left it unstamped. The same would apply to a purchaser of Chinese furniture.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 81, 82—agreed to.

Clause 83—Evidence as to person employed or work done in breach of Act:

Mr. MALE: This clause was far too strong. A place where two men were employed was a factory and if a policeman heard them hammering up a shelf that could be taken as prima facie evidence that work was being done there.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause was intended to meet special difficulties which the inspectors encountered. A section of the community were consistently evading the provisions of the existing Act. There was one place where the factory was surrounded with a galvanised iron fence, having barbed wire on top. The doors were kept locked and the windows were covered with dark blinds. The inspectors knew that this was a factory, and that work was being done in prohibited hours, but we could not get at them. The law now declared that we must actually see these people at work before we could secure a conviction and it would be impossible to do this unless we had a clause of this description. An honest factory would have nothing to fear; it would never be convicted under this clause. Those who purposely and determinedly and continuously evaded the Factories Act required special treatment, and this clause was intended to reach them and no one else. If an inspector heard work going on in a closed-in factory and was convinced by the nature of the sounds that work was being done, that would would be taken as prima facie evidence that the Act was being violated.

Clause passed.

Clauses 84 to 90—agreed to.

Clause 91—Minimum penalty:

Mr. MALE: Would the Attorney General inform the Committee whether this clause was new and whether similar clauses existed in other measures. We seemed to restrict the discretion of the magistrate by telling him that there should be a minimum penalty.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There were other Acts of Parliament which fixed minimum penalties and hon. members opposite had been instrumental in passing some of them. Such a provision was very necessary especially in a measure of this kind. We had found by experience that offenders had been brought before magistrates and had been fined a nominal amount, a mere bagatelle, which was no deterrent and no punishment. Something more serious than that was necessary and magistrates had to be directed that they must fix such a penalty as would be a safeguard and a warning to others.

Clause passed.

Clauses 92 to 96—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 37—Payment of wages:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was his intention to ask the Committee to vote against this clause in order that on recommittal a portion of it might be added to Clause 40.

Clause put and negatived.

Schedules, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Recommittal.

On motion by the ATTORNEY GENERAL Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 40.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS moved an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subclause 7:—(7.) (a.) Every person who is employed in any capacity in a factory shall be entitled to receive from the occupier such payment for his work as is agreed on: provided that (notwithstanding any agreement purporting to fix a lesser sum) he shall be entitled to be paid five shillings per week for the first year of employment in the trade, ten shillings per week for the second year, fifteen shillings per week for the third year, and so on by additions of five shillings per week for each year of employment in the same trade, until a wage of twenty-five shillings is reached, and thereafter a wage of twenty-five shillings per week. (b.) Such rate of payment shall in every case be irrespective of overtime. (c.) Such payment shall be made in full at not less than fortnightly intervals. (d.) If the occupier makes default for seven days in the full and punctual payment of any money payable by him as aforesaid, he is liable to a fine not exceeding five shillings for every day thereafter during which or any part of which such default continues. (e.) Without affecting any other remedies for the recovery of money payable under this section to a person employed in a factory, proceedings under the Masters and Servants Act, 1892, for the recovery thereof, as being due under a contract of service, may be taken by an inspector in the name and on behalf of the person entitled to payment in any case where the inspector is satisfied that default in payment has been made. (f.) The occupier of a factory shall not be entitled to make any deduction, set-off, or counter-claim against a claim for wages or other remuneration for work actually and properly done by any employee, except to the extent of special damage (if any) which he proves that he has suffered by reason of the unlawful act or default of the claimant in leaving the employment or being absent from the employment after the work was actually and properly done as aforesaid, and the occupier of a factory shall not make or attempt to make any deduction from the wages or other remuneration for work actually and properly done by an employee, except to the extent aforesaid.

This was an amendment dealing with the minimum wage, and it had been thought advisable to place it in this clause so that it would come under the section prohibiting sweating in factories. The section read—

> The provisions of this section are specially intended for the better suppression of what is commonly known as the "sweating evil," and shall be construed and applied accordingly.

It was intended that this minimum wage should only apply to those who were not in a position to approach the Arbitration Court or some other tribunal for the purpose of getting their wages regulated, and that those people who were unorganised, especially young women who worked in factories, should not work under sweating conditions, so far as the rate of remuneratinon was concerned.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Hon. members would remember that last night he had agreed to the postponement of Clause 37. There was some difficulty in the clause, as it stood then, and unless its purpose was made clear it would be inadvisable to retain that clause in the Bill. Section 40 dealt with certain provisions to avert sweating, an evil which he admitted was not very extensive in

Western Australia, but which we wanted to guard against at all events. This section specially made provision against sweating, and the payment of a minimum wage and annual increases was also in the same direction and for the same purpose. Therefore it should naturally come under that heading. For that reason he had consented to the removal of Clause 37 and to swell Section 40 by this addition.

Amendment put and passed.

Bill again reported with a further amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Appointment of Commissioners:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: What were the intentions of the Attorney General in regard to these commissioners? It had been the custom from time to time for Parliament itself to amend the Electoral boundaries through the medium of a Bill submitted by the responsible Ministers of the day. In proposing to appoint commissioners the Government sought to change the system. These commissioners were to be appointed by the Governor, which meant, of course, the Government of the day. Already it had been pointed out that the Government had power to-day to do all that the Bill empowered them to do, the only difference being that under the Bill they asked Parliament to take the responsibility for something they would otherwise do on their own responsibility. If commissioners were to be appointed Parliament should know who they were to be. The Government were asking Parliament to appoint the commissioners, but were not letting Parliament know who would be the commissioners. Under the Federal Act one of the commissioners must be the Surveyor General or an officer of his department. He doubted if a fairer system than that which had obtained in the past would result under the commissioners, because they would simply report to Parliament and Parliament would do as it pleased. Under the Federal Act it was not so. The boundaries recommended by the commissioners could be objected to and the recommendation sent back to them, and a further recommendation made. In that respect this Bill was unlike the Federal law. He objected to the appointment of commissioners, who would be the Minister's servants, who would serve the Minister, consult with the Minister, and do for the Minister probably what the Minister wanted done. The commissioners were to be appointed as soon as the Bill become law. Therefore the Attorney General must know what his intentions were. The hon. member had disapproved of the redistribution brought forward by the previous Government, because everything was wrong and there was gerrymandering. It could be said with truth that the boundaries fixed by the last Redistribution of Seats Act did not suit the country as was shown by the state of the Government benches, but it would probably happen that the boundaries fixed by the commissioners would be equally disastrous. He objected to the appointment of these commissioners because he thought the alteration of the system unnecessary. Would the Minister tell the Committee the names of the people he proposed to appoint, and if not, the qualifications he considered necessary for the commissioners to possess?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was impossible to know what Ministers could do or avoid doing which would not meet with the criticism and contumely of the hon. member. If the Government attempted to do this on their own account, they would be accused of doing it for party political purposes. When the previous Redistribution of Seats Bill had been under discussion he (the Attorney General) had said that this matter should be referred to an independent tribunal for decision. As a matter of fact every member in the House was interested in the seat he held. A member did not want any changes, and if changes were necessary he could

not judge of matters that might deleteriously or disadvantageously affect himself. If there was one thing that ought to be taken outside political influence it was the delimitation of electoral boundaries. No individual member should have a say in what should be done in cool blood and calm calculation. The hon. member for Northam, with his usual surfeit of suspicion, said that because the Government appointed a commission it must of necessity be a corrupt commission.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I did not say anything of the sort.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The inference was all through it. It was an untrustworthy thing; it was looked on as an offence. The Government had taken the precaution to have an independent body. That was the intention.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who are they?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member would know in due course. Did the hon. member want to take the responsibility? Did he want to choose them? What nonsense hon. members sometimes talked. Did the hon. member know of an instance where such Commissioners were appointed and the Governor did not appoint them. Was not that the course? Was not that the procedure laid down not only in this Parliament but in every constitutional self governing community all round the world. It was the proper course to take.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You are wrong.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the hon. member convicted him by giving an instance where a Royal Commission was appointed by other than the Governor, then he would stand a culprit and beg the hon. member's pardon. But the hon. member could not. Had not the time passed when these subterfuges could be used to hoodwink the public outside. The Government could not exercise the ordinary functions of Government imposed on them without having insinuations cast upon them of doing something unworthy of Ministers. That was the attitude the hon. member was taking to-night. Everybody who had heard the hon. member's speech knew that, for he had accused the Government, and his leader did the same thing the other night, of not having the courage to take the responsibility of doing the work ourselves. That was another ground of accusation. If the Government appointed commissioners it must be done in the usual way. When that argument was answered the hon. member said, "You must not appoint commissioners at all, you must do it yourselves." What a howl there would have been if the Government had presented a map with anything like the lineal gymnastics that the late Government did. The Government did not want to participate in the outlines of the various districts that were to be the basis of future electorates; the Government desired to stand aside. It might affect his (the Attorney General's) constituency materially. It would affect every other constituency in some way or other, some disastrously, some of them beneficially. While all were interested, was it not a manly course to take to stand aside and say, "We will obtain men qualified to do this work?

Mr. Elliott: In your way.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the way of the Bill, and if they did it in the way of the Bill they did it in the way of Parliament, because they could not follow the instructions unless Parliament authorised them to do it. It was the instructions of Parliament but in the Government's way. Whose way would the hon. member have? In the way of the new hon. member for Geraldton?

Mr. Elliott: You do not say you give them a free hand.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No person could. We give instructions and it will be Parliament giving instructions when they were given, if the Bill became law, to decide whether there should be seats for squatters, seats for cockies, seats for bona-fide selectors, seats for auctioneers, seats for land jobbers——

Mr. Male: And lawyers.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: And lawyers, if the hon. member liked. Leave it open to them. They would not undertake a commission of that kind. But honourable men would ask for instructions as to what guiding principles they

were to pursue in order to give a map worthy of consideration. There were hundreds of different principles that could be brought into operation, and the matter of principle was the matter of policy which the Government took the responsibility for. The Government said, "We believe in, as far as possible, giving equal political power to each political voter. That was the first guiding principle of the Government.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You do not.

Mr. Elliott: The North?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was only an exception. That was true; we made an exception, and that exception the hon. member himself would defend, and the hon. member would extend it if he had a chance.

Mr. Elliott: One of the good principles in the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We were to be damned for putting good principles in the Bill. We were damned for everything. Damned for good principles, damned for bad principles and damned for everything. The Government could not do wright, but we were determined to accept all the responsibility that was justly ours as a Government for giving the directions. These were the principles the Government stood by, recognising that manhood, human flesh and blood was the first element of the vote. We still recognised the difficulties in approaching the metropolis, the seat of government, as a factor that should be considered, therefore we provided for an allowance in the elasticity of the voter. We recognised the importance of the vast territory north of the Gascoyne. We recognised there the basis of a future young nation.

Mr. Male: You only partly recognise it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: To the utmost with consistency to our other principles. Because we had done that we were accused of doing something wrong. Because we took the responsibility we were wrong; if we did not take the responsibility we were still doing wrong. We could not do right in the eyes of the hon. member. He had been asked what the Government would do and who they would appoint. Let us first of all get the right to appoint anybody. We would take the responsibility for the appointment when the time came; we would shirk nothing. It would be open to discussion; it would not be done in secret. We could not appoint a commission and then allow the commissioners to work out of the light of day. It became public property at once, and every member in the House could take the Government to task for the appointment. The hon. member asked who he (the Attorney General) had in his mind. The Government intended to get the best men capable of doing the work. The first consideration would be fitness for the duty they would be asked to undertake, and subserviency to the party would not be considered. The Government desired, however long they were in office, to have it said of them, whatever their evils, that they had done their utmost to be honourable and honest with the public. The hon. member need not fear, the best available men for the work would be chosen. If any mistake was made or any error occurred in the exercise of their judgment the Government were at the mercy of the House. After all, when all was said and done, what were they doing? Asking three men to draw up a map, which map was for this Chamber, not for the delight and delectation and self-glorification of the Government. It was for the purpose of bringing down a practical measure of re-distribution, the outlines of which were to be drawn up by this independent body. It was to be submitted to our worthy masters, submitted to the captious hon. member, and to the new Cupid who came into this atmosphere of love and amity. Everyone would have a chance of criticising it. Rest assured that the work would be done straightforwardly, and done above board and in the full light of day. The best men would be chosen, if the Bill passed, to draw a map of the districts of the new electors.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Members had heard the eloquent speech of the Attorney General but he had not given the information desired. The Federal Act said the Attorney General might appoint three

persons in each State to be commissioners, and if the services were available, one shall be the Surveyor General or an officer of his department.

The Attorney General: Is that Queensland?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: No. It was the Federal Act. That Act indicated clearly what was to be done. Would the Attorney General say what his intentions were with regard to even one of the commissioners?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was proposed to do just what had been done in Queensland. In the Queensland Act it was provided that as soon as might be after the passing of the Act, three electoral commissioners should be appointed by the Governor-in-Council. Here we had taken the same steps, and the directions to be given here were the same as those which had been given in Queensland, though not in the identical order.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Attorney General should give us the fullest possible information. The Minister troubled very little about members of the Opposition. Once we had passed the Bill we would have no opportunity of seeking further information. He required information as to the qualifications of the gentlemen the Attorney General had it in mind to appoint. Why should not the commissioners be required to report direct to Parliament instead of to Ministers? If Parliament was to have any hand in passing legislation of this class, hon. members should know what was in the mind of the Minister.

The Attorney General: We cannot name possible commissioners before we have authority to appoint them.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: After all, the Government were going to appoint these commissioners, who would hand their report to Ministers, to be brought down to Parliament. He hoped the public would realise just what was happening in regard to this matter.

Mr. CARPENTER: This was the most harmless electoral Bill ever introduced. It had taken many years and much effort to secure a clean system of electing the people's representatives. In making this proposal to place the delineation of electoral boundaries in the hands of commissioners the Government had taken a step forward towards political honesty in elections. The member for Northam was one of the guilty parties who had assisted to pass one of the worst gerrymandering Bills ever known in Australia. The hon. member was very anxious to know who the commissioners were to be.

Hon. J. Mitchell: No, I asked merely for their qualifications.

Mr. CARPENTER: And the hon. member asked who they were to be. Unfortunately the hon. member had been left in charge of the Opposition and, although he could not criticise he could object, and so the Committee had to sit hour after hour listening to the hon. member's pointless remarks. The gerrymandering Bill of two or three years ago, passed by the hon. member and his colleagues, had aroused more public indignation than any of its kind, and one of the hon. member's former colleagues Mr. Keenan, had described it as marking the lowest depths of political degradation to which any Government had ever sunk.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am afraid this is very wide of the clause.

Mr. CARPENTER: At all events the country had endorsed that opinion and almost annihilated the late Government who were responsible for the passing of the Act. To-day the Government were trying to do what the country had sent them here to do.

Mr. MALE: We had had the Minister going into heroics over the Bill the other night, and to-night the Attorney General had tried to explain that Ministers were accepting their full responsibility, that after all it was the correct thing for the Governor in Council to appoint Royal Commissions. That was so, but it was not usual for the Government to come to Parliament for permission to appoint a Royal Commission. The Government did not come here and ask us to appoint a commission to inquire into the management of the

State steamers. The leader of the Opposition was quite right the other evening when he informed the House that the Minister was shirking his responsibility. We were not necessarily to be controlled by what was done in other States. Why could not the Government do the manly thing and appoint their commission?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was perfectly true that under a certain set of circumstances the Government might have appointed these commissioners to do this work if it were not necessary to lay down some definite lines upon which the commission were to act. The objection that was raised to the redistribution by the previous Government was that commissioners were not appointed, that the Bill was drawn up by the Ministry, who were vitally and personally interested in the distribution of electorates, and that neither Parliament nor the public had any knowledge whatever of the terms of the Bill or the propositions in regard to the redistribution until the measure was submitted on the eve of its discussion in Parliament. In the present Bill the commissioners were asked to carry out the redistribution on a basis set forth, which the Government desired should have statutory authority given to it by the passage of the Bill through Parliament. It was true, of course, that members of the Opposition were in the minority, but this was a preliminary stage which gave them the right of criticism and the opportunity of publicity for that criticism. When the commissioners were appointed, pursuant to the Bill, there would be a further opportunity for hon. members to exercise their right to criticise the appointments if they regarded them as being undesirable or unsuitable, and there would be a further opportunity when the work of the commissioners was completed, embodied in a report, and submitted to Parliament. In view of the fact that redistribution at the will of the Ministry or the dominant party had always been unsatisfactory, and had given rise in every country enjoying Parliamentary government to unsavoury history, it became us as a Parliament to adopt some other means. In New South Wales the method now proposed had stood the test of 20 years; Queensland had adopted it, and it had been adopted under the Commonwealth. Wherever it had been adopted it had worked satisfactorily, and there had been no desire to revert to the old order of things.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Attorney General asked for power to appoint commissioners who would advise him as to the boundaries which he would submit to Parliament.

The Minister for Mines: He undertakes to put their scheme before Parliament.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: They advised him. The Government must bring down a Bill and take the responsibility for it. The public should understand just how far these commissioners had power. The Government must be prepared to submit to attack, no matter how much they might wish to shield themselves behind the persons appointed. If the previous Government had wanted to arrange the boundaries to suit themselves they would have done it a bit better than they did.

Mr. Carpenter: You thought you arranged them well enough.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The previous Government brought in a Bill which was alleged to be wrong and corrupt, and yet it resulted in the defeat of two of the Ministers of the day. Yet it was stated that the Ministers, who were said to have taken the responsibility which commissioners ought to have taken, fixed the boundaries to suit themselves. The contention was ridiculous. The present Bill was merely a measure for the purpose of saving Ministers from responsibility.

The Attorney General: It is a similar measure to that of the Commonwealth, and similar to the Acts of Queensland and New South Wales.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: One could not find a single marginal reference to a clause having been taken from another Act. These commissioners would be useful no doubt to the Ministers and members on the Ministerial side. These commissioners would be useful to Ministers and those who sat behind them.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Premier had stated a few nights previously that he had not the slightest idea as to who were to be the commissioners. It is almost incredible that the gentleman at the head of affairs, with the Attorney General sitting next to him, should be absolutely ignorant on this point. Ministers contended that it would be an indepedent tribunal; but could they say that in the face of the Premier's statement that he had no idea as to the personnel of that tribunal? The commissioners would be under no responsibility, they would be working according to directions and therefore would be limited in the scope of their investigations.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Duty of commissioners:

Mr. MALE: Had the Minister considered the advisability of increasing the number of electorates beyond 50? It was proposed to rob the North of a member. This was entirely without justification. The population up there had not decreased nor had the importance of the North decreased, and in his opinion the North was entitled to an increase rather than a decrease in its representation. It was only reasonable to consider the advisability of increasing the number of members for the North. As time went on these outback districts would lose in representation in proportion to the population, but they ought not to be asked to consent to any reduction in their actual representation.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Frequently he had considered the question of whether there should not be larger representation for the whole State; but surely the hon. member would not be desirous of increasing the burden of government on the people at the present time. Most certainly we could not at this juncture afford to enlarge the membership of the House.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Quota and matters to be considered:

Mr. MALE: The clause provided that the quota of electors should be ascertained by reference to the total number of electors appearing upon the latest electoral rolls of the State. If the quota was to be made up on the present electoral rolls it was doubtful if we would get very satisfactory results. We had seen the condition of the Geraldton roll, and probably that was no worse than others.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The latest rolls would be those of 30th September last. They were the latest rolls for the whole of the State. Of course there were errors in all rolls. Some roll must be taken, and preferably the latest.

Mr. Male: Could we not get a new roll for the purpose?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Only at enormous cost. What was desired was to arrive at an approximate quota for the 50 electorates.

Mr. WISDOM: If the Bill was to be of any use it would have to be based on a correct roll, otherwise it would fall through. At present the rolls were in a particularly bad state. Prior to the next general election there would be the usual rush for places on the roll, with the result that the rolls would be completely altered in each case. Any scheme based on the present bad rolls would result in the position being worse than at present. To be successful the scheme depended upon having rolls as nearly perfect as possible. In order to get that it would be necessary to prepare special rolls. Surely it was worth the expense. At present the onus of getting on the roll was thrown on the electors, and the electors did not trouble about it at all. The only chance of making the scheme successful was to throw the onus of completing the rolls upon the Electoral Department, as was done in the case of the Commonwealth. Without this the scheme would be useless. He moved an amendment—

That after "division" in line 1 the words "electoral rolls shall be prepared and" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Without the amendment suggested by the hon. member, an electoral roll would have to be prepared for the purposes of this division because the clause itself expressly stated that the quota should be ascertained by taking the total number of electors whose names appeared on the latest elec-

toral rolls. It was not possible in the case of a Bill of this kind to secure absolutely perfect rolls. About the only time that it was possible for the electoral department to make the rolls approximate anything like the total number of qualified electors was at election time, when interest was aroused and when electors became busy securing their political privileges, but if we reserved the preparation of these electorates until that time, it would be absolutely impossible to have a Bill submitted to Parliament and the necessary machinery prepared in order to have the rolls ready for the elections. To carry out the redistribution of seats, the rolls ought to be prepared some time before the period fixed for the general elections and that being so, the Government realised that the only rolls upon which a redistribution could be prepared, unless of course they embarked upon a heavy expenditure and which even then would not secure the result desired by the hon. members, they must accept the latest rolls prepared by the Electoral Department. If we were to take the rolls which were prepared in view of a general election, the Commonwealth rolls, there would be, according to the statements made by the electoral officers, an error on the other side just as great or perhaps greater than the error on the side of deficiency which would probably occur in regard to these latest electoral rolls as specified in the Bill, because, owing to the rush and hurry and fear that the electors might be prosecuted, there undoubtedly had been duplication. Under those circumstances hon. members would realise that the only rolls which could be utilised were the latest and any inequalities which might exist would apply to all the electorates.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not in the same degree.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then the law of averages would come into play, and when the hon. member found the redistribution worked out on the basis of the Bill, and the rolls were prepared, there would not be many great errors. There was no other alternative but to adopt the proposal contained in the measure.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Every thing depended on the general accuracy of the rolls. He had recently gone through a rather strenuous election and it might be interesting if he were to explain the condition in which the electoral rolls at Geraldton were. There were two parties engaged in a strenuous fight, and out of 2,400 names which were on the roll, the votes recorded numbered only 1,500, so that that total was 900 short of the names shown on the roll, and of that number there were 700 who were not in the district and were not entitled to exercise the franchise. It was most important to have the rolls as nearly accurate as possible and the rolls should therefore be specially prepared.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment proposed would destroy the efficacy of the Bill. If we adopted the amendment and took a census of the State, we could not have a redistribution of seats in this Parliament.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There was a good deal in the contention that the rolls should be made as perfect as possible.

The Attorney General: The point is not the discussion of the electoral machinery, but a division into districts to get a quota on the latest electoral rolls.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Northam could only discuss the amendment.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The fact remained that the rolls ought to be cleaned up. The Minister would not bring in the Bill for the redistribution until some time next year and his department would have an opportunity of doing what was proposed if he allowed the amendment to go through.

The Attorney General: They will be up to date without the amendment.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The rolls at Geraldton were a failure, as had been pointed out and if they were not put in order was there any guarantee that they would be in order when the division was made?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The member for Geraldton (Mr. Elliott) pointed out that there was a large number of names on the Geraldton roll which should not have been there, but it was a fact also

that there was a number which should have been on that roll. The reversal of the position would have made the total just about the same. The member for Geraldton did not claim that the population of that town had decreased since the previous election, and neither had it increased, so that the numbers ought to have been about the same now as they were at the time of the general election. In no electorate to-day did we have a roll which was substantially correct. In practically every electorate about the right number of names would be found on the roll. There might be names that should not be there but there were also a number of names which should be there but were not there. There was no electorate in the State that had greatly increased in population, nor any one that had greatly decreased. Therefore the September roll would be sufficient for all the purposes of this measure.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE moved an amendment on the amendment—

That the word "specially" be inserted before "prepared."

The statement of the member for Subiaco, that there was no necessity for a special roll was surprising in view of the fact that there was a very grave probability of wiping out altogether certain electorates. He was in favour of the amendment, but he would like to ensure that a special roll would be prepared. This would be only doing bare justice to the sparsely populated districts, where the people had great difficulty in getting their names on the rolls. The member for Subiaco had said that the numbers on the rolls did not vary very much, yet the member for Williams-Narrogin had said on the second reading that the roll for his electorate contained to-day 3,046 names, although he was confident there were 5,000 electors in that district. If that was so we would be doing a grave injustice to the sparsely-populated districts if we did not require a special roll to be prepared for the subdivision of the State into electorates. Prior to the last redistribution of seats, special precautions had been taken by the Electoral Department to ascertain as accurately as possible the number of electors in the various districts. There was nothing to prevent the department making a house to house canvas, which was the only proper way of obtaining a correct roll. The agricultural districts were likely to suffer to the extent of three or four seats, and therefore they were concerned in seeing that the rolls on which the quota would be based were up to date.

Amendment (Mr. Piesse's) on amendment negatived.

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

Ayes	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	24
Majority against		..	14

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Elliott	Mr. Monger
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Male	Mr. Layman (*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Price
Mr. Chesson	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gill	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lander	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. UNDERWOOD moved a further amendment—

That in line 6 of Subclause 1 the word "Gascoyne" be struck out.

The object was to provide for three seats in the northern portion of the State. He desired all the country north of the Tropic of Capricorn to retain its present representation. His experience went to show that it would be practically impossible for men to get a thorough local knowledge of the districts in that country if they were enlarged to any greater

extent than at the present time. If the amendment was carried, it would be necessary to strike out the proviso and also to insert something.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: A preferable amendment would be to strike out "forty-seven" and insert "forty-six," so as to retain the present four seats for the northern portion of the State. No alteration of boundaries there was possible, because the people in those four electorates followed more or less the same occupations. The hon. member would probably achieve his object better by making the alteration suggested.

Mr. Underwood: The amendment I have moved will suit me.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The object of the Government had been, in the first place, to recognise the principle of the political equality of all citizens, and in the next place to recognise distance from the capital and difficulty of access to the seat of Government. The fact that the Bill provided that the North-West should have three seats, irrespective of the quota, was a special recognition of the conditions of that portion of the State. In the opinion of the Government they had gone as far as was justified in the circumstances. Yet he was quite prepared, personally, to recognise the special circumstances of the North-West, and he would go so far as to say that the Government would yield to the wish of members, if it was desired that the amendment proposed by the member for Pilbara should be carried. They would do so on account of the exceptional conditions appertaining to the North-West. He was willing to accept the hon. member's amendment if the Committee so desired. He was willing to make such a departure from the principle of equal political power to each citizen in view of the fact that we must recognise a territory with such possibilities before us. All things considered it might be conceded the country should have strong representation and he was willing to consent to the request outlined by the hon. member for Pilbara so that three representatives would be given north of the Tropic of Capricorn.

Mr. Elliott: Would that include Gascoyne?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Gascoyne would come in among the other 47.

Mr. McDONALD: It was pleasing to hear the Attorney General say he would accept the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara. It would mean that three of the northern seats would remain practically as at present and the other with certain additions from other constituents to bring the quotient up to the necessary amount.

Mr. MALE: A tremendous lot had been heard in connection with the Electoral Bill brought in by the previous Government about gerrymandering, and a lot was heard now about the purity of the methods of the present Ministry. Nevertheless there was a mighty big flavour of gerrymandering in this amendment, and he was greatly surprised to hear the member for Gascoyne meekly submit to it, accepting it as a favour.

Mr. McDonald: There is no favour about it at all; it is bare justice.

Mr. MALE: It could not be bare justice when we knew the hon. member's district could not make up the required quotient which would be demanded by the southern portion of the State. There was no justice in that unless one was going to admit the principle of equal representation according to population. If we were prepared to swallow that holus bolus there was justice in it. He (Mr. Male) admitted that so far as his own particular seat was concerned, it might be proposed to do justice, but one ought not to be entirely selfish, and he would be wanting in his duty if he did not put up a plea for Gascoyne when he found the member for Gascoyne himself would not make that plea. To make up the quotient for Gascoyne numbers would have to be taken from some other district. It was possible that the numbers might be acquired from one of the mining districts.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It has been discussed.

Mr. MALE: Of course it had been discussed. It had been his own intention to move an amendment to provide that

the four northern seats should be left as at present and the southern portion of the State be divided by 46.

The Minister for Mines: The effect of this amendment will be the same.

Mr. MALE: It would be the same with a mighty flavour of gerrymandering attached to it. He had battled hard for the North, and when he saw two of its members going back on it there was some justification for feeling sore. It might be said if he voted against the amendment that he was desirous of dividing the whole of the North into three instead of four, but the Committee knew that it was not his desire that the whole of the North should be divided into three. The country knew such was not his desire, but the country would know that the hon. member for Gascoyne was prepared to throw his district into the southern districts to be divided up and given that quotient, and to allow probably a portion of a goldfields district to be attached to it.

Mr. Gill: That is no crime.

Mr. MALE: There was a smell about it which he did not like. Although he was compelled to vote against the amendment he did so because he believed the North was entitled to retain four members as at present.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was a sad thing to find that because he had yielded to the wishes expressed by the hon. member himself, and to the wishes of others on that side, the hon. member was enraged. It was a pity the hon. member was offended because he (the Attorney General) had yielded to what others had asked for on that side and what the members for the district unitedly asked for. Admittedly in doing it he was departing from the principle which he thought ought to prevail of equal manhood having equal political power. On that principle the North-West would not have more than one member, or two if the boundaries were enlarged for the purpose. The Government in the first place gave three, and now, in order that the charge of neglecting that important part of the country could not be brought against us, in order that we might say we were at one with the hon. member himself in giving more than double the representation to the North-West according to the standard, now because we were giving them four we were accused of some political gerrymandering, and the hon. member for Kimberley rose in indignation, protesting that he was not selfish and would have preferred some other way of cutting up that area. One could not understand the hon. member getting indignant except that it was because we had taken away the edge of his sword of abuse. We had deprived hon. members opposite of a genuine source of vituperation; we had robbed them of their platform glory, and had given them the full number of members for the North-West.

Mr. Male: You have given us nothing.

Mr. McDONALD: The member for Kimberley and the public generally might be reminded that when this Bill was before the House on the second reading the member for Pilbara outlined his present amendment, and a reference to *Hansard* would show that he (Mr. McDonald) had stated that he would welcome the amendment because at least it would give some measure of justice. According to the terms of the Bill one of the seats had to go. It was not a question, although it was a grievance of members opposite, that the commissioners were getting certain instructions and that they were directed to leave out one of these seats. Since that time he had received telegrams from the two principal public bodies in his constituency stating that indignation was being shown in that constituency owing to the partial disfranchisement which was threatened, and asking him to do his best to secure the retention of the present representation. In supporting the amendment, therefore, he was acting in the interests of his constituency.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: As the member for Gascoyne had stated this amendment was outlined pretty clearly on the second reading of the Bill, and, therefore, the member for Kimberley who took such a great interest in the North certainly could not reasonably claim that the amendment came as a surprise. True, the amendment

was not on the Notice Paper, but hundreds of amendments were not placed on the Notice Paper, especially at this time of the year when we were putting legislation through at a rapid rate. In regard to the alteration he contended that the Government had treated the North-West liberally. As a matter of fact it was a somewhat difficult proposition to argue that a person in the North-West should have more voting power in this House than a person down here. Of course there was the other side, and there was no doubt that in accepting the amendment the Government had given liberal consideration to the people in the Northern portion of the State. So far as the hon. member for Kimberley was concerned, and the work he had done for the North-West, most of the people on the coast were of opinion that that work was scattered around Broome and the pearling industry, but it had to be remembered that there were other industries besides pearling and which were of greater advantage to the State. The amendment it was to be hoped would be carried and it was certain that the people of the North-West would appreciate the liberality with which the Government had treated them. The amendment provided that the whole of the territory north of the Tropic of Capricorn would retain its present representation and it seemed to him that was a reasonable and just proposition. The country south of the tropic was taken as one and the north was specially treated. So far as Gascoyne was concerned, that would still have a member, the only difference being that there would be about 600 or 700 more electors in it. At present there were 1,700 odd names on the Gascoyne roll, and under the new quota it would require about 2,400 electors. He desired again to express his thanks to the Government for accepting the amendment and treating these people as they had done in the way of representation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The change in the views of the Attorney General was astonishing. He would remind the Attorney General of the language he had used on the second reading. Speaking in connection with this measure the Attorney General made use of these words——

The CHAIRMAN: Where were those words used?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the House.

The CHAIRMAN: It was not possible for the hon. member to quote from *Hansard* of the current session.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was not his intention to do so. The notes he had were his own notes of what the Attorney General said. These were the words of the Attorney General—

> Whilst it is true we may not know all that is necessary for the Kimberleys and the North-West, and that those whose lives are spent down here, who never travel and never read, do not know of the requirements and possibilities of that portion of this great State, still one man can communicate the truth to receptive ears with as much force as twenty. I refuse to believe that the men representing the goldfields, those who represent the country districts, and the men representing the towns, are dead to the value of that great area represented by the member for Roebourne. I refuse to believe that those who sit in this House, who have never seen the Kimberleys, and are not aware of the nature of the soil, or the possibilities of the Gascoyne or the Pilbara electorates, I refuse to believe that they are absolutely callous to the welfare of that portion of the State.

The Attorney General: I am glad to stand on that rock.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What had happened to the Attorney General in the interim? He had come here to-night with a different statement which would be seen in the next issue of *Hansard*, and he (Mr. Elliott) would take the opportunity of framing both these statements and showing them to that gentleman.

The Attorney General: And I shall always be proud of them.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The point was that the treatment which the Attorney General had extended to the Gascoyne district he would be asked at the proper time to extend to the agricultural centres. The Premier had said in the House, "I do not

know how this distribution will pan out." That was an extraordinary statement because the hon. member for Mount Margaret declared without fear of contradiction that it was known 18 months before that the Mount Margaret seat was to be wiped out. The late member for Cue was also well aware of the fact that under this measure the Cue seat would be swept away and that gentleman took the first opportunity of getting out and he did get out.

Mr. GARDINER: It was surprising to hear from the member for Kimberley that it was his intention to vote against the amendment. He (Mr. Gardiner) was not altogether satisfied with it because he considered the North-West was entitled to greater representation than it had received in the past. His reason for supporting the amendment was that it would leave the North-West practically as it was. If, however, he thought there was a possibility of having an amendment carried, the effect of which would be to bring about greater representation, he would be prepared to support such an amendment, but if we accepted the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara it would be a compromise.

Mr. THOMAS: The Attorney General was to be congratulated on accepting the alteration which had been proposed. Statements had been made in regard to the abolition of seats which were without a fragment of foundation.

Mr. Taylor: Well you try and refute them; now is your chance.

Mr. THOMAS: They are absolutely unjustified, and they cast aspersions upon the Ministry, and the party to which the member for Mount Margaret belonged. The statements that hon. member made were without a fragment of justification.

Mr. Taylor: Well, reply to them.

Mr. THOMAS: No matter who the member might be, that member had no justification for saying that he knew what the result of the redistribution was going to be.

Mr. Elliott: What made the member for Cue get out?

Mr. Taylor: That was a pretty good omen.

Mr. THOMAS: No doubt in a little time Mr. Heitmann would be asking, what made the present member for Geraldton get out.

Mr. Taylor: All our positions are precarious.

Mr. THOMAS: I do not agree with the hon. member's assertion. Without any provocation at all, hon. members asserted that the Bill had been introduced with ulterior motives. As a matter of fact the Bill was based on certain principles promised long ago by the party, and those principles had been faithfully adhered to. No member could tell with any degree of accuracy how his particular constituency would pan out as the result of this redistribution. There was not the slightest doubt the commissioners would carry out their duty in an honest, straightforward manner. He was pleased to see that the North-West would maintain its present representation.

Mr. Male: You can see double, I think.

Mr. THOMAS: It was to be hoped he took a clearer view of things in general than did the hon. member. One of the Northern members had declared he would like to see more seats allotted to the North. That would apply to most parts of the State. Personally he would like to see another seat for Bunbury. He was surprised that the member for Kimberley (Mr. Male), after having eloquently advocated the claims of the North-West the other evening, should now, when the point to which that hon. member had referred was rectified, again declare that the Government were wrong. Apparently the hon. member was finding fault for the mere purpose of finding fault.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Every member of the Opposition desired that the representation of the North should remain as it was. There were in the North four electorates with interests in common, and those four had always been regarded as standing apart from the the rest of the State. In Gascoyne there were 1,771 electors, in Kimberley 1,293, in Pilbara 1,091, and in Roebourne 1,396. The proposition was to put Gascoyne in the Southern division of the State and give only three members to the North. He

was surprised that the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) should have suggested this, and still more surprised that the suggestion should have been supported by the members for Roebourne (Mr. Gardiner) and Gascoyne (Mr. McDonald). If the proposal was carried, Gascoyne would not have the representation it had to-day.

Mr. McDonald: What is the difference, whether the total is made up from the northern or the southern side?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There was no question of making up the quota at all. Members supporting the amendment had shown conclusively that they did not care a jot for the people of the Gascoyne.

Mr. Underwood: We can put more on to Gascoyne, but not on to the others.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Any one of the four could be added to. Members representing the North had taken some credit for having induced the Minister to allow Gascoyne to be deleted from the North. What was required was to alter the 47 electorates of the South to 46, leaving four seats in the North. To carry the amendment would be absolutely unfair. It was strange that the Attorney General should have so easily given way to the pressure put upon him.

The Attorney General: Not easily. If we do not budge we are stubborn, and if we do budge we are mean.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Only certain members could induce the Attorney General to change his views.

The Attorney General: No change of views whatever.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Bill provided that the four electorates should become three electorates.

The Attorney General: I still give to the North-West three representatives.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Attorney General now said that he was giving three representatives to the North and a fourth to Gascoyne. For some reason Gascoyne, which had 1,771 electors, was to be added to the southern portion of the State, when it rightly belonged to the North. The member for Gascoyne had always been considered a northern member and on questions affecting the North he had been looked to just as much as any other northern member. In the 1911 Act it was realised that the North with its great pastoral industry was worth four members, but there were not to be four members for the North in future. The Attorney General had clearly said that if he had his way he would make the whole of the North, including Gascoyne, into three electorates. Would not the Minister see that the interests of Gascoyne were inseparably bound up with the North and were in no way connected with the interests of Geraldton?

Mr. McDonald: Does the pastoral area stop at the Murchison river?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member knew how many people were to be found between Greenough electorate and his electorate. He protested against the North being sold by its members and being robbed by the Government. This was an unsavoury suggestion, particularly when northern members knew that the Opposition were willing to vote that they should retain the four northern seats as they were to-day, yet they accepted a suggestion that Gascoyne should be made a separate electorate by including portion of the South-West and taking in a body of people who had no community of interest with those who now formed the Gascoyne electorate. The northern members should assist the member for Kimberley to retain four seats for the great pastoral areas, but evidently members on the Government side had come to a very good understanding.

Mr. Underwood: We have done what the leader of the Opposition wanted done.

Mr. PRICE: One hardly knew what to understand from members opposite. The assumption of indignation was highly amusing. The member for Kimberley (Mr. Male) talked about the harm that was to be done to the North-West. In what way? The North-West was still to have four members. The member for Geraldton assumed a tone of righteous indignation because if the amendment was carried Gascoyne would have

700 more electors than to-day. Two years ago the very members who were rising in indignation against Gascoyne being made to include 700 more electors than at present, had not hesitated to frame for their own party purposes electorates which, though within 40 miles of Perth, had half the number of electors contained in electorates 300 miles away. The member for Kimberley had spoken of a grave wrong which was being done to the great North-West. One could not help being disgusted with this assumption of indignation, which only existed on the lips of the hon. member.

Mr. Underwood: It exists only for stage purposes.

Mr. PRICE: That was correct. If it could be shown that any part of the North-West was being unfairly treated in any portion of this measure, he (Mr. Price) would not hesitate to vote against it. Under the Bill every constituency in the State would be dealt with fairly and justly by commissioners and not by politicians at a party meeting, as was done three years ago. The commissioners were only limited insofar as the number of voters was concerned and even there we would have justice, as the further an electorate was away from the metropolis the smaller would be the proportion of electors it would have to carry. The whole trouble to-night had arisen because the Government proposed that the Gascoyne electorate should have some 700 more electors than it had to-day. There was no suggestion of taking away a member from the North-West, although the member for Kimberley wished people to believe such was the case. It was regrettable that members of the Opposition had not seen fit to treat this amendment with a small portion at least of justice and fairness. He regretted assumed indignation which did not exist in the hon. members' hearts, but had been assumed purely for stage purposes. The amendment would do justice to the North-West and would not be imposing hardship on any other electorate, as it would only mean increasing the quotas of other electorates by a very small number indeed.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Nothing unfair had fallen from members of the Opposition in regard to Gascoyne. On the contrary it was to do justice to Gascoyne that we opposed this amendment. Gascoyne had always been considered a part of the North-West of the State but an endeavour was being made in this Bill to bring it into the southern districts of the State, to treat it similarly, and make it subject to the same quota as the districts south of Roebourne. One of the principles underlying the Bill was that means of communication and distance from the capital should be considered. If Gascoyne was left as it should be, one of the four northern districts, independent of subdivision and independent of the quota provided under this Bill, we would then be considering these districts according to their means of communication and distance from the capital. Members of the Opposition feared that by the amendment there would be brought into the Gascoyne electorate interests which were diverse, interests which were not in common with the district as it was at the present time. It was distinctly a pastoral district and in order to obtain the number of electors that would be necessary under this Bill, interests would have to be brought in which were not in common with the interests of the district as they now were. It would be impossible for the commissioners to prepare the quota necessary for that district without bringing in interests which were not common to those of the district. It was not his intention to suggest that there were ulterior motives underlying the desires of the Government in connection with the acceptance of the amendment, but he declared that it was not fair to the Gascoyne district as it was at present constituted that it should be brought to the same position as the rest of the State south of Geraldton.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Esperance is in a similar position.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Esperance was nearer to the goldfields, and the climate was very different. Moreover, hon. members opposite were claiming that Esperance was a great agricultural district.

There was no need to argue whether the interests of Esperance were similar to those of the North-West. In his opinion they were absolutely different. He was sorry the Government were supporting an amendment of this nature which would allow the four northern constituencies to remain as they were at present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The amendment was the one, almost the only one, which would give effect to what was desired. If we looked at the map we would find that the whole of the country to the north of the Tropic of Capricorn had three seats at the present time, and it was quite impossible to add to one of those three seats without taking away a portion of one of the other constituencies. What he meant to say was that a portion of one constituency would have to be altered if it were desired to make any addition to either of the others adjoining. Gascoyne could only be extended either south or east. The division which was proposed was the best that could possibly be made, and if it was put before an unbiassed person he would say that it was the most scientific that could be made in that part of the State. The complaint was not that we were taking away Gascoyne, but that we were adding 500 or 600 votes to it, but it was only a fair proposition that it should carry those votes.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member who had just spoken ought to be logical in his deductions regarding the North-West constituencies.

The Attorney General: He will not go to you for lessons in logic.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The member for Pilbara was the henchman of the Attorney General, and therefore it was not supposed that he would do so. The Attorney General should return a *quid pro quo*.

Mr. Underwood: The Attorney General will never be able to teach you logic. You have not the capacity to learn.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The member for Pilbara was neglecting his duty when he made the proposal which was now before the Committee. It would be well for him to withdraw his amendment and permit to be moved the amendment desired by the member for Kimberley that the seats should remain as they were at present.

Mr. Turvey: Why object to the amendment which provides for four seats?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It destroyed the representation enjoyed by the great industry in the North-West. It was more in sorrow than in anger that he pointed this out to hon. members.

Mr. PRICE: Attention might be drawn to the fact that we had the member for Northam talking about the unfair treatment of the North-West. If the hon. member was sincere——

Hon. J. Mitchell: I always am sincere.

Mr. PRICE: Then how came it that the Gascoyne electorate did not receive the same consideration as electorates like Sussex, Irwin, Beverley or Murray-Wellington, when the hon. member's party submitted their Redistribution of Seats Bill? As a matter of fact to-day Gascoyne had 1,771 electors, and Sussex only 1,695; so why this outcry? Beverley had 1,765 electors or fewer than were to be found in Gascoyne. Irwin had 1,661 and Murray-Wellington, practically a metropolitan-suburban suburb, had only 1,994. Yet hon. members said the Government were not doing fairly by the North-West. Certainly the North-West had not received fair consideration when the last redistribution was before Parliament, for the whole energy of the then Government went in protecting their own supporters. Yet because the present Government proposed to bring Gascoyne into the Southern division, of course they were doing something wrong. The wrong was that the Bill had not been brought in by the right party. The opposition to the Bill was so devoid of logic and reason that it was surprising to find anybody supporting it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In 1911 Murray-Wellington had 2,207 electors, Sussex 2,256, and Gascoyne 1,811. That was according to the roll.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: And the estimate then was, Sussex 1,900, Murray-Wellington 1,700, and Gascoyne 1,400. It went to show how fallacious was the contention of the last speaker.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Notwithstanding that for many years past the North had had four representatives, it was now considered necessary to reduce the representation by extending the area to the south. In his opinion it was necessary to provide for an increased number of representatives of the North rather than to decrease them.

Mr. Underwood: Where are we decreasing them? You are not stating a fact.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: The effect of the amendment would be to extend the area of the northern part of the State and so reduce its representtation.

Mr. Underwood: You are wrong again.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: It meant that the quota for Gascoyne would have to be raised, and the additional electors would be taken from the adjoining southern electorate.

Mr. Underwood: But Gascoyne is not in the North.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: It had been wisely provided in the past that those four electorates should stand by themselves and be given special representation. Even in the Bill that principle was admitted. In accepting the amendment the Government were doing an injustice to the North. It was the desire of all members of the Opposition that the North should retain its four seats. The members of the North themselves should be the first to oppose anything that would result in a lessening of the representation of the North, which to-day was not as great as it should be.

Mr. MALE: It was his intention to divide the Committee on the amendment because, unless a division were taken, and the position thus made clear, it would not be possible for him subsequently to move his proposed amendment to strike out the word "seven." He regretted that those members who had been looked upon as representing the North had gone back on the North. The member for Pilbara had stated by interjection that Gascoyne was not portion of the North, but for years they had treasured the fact that the members for the constituencies from Gascoyne upwards represented the North. They had seen their members dwindle one by one but they had little expected to see the portion of the State they represented dwindle also. He at least would be true to the principle that the North was represented by four members, and he would vote against the amendment.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	23
Noes	.. .. ..	11
Majority for	.. ..	12

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Swan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lander	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDonald	(*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Monger
Mr. Elliott	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(*Teller*).

Amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.