

Commissioner of Railways should be responsible for the payment of interest on the outlay. It is monstrous. There is no business interest in the city that would agree to such a proposal. It is a liability of the State, not of the Railway Department, and the Bill as originally presented should have been accepted.

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

| | | | | |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 3 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 10 |

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Hon. J. M. Drew | | Hon. E. H. Gray |
| Hon. W. H. Kitson | | (Teller.) |

NOES.

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Hon. J. Ewing | | Hon. J. Nicholson |
| Hon. G. A. Kempton | | Hon. H. Seddon |
| Hon. Sir W. F. Lathlain | | Hon. H. A. Stephenson |
| Hon. A. Lovekin | | Hon. H. Stewart |
| Hon. W. J. Mann | | Hon. J. T. Franklin |
| | | (Teller.) |

PAIR.

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----------------------|
| AYE. | | No. |
| Hon. C. B. Williams | | Hon. C. H. Wittenoom |

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 2. Title.—Insert the words "the operation of" before the word "certain," and at the end insert the words "and for other purposes."

The CHAIRMAN: This is a consequential amendment and therefore will be insisted on.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 1st November, 1928.

| | |
|---|------|
| Questions: Water meter rents, Kellerrerrin ... | 1578 |
| Oil prospecting ... | 1578 |
| Personal explanation, Mr. Angelo and inaccurate | |
| Press report ... | 1579 |
| Leave of absence ... | 1579 |
| Bills: Electoral Districts Act Amendment, 22., Com. | 1579 |
| report ... | 1579 |
| Feeding stuffs, returned ... | 1607 |
| Railways Discontinuance, Council's message ... | 1607 |
| Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed ... | 1607 |
| Mines Department ... | 1607 |

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

QUESTION—WATER METER RENTS, KELLERBERRIN.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: 1, What amount has been collected for water meter rents during the last 15 years in the Kellerrerrin Road Board district? 2, Is it correct that users of these meters have to pay for repairs in addition to paying a charge of 10s. per year? 3, What was the original cost of the meters? 4, As these meters have presumably been paid for several times over, will he now abolish the meter rent charge? 5, When was the meter rent charge abolished on the goldfields?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURAL WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, Approximately £2,050. 2, Users of departmental meters are called upon to pay for damage done to such meters, but they are not required to pay for ordinary maintenance and upkeep. 3, The cost of meters varies. The average original cost was £4 10s. and the average cost of fixing £1. 4, As experience has proved that the rents collected are sufficient only to cover interest on the outlay and the cost of maintenance and nothing towards the capital cost, I am not prepared to abolish the meter rent. 5, As from the 1st July, 1923. The Lands Department pay to the Water Supply Department the revenue lost through the granting of this concession.

QUESTION—OIL PROSPECTING.

Mr. TEESDALE asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that Australia House officials have given unfavourable replies to inquiries as to the position of oil

prospecting in this State? 2, Would it be possible to instruct the Federal authorities to advise Australia House that any inquiries regarding Western Australian industries are to be referred direct to our own Agent General at Savoy House?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, The Prime Minister will be advised that the suggestion has been made in this House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. Angelo and Inaccurate Press Report.

MR. ANGELO (Guscoyne) [4.34]: I desire to make a personal explanation. Reporting a speech I made in this House last evening, the "West Australian" has the following sentence:—

Practically all the sheep in the North-West had nodules.

I very much regret if that is the impression I conveyed to hon. members and to the Press. What I wished to say was that practically throughout the North-West sheep had nodules. There may not seem to be much difference in the phraseology, but this is a very big matter and it is only fair that the wrong impression created should be corrected. The condition referred to is not by any means restricted to the North-West, but is existent throughout this State and also throughout Australia. I have here a letter from the Director of Agriculture, written in October, 1928, in which he admits that there has been a large percentage of nodules found in sheep throughout Western Australia, and that this condition has extended in some measure to lambs. He points out, however, that the condition is not in any way injurious to human consumption, provided the nodules are removed from the sheep at the time of inspection. This morning I also received assurance from the Chief Inspector of Stock that that is the case.

Hon. G. Taylor: Nodules are not so prevalent in sheep as they are in cattle.

Mr. ANGELO: I am told that the condition is increasing, but that it has no effect upon human consumption or upon local killing. Unfortunately, it is a disadvantage for the export trade to Great Britain. As I stated last night, regulations have lately

been introduced by Great Britain prohibiting the importation of carcasses which have had nodules, even after the nodules have been removed. I think it is only fair to producers and consumers to make this explanation, and I thank the House for having permitted me to make it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Hon. W. D. Johnson (Guildford) and Hon. M. F. Troy (Mount Magnet) on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. LATHAM (York) [4.37]: I shall not oppose the second reading of the Bill. Its provisions are far and away better than the existing state of affairs regarding the representation of the people. I regret to be compelled to support the measure, as I consider it most unfair to agricultural representation. I should have liked to see a much more comprehensive Bill brought down, one that would reduce the number of members in this Chamber and also in another place. I suggest for serious consideration that the management of the State could well be carried out by 30 representatives in this House and by 18 in another place. The cost of government in this State is higher than in any other State of the Commonwealth. I suggest that economy in this respect might be adopted on highly practical lines, thus giving a lead to other action in the same direction. The cost of government as regards the Commonwealth is 1s. 8d. per head, and the corresponding figures for the States are—New South Wales 1s. 11d., Victoria 1s. 5d., Queensland 2s. 5d., Tasmania 3s. 9d. and Western Australia 5s. 5d. Surely it is worth while considering whether we cannot bring about a reduction in the cost of government which is the highest of all the States.

Hon. G. Taylor: Anything that is good always commands a high price.

Mr. LATHAM: I freely admit that there is not a member of this Chamber, quite irrespective of party, who is not doing the best

he can for his constituency and the State. But let me point out that the people of Subiaco are thoroughly well represented by their present member, who represents 11,000 electors. I feel quite confident that my proposal can be adopted, judging by the fact that the interests of Subiaco are being looked after so carefully as they are at the present time. I could mention the cases of other members, but I have picked out Subiaco because its member evidently represents his electors satisfactorily, seeing that he has been returned by them so often. As regards the agricultural districts, let me point out that the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) represents 5,000 electors, and it can be confidently claimed that his representation of them is satisfactory. Thus there is no need to have so small a quota as 3,000 or 4,000. It can be increased with safety to 5,000 or 6,000. That is as regards the country districts, and I suggest that the city quota might well be raised to 10,000 or 11,000. I regard the Bill as inequitable. Take the central goldfields area fixed by the Act of 1923. There is a compact little area of four miles square, and it has four representatives in this Chamber at present, and will have four representatives if the Bill becomes law.

The Premier: No, it will not.

The Minister for Mines: Where did you get your figures from as to the four miles square?

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister is not prepared to doubt that statement anyhow.

The Minister for Mines: I do question it.

Mr. LATHAM: I measured the area this morning, and it is four miles square.

The Minister for Mines: That is why my electorate runs as much as 48 miles southward, and—

Mr. LATHAM: The southern boundary may run that distance, but there are no electors in that quarter.

The Minister for Mines: Yes, there are.

Mr. LATHAM: Then they are very few.

The Premier: I am sure the hon. member is mistaken when he says that the goldfields central area will have four representatives under the Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: Will the Premier correct me if I say that Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, and Hannans will have four representatives under the Bill. Those electoral districts have a total of 8,394 electors according to the figures furnished by the

Chief Electoral Officer. Divided by the quota of 2,000, that will give four members.

The Premier: No. The area will be different altogether.

Mr. LATHAM: Perhaps the area may be different. However, here is a small compact area entitled under the Bill to four representatives. The Premier will not argue that that is not so. I submit that a comparison should be made between that area and such electoral districts as Irwin, Moore, Greenough and Toodyay. Let hon. members glance at the map and observe the vast areas covered by those four electorates. Yet that compact little goldfields area is to have a representation of four, the same as the four agricultural districts. Surely that is unreasonable. However, as the Premier has pointed out, the probability is that districts may radiate from the goldfields central area. If they do, it will put a different aspect on the matter. Looking at the map, one is convinced that the representation of the central goldfields area under the Bill will be very similar to what it is to-day.

The Premier: No.

Mr. LATHAM: I will take the Boulder electoral district. I do not know whether my measurements are correct, but I measured the district to the best of my ability and found it to be one square mile. I am not concerned about its representation to-day, but I want to point out how convenient and easy it is for one man to represent that area, with its community of interests and its close proximity to polling places. There should be no difficulty whatever in getting a 100 per cent. poll in that area. How much more difficult is it to get even a 50 per cent. poll in either Toodyay or Greenough or Irwin, owing to the vast areas and the distances from polling places. That is something for agricultural representatives to complain about. In the Bill brought down by the present Leader of the Opposition there seemed to be nothing unfair. For the life of me I cannot see why people in that compact goldfields area should ask for the same representation as people away up in the Mt. Margaret, the Mt. Magnet, or the Mt. Leonora electorates. These latter people are entitled to a great deal more representation even than the people of the agricultural areas. I venture to say there is not one member on the cross benches who will not support me on that point. I have a good deal of faith in the commission-

ers under the existing Act, and for my part am quite prepared to leave such matters to them. All I am sorry for is that a Bill has to be brought again to this Chamber and perhaps torn to pieces by members, just as the last one was. I think the decision of the commission should be final and that we should stand or fall by it. I am wondering whether the Premier has any more faith in them to-day than he had when the Leader of the Opposition introduced the last Bill in 1922. It is well worth quoting what the Premier's idea was at that time.

The Premier: There is a good deal of difference in the present position.

Mr. LATHAM: Not much difference. The commission is to consist of a judge of the Supreme Court, the Surveyor General and the Chief Electoral Officer, unless, of course, any of those gentlemen is away from the State, or there is some other reasonable excuse to appoint someone else in his place. This is what the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, said in 1922—

The commission will be only a camouflage. An office boy could do it with the statistics. What is there for the commission to do?

The Premier: That is not a reflection on the commission.

Mr. LATHAM: No. Still I am glad to hear that the Premier has a good deal more faith in them to-day than he had at that time. That interjection of his might have been made in a moment of anger.

The Minister for Works: There is nothing in that statement expressing want of confidence in the commissioners.

Mr. LATHAM: The Premier asked what was there for them to do, and added that it was only a camouflage, suggesting that the Bill was already loaded. We are not suggesting that, except that we say the proposed representation is unfair to the agricultural districts. The Minister for Justice, who is an important man in the Ministry to-day, said the commissioners would have their instructions. This will be found in "Hansard," page 2767 of 1923. We are not going to make those statements, suggesting that the commissioners will have their instructions.

The Premier: What the Minister meant was, instructions under the Act. Please do not infer anything else. There could be no other instructions.

Mr. LATHAM: It is nice to know that. After all, the Minister for Justice controls

the Chief Electoral Officer, and I hope I misunderstood that remark of his.

The Premier: Do you suggest otherwise?

Mr. LATHAM: What he said was that the commissioners would have their instructions.

The Premier: Instructions from the Act. What else do you suggest?

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know what it was the Minister for Justice suggested.

The Premier: Instructions from the Act.

Mr. LATHAM: A very good excuse.

The Premier: Don't say that.

Mr. LATHAM: We on this side have a great deal of confidence in the commissioners and are prepared to leave it all to them. I am prepared to ask them to even fix the boundaries. We would accept them without seeing them, provided, of course, we had better representation for the agricultural areas. I believe in having a representative Government. But we cannot have that on a one man one vote, one vote one value principle. At all events we cannot have it in a State like this, with its vast areas, its scattered population, its great distances from the capital, from the seat of government. It will be impossible for us to have representative government under those conditions. There is not any member who will not say that the people who go out into the country farming, or mining, or anything of the kind, are not better entitled to direct representation in Parliament than are the people of Perth. It is impossible for those people in the outback districts to reach the heads of departments, to get the ear of politicians as frequently as city people do, and it is impossible for them to keep their eyes on Parliamentarians, as the city people can. Therefore they are entitled to more consideration than are the people in the city. I know that the provisions of the Act are all that can be desired. It is provided that the boundaries are to be decided on the principles laid down in the Act, which are community of interests, means of communication and physical features. That should be sufficient safeguard for us. But the probability is that, in passing the Bill as it stands, we are not providing for those principles set down in the Act. If we pass the Bill as it is, providing for the proposed representation in the whole of the mining areas and the pastoral areas, I do not think we are going to have that fair representation we ought

to have; because we cannot possibly say that the same means of communication exist, and therefore it is overriding that principle in the Act. If we go into the question of community of interests, the probability is that the pastoral areas are entitled to the same representation as those in the North. Because, after all, the North and the North-West are practically pastoral countries, and so are those outback mining areas. I sometimes think we too frequently discuss the city as against the country. In reality it is not that at all. It is a question of the industries established in the country districts, with their disadvantages, and the industries and commercial life of the city. The one is totally different from the other, and it is so difficult for the people in the country districts to co-operate with each other to get the best form of government for their advantage. I think we should not differentiate, as we appear to do, between those districts I have mentioned, namely, Boulder, Kalgoorlie, Hannans, and Brown-hill-Ivanhoe, and other districts. Their distance is 375 miles from Perth, and when we consider their compact area and compare them with Albany, 341 miles away, we cannot say honestly that the people of Kalgoorlie and Boulder are entitled to twice the representation of Albany. The means of communication are exactly the same and the distance from the seat of government is the same, but the area is quite different. The scattered area of Albany should entitle it to the same consideration as is given to the goldfields. If we were to follow out that one man one vote, one vote one value principle, and asked the Federal Parliament to adopt it, we would have very different representation in the Senate from what we have to-day. The six senators of Western Australia represent 210,949 electors, while the six senators of New South Wales represent 1,329,080 electors. I do not think anybody would suggest that we should bring about an alteration of that. I say the principle that applies in the Commonwealth should apply also in the various electorates of this State. I hope we shall not discuss the Bill from that point of view. The probability is that the Premier will permit us to make some more reasonable representation for the people in the agricultural districts. The people in the outer mining districts also are entitled to more representation than is

proposed for them; because although we sometimes speak of the disparity between the representation of the electors of Menzies and the electors of Canning, I venture to say that the people of Canning, if they had no direct representation at all in Parliament, would still have more influence in this Chamber than the people of Menzies could have with their single member. For the people of Canning are always in touch with the heads of departments and members of Parliament or other influential men, who would find means of obtaining for those people what they might want. Recently I read a quotation from a speech by Mr. Gladstone who, in discussing a Bill for the better representation in Parliament of the people of Great Britain, said that if the people of London had no representatives at all, they would still have more influence in the Parliament of Great Britain than would the people of Edinburgh if they had 25 representatives in that Parliament. The same thing, of course, applies in this State. I hope we shall get amendments through Committee to adjust the anomalies in the Bill. I am sorry the Government have not seen fit to accept the law as it was, but I say candidly that the Bill before us to-day is more than I expected, and so I propose to support the second reading, reserving the right to amend the Bill in Committee with a view to getting better representation for the agricultural districts.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [4.56]: I will support the second reading for the reason that the Bill is a lot better than the existing position. But in doing so I intend to carry out what I think my duty, not only to the people whom I represent but to the people of the State, namely to criticise the Bill and to give reasons why the Bill should have followed different lines. After the last election I made certain complaints in the House in respect of the State rolls. I intend again to stress those complaints to-day and to show proof of the statements I am going to make. At the last election I made certain very serious statements, among which was this: At the time of the election I ascertained that on polling day 35 people came to Dowerin and found that their names were not on the roll, while the total number of votes recorded there was 180. At Wyalkatchem that was the experience of 50 persons, and the poll showed

that 240 votes were cast. At Korrelocking 17 persons found they were not on the roll, and 80 electors voted. At Nembudding 17 persons found they were not on the rolls and 17 other persons voted there. I consulted the Chief Electoral Officer on this point and stressed the fact that at some time or other we would have a redistribution of seats and that it was only right that some effort should be made to get the people of the country districts on the roll. I also showed the House that the Toodyay subdivision of the Federal electorate of Swan has not quite the same boundaries as the State electorate. Generally speaking, it does follow the same lines. I estimate that there should be 500 more voters in the Toodyay subdivision of the Swan Federal electorate than are on the State roll. But to-day there are over 1,500 more on the Federal roll than on the State roll. The Federal roll shows 6,994 electors, while the State roll shows 5,332.

The Minister for Mines: Are the boundaries the same?

Mr. LINDSAY: They are not quite the same, as I have said. But I have studied the two boundaries, and from my close knowledge of the district I say there should be 500 more electors on the Federal roll than on the State roll. I have here the latest subdivision of the Commonwealth roll. In the Toodyay subdivision I find that 402 names have been added. When I get this supplementary roll I find not one of them on the State roll.

The Premier: What is the difference between the dates of the two rolls?

Mr. LINDSAY: I shall explain that. I admit, after counting up the names, that a small number have been put on the State roll—186—but 402 have been put on the Federal roll.

The Minister for Railways: One set of figures is up to October, and the other set up to June.

Mr. LINDSAY: I understood the Premier to say that the figures he presented were up to the 24th October, so that the date should coincide with the date of the Federal figures. There are 402 names on the Federal supplementary roll and if they were all added after the 30th June, then 186 is all that has been added to the State roll. Ninety-five per cent. of the names on the Federal roll for the Toodyay electorate are people in towns or near post offices. That surely

shows there is something wrong with our State roll. I was told that for the last State election a canvass was made of the Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany and central goldfields districts, but no attempt was made to get the people of the country districts on the roll. I said then, and I repeat now, that in my opinion at least 1,200 people in my electorate are on the Federal roll and not on the State roll. Consequently, before we have a redistribution of seats there should be means to ascertain the exact quotas.

The Premier: Do not you think that obtains in every constituency?

Mr. LINDSAY: In my electorate there is a great deal of new development, and many settlers are not within 20 or 30 miles of a post office. Those people rarely go to the post office and have not opportunities to get their names on the roll. City people live almost alongside the post offices and they are able to meet and discuss questions and get their names on the roll. Prior to the last election there was an organised attempt to get the people of the metropolitan area enrolled, and I believe it was successful. According to the figures presented by the Premier there are 108,866 electors in the metropolitan area and the population statistics to the latest available date—the 31st December, 1927—show that the population of the metropolitan area was 191,791, consisting of 95,358 females and 96,433 males. Thus there are roughly 1,000 more males than females in the metropolitan area.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is wrong with that?

Mr. LINDSAY: Of the 191,791 population of the metropolitan area, 108,866 are on the roll. Every member must agree when I say that there must be a bigger percentage of children in the metropolitan area than in any other part of the State. Thousands of country children are sent to Perth to be educated.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Mr. LINDSAY: I believe that is so.

The Premier: Only a few hundred.

Mr. LINDSAY: There are hundreds and probably thousands of married men working in the country districts and their families are residing in Perth.

The Minister for Railways: They are on the Perth roll.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes, but I am dealing with percentages. The population of the State is 392,292, consisting of 211,628 males

and 180,664 females. Thus there is a preponderance of males in the State of 30,964, while the preponderance of males in the metropolitan area is only about 1,000. That goes to prove the accuracy of my statement. The men are working in the country and a bigger percentage of women and children are living in the city. Therefore, the metropolitan area should not have a larger percentage enrolled than have the country districts, where there is a greater number of adults. Following up that point, we find that of the adult population of 191,791 in the metropolitan area, 108,866 are enrolled. In the country districts, where there are 200,501 adults, there are only 102,000 odd on the roll. In other words, the country districts have a population greater by 8,701 people, but against that the number enrolled is 6,281 less than in the metropolitan area. That convinces me that people of the country districts are not enrolled in the same proportion as are those in the metropolitan area. Therefore, before any redistribution of seats Bill is brought down, there should be an organised attempt to secure the enrolment of people in the scattered districts so that there will be a fairer distribution of seats than otherwise would be possible.

The Minister for Railways: There is a big proportion of foreigners in the country, too. That would make a difference to your calculation.

The Minister for Mines: If the mining companies were loyal to Britain and Australia, there would be another two representatives of the goldfields.

The Minister for Railways: There must be 8,000 or more foreigners in this State.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Bill will alter the basis of representation for the metropolitan area and the goldfields, but it will leave the agricultural area as before. While I admit that the goldfields were the making of Western Australia, they have gradually declined. It is the agricultural area that is now providing the wealth on which a majority of the people live. Therefore, instead of seats taken from the goldfields area being given to the metropolitan area, they should have been given to the country. The Premier made a statement to the effect that the agricultural areas, in comparison with the central goldfields, were within easy distance of the city. I wish to show that that is not correct.

The Premier: Did I make that statement?

Mr. LINDSAY: I took it down at the time. The Premier said the agricultural areas, in comparison with the central goldfields, were within easy distance of the city.

The Premier: Yes, some of them.

Mr. LINDSAY: Let me take my own electorate that I know so well. Kalgoorlie is 375 miles by train from Perth and it takes 17 hours 27 minutes to do the trip.

The Minister for Mines: Provided the train is on time.

Mr. LINDSAY: If the Kalgoorlie express cannot run on time—

The Minister for Railways: I do not think we shall discuss that.

Mr. LINDSAY: When the express reaches Kalgoorlie, there is only a short distance to traverse to reach the centre of at least five goldfields electorates. My electorate starts just over the ranges, about 40 miles from Perth, and there are five distinct lines of railway through my electorate. To get to Lake Brown by train, a distance of 223 miles, while another 19 miles has been built on to the end of it, takes 19 hours as compared with 16 hours 27 minutes to travel to Kalgoorlie.

The Premier: But what about the motor car?

Mr. LINDSAY: We are dealing with the question of representation. It would be absolutely impossible for me to carry out my duty to my constituents if I had to traverse my electorate by train. On some lines there are only two or three trains a week, and I could not afford to wait two or three days in one centre.

The Minister for Railways: This Bill will prevent that, because there is no community of interest between Lake Brown and Toodyay.

Mr. LINDSAY: The point is I have to travel to Lake Brown. Leaving out Toodyay, I have still four other railways in my electorate and I shall tell the Minister all about them if he will only give me a chance.

The Premier: This Bill will give you a very safe seat.

Mr. LINDSAY: My seat may be safe with no Bill at all. The first of the other four lines is to Toodyay, 96 miles from Perth; the second to Nungarin 187 miles; the third to Lake Brown, or rather Campion now, 242 miles, and the fourth to Kulja, 187 miles. To the Kulja line has to be added another 72 miles, making the

total distance 259 miles, a journey that will take 21½ hours as compared with 17 hours 27 minutes to travel to Kalgoorlie. So I maintain that my electorate is much harder to represent than is any of the central goldfields districts.

Mr. Griffiths: Pingelly is a worse example because it takes 25 hours to get to Kondinin.

Mr. LINDSAY: Although it is 187 miles to Kulja, it is quite impossible to reach the far eastern portion of my electorate without making a journey of 400 miles by motor car. That is considerably farther distant than any one of the central goldfields electorates. It is my opinion that this Bill should have provided for the central goldfields electorates being placed on the same footing as the agricultural seats. Let us consider what counts for most in the country districts. The electorate of Subiaco has been mentioned. I have heard the member for West Perth say that he found nothing to talk about so far as his electorate was concerned, because the local governing body looked after the roads and the Education Department looked after the schools and practically nothing else remained.

Mr. Richardson: You have never heard me say that.

Mr. LINDSAY: How about the representative of an agricultural electorate? He is the only man known to the people in the back country. If a public meeting is called in the back country, it receives no publicity. The Perth newspapers do not report it and assist the people in their agitation. If anything happens in the metropolitan area, the Town Hall is engaged for a meeting and quite a big agitation is created, and columns of the newspapers are devoted to the subject, which is thus brought under the notice of every member of Parliament. But we never read anything about the needs of the people in the country districts. We are starting to build up a nation; our people have gone out into the virgin country where they want roads, schools, hospitals and halls, and they want the member for the district to assist them to get sport and everything else going. I help all I can.

The Premier: And give them contributions.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. At this moment I have in my pocket a letter asking for a guinea towards the erection of a school.

Hon. G. Taylor: You will send a couple of guineas, I suppose.

Mr. LINDSAY: Those people are endeavouring to raise money to build a school, as there are only nine children in the neighbourhood. They have asked for a donation and they will get it because they deserve it. City members have not the work to do that falls to the lot of agricultural representatives. If a function takes place at the week end 250 miles away, I have to get into my motor car and travel there. All the talking I do in this House will not get me too many votes; they are obtained by going amongst the people and saying "Good-day" to them. Speaking seriously, although I shall support the second reading of the Bill, I do not think it is just in its application to the agricultural districts. The quotient in the city should have been increased. In the Bill three should have been four, and the agricultural areas left as two. I suggest that the central goldfields should have the same quotient as the agricultural areas, and that the outer mining and pastoral areas should be on the 2,000 basis. Yilgarn and Kanowna are classed as mining and pastoral. From what I have been informed, it is doubtful if in the Kanowna electorate there are 50 persons now working in the mining industry.

The Premier: More than that.

Mr. Teesdale: Fifty-two.

Mr. Griffiths: Fifty-one.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am not far out. No doubt the member for Avon is quite correct.

The Minister for Railways: It would be for the first time.

Mr. LINDSAY: I do not say that Kanowna should be on the same basis as other agricultural areas. It contains immense tracts of country yet to be developed. There is not a large population there to-day, but it will be large in a few years' time. It would not be right to place it on the 4,100 figure, but it would be right to put it on the 2,000 figure. It is a misnomer to call it a mining and pastoral area. It should be placed in the category of an agricultural district. We represent the agriculturists, and it might give us a better chance of winning the seat if that were done.

Hon. G. Taylor: That will not help you.

Mr. LINDSAY: I support the second reading and hope the Bill will be carried. Although it is not as good as it might be,

it will provide something better than we now have.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [5.17]: I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the member for Toodyay. They appeal particularly to me.

The Premier: Do not repeat them.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I do not want any help from the Premier in making my speech. The hon. member referred to the central mining areas as being comparatively ungettable. He quoted Lake Brown and Kalkalling as presenting far greater difficulties in the way of access than a central mining constituency. I interjected that the member for Pingelly was worse off than the member for Toodyay. I find that the member for Pingelly must spend five minutes less than 25 hours to reach Kondinin from Perth, although that place is a long way inside it, whereas it takes only 15 hours 27 minutes to get to Kalgoorlie from Perth.

Mr. Marshall: It would take me the best part of six days to reach the nearest boundary of my electorate, and I am not growling.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The hon. member is not in the Central Goldfields area.

Mr. Wilson: I am worse off than you are.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The member who represents Pingelly or Beverley or York or Avon or Toodyay has not only a train journey to undertake, but he must visit the outlying centres. To do that would take him almost as long as will the train journey. The member for Toodyay pointed out that there should be some reduction in the numbers for the agricultural areas, certainly more so than in the case of the city. In the metropolitan area members have easy access to heads of departments and to Ministers. That is quite plain. On the occasion of the last elections, I went carefully through my rolls. I had no assistance from the Electoral Department, beyond the courtesy extended to me by Mr. Gregory, the head of the department in my electorate. By my own efforts I put on something like 1,500 names. I did this by asking people if they were on the roll, giving them cards, and inducing them to sign them. I really had to act as an electoral officer.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We ought to enforce the compulsory provisions of the Act.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: When the Bill, of which the Leader of the Opposition was the originator, was before the House, there was

a great outcry from various members as to the necessity for bringing the rolls up to date. Mr. Angwin, for instance, took the Premier severely to task because the rolls had not been brought up to date. He quoted the North-East Fremantle electorate, in connection with which he had himself put between 1,200 and 1,300 names on the roll. He said that the rolls had been to a certain extent purified, but no attempt had been made to put names on them. The figures given by the member for Toodyay are illuminating. They show that there are many people in the State who should be on the roll but whose names are not there. A comparison between the Commonwealth rolls and those for the Avon district show figures almost as disproportionate as they are in the case of the Toodyay electorate. Before this measure is handed over to the commission for the allocation of the boundaries, every possible effort should be made to put eligible electors on the roll.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The compulsory provisions of the Act should be enforced.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The rolls should be brought up to date before the elections.

The Minister for Railways: We will do that to-morrow.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We did not do it, and you have not done it.

The Premier: We will do it to-morrow.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: A good point has been made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister for Railways. There are hundreds of people eligible to go on the roll. In my electorate changes are constantly occurring and there are hundreds of people who are not enrolled. I have been recently in the Yorkrakine and Tammin districts and met quite a number of men who were not on the roll. I told them they were liable to be fined if they did not put their names on the roll, and I have sent cards to many of them. At the race meetings people have asked me about getting on the roll. Even at a gathering of that sort one meets numbers of such people. Many men I have known in Perth have gone into my electorate, but they are not on the roll. There are also numbers of new arrivals from the other States who are in the same position. I find the same kind of thing in existence all over my electorate. There is a big increase in the population of the Avon electorate, and many new areas are being opened up, such as North and South Bodallin, Noongar, and North-East

Westonia. Several new settlers have gone out there. No attempt has been made to get them enrolled, except what I myself have done, by warning them of the danger of being fined if they do not get on the roll. I know there are many discrepancies in the country districts. I hope, when the Bill is in Committee, something more in accordance with fair play will be done for the agricultural districts. I do not think anything like the correct number of people in those districts has been put on the roll. One of the first duties of the Government before instructing the members of the commission to carry out their task, is to bring the rolls up to date. The Bill is long overdue. It would be impossible to continue as we have been doing, when we find such disparities in the electorates as 270 electors, 416, 575, 848, and the big jump to 18,762. It is time something was done to adjust those anomalies. In the "Bulletin" it was pointed out recently that the position in Western Australia was very much the same as was the case in Old Sarum. It was pointed out that many of the constituencies in the State were on the same farcical footing as Old Sarum, which, without any voters, returned two members. The position has been plainly set forth by the member for Toodyay. His remarks apply with equal force to Avon. The rolls must be brought up to date so that there may be a proper allocation of the districts, otherwise in two or three years' time we shall be just as badly off as we are to-day. I support the second reading.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [5.27]: I do not know that the Bill calls for a lengthy speech. Although it may not be all that we desire, I intend to support it. I would not have spoken had it not been that I feel metropolitan members must express their views towards a redistribution of seats. Naturally those who represent agricultural areas desire greater representation than they have to-day. It may be some palliation for their feelings when I say that the agricultural districts represent more than one-third of the total number of members in the House. Whilst I could have hoped that the metropolitan area would be divided into smaller districts, because it is rather a tragedy that there are so many people in the metropolitan area, the great disparity in numbers lends itself to a division such as the Bill is calculated to give.

The Premier: The agricultural districts represent two-fifths. You said the representation was over one-third.

MR. RICHARDSON: That is so. It would really be better for this State if in the metropolitan area there were not more than 70,000 or 80,000 electors, the remainder of the people being out in the country producing wealth.

Hon. G. Taylor: All the Australian capitals are in the same position.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Whilst that is so we must bring down a measure that is calculated to provide a representation as nearly as possible equal in the matter of area and population. While there is a good deal to be said in connection with the inner goldfields constituencies and their representation as provided for in the Bill, still, as the Premier suggested, in all probability it will be the desire of the Electoral Commissioners to extend the boundaries of those electorates and make them rather larger in area than they are to-day. If that is so, we must again look to the future and see that those parts of the State are properly provided for. As the Government are dealing with electoral matters, I would like to see them go further and, in addition to having compulsory enrolment, to legislate for compulsory voting as well.

Hon. G. Taylor: We have compulsory enrolment now.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, but I want the principle of compulsory voting to be introduced as well. To-day we can see the difference between the conduct of Federal elections and those conducted by the State. If we had compulsory voting as well, it would save a good deal of trouble. It would ensure the people exercising the franchise in greater numbers than they do to-day. I hope the Government will deal with that matter at an early stage. I have nothing more to add beyond saying that I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [5.32]: I agree in common with other hon. members, that the Bill is long overdue. Ever since I have been a member of Parliament it has been the aim of the Country Party to secure a redistribution of seats. I do not know that I am particularly keen on the Bill, because it is not altogether to my liking.

Mr. Sleeman: What is wrong with it?

MR. BROWN: I shall tell the hon. member in due course. In the measure introduced

by the Leader of the Opposition, the agricultural districts would have had 24 seats, whereas in the Bill before us the country electorates will remain at 21, as at present. It is a matter of common knowledge that throughout the country districts there is much virgin country similar to that which, four or five years ago, we did not consider would be settled. Those areas are being settled rapidly now. I regret that the Yilgarn electorate has been placed in the mining and pastoral group. How much mining is being done in the Yilgarn electorate now, and how many men are being employed in connection with those operations? I have no hesitation in saying that there are very few indeed, and there are not likely to be any more, because mining is exhausted in that area.

Mr. Sleeman: That applies to other areas as well.

Mr. BROWN: Then there is the Kanowna electorate. There is not much mining carried on south of Kalgoorlie, and the Kanowna electorate runs along the Esperance line. There are extensive agricultural operations being carried out in that area. The electorates I have referred to will carry many more than 2,000 electors. In Yilgarn there will be between 5,000 and 6,000 people in the near future. The area covered by the 3,000 farms scheme is situated in that particular locality. At present the Yilgarn electorate extends from Bullfinch to Ravensthorpe. That is a very considerable area, and it is one that it is impossible for a single member to work. I would like to see a new electorate created in that part of the State. If that were done, community of interest could be taken into account. In my opinion the Pingelly electorate is badly formed. It is about 27 miles wide and 140 miles long. Some people might regard that as an easy electorate to work, but I can assure hon. members it is not. If I were to go to Kondinin by rail, it would take me three days to get back again. It is a small electorate with just over 3,000 names on the roll. Compare the Pingelly electorate with the Canning electorate in the metropolitan area. Canning has 18,762 electors on the roll. I know which electorate I would prefer to work. I would choose Canning without hesitation. There are tramway facilities, telephones, and so on, and one can traverse the whole of the electorate in half a day. According to the provisions of the Bill, the

Canning electorate will be entitled to three members. In my opinion two members could easily cope with the work required in such an area, yet, with a quota of 6,400, the Canning electorate will be entitled to three members.

Mr. Sleeman: But those members will represent electors, not sheep!

Mr. BROWN: Some people believe in the principle of one-man one-vote. If a Bill were introduced and its provisions were on a population basis, it would be unfair to the country districts. In my opinion the Government are not sincere, and do not practise what they preach. The Premier said that the four northern electorates should be left as they are at present, because of the enormous territory they cover. If the Government believe in that principle, then the agricultural districts should receive greater representation than is provided for in the Bill. Should the Bill become law, there is not the slightest doubt that if there is a change of Government, a further redistribution of seats will be made, and it will be carried out on a more equitable basis than that proposed by the Government. The pocket boroughs that have been allowed to exist on the goldfields are a disgrace to the State. When we consider the difference between a seat containing 270 electors and a seat with 18,762 electors, members must appreciate the disgraceful state of affairs.

Mr. Sleeman: A little while ago you were talking about miles, not people.

Mr. BROWN: Does the hon member consider an electorate with 270 votes, is a fair thing?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, he does!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Pingelly must address the Chair.

Mr. BROWN: In common with other hon. members, I consider the Bill represents an improvement on the present conditions, but when we consider that provision is made for 17 metropolitan members and still only 21 members for the agricultural areas, I can hardly accept any such suggestion as representing a fair or equitable electoral allocation. At present the electorate of Moore has 3,901 voters on the roll. There is not the slightest doubt that there are many more people in that electorate who should be on the roll. Then again there is Toodyay with 5,332 on the roll, which is 1,332 over its quota. Northam has 3,392

electors, which is 608 under its quota. If a portion of Toodyay were added to the Northam electorate, it would improve that position. Then York has 4,703 electors, which is 703 over the quota. Beverley has 2,461 electors, which is considerably under the quota. I am satisfied that there are more people in the Beverley electorate than there are on the roll at present.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: While there are always some going on, there are always some to go off.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, but with the young people coming of age, there should be many additional names placed on that roll. If the Beverley electorate were to include portion of the York constituency, together with portions of the Pingelly and Narrogin electorates, an adjustment could easily be made. That, however, is not my argument. I contend that the agricultural districts will not secure fair representation under the provisions of the Bill, and particularly does that apply to the newer agricultural districts, such as Yilgarn. I would like to see community of interest taken more into account, and there is none in the Beverley, Pingelly and Narrogin electorates. The principal towns in those electorates are along the Great Southern railway, and naturally the greater proportion of the electors are in those towns. The Williams-Narrogin electorate has 4,706 electors. I have not the exact figures at my disposal, but I am sure that the greater proportion of those people are resident in the town of Narrogin itself. That is hardly fair. If we could have a new electorate that would comprise portions of the Pingelly, Beverley and Narrogin electorates, it would be in the interests of the country. We are looking forward to a great influx of farmers who will take up holdings in this State. The only land we have available is virgin country, particularly where the 3,000 farms are to be located. Hon. members know exactly where that area is.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There are 3,000 people wanting those farms and cannot get them.

Mr. BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition knows we have the country for those people.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But 3,000 cannot get blocks.

Mr. BROWN: The Government cannot survey all that land at once. It will take

some time before the people can be settled. If those 3,000 farms are available for settlers, what will be the result? On an average farm of from 1,000 to 1,500 acres, how many people are employed? I take it that the average will be nothing less than two. If the farmer is a bachelor, he will have at least one other man to help him; if he is a married man there may be three or four votes on the farm. Calculated on that basis, it is quite possible that we shall have between 6,000 and 7,000 additional voters when that scheme is in operation. The greater proportion of the farms affected will be in the Yilgarn electorate, yet, according to the electoral figures, Yilgarn to-day has only 1,346 names on the roll. The electorates of Yilgarn and Kanowna will in the future contain many more electors than their quotas. In that event, the work that will be entailed in those two electorates will be too much for a single member. It would be much better if we could have another electorate in that area. What do the Government intend to do?

The Minister for Mines: The commissioners will decide that, not the Government.

Mr. BROWN: Is the matter to be left entirely in the hands of the commissioners?

The Minister for Mines: Yes.

Mr. BROWN: If that is so, I do not know that I have much objection to offer to the Bill.

Mr. Lambert: A lot of the farms you refer to will be in the southern end of the Coolgardie electorate.

Mr. BROWN: But the Coolgardie electorate will be wiped out.

Mr. Lambert: You will be wiped out before the Coolgardie electorate is done away with. At any rate, what you suggest does not necessarily follow. In fact, you are barking up the wrong tree.

Mr. BROWN: A great deal will depend upon the powers delegated to the commissioners. If unconditional powers are given to the commissioners I will not have any objection, because they will decide these matters for themselves. In the Bill, however, there is provision for additional seats in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Sleeman: But who will fix the boundaries?

Mr. BROWN: I do not know how they will be fixed in the metropolitan area. Take the Leederville electorate, for instance. It would be easy to divide it into two.

But when we come to the Canning electorate, with its 18,000 voters, if we carry out the provisions of the Bill we shall have to cut that electorate into three. It is not in the best interests of the State that that should be done. Surely the Government know where these divided electorates will be.

The Minister for Railways: The Commission will do that.

The Premier: A lot of people would like to know.

Mr. BROWN: I have no doubt in my mind that the Government know pretty well where they are going to be. They are not going to be in the country, that's certain. They will be where the Government will be sure of having supporters.

Mr. Pantou: I will tell you after dinner where they are.

Mr. BROWN: Menzies will have a pretty good go with 260 electors, and I must say, while referring to Menzies, that I admire their member.

The Premier: Wise people, those 260.

Mr. BROWN: There must be very little to do in an electorate like that.

Mr. Pantou: Don't be hard!

Mr. BROWN: In the older established agricultural districts the population is not likely to increase. York has more than its quota because it has two large towns in its electorate. In Pingelly and Beverley the population will not increase. Around Pingelly every acre has been taken up and if that be the case, there is no possibility of an increase in population.

Mr. Lambert: What is preventing York from increasing?

Mr. BROWN: It is a very old district.

Mr. Lambert: And the people are very old.

Mr. BROWN: In these older districts the tendency is for one man who is pretty well-to-do to buy out another. Instead of holding farms of 1,000 acres, there are many who have properties of 3,000 and 4,000 acres.

Mr. Lambert: Is there no natural increase in those places?

Mr. BROWN: The natural increase is not very big. A number of the children who leave school every year do not remain in the country: they go to Perth and other cities. That accounts to some extent for the population figures remaining fairly stationary.

The Premier: Have you left the Pingelly district?

Mr. BROWN: No, certainly not. I do not know whether the Government regard this as a joke. It is possible that they will get a big surprise when the numbers go up.

The Minister for Railways: There is no opposition so far.

Mr. Teesdale: The member for Pingelly is referring to the elections.

Mr. BROWN: The Bill is not to my liking. If I had the framing of it I think I could make a better job of it. It would certainly be a more equitable Bill. The commission will take notice of the way in which the measure is dealt with. I am not satisfied with the Bill, but it is an improvement on what we have at the present time. The country is crying out for a redistribution, but at the same time I know there will be keen disappointment in some electorates, and especially will that be so in the eastern part of my electorate. There is not that community of interest in the eastern districts that there is in the western part. It is absurd for the Government to think that Yilgarn will be left as it is at the present time. It is also absurd that it should be called a mining area. It is absurd to call Yilgarn and Kanowna mining areas or pastoral areas; they are not going to be either. They are going to be agricultural. I cannot make anything else of them. They are to be given a quota of 2,000. Nobody will tell me that that is equitable. That is one of the objections I have to the Bill and it is one of my disappointments. At the same time half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, and perhaps it is just as well for us to accept the Bill as it is.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [5.52]: In 1911 the Government of the day brought in a Bill to adjust the boundaries. I have a lively recollection of the occasion; it caused a great deal of trouble at the time. The Bill was forced through the Lower Chamber in the small hours of the morning and it was eventually passed by another place. That was 17 years ago. I have a recollection, too, that last session the Premier definitely said on the floor of the House that before the end of the present Parliament he would introduce a measure that would be a greater advantage to the State so far as the electoral boundaries were concerned. Conse-

quently it was with great interest that I listened to the Premier when he introduced the Bill.

The Premier: Did you ever hear a man talking of suicide as I did then?

Mr. STUBBS: I am coming to that. When introducing the Bill the Premier said it should have been introduced long ago, or words to that effect. It is proposed that the representation of the metropolitan area should be increased by five seats. I am satisfied that that number of new constituencies will be created under the Bill. But for this, the Premier would undoubtedly be committing hara kiri. If I understand the Bill correctly, the Government will lose a few goldfields seats and unless they win a certain number to counteract that loss, they will undoubtedly be committing political suicide.

The Premier: Cannot the hon. member understand that the Government are really doing something they believe to be fair?

Mr. STUBBS: I give credit where credit is due. The Bill is long overdue and should have been introduced by the previous Government.

Mr. Latham: Should have been passed.

Mr. STUBBS: Yes. As a unit of this Chamber, I give the Premier and his Government every credit for their honesty of purpose in introducing the Bill. I believe it is a sincere attempt to create boundaries different from those that have been in existence for the last 17 years. All the speakers on this side of the House have concluded their remarks by declaring their intention to support the Bill. I, too, desire to say that I shall support the Bill, although it does seem extraordinary to hear it said that the brains of one man in a mining district are equal to the brains of two men in the metropolitan area.

The Premier: Pardon me, two in the agricultural and three in the metropolitan.

Mr. STUBBS: Anyone who has studied the map of Western Australia will agree that it is extremely difficult for one man to adjust boundaries without creating anomalies. I believe that the Government are honestly attempting to adjust the boundaries, and therefore I intend to support the Bill.

MR. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [5.56]: Everyone admits that a rearrangement of the boundaries in this State is necessary,

so as to give better representation to the citizens of the State. All the same, I am not too enthusiastic about the Bill.

Mr. Stubbs: Hara kiri.

Mr. Davy: It is murder so far as you are concerned.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is far from murder. I have in view the rearrangement as it was arrived at by the previous Commissioners. But it has always appeared to me that the cities throughout Australia are over-represented.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. LAMBERT: The people who should be represented at the seat of government and from every possible aspect, whether it be domestic, parochial or national, are those who go to the outlying parts of the State to help develop it, not the city dweller. I believe the Government will be justified in bringing in a Bill to provide for one member, say, within a radius of five miles of a seat of government. I say that because every member in the House represents the State. We, as country members, are called upon to deal with almost every question which is incidental to and of importance also to the capital city. We deal with railways, tramways, metropolitan water supply, and almost every activity associated with the economic and industrial life of the country. For that reason, I consider the capital city would be well represented if it had one member to represent a radius of five miles from the centre of the seat of government.

The Minister for Works: What nonsense!

Mr. LAMBERT: The member for South Fremantle says, "What nonsense." Of course he says that. I have not the slightest doubt that he and many other city members believe they should have a quota—

The Minister for Works: I am not a city member.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Minister is a semi-city member.

The Minister for Works: I represent a district further from the city than are the districts of some country members.

Mr. LAMBERT: Possibly the hon. gentleman is imbued—

The Minister for Works: With a little fair play.

Mr. LAMBERT: No; with the city aspect. It is comparatively easy for a city

member to represent 5,000 or 10,000 or 20,000 people. Take the case of the member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale). I would much rather represent the 18,000 electors within the boundaries of Canning than represent one of the North-West seats, for instance, or one of the outer goldfields seats with a few hundred electors. The representation of such a seat as Canning is infinitely easier. People speak of the amount of correspondence and work involved, but the whole of the work that is done by a city member is by way of personal interviews at Parliament House. In fact, city constituents interview me every day of every week, and every week in every year, either in connection with work or some other matter that concerns them. I do not know that any city member is called upon to deal with matters affecting Gaseoyne, or Kimberley, or Coolgardie, or Roebourne, or the Murchison. Not one city member wastes a moment's time either on questions affecting those electorates or on matters of a personal or parochial nature arising out of them. But we are called upon every day of the week to deal with questions affecting them either one way or the other. For that reason I contend that if Parliament wishes to arrive at a reasonable basis of representation, a basis on something like scientific lines, a basis that would commend itself to people possessing common sense, Parliament would say that every member of this Chamber in the first instance represents the capital city. Because of the tendency of people to rush into the city, as instanced by the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown), one representative would be quite sufficient for the electors within a five-mile radius of the seat of Government.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is right; that is the stuff to give them.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is my belief. While I commend the Government for their sincere desire to readjust boundaries on equitable lines, I still stoutly and strongly disagree with the manner in which they are attempting that task. While I shall formally vote for the second reading of the Bill, in the hope that when the boundaries have been readjusted the report of the commissioners may be such as will commend itself to me, I consider that we should have some attempt made to solve the bigger and broader problems of representation, and to resist the incessant demand of the capital

cities of Australia to dominate the Parliaments of Australia. In every Australian capital the influence of the city members dominates the Parliament.

The Premier: It is not so much the city members. It is the fact that all members reside in the city and are influenced by the city environment.

Mr. LAMBERT: And by the Press of the city.

The Premier: I would not say that.

Mr. LAMBERT: Undoubtedly it is a big reason. The people who to-day are helping to fashion the future of Australia as a nation saw fit to spend numerous millions upon a capital city away from the influences of the old capitals.

The Premier: That was against the influence of the Press, you know.

Mr. LAMBERT: The influence of the Melbourne Press.

Member: Also that of the Press of Western Australia.

Mr. LAMBERT: Let us admit that for a moment. I do not know that we have any great fault to find with the influence of the metropolitan Press. But every requirement is paraded for public view through the Press every morning of the week.

The Premier: Is not that a requirement for the whole State?

Mr. LAMBERT: True, but every day there are proceeding active governmental functions with which we, if we take a parochial standpoint, have no concern whatever.

The Minister for Works: We take a bigger outlook, perhaps.

Mr. LAMBERT: No. Upon Parliament as constituted to-day, there is imposed the necessity of assisting to control such things as the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies has under his care.

The Minister for Works: We control water supplies all over the State, and even at Coolgardie.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is true in a much less degree.

Mr. Stubbs: The Eastern States control such things by means of boards.

The Premier: Governmental activities are more manifest in the country than in the city.

Mr. LAMBERT: I strongly disagree with the Premier. In the city there are tramways, water supplies, and electric light and power—things with which, from a parochial

point of view, the outlying electorates of the State are not concerned at all. However, if I may be permitted to make my speech the Minister for Works can remain the possessor of his own high-flown ideas upon subjects of this description. The Bill is a passable and reasonably decent attempt to give better representation to the people of the State. I am prepared to fight both inside and outside this Chamber to see that the outlying districts, and particularly the district I represent, are not overburdened with territory. With the development that is going on, I have quite enough acreage to travel over and look after. Drawing the fairest comparison possible, I say that I carry out just as many duties and do just as much work as many members representing electorates with five or six times the population of mine. Certainly I would gladly exchange my electorate for some electorate nearer the seat of government.

Mr. Lindsay: Even Canning.

Mr. LAMBERT: No, not Katanning.

Mr. Lindsay: I said Canning.

Mr. LAMBERT: I thought the hon. member said Katanning, and I am about as popular in Katanning as the Premier is popular with the member for Katanning. From that may be gauged my popularity in the electorate in question. I do not know that at this stage I need say anything more. My great hope is that if the Bill becomes law and the function of re-arranging boundaries is remitted to a commission, the redistribution will be on such lines as will commend themselves to members generally and will be equitable to every portion of the State, and particularly to that portion which is now the most important—I refer to the outlying portion.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [6.13]: I view this measure in quite a different light from that in which it appears to the previous speaker. My idea of Parliament is not industries, or cities, or strips of land to be represented, but the people to be represented. The whole scheme of Parliamentary government is designed to give expression in Parliament to the views of the majority of the people.

The Premier: That is the only thing.

Mr. DAVY: That being so, I cannot for the life of me see how it is possible to obtain any logical or equitable system of electoral districts that is not based on the scheme

of one vote one value and adult suffrage. Insofar as the Bill cannot by some logical process be brought into line with that principle, it is a bad Bill. However, I think it can be brought into line. After all, when we talk of one vote one value, the idea is that everybody shall get equal representation in Parliament. That is the broad principle. One vote one value is merely a piece of machinery for achieving that principle. One vote one value would not, in fact, get equal representation of everybody, because other factors would prevent some persons' one vote giving them the same representation as the one vote of other persons. The one vote of a man living in Kimberley certainly could not achieve for him the same representation as the one vote of a man living in West Perth.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. DAVY: The member for Coolgardie, to my mind, in arriving at the views he expressed concentrated his attention on the interests of members of Parliament, not on the interests of the constituents whom they represent. He laid stress on the great amount of work entailed by the representation of those in outback constituencies, and he claimed that a great deal of running about had to be done by a member of Parliament such as himself. He certainly gave me the impression that he would appear to be poaching on the preserves of other members, which does not seem to me to be quite in order.

Mr. Wilson: In what direction?

Mr. DAVY: In the direction that he appears to be ready to try to forward the interests—

The Premier: The interests of members.

Mr. DAVY: No, of constituents whose interests ought to be forwarded by other members.

The Minister for Justice: He should know the gentle art of pushing people back.

Mr. DAVY: I think he does. But he leads us to believe that he finds jobs and acquires information on behalf of constituents of most of the metropolitan members. It is very nice of him. But personally I would prefer that when one of my constituents goes to him with a legitimate request he would refer that constituent to me.

Mr. Panton: But none of your constituents is ever looking for a job.

Mr. DAVY: Don't worry. The hon. member is quite wrong. I am very sorry to say that quite a number of my constituents are looking for jobs; in fact I do not know of any member who has not at the present time some of his constituents looking for jobs. It is one of the saddest things we have to face.

Mr. Lindsay: But surely it is not the job of a member of Parliament to find work for his constituents.

Mr. DAVY: I do not think it is. The real job of a member of Parliament is here, in Parliament, representing the views he has been elected to express. There is a subsidiary job that has grown up, and some members, I think, have encouraged its development. I have heard that there have been members of the House who would act as a sort of purchasers for all their constituents, who would even be prepared to buy a pair of boots, or some intimate article of wear for their lady constituents. In fact there is nothing they would not do. That is not our job. If an hon. member chooses to do it, of course it is quite all right. Each member must be the judge of just how far his job extends. But we can draw definite lines between the two jobs, namely, Parliamentary representation, and that other legitimate job of making representations to departments and that type of work that we are called upon to do. But, after all, that is a subsidiary matter, and to make a difference between the voting capacity of citizens in various parts of the State from the point of view of the convenience of the man who represents them, seems to me to be quite wrong. Therefore we come back to the position that, as we want every citizen to have equal representation, it is necessary to justify an apparent departure from that by saying that owing to extra distance from the capital, or something of the sort, we must have fewer people represented by one member in some parts of the State than in others. I think a fair case can be made out for having a very much fewer number of constituents in a place like Kimberley than in, say, Perth, but by what logical process the proportion can be decided I do not know. Nor do I think the Premier himself is prepared to defend this Bill on a process of logical reasoning. It cannot be done. Clearly it is a matter of opinion. But I do say that the arguments advanced in this House in favour of a greater representation for, let us say, primary producing constitu-

encies than for metropolitan constituencies, do not convince me at all. It is of no use a man hoping to convince me when he says the primary producer, the farmer, has twice the capacity for using his brains that the man in the city has.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He has; it can be proved.

Mr. DAVY: I do not think there is any such proof. With the greatest possible respect for those members who sit on the cross benches, and who all represent farming constituencies, I do not think they themselves would claim that they are twice as able—

Mr. Latham: We have never suggested it.

Mr. DAVY: No, and I wish to say I do not think they would suggest such a thing. It is admitted, of course everybody admits, that in Western Australia the source of all our wealth and happiness is the primary producer. That is true. But the rest of the community has a considerable importance. I would ask those members who do represent primary producing constituencies not to lose sight of that. If I may be permitted I should like to draw an analogy—not a very accurate one, but one which appears to cover the position well enough for an illustration in an argument of this kind. Let us say the primary producer is the reservoir, the dam, and that the rest of us are the pipes that lead the precious fluid in the dam to the people who want it. We may get rust in the pipes. Undoubtedly we have a certain amount of rust. Or we may get too many pipes leading from the source of supply. But the pipes are just as important to the people to be supplied as is the dam with the water in it.

Mr. Latham: Very often there is a lot of friction when water passes through a pipe.

The Premier: Yes. And also the dam may leak.

Mr. DAVY: If for "friction" we substitute the word "waste," it may be said that we get waste in the process of helping the farmers to put their products on the market. But nevertheless the city man is necessary. We must have even lawyers in a community.

Mr. Latham: Oh, we can do without them.

Mr. DAVY: No, you cannot. You must have even lawyers. You might wipe out

racecourses and picture palaces, but even those, I think, are necessary. It is difficult to point to any person definitely engaged in a legitimate activity in Western Australia who is not playing his part in the whole, and who is not in essence just as important as the farmer.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVY: Cut out the rest of us, and what does the farmer do in most cases? In Western Australia the farmer would immediately starve, because he cannot live on his land.

Mr. Latham: He would live longer than would the man in the city without him.

Mr. DAVY: That is so. I do not want the hon. member to think I am putting forward an argument of hostility towards the farmer.

Mr. Lindsay: It is just as well you explained that.

The Premier: Other people are necessary, as well as the farmer.

Mr. DAVY: Of course so, particularly in Western Australia. In many cases unfortunately the farmer is the one live man. He cultivates his land, lives on tinned meat and grows wheat. If you cut away the rest of the community, he has nothing to eat but wheat. The member for Claremont (Mr. North) will tell us that wheat alone is sufficient. But personally I do not agree with that.

Mr. Lindsay: The farmers do not come to Perth to get their meat.

Mr. DAVY: There are many farmers in Western Australia, I believe, who fetch their meat from Perth in tins.

Mr. Latham: Not many.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, many. Of course a farmer who is self-contained on his property could snap his fingers at the rest of the community.

Mr. Lambert: But the farmer is showing every day that he can cut out the middle man in the city who is living on him.

Mr. DAVY: He ought to be encouraged to do so. But he does not cut out the middle man. He merely substitutes his own organisation for the middle man.

Mr. Lambert: That is not a middle man.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, it is, and the farmer has to pay for the service rendered. The Western Farmers Ltd. is merely a big organisation with a big staff and large activities.

Mr. Withers: The farmer has to pay commission to the firm.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, it amounts very much to the same thing. It may be a more economical system than dealing through the customary middle man, but there it is. It is of no use people coming to us and telling us the farmer should have more votes than the city man. He ought not to have anything of the sort. We ought all to have the same representation in Parliament.

Mr. Lambert: The same value of representation.

Mr. DAVY: The representation of each of us ought to be equally effective. I admit that in a State like Western Australia we cannot get that representation equally effective without making provision for fewer people being represented by one man in some parts of the State than in others.

Mr. Lindsay: Your argument is that there should be more members representing the metropolitan area than all the rest of the State?

The Premier: The hon. member did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. DAVY: No, I certainly did not.

The Premier: The member for Toodyay is anticipating. The member for West Perth did not say that at all.

Mr. DAVY: No, and I do not propose to say it. If the member for Toodyay has misunderstood me, it must be that I have not expressed my self properly.

Mr. Kennelly: Not necessarily.

Mr. DAVY: I suggest that that is the explanation. I did not say what the member for Toodyay credited me with saying. But I do say that the basis of any distribution of seats must be equal representation for each person.

The Premier: That is the basis.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, and I say that in order to achieve that equal representation for everybody in a State like Western Australia, we must diverge from the one vote one value principle.

The Premier: That is the point.

Mr. DAVY: I agree; but how we are to arrive at what the proportion should be, I do not know.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is entirely a matter of opinion.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. The Bill appears to represent a sincere attempt to get over that difficulty, and although I have no doubt my friends representing primary producing constituencies would like to have their task made easier, nevertheless they have ex-

pressed a willingness to accept the situation. I think we can get a better Parliament through this Bill, more Parliamentary representation of the opinions of the people, and so I will support the measure. But there is one point to which I object in the piece of legislation that will exist when this Bill becomes an Act, and so amends the original Act. I do not think it is a sound principle to leave it still in the power of Parliament to alter the findings of the Commission. I remember two or three years ago when we were dealing with the Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, another place proposed that the findings of the Arbitration Court on the basic wage should be subject to the approval of Parliament. There was a scream of rage from members sitting on the Government side of the House. They said, "It is a monstrous proposition. We having decided that this was a matter to be entirely divorced from politics, in those circumstances should Parliament be permitted to criticise the act of that independent body?" I agreed with them, and for exactly the same reason I say this matter, because of its difficulty from the point of view of members to exercise an impartial judgment, having been handed over to an independent tribunal to decide, its decision should be final.

Mr. Lambert: Not to decide, but to suggest to Parliament.

The Premier: That is the difference.

Mr. DAVY: I do not agree with that. If all we are doing is to ask the independent tribunal to make suggestions to us, why bother with it at all?

Mr. Lambert: That is the provision made by the party you sit with.

Mr. DAVY: What does it matter who put the original Act on the statute-book? What is the good of talking like that? Anyhow, I was not then a member of Parliament. If I had been, I certainly would have tried in the best way I could to have the defect remedied at the time. But there it is. The reason we have decided this matter should be dealt with by an independent tribunal is that we recognise men should not be judges of their own cause. We have decided that this matter shall be worked out by an independent tribunal. Yet, when the decision reaches us, we are going to have happen what occurred five or six years ago. We shall have certain members who are not suited by the findings of the Commission

making strenuous endeavours to amend the Bill embodying the findings of the Commission. I say that is wrong. The Commission's findings should be absolutely final and should have the force of law. In Committee I propose to move an amendment to that effect. I do not expect to receive a great deal of support—

Mr. Pantou: You never know.

Mr. DAVY: But I hope I shall get some support. I propose to endeavour to remove from the Act that defect which appears to me to be a serious one. Otherwise I shall support the Bill.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [7.48]: I propose to support the second reading of the Bill, although I agree with many members that it is not as good as it might be. The Premier, in introducing the subject, said he saw no reason why there should not be one vote, one value.

The Premier: I did not say that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: If we had one vote, one value, the agricultural districts would be better off than they will be under this Bill.

The Premier: But I did not say that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Despite the contention of the member for West Perth, I see no reason why five additional seats should be given to the metropolitan area. He seems to think that this country exists on wheat alone. He asked, "What would the farmers do if it were not for the tinned meat sent up to them?"

Mr. Lindsay: They have rabbits in the wheat belt.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: What would happen is that the farmers would go to the South-West portion of the State—

Mr. Teesdale: And eat barley.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: —which part of the State would rear better and stouter men than the member for Roebourne.

Mr. Teesdale: I surrender.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Eighty per cent. of our foodstuffs are provided by our own efforts. The Premier has set the Commission an enormous task. On the figures he has given us, I do not know what is going to happen in the South-West part of the State. Are we going to bring an electorate from Geraldton or Greenough right down in numbers to reach the quota until we get to the South-West, and there create an additional seat?

The Premier: You will have plenty of time to discuss that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It will be unworkable. With 5,522 electors on the roll in Albany, 5,730 in Nelson, 4,585 in Collie, and 4,004 in Sussex, how can the Premier work out the figures?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Leave it to the Commission.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: How can the Premier expect the Commission to work it out? It is an absolute impossibility. Why should the vast North-West—that wonderful country of which we have heard so much—claim four members when its population is decreasing year by year? Why should it be specially entitled to four members?

Mr. Latham: On account of its geographical position.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: That does not matter one iota. In the North are miles—almost thousands of miles—of country unpopulated save by a few cattle, sheep, and a few of the friends of the member for Roebourne—aborigines.

Mr. Teesdale: And more's the shame. You have had all the money or we would have got some.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The North-West consists principally of the towns on the coast-line. Why should the central goldfields be so wonderfully favoured under the Bill? Is it because the Premier is responsible for its introduction and has made provision for his three Ministers and the Chairman of Committees? It seems to me very much like it. On the central goldfields there is every facility and every comfort. A water supply has been provided, the like of which the country districts do not possess. Millions of money have been spent there, and yet the Premier tells us it is a fair measure to give them safe pocket boroughs and make their mean quota 2,375 as against the agricultural quota of 4,000 odd.

Mr. Panton: There has been a lot of money produced on the goldfields, anyhow.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Not too much money is being produced there now.

Mr. Panton: And the sinking fund paid for the water scheme.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: But the taxpayers generally, and not the goldfields community, provided the sinking fund. Why should the Premier treat us in this scant manner? Is it not the South-West portion of the State to which we look to produce the foodstuffs

and save the heavy drain of money that is passing to the Eastern States every year? Is it not the wheat-growing country that is making our railways pay? Are not our railways providing employment for thousands of people? On whom is the metropolitan area dependent? Is it not the timber industry that has made the one-time little port of Bunbury the fourth largest export port in Australia?

Mr. Brown: Oh!

Mr. J. H. SMITH: "Oh!" says the member for Pingelly. He does not realise the wonderful opportunities and the great potentialities of this country. I can see Pingelly being wiped off the map as a result of this measure, and then my friend will have to come down to the South-West, and we shall show him some decent country. I do not intend to oppose the second reading. The measure will represent something better than we have had since 1911. That Act has been a blot on the fair name and history of the State.

The Premier: Let the dead past bury its dead.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Years ago I remember a worthy member going around the country with a map almost as large as a wall of this Chamber—anyhow, it took a buggy and three horses to carry it—and his Government that put the Bill through was defeated. This measure is perhaps an improvement on it, but I claim that it is "good-bye, good-bye!"

Mr. Maley: To the South-West?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Not to the South-West, but to the administration under which we have suffered for six years.

The Minister for Railways: Suffered?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. Teesdale: Well, do not tell them so.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: May I repeat that I hope the Premier at the last moment will see his way clear to amend the Bill and be reasonably fair. We are not jealous of the metropolitan area but let him give it three additional seats, and make the other two seats available for the agricultural area.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [7.56]: I have very few words to say on the second reading of the Bill. Still, as the member for Menzies, the member for Murchison and I will probably be among the

slaughtered innocents, we should be allowed to devote some time to the measure. It will be within your memory, Mr. Speaker that this is the fourth Redistribution of Seats Bill that has been brought down since you have been a member of this House. Every one of those measures, from its very inception, was of a nature that startled members to a considerable degree. This Bill, however, seems to have been received with unusual calmness, and there has been no protest to speak of and certainly no acrimonious discussion.

Mr. Panton: Let us start it now.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No. I wish to direct attention to the attitude of the present Premier—

The Premier: Oh, don't!

Hon. G. TAYLOR:—when he was Leader of the Opposition and the measure of 1922 was before the House.

The Premier: Of course, that was a different Bill.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, but the principle of this Bill is exactly the same as the principle of the parent measure. It was upon that principle that the present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, was so offensive, if I may say so.

Mr. Lambert: So aggressive.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: He was more than aggressive; he accused the then Leader of the House of bringing in a Bill for no less a purpose than gerrymandering.

The Premier: Why resurrect the past?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Merely to show the generosity of the present Opposition as compared with the attitude of the Opposition at that time. When the present Opposition see something beneficial for the State, or at any rate an improvement on what we have at present, they are prepared to meet it in a spirit helpful to the Government in order to make for the better government of the country. I do not wish it to be thought that I have made a statement that cannot be substantiated. The whole speech of the Premier on the second reading of the 1922 measure reeks with vituperation.

The Premier: I was a young man then.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Here is one small paragraph.

The idea of dividing the State into five areas in the Bill can only have been adopted with the object of more effectively manipulating the electorates. What need is there to

divide up the State into little groups called areas, except it be with the idea of more effectively gerrymandering the electorates?

The Premier: Well, I have complied with that and cut it down.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We have not divided the State into four; the Premier's Bill contains one group less than my chief's Bill. My chief's Bill was said to be a gerrymandering Bill. If we argue logically we must say that the present Bill is one degree less gerrymandering on the Premier's own argument.

The Premier: Three degrees.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We have three groups now, and we had four then. Another passage by the Premier that appears in "Hansard" of December, 1922, is—

Is any member prepared to contend that 2,800 electors for Northam is the equivalent of 3,400 electors for my district?

Mr. Davies: What influence has caused the mining areas to be divided into two?

Hon. P. Collier: In order that it may be possible to manipulate the boundaries, a higher quota is asked for in the case of the central mining area than in the case of the outlying districts.

The Premier: A very sound reply.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There are dozens of such instances. The Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, was accusing the Government of manipulating and gerrymandering.

The Premier: Not accusing anyone.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Let us go back to the year 1911. The Bill then was fought as no Bill has ever been fought in the history of my parliamentary life.

The Premier: I remember that you took possession of the Chamber.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We were so satisfied that it was an iniquitous Bill that we fought it for days and nights until members were exhausted. Some went to sleep while we held the fort. The remarkable thing was that the Government which brought down that Bill met their fate at the following election.

Mr. Panton: I am afraid the Government will meet their fate with this one.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The electorate of the member for Collie stood in the way of the defeat of the Government. They were defeated by the awful range of boundaries between Collie and Sussex. A Labour Government followed. They made some attempt to alter the boundaries, but it was futile

The boundaries remained for something like five years under that awful Bill. It was said to be the ruin of Western Australia, a scandalous proposition from the point of view of the Opposition. We worked under it for five years. Another Government came in for a further four or five years. The present Government have been in office for $4\frac{1}{2}$ years, and we are now contemplating the removal of that objectionable Bill.

Mr. Wilson: Why change it at all?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I know that the member for Menzies and I would not go to a great deal of trouble to do so. Whilst we have not many electors, they are apparently well satisfied with us and we with them. I am confident the member for Collie is quite pleased with his electorate. If we were guiding the destinies of this House, I think we would leave things as they are. But we cannot argue from that point. We must be honest and admit that the present boundaries are anything but fair. We have only to look at this slip of paper containing the number of constituencies and the number of electors. The position is appalling and should have been remedied years ago. In some cases the numbers are down to 200 or 400, and they go up as high as 16,000 and 18,000. That is not fair representation. It is absurd to argue that in a sparsely populated country like this we can have the system of one vote one value. It is the only logical way to base the representation of people in Parliament, but it cannot be worked. Like many other theories it is hopeless to put it into practice. I see the weakness of this Bill as I saw the weakness of the other Bill.

The Premier: Or any other Bill.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The member for West Perth pointed out the weakness. It is that the recommendations of the Commission will be brought down in the form of a Bill to be enacted, a debate will ensue and members will show their dissatisfaction. We shall have the same deplorable debates on the recommendations as followed in the other case. I well remember them. I sat where you, Sir, sit and had to look on, and see my electorate in danger of being wiped out without offering a word in support of it. The weakness there is the weakness here. Members said, "Send the Bill back to the Commission: they know what we want now and they will remedy the defects." That is beyond human conception.

Mr. Panton: It was sent back.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The House did not send it back. The Commission would not touch it. They thought they had fulfilled all that was required of them by Parliament. Parliament gave them powers to regulate the boundaries and they did what was expected of them. Parliament had the power to regulate the boundaries, but delegated it to the Royal Commission. Parliament should have decided the boundaries. It was not for the Commission to do that, and then submit them to us to alter again. That was absurd. We should have done it from the first and not appointed a Commission to do it. That was the weakness of that Bill, and it is the weakness of this one. In Committee I hope the Premier will amend the Bill in that direction. A lot has been said about the metropolitan area. It is more difficult to represent an outlying district with 500 electors than it is to represent a metropolitan district with 18,000 electors. The member of an outlying district has to look after the requirements of his people. The whole of their business on the goldfields is transacted with the Government, either with the Mines, the Forests or the Lands Departments.

Mr. Marshall: It is all departmental work.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: In the city everything is done by the City Council. Most of the city electors treat with their municipality.

Mr. Marshall: And through deputations and organisations.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Through deputations to Ministers and through the Press. A person may find mud in the tap leading into his scullery. He communicates with the Minister for Works, as a result of which a long paragraph appears in the morning paper and another in the evening paper drawing attention to the negligence of the Government. In the outlying districts, if there is no water, a man has to cart his own, or sink a well, and draw the water up by hand. If anything should happen to him along the road he has to get back the best way he can. In the city all these things are done by telephone and through municipalities or the Press. The people are so congested that their wants are easily demonstrated.

Mr. Marshall: The pressure they bring to bear is very effective.

The Premier: If there is no water outback, a man may have to travel 100 miles for it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, and get it home the best way he can. No one finds fault if the water is not too clear or is a little bit

muddy. If it is not quite fresh one has to put up with it. If many of the outlying districts had as much Government money spent upon them as is spent in the metropolitan area, there might be more electors on their rolls.

Mr. Panton: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clydesdale: The electors of the metropolitan area pay for all they get.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I question that. People outback have to pay for all they get. They do not get the representation they should have, and cannot get the ear of Ministers or bring pressure to bear upon any Government. In the case of the Federal Parliament it was the cry of the people in the outer parts of Australia that the seat of government should be moved to Canberra away from the influence of the Melbourne Press. What affects them affects us. Where the centre of Government is and the population is large there is pressure brought to bear upon the Government. There should be a larger margin of difference between the outlying districts and the metropolitan area. To set down 2,000 people in the back country as being equal to 4,000 or 6,000 in the metropolitan area is absurd. The proportion should be far greater. As the Premier has said, it is difficult to make the Bill any better than it is, but I think it can be improved. The metropolitan area should not have the representation provided for it in the Bill. It would be more equitable if a larger number of members was provided for in the sparsely peopled portion of the State. That is a matter to deal with in Committee. I hope, when the Commission is appointed, we shall accept their recommendations, put them into the form of a Bill, pass it through Parliament, and enact it. I support the second reading.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.15]: Perhaps I may be pardoned for contributing to the debate on this important measure. If there are any members who could be expected to look with disfavour upon the introduction of a Bill such as that before us now, they are those who, like myself, represent the outer goldfields electorates. It is difficult for a member who is in personal touch with his electors and knows practically every individual in his constituency, to tell his electors that it does not matter how generous they have been to him, or how successfully he has represented them, it is his

duty to say that the electorates must be changed. Perhaps we might feel we would like to retain the present electoral boundaries, but we cannot honestly agree to a continuance of the present arrangements if they can be altered by the Electoral Commissioners. Those boundaries are altogether too inequitable. The unfairness of them is apparent to everyone who takes an interest in politics. Reluctantly I have to support the Bill, not because I feel it is fair and equitable, but for the reasons I have just outlined. Members who are in my position cannot help adopting that attitude although it may mean their political execution. In justice to the people generally we are compelled to accept any measure that is fair and equitable. I have listened carefully to those who have contributed to the debate. Several points stressed have been wide of the issue, and some of the arguments advanced have been entirely beside the question. We cannot in fairness to the principles that Parliamentary representation involves, say that because of distance from the seat of government and the isolation of some electorates, they should have a fewer number of electors, compared with other more favoured constituencies, which should have a greater number of voters. I agree with the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) in the argument he advanced when he claimed that the principle of one vote one value was the proper one to adopt. On the other hand, when one analyses the position as it applies to Western Australia, it is easy to see that such a principle would be positively unfair. It would be equally grotesque to argue that the present electoral boundaries are fair. Members have spoken of the vast areas they represent. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay), the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown) and one or two other members stressed that point. If I were to adopt that attitude, I am doubtful whether there is any member in the Parliament of this State who could put up as good an argument in opposition as I could, and I would base that opposition upon logical grounds. I have the biggest electorate of all, and my constituency carries the largest population of any in the outer goldfields areas. At the same time, my electorate has the best prospects, from a gold mining point of view, not excluding the Golden Mile. I refer, of course, to Wiluna. Notwithstanding the pos-

sibilities of that part of the State, and the anomalies that may arise in relation to the quota, I am prepared to say that I shall support the Bill. I realise that the area of a constituency is a factor that should be considered. There are many hundreds of electors in Western Australia who are living in isolation. In some instances they may be living singly in far distant spots, or perhaps as many as half a dozen may be tucked away at some isolated centre many miles away from anything approaching civilisation. No member will argue that because people go out into such places and sacrifice all the good things that are enjoyed in the cities, they should not have the right to receive at least occasionally a visit from their Parliamentary representatives. In order to visit such outback centres a member of Parliament has to travel long distances, and has to pay dearly for the trip. Nevertheless, a member is under an obligation to visit his constituents in those isolated spots. When the big upheaval took place many centuries ago, with the result that the people secured the right to say who should represent them in Parliament, it was never anticipated that circumstances, such as those that apply in Western Australia, would arise. With the march of time, many considerations have crept in, and increased the responsibilities of a member of Parliament. Surely those considerations affect representatives of far distant and widely scattered electorates much more than those who have city electorates. I believe the Bill, although it approaches fairness, is weak in one or two respects. Reference has already been made to the departure from the principle of one vote, one value. I believe there is a weakness regarding the four northern seats. I cannot see for the life of me why an electorate such as that of Gascoyne should be included in the northern group. If distance from the seat of Government and area can be advanced as arguments, then Gascoyne has not such a strong case as the Murchison seat for inclusion in the northern group. At its nearest point the Gascoyne is closer to the seat of government than the Murchison, but its northern boundary is no further north. I claim, therefore, that the Gascoyne has no greater claim for inclusion in the northern group, from a political standpoint, than has the Murchison electorate. Then again, the Gascoyne has two aerial services per week, and on an average one ship per week. There

is also a network of services into the more remote parts of the Gascoyne electorate through the medium of the Meekatharra railway service and the agency of motor mail contractors via Cue, Meekatharra, Mullewa and Pindar. On the other hand, the Murchison electorate has a service comprising two trains a week! Why should the Gascoyne electorate be so specially favoured? Having regard to the gold-mining prospects at Jimblebah, which has every appearance of developing into a big mine, and the prospects at Wiluna, which will be a city itself in time, I have no hesitation in saying that whoever may represent that electorate in the future will have one of the biggest in area and in population, notwithstanding that its nearest point to the city is 600 miles inland. In spite of these prospects and possibilities, the Gascoyne electorate is included in the northern group and is allowed to remain as it is without any addition to its quota, merely because at the present moment it cannot provide the quota necessary under the Bill. I am in accord with those who think that once we have decided upon a redistribution of seats, the Electoral Commissioners should have the final say. We should have nothing more to do after having laid down the basic principles to govern the redistribution. We should be stultifying ourselves if we said, "Very well, we shall have nothing to do with the redistribution of the boundaries: that is the principle on which we guide you; now give us your proposals." If we are to have the final say in the redistribution, I suggest that the Premier should call the party together and that we should do as we did in 1911. But having given the commissioners the basic principle on which to work, or laid the foundation for them, they should complete the task. Arguments may be advanced to show why the commissioners should have the final say, but there are technicalities and certain classes of work in the adjustment of the boundaries which can be done only by experts, those who have the required knowledge for the building of the structure. I agree that if the structure is built on the principles we lay down, there will be no cause for complaint.

The Minister for Railways: Often a bad job is made out of good material.

Mr. MARSHALL: I admit that in the course of erecting a building fault is sometimes found in the workmanship or the ma-

terial. In this case, however, I shall be inclined to accept the decision of the commissioners, and I am accusing myself, as much as any other member, when I say that there is a desire on the part of members to hold what they have. We become acclimatised, as it were, to our electorates, and we do not like the idea of interference with boundaries. Consequently we are influenced, subtly probably, to retain what we have. The commissioners have no regard for any particular member or electorate. They will do just what the Bill instructs them to do. They are not interested in who shall represent any particular part of the community. On the recommendation of the commissioners in 1923, the Murchison seat probably was the worst treated of the 50. Unfortunately it was the best the commissioners could do under the Bill submitted to them. In my opinion they made only one mistake, but it was a small one. Instead of bringing the Murchison seat down south, they might have taken it across the State and so kept the community of interest in that electorate. Thus they would have done it no harm. But to bring it into the agricultural areas was an anomaly. Still, it was the best that could be done in the circumstances. I do not know any of the commissioners, but their positions would imply that they are trustworthy officers and possessed of technical knowledge, so I shall be prepared to accept their decision as final.

MR. FERGUSON (Moore) [8.35]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. PANTON (Menzies) [8.36]: I do not propose to detain the House very long. I principally desire to express my regret that the necessity for the Bill has been brought about largely by the decline of gold-mining. The Premier interjected, "At Menzies." In the next Parliament Menzies will in all probability get a spell. What is more, Menzies made it possible to some extent for the party on this side of the House to exist. Like the member for Murchison, I feel there is no option but to support the Bill, more especially remembering the position Menzies occupies at the present time. I also agree with the member for Murchison that with the redistribution of seats there will be

anomalies—in regard to the newly created seat, which obviously must be Leonora-Mt. Margaret-Menzies. If we are going to get the 2,000 quota there, it must include part of Coolgardie, and with a territory embracing those seats the anomaly will be more apparent than it is at the present time in connection with the North-West seats.

The Premier: In regard to area.

MR. PANTON: And in regard to facilities for postal communication. As a matter of fact, with the obvious seat that will be created out of those three districts there will be an area which will run across to South Australia, but the peculiar feature of that electorate will be that almost throughout its area in practically every few miles of it, it will be possible to find some electors, whilst so far as community of interest is concerned, it will be hard to define it between mining, sandalwood, prospecting, pastoral and other industries. I find from the figures that have been placed before us in the printed sheet, that in the electorate to be formed from the three seats named there will be about 1,576 voters, or 474 short of the quota—just half of the Coolgardie electorate. I find that three of the North-West seats, which it is proposed to leave alone, will have 2,021 voters. In the Murchison greater anomalies will arise in the next three years. As the member for Murchison has told us, the electorate will undoubtedly be the biggest in area, probably before the end of the next Parliament, and it will have between 3,000 and 4,000 more than its quota. There is not a shadow of doubt that when Wiluna is in full swing there will be 2,000 or 3,000 men and women there.

Mr. Teesdale: We were to have over 35,000,000 bushels a few days ago.

MR. PANTON: Wheat depends upon the elements, and the several thousands that will be found at Wiluna shortly will depend upon the railway. As soon as the line is constructed and it is possible to transport machinery to Wiluna, the numbers will increase. Personally I am not too satisfied in respect of the Bill that all is as well as it appears to be on the surface.

Mr. Teesdale: We had enough of it last time.

MR. PANTON: It will be an agreeable surprise if we do not have a lot more when the Bill comes back from the commissioners.

Hon. G. Taylor: Let us do all our work before it leaves this Chamber.

Mr. PANTON: If the hon. member and I had sufficient weight behind us it would not leave in an unsatisfactory condition. A great deal has been said, especially from the Country Party benches, in respect of areas, motor transport and various other matters from the point of view of their particular electorates. It is just as well for Country Party members to remember that though they have suffered certain disabilities they have done a great deal better than the people in the outback mining centres as far as getting the ear of Ministers is concerned.

Mr. Lindsay: We have something to go to the Minister about.

Mr. PANTON: There is no doubt about it that the farming districts in respect of railway freights have all the pull over the outlying goldfields. They get the essential commodity for the production of wheat—super.—carried at a minimum cost, whilst the mining areas pay the maximum freight for their essential commodity—explosives.

The Minister for Railways: It is reduced.

Mr. PANTON: Reduced to such an extent that it is hardly noticeable. In addition particularly every commodity used on the goldfields—mining requisites and food-stuffs for the people—will be found at the top of the railway rates. I do not want the Minister to growl: I am merely pointing out to the members of the Country Party that they are not the only sufferers. I am not even advancing a plea for a reduction of freights.

Mr. Lindsay: The rates are the same as those to the country districts.

The Premier: But is it not important that one section of the community is near to the port, while the other is far away, the greater distance increasing the cost of haulage and everything else? It is the disability that the mining industry—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PANTON: That is the big disability. Whoever may be the fortunate possessors of two of these seats under the proposed redistribution will have to travel to Kalgoorlie before even setting out to reach their electorates. Country members talk of the necessity for motor cars in order to reach their electorates, but most country members can reach their districts in a day, especially to attend a function. It will take the prospective member for the new Murchison seat a day to get to Kalgoorlie, and then it will

take him a considerable time to reach his electorate. North-Western members can visit their electorates only once a year, during recess.

Mr. Lindsay: That is why the thing is easy.

Mr. PANTON: The prospective member for the new electorate of Murchison will not be able to see one-third of his electorate once a year, even with the aid of a motor car.

Mr. Griffiths: He will have to get Brearley on the job.

Mr. PANTON: Brearley has certainly facilitated correspondence with the North-West. However, I rose principally to express my regret that owing to the decline of the industry which made Western Australia possible, this redistribution of seats has been proposed. I am optimistic enough to prophesy that within no longer time than it has taken to bring about a new redistribution since 1911, a period of 17 years, the goldfields will be producing sufficient gold, even in the electorates now proposed for wiping out, to warrant yet another redistribution of seats which will restore something like the present position.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Repeal of Section 4 and substitution of a new section; Number of districts in each of three areas—how ascertained:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: This is the vital clause. I desire to move a new clause, and should like to discuss it at this juncture. The new clause is to the effect that the Bill to be drafted by the commissioners and to be submitted to the House shall be passed by the House into law without any amendment; that members shall have the right only to accept or reject.

The Premier: That is the position now—accept or reject.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But we tried to amend the last Bill.

The Premier: No; we rejected it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But the trend of the debate was how to amend without sending back. That is a hopeless proposition.

Mr. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (a) of the proposed section "three" be struck out, and "four" inserted in lieu.

During the second reading debate I voiced my opinion that further consideration should be extended to the agricultural areas. The amendment merely asks for the agricultural districts what is granted by the Bill to the outer mining area. If the amendment is carried, four votes in the city will equal two votes in the agricultural districts, and two votes in the agricultural districts will equal one in the mining area.

The Premier: This clause is the whole Bill. I have nothing to add to what I said on the second reading.

Amendment put and negatived

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. DAVY: I have two new clauses to move. The first new clause proposes to amend Section 9 of the principal Act, Subsection 1 of which reads—

The report shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament forthwith after the making thereof, if Parliament is then in session, and, if not, forthwith after the next meeting of Parliament, and a Bill shall be introduced for the redistribution of seats at Parliamentary elections in accordance therewith, and for the readjustment of the boundaries of the electoral provinces, and such Bill, if duly passed and assented to, shall come into operation as an Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation

I move—

That the following clause be added to the Bill:—"Section 9 of the principal Act is amended by the deletion in Subsection 1 of the words 'if duly passed and assented to, shall come into operation as an Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation,' and by the insertion in lieu thereof of the words 'shall be enacted by Parliament without amendment.'"

It seems to me in the highest degree improper that Parliament should propose to amend the findings of the commission. The very arguments in favour of creating a commission instead of having the thing done by the Government bringing down a Bill in the ordinary way, are arguments in favour of the commission's findings being final. I take it that the reason for creating the commission was that it was felt that members were too much concerned, both personally and through their constituents, with any redistribution of seats to be able

to bring an entirely free and open mind to bear upon the question. The thing is so wrapped up with the political welfare of parties and individuals as to make it almost impossible for us to be clear and fair and to see all round the proposition as should be done. It is a truism that no man should be permitted to be a judge in his own court. It was that feeling which caused us to create the commission. If we are going to reserve to ourselves the right to criticise that commission, we are stultifying their appointment, and we are not avoiding the difficulties which the appointment of the commission desired to avoid.

The Minister for Railways: This House must take some responsibility.

Mr. DAVY: We take the responsibility by handing this job to someone else.

The Minister for Railways: To whom are they responsible?

Mr. DAVY: We have carefully selected three persons to form the commission, whose positions are such as to make them likely to do their work properly irrespective of responsibility. On the last occasion the commission consisted of the Chief Justice, the Surveyor-General, and the Chief Electoral Officer, all carefully selected men. Why should we be afraid to hand over the job to them? If we are afraid and we appoint this independent tribunal, we do so with our tongues in our cheeks.

The Minister for Railways: No.

Mr. DAVY: Why bother about the commission? Why do not the Government merely call them in and say, "Will you please do this and make a report; if we like it we will put it before Parliament." If we can alter the report and frame the Bill as we like, why create this statutory tribunal?

Mr. Griffiths: Where would the independence of the commission come in?

Mr. DAVY: The whole point of the commission would vanish.

Mr. Withers: Do you suggest that Parliament should be subordinate to the commission?

Mr. DAVY: No more than Parliament is subordinate to the Arbitration Court. Both houses decided it was wise to create an independent tribunal to fix a basic wage. When it was proposed in another place that the findings of the court on that subject should be reviewed by Parliament, members opposite were wildly indignant. The same

principle exists here. If it is not necessary to have the job done by independent people, why appoint them? If it is necessary, let us do the thing properly and have no sham about it. In the case of the other Bill, the report was unsatisfactory to many people.

The Minister for Railways: It should be satisfactory to the majority.

Mr. DAVY: It may be unsatisfactory to all.

The Minister for Railways: If so it ought to go.

Mr. DAVY: It is possible to imagine a state of affairs where a proper redistribution would hurt everyone. It is very difficult for a member not to view a matter of this sort through coloured glasses. I urge the Committee to carry some amendment which will cause this piece of work to be carried out by people who are under no political influence.

Point of Order.

Mr. Lambert: I rise to a point of order. I should like a ruling as to whether the proposed new clause is in order. I do not think any member can move to make it mandatory upon Parliament to carry some Bill without amendment. The Standing Orders set out the procedure to be followed in the case of every Bill. The suggestion of the member for West Perth is, in my opinion, contrary to the Standing Orders.

Hon. G. Taylor: In what way?

Mr. Lambert: We are asked to carry a Bill without amendment.

The Premier: We are asked to pass this Bill which will say that we must pass another without amendment.

Mr. Lambert: We bring down a Bill later, but by a previous Act it becomes mandatory upon Parliament to pass it without amendment. That is contrary to the Standing Orders.

The Premier: We cannot pass a Bill which says that we must not amend some later Bill.

Mr. Lambert: All the Standing Orders are opposed to such a thing.

The Premier: It is certainly out of order.

Mr. Davy: Would you support another new clause to the same effect?

Mr. Lambert: I will deal with that on its merits.

The Chairman: In my opinion the proposed new clause goes beyond the scope of the Bill.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is not the point of order.

The Chairman: I rule that the proposed new clause is out of order, and goes beyond the scope of the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We could add words which would give the commission power to fix the boundaries without further reference to Parliament. If the commission were to carry out such instructions and give each electorate the quota set out in the Bill, Parliament could not possibly reject their findings.

Mr. Kenneally: What is before the Committee?

Hon. G. Taylor: The proposed new clause.

The Chairman: There is no amendment before the Chair at present.

Mr. Davy: I understand the ruling is that the proposed new clause is outside the scope of the Bill. The Bill is an Act to make provision for the better representation of the people of Western Australia in Parliament. I submit that my new clause does come within the scope of the title of that Bill. My object in moving it is to make better provision for the representation of people in Parliament.

Mr. Kenneally: Is the hon. member dissenting from the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. Davy: Yes.

The Premier: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. Lambert: Try to get it by some other means.

Dissent from Chairman's ruling.

Mr. Davy: I move—

That the Committee dissent from the Chairman's ruling.

[The Speaker took the Chair.]

The Chairman reported the dissent.

Mr. Davy: I submit that the ruling given by the Chairman of Committees was wrong. The object of my amendment is to make provision for the better representation of the people of Western Australia in Parliament, and that is in accordance with the Title of the Bill. I submit that my amendment is every bit as much within the scope of the Title as any other word in the Bill. I suggest, too, that it is more important

than any other portion of the Bill. If we are to get a truly independent report, and the work is to be done properly in a manner that we think we cannot do ourselves because we are influenced, then the findings of the Electoral Commission should be absolutely final. Further than that, Standing Order 260 admits of the new clause being inserted, subject to a subsequent alteration to the Title if it were necessary. That Standing Order reads—

No clause shall be inserted in any such draft foreign to the Title of the Bill, and if any such clause be afterwards introduced, the Title shall be altered accordingly.

Thus if we included my amendment, what alteration would any hon. member suggest should be made to the Title of the Bill?

The Premier: It would be necessary, not to alter the Title, but to alter the amendment.

Mr. Davy: The Standing Order I have read admits of the possibility of introducing a clause at variance with the Title, but indicates that subsequently the Title must be altered. The Chairman of Committees has ruled my amendment out of order, because it is foreign to the Title of the Bill!

The Premier: No, to the scope of the Bill, not to the Title.

Mr. Davy: But the Title defines the scope. The Minister for Railways: No.

The Premier: The scope of the measure is the basis of the representation of electorates in the House. Your amendment has nothing to do with that basis. It provides that the commissioners' report cannot be amended. That is outside the scope of the measure.

Mr. Davy: The Bill merely defines the principle upon which the commissioners shall do their work, and it provides the machinery.

The Premier: But from a different aspect. The Bill says this is the basis and nothing more, and your amendment says the commissioners' report must not be amended. That is outside the scope, and is a different aspect of the matter altogether.

Mr. Davy: I consider that the amendment is well within the scope of the Title and of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I am prepared to deal with the point. There can be no doubt about it. We must make a distinction between the Title and the purpose, scope, or, if I may

use the expression, limitations of the Bill. The Bill itself does not propose to repeal or annul the parent Act, which stands. But it does propose to amend certain portions of the parent Act, and nothing more than that. That is the scope of the Bill. Whatever is outside and beyond that scope is strictly speaking, and rightly so, too, out of order. But there is another point I would ask the hon. member to consider. The point is that his amendment would oust the functions of the Legislature and would be delegating to an irresponsible body, an Act that would have force of law without having gone through the formalities necessary under our Constitution for the making or passing of laws. On that score it is beyond our possibilities. This Legislature is a responsible body, but the commission is an irresponsible and delegated body, appointed to perform only certain set functions, not to make laws. Therefore, on that score, if on no other, I must support the ruling of the Chairman of Committees.

Hon. G. Taylor: The last ground appears to be the strong point. While this Parliament delegates its power to a Royal Commission to submit to it a report on the electoral boundaries of the State under certain conditions—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member disagreeing with my ruling?

Mr. Marshall: On a point of order. I want to know if the member for Mt. Margaret is permitted to discuss the ruling you have given?

Mr. Speaker: Only if he intends to move to disagree with it.

Mr. Marshall: Can a member speak on your ruling without moving to disagree?

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the hon. member if he intends to do that.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not intend to take advantage of the occasion to make a speech without indicating whether I intend to move to disagree with your ruling. I intend to act honourably towards you, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to move to disagree with your ruling, but I know it is not sound.

The Premier: There is no doubt about the ruling at all.

Committee Resumed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL—RAILWAYS DISCONTINUANCE.*Council's Message.*

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it insisted on its amendments disagreed to by the Assembly.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1928-29.*In Committee of Supply.*

Debate resumed from the previous day; Mr. Pantou in the Chair.

Department of Mines (Hon. S. W. Munsie, Minister).

Vote—Mines, £104,975:

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [9.28]: I do not intend to have much to say regarding the Mines Estimates. I am sorry I have to again report a decline in the gold yield. I think the decline this year is due principally to the fact that we have been unable to provide railway facilities to Wiluna. I am positive that had the railway been extended to Wiluna during the year we would have stopped, within a short period, the decline in the production of gold, at any rate for a few years. Then again, with regard to the Eastern goldfields, I was hopeful that before the end of the last financial year, the Golden Horseshoe mine would have been in full swing. I have been disappointed in that connection although the company agreed to raise a considerable amount of capital, probably £150,000, for working the mine. The report of a gentleman who was sent to sample and report on the mine is being awaited by the company, and I hope that in the near future there will be a large number of men again at work on the mine. I might mention that quite recently in the Kalgoorlie district there has been a discovery in what is known as the Hidden Secret lease. A fair amount of prospecting has been going on there for some considerable time, and recently one of the owners of the Hidden Secret struck a very rich lode carrying telluride and silver of a

very high value. I am informed that in the sulphide zone the values are equal to the rich chute that was discovered many years ago in the Hidden Secret, and it is believed they have picked up the lode again on the south side of the bar that cut off the lode in the lease. If that is so, there is a bright future for that lease. I am also informed that in driving in the oxidised zone, about 175 feet in depth on the top of the lode, there is both fine and coarse gold showing freely. The discovery is of sufficient importance to warrant my sending Mr. Wilson, the Assistant State Mining Engineer, to Kalgoorlie for the purpose of examining the find and giving his opinion upon it. As I say, if they have picked up the Hidden Secret chute on the south side of the bar, there is a bright future for that lease and probably for other leases running south from it. Because where they have made this find the whole of the prospecting in the past has been done on the western side, and there is a possibility that the lode will run for some considerable distance east of where any prospecting has been done. I may also mention that the department agreed recently to give assistance in approved cases to individuals or syndicates for the purpose of prospecting for deep alluvial. This has never been done in Western Australia before. I think the department is justified in that attitude, particularly in and around Kalgoorlie. It has always been amazing to me to see that hill, about a mile in length, the richest mile of country in the known world, and to reflect upon what may be around it. All geologists tell us that at one period the hill was much higher. The amazing thing is that all that rich stuff should have been swept down and no deep alluvial found anywhere in the vicinity. Some alluvial leads around both the east and west sides of the hill have been discovered, but they have never been traced to the main channels, which should run north and south. A syndicate has been formed in Kalgoorlie for the purpose of seeing if that can be picked up. That syndicate have put up various suggestions to me. They want to know if they raise £5,000 or £10,000, will I subsidise them pound for pound on the amount raised. That I am not prepared to do. But if they raise £5,000 and take an area, and the officers of the Mines Department report to me that they have

a reasonable chance of success, I will be prepared to subsidise them pound for pound on the actual work done. Boring is proceeding at Braeside. Although I am disappointed to have to say that the first bore showed no payable values, the management are still optimistic about the bores that are to follow. They have mapped 13. The departmental officers themselves did not expect very high results from the first bore. However, I am hopeful for the results of the subsequent bores, and I say that, in the interests of Western Australia, it would be a Godsend if values could be produced by the bores going down at Braeside. For we have there the right people interested; people who are prepared to spend money if they can get a possible chance of success. The same company is interested in Mt. Isa in Queensland, and have already agreed to spend three millions of money there. If we can get them really interested in Western Australia, and they should be prepared to spend that amount here, it would give Western Australian mining a very big lift. I am hopeful that the bores at Braeside will disclose values. During the last 12 months there has been in the Mines Department a policy of doing a considerable amount of boring, the department bearing the whole of the cost. That is in relation to boring on abandoned leases where there is a reasonable chance of finding a mine. The first to be tested was the old Tindalls at Coolgardie. The ground was reserved by the department before they decided to bore. They have put down three bores, and I have been surprised that there has been no application for that ground, seeing that the bores disclosed the values that they did.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Have the results been made public?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, they have been published in the Press. The first bore averaged only about $5\frac{1}{4}$ dwts., but the second bore disclosed that over 2ft. in width of the lode there was 6 ozs. and some dwts., and, for the next 2 feet, 2 ozs. and some dwts., and for the next 8 feet, 1oz. 12 dwts. The third bore disclosed 1oz. 3 dwts. I mention this because of the many people becoming interested in mining in Western Australia. I believe that if they could get one prize, they would readily invest money in such mines as Tindall's on the values shown by the bores. At present the drill is being worked not on whole time by the

department, because the owner of the lease is paying half the expense on a show north of Leonora, the name of which I do not recall. Only one or two bores will be put down on that lease, and if they are not successful we have arranged that the drill shall be shifted to another mine in the electorate of the member for Mt. Margaret, the old Lancefield. I believe the company interested in the Lancefield at present have re-pegged several leases I have reserved for them until they get the bore. The results, in my opinion, will prove satisfactory. I say that for the reason that for a long time there was great difficulty about the treatment of the Lancefield ore. But as the result of the experiments made at Wiluna, there will no longer be any difficulty, I am assured, in the treatment of the Lancefield ore. When that mine stopped I believe the underlay was only between 700 and 800 feet in depth, and the lode was just as high in value at that point as it was anywhere else. The intention is to cut the lode at a greater depth. If that lode continues, ere long there will be at Lancefield again a mine employing a fairly large number of men. Apart from gold mining altogether, I am pleased with the report of Dr. Woolnough, the Commonwealth Geologist, on the oil bore at Freney's. A considerable time ago a paragraph appeared in the Sydney "Bulletin" discrediting the Freney bore, and making statements that, in my view, were not correct on the reports supplied to the Mines Department. I submitted the paragraph to the State Mining Engineer and the Geologist, and after consultation with them I replied to the "Bulletin." I am pleased to say the editor published my reply word for word. I mention this because Professor Woolnough's report, published in the "West Australian" the day before yesterday, takes up exactly the opinion I expressed from the departmental officers to the "Bulletin" nearly six weeks ago. While there is nothing to rave about in the discovery at Freney's, it is something to know that men like Professor Woolnough and Mr. Blatchford have definitely certified that crude oil has been found there. That is a very hopeful discovery for Western Australia. I trust that the water that has got into the hole has not damaged the oil sands. At this juncture I want to issue a word of warning to any other company that might start boring for oil. I have a complaint

against the Freney Oil Company. They have not carried out their obligations under the Act in their notification of what happened in the bore. Had they done, as under the Act they were supposed to do, namely, notified the department immediately they struck water, they would not have been in the difficulty they are in to-day. But they did not do that. They went on and struck so much water that it rose to within 175 feet of the surface. All geologists and oil experts say that to be successful with oil, the bore must be kept dry. What has happened may mean that the present hole may have to be abandoned, and the company will have to bore again from the surface, all because they did not comply with the conditions laid down in the Act.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is the depth of the bore?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is either 2,132 ft. or 2,332ft., I am not sure which.

Hon. G. Taylor: Then there will be a lot of lost work there.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, but both Dr. Woolnough and Mr. Blatchford say they believe that, with proper appliances, there is a prospect of saving the present hole and getting it dry.

Mr. Angelo: At what depth did they strike water?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They are not certain of that. They were wrong in not notifying the department forthwith. When they did notify us, the bore was sealed off. To-day Dr. Woolnough is not sure whether they have struck a fresh supply of water, or whether the first supply has broken away and gone down to the bottom. At all events, so much water have they that it is exercising a pressure of 128 lbs. to the square inch.

Hon. G. Taylor: At what depth was the first water struck?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I cannot say from memory. It was not very deep.

Hon. G. Taylor: Surely they could easily pump it down to that leakage.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They tried to seal it off and bale it out, but failed. Then they tried to take tests by various means from the bottom. To give some idea of the pressure of water, they tried with a galvanised iron pipe, with a clap on it, to get a sample of water as near the bottom as

possible. They sealed and soldered that, but the pressure was so great that it formed compressed air in the bottom and the air was actually blowing off through the solder. There is no question about the heavy pressure of water. Until proper methods are adopted to enable the bore to be again opened up, it has been filled with clay in order to protect the oil sands. I wish to make special reference to the Sons of Gwalia Mine. Members are aware that some time ago the Government decided to devote portion of the £260,000 odd of the money available from the disabilities grant to assist the Gwalia Company. The technical commission appointed by the Migration Commission, the officers of the Mines Department and Mr. Kingsley Thomas—who was appointed a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the mining industry—all recommended that assistance should be given to the Sons of Gwalia Mine, and reported that if it were given, there was a reasonable chance of success. I do not know of any mine in the State that during the last three months has operated under such disadvantageous conditions as has the Sons of Gwalia. Prior to receiving assistance it had been decided to salvage the mine. In other words, it was intended simply to work out the ore developed and abandon the mine. That programme was started on, and when we decided to grant assistance there was not too much ore left ready for development. Consequently, the management has had to crowd machines into the working faces, which method is not nearly so economical as proper working. I mention this because I intend to quote the results of the last three months. I wish to give every credit to the management for what it has done to revive mining in that district. I am kept posted monthly with an accurate account of the development that is taking place. Values in the winzes being sunk from the bottom level are satisfactory. I am giving away no secret when I say that values over a width of 72 inches have averaged 40s. per ton. Unquestionably the values are there. I stress this particularly because, if the Gwalia Mine can get those results, why cannot the mines in other parts of the State do it also? Times out of number I have been told by the Chamber of Mines in Kalgoorlie that it is impossible to reduce mining costs on the Golden Mile. I admit

that the Kalgoorlie mines have to roast their ore, which is not necessary at Gwalia.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Gwalia ore is not so refractory.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is so. But the State Mining Engineer assures me that Gwalia ore is harder to fine grind than is Kalgoorlie ore, and it is all fine ground at Gwalia. In July the quantity of ore broken and crushed was 11,246 tons at a total cost for mining and milling of 21s. 5.21d. per ton.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is nothing to complain about in that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Kalgoorlie managers say they cannot treat ore for that. I have not yet been able to get a statement from them as to the cost of roasting the ore. I should like to get some proof of the actual cost of roasting ore at Kalgoorlie and, after adding it to the cost of mining and milling at Gwalia, compare the two sets of figures. I am satisfied that the Kalgoorlie figures would not be nearly so favourable as are the Gwalia figures. It cannot be said that Gwalia is working at an advantage over Kalgoorlie inasmuch as the rate of wages is slightly higher there than on the Golden Mile.

Mr. Griffiths: And Gwalia is situated at a far greater distance from the source of supplies.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes; as a matter of fact, the Sons of Gwalia Mine is drawing its supply of mining timber from west of Burracoppin and hauling it to Gwalia. For August the Sons of Gwalia mined and treated 11,616 tons of ore at a total cost of 19s. 1.64d. per ton, while for September the quantity was 11,208 tons at a total cost of 19s. 3.05d. I am quoting these figures in order to have them published in "Hansard" as a record of what can be done in mining and treatment in this State.

Mr. Marshall: It would be well if the Press reported them, too.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. I am hopeful that something will be done to reduce costs at Kalgoorlie. If Kalgoorlie mines could get down to those figures, plus the cost of roasting the ore, I am satisfied that every mine in Kalgoorlie would be paying handsome dividends. For the life of me I cannot understand why those mines cannot get down to equal costs. I go further and say that the secret

of success on the Sons of Gwalia is the use of gas producers. Some time ago, following an agitation in the mining industry, the Premier went to Kalgoorlie and publicly announced that the Government would give a fairly large sum of money to assist in providing additions to the Kalgoorlie power plant in order to supply cheap electricity to the mines. Then three experts were appointed to go to Kalgoorlie and report—men who knew their work well. They went to Kalgoorlie and presented a very elaborate report for the establishment of a power station, the total cost of which would have been something like £273,000. I wish to emphasise that the Gwalia company, by using suction gas, is producing its own electric current at about one-third of what the experts reported as the cost at which the company could supply the Kalgoorlie mines after an expenditure of £273,000. An important lesson is to be learned from the Sons of Gwalia mine, which has proved conclusively that mining costs can be reduced. Since the Government have been assisting the mine, the management have succeeded on three occasions in getting the total costs below pre-war figures. That is something of which the management might be proud. I, as Minister for Mines, am proud of it. At any rate, when the management secure such excellent results, they should receive the credit due to them. I believe that the Sons of Gwalia has as manager a man who is as capable as, if not more so than any mine manager in the State or out of it. In my opinion the results of his work have proved it. When I introduced the Mining Estimates last year I spoke a good deal on the eventual prosperity of mining, but gave a pretty doleful tale of what mining had meant to the health of the men engaged in it.

Mr. Griffiths: Before you pass on to that, can you say how the discoveries at Westonia are panning out?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I cannot say from memory. Last year I went so far as say that if the 1926-27 examination was correct as compared with the 1925-26 examination, the sooner we closed down on mining in this State, the better it would be.

Hon. G. Taylor: On the report there was nothing else to suggest.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is so. I said I did not think the examination

this year would disclose anything like such unsatisfactory figures. The final figures are not yet available for this year. When I made my statement last year the final figures for that year were not available.

Hon. G. Taylor: But your statement to-night will be on the same basis.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. At present there are still about 250 men to be examined. If we may take last year's examinations as a criterion, the men still to be examined will improve the figures for this year, as they did in both the previous years, because they are principally men working in shallow and small shows. The figures for the three years are as follows:—

1925-26.

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Total number of men examined ... | ... | 4,023 |
| Suffering from miners' phthisis— | | % |
| Early ... | 499 | = 11.4 |
| Advanced ... | 183 | = 4.5 |
| Plus tuberculosis ... | 181 | = 3.8 |
| Suffering from tuberculosis only ... | 11 | = .8 |
| Normals ... | 3,239 | = 80.6 |

1927.

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Total number of men examined ... | ... | 3,728 |
| Suffering from miners' phthisis— | | % |
| Early ... | 381 | = 10.2 |
| Advanced ... | 93 | = 2.5 |
| Plus tuberculosis ... | 123 | = 3.4 |
| Suffering from tuberculosis only ... | 10 | = .8 |
| Normals ... | 3,116 | = 83.6 |

1928.

(As reported to date.)

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Total number of men examined ... | ... | 2,962 |
| Suffering from miners' phthisis— | | % |
| Early ... | 312 | = 10.5 |
| Advanced ... | 86 | = 2.9 |
| Plus tuberculosis ... | 34 | = 1.2 |
| Suffering from tuberculosis only ... | 3 | = .1 |
| Normals ... | 2,527 | = 84.3 |

The examination discloses that of 2,962 men working in the mines last year, 37 suffered from either tuberculosis only or from tuberculosis and phthisis, as against 138 in the first year of examination and 141 in the subsequent year.

Hon. G. Taylor: How do their ages run?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have not particulars of their ages. It is fair to read the comparative figures, since they show the improvement to be even greater than the figures first quoted suggest. Hon. members who understand the position will realise the effect of the comparison. The report states—

The 312 men reported to be suffering from miner's phthisis early comprise 272 who were reported as suffering from miner's phthisis early in the 1927 examinations, 35 who were previously reported as normal, and five new cases, that is, cases reported for the first time.

Of the 86 advanced cases, 72 were previously reported as advanced, 13 as early, and one as a new case. Out of the total of 398 early and advanced cases, there were only 42 fresh cases, as compared with 71 out of 474 in the 1927 examinations.

It will be seen that there is an unquestionable improvement in this year's examinations as compared with those of 1926 and 1927. If those figures were a fair criterion, if out of 3,000 odd men 130 or 139 were to be cut down by tuberculosis in every year, the sooner we stop mining the better, under those conditions. Mining would not be worth going on with then. To show the obligations devolving upon the State under the Miners' Phthisis Act, I quote the following:—

The number of persons in receipt of compensation in respect of themselves and dependants is 218, and the aggregate amount of compensation paid up to the 30th June last since the inception of the Act was £63,547 19s. 6d. The amount paid for the last financial year was £37,922 6s. 10d., and it is estimated that £40,000 will be required to meet the compensation for the current financial year. Since the first group of men was withdrawn from the mines, on the 27th January, 1926, 79 have died and 29 are permanently incapacitated from work. The number of dependants of the deceased and totally incapacitated men is 259, comprising 71 wives, 39 widows, and 149 children.

It is not pleasant to have to make such a report, even though it does reveal a vast improvement on the previous examinations. I have also particulars of men, not working in the mines, but applying for work in the mines, who were examined during the year. About eight months ago a regulation was laid on the Tables of both Houses, and not disagreed to, providing that no man can get employment in the mining district who is suffering from any of the diseases specified in the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. G. Taylor: A few such men are there.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A good number of such men are working in the mines at present, and we do not debar them from continuing; but it was only fair, from the aspect of protection for the men themselves and of protection for the industry, to issue that regulation. It is to the effect that men must be medically certified as not suffering from any of the diseases mentioned in the Third Schedule before they can be employed in the mines.

Mr. Marshall: It is only a fair thing to the industry.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: That was one of the considerations which influenced me most as Minister for Mines. Just at that time there was a big slump at Broken Hill, and naturally the men put off there would come to look for work in Western Australia, as the most active of the States in mining. In the absence of the medical examination, such men might obtain employment while suffering from dust, either early or advanced, but so long as they had not contracted tuberculosis they could get into the mines. Accordingly that regulation was issued. The total number of men who have applied for work since then is 536, and of those 499 were normal. One was suffering from cellulitis over the patella, 11 were suffering from miners' phthisis early, five from miners' phthisis advanced, seven from miners' phthisis plus tuberculosis, 11 from tuberculosis only, and two from ankylostomiasis. I am sorry I cannot record an increase in the output of gold for last year. Something extraordinary will have to happen to enable me to report an increase for this year; but I am positive that in the year following, when Wiluna will have got going, the industry will turn the corner and show a big increase in the output of gold in Western Australia.

MR. LAMOND (Pilbara) [10.8]: It is to be regretted that the gold production of the State has decreased, and year after year continues on the decline. It is gratifying, however, to hear the Minister speak with such confidence of Wiluna, and express the anticipation that when that centre is provided with railway facilities we may look for a revival in gold production. I am pleased that the Government have treated the Braeside district so sympathetically. They have granted a liberal subsidy to the company operating there. I recently visited the centre, and was not over-pleased with the positions that had been selected for diamond boring operations on the field. I do not profess to know much about boring, but it did appear to me, as a layman, that the sites chosen were on the wrong side of the lode. In ordinary mining the practice is to put down a prospecting shaft to prove a lode or reef on the hanging wall of the lode. The sites selected for boring, and especially those which were being worked during my visit, were on the footwall side

of the lode. Most of the prospectors there were rather disappointed, but I have no doubt that the officer responsible for the selection of those sites will be able to explain his action. Doubtless he had his reasons for the choice he made. Gold-mining in my district is at a low ebb. The attention of mining people is turned more towards asbestos and tin. A lot of interest had lately been shown in the large asbestos deposits in the Pilbara district. Thousands of tons of this mineral could be produced at a very profitable rate if the Tariff Board could be induced to give the same assistance to the industry as they have given to others. Asbestos is brought into the Commonwealth free of duty. This seriously affects the industry in the North-West. I understand that most of the asbestos used in Australia comes from South Africa, which brings us into competition with that country. I shall be glad to know if the Minister can make representations to the Tariff Board with a view to having a small duty placed upon this commodity. I believe that manganese carries a 33 per cent. duty. If a similar duty could be placed on imported asbestos it would make a great difference to the industry. Thousands of tons of the mineral could be worked in Pilbara.

Mr. Angelo: Where would you get the market?

Mr. LAMOND: In Australia. A good deal of asbestos is used in this State alone. The Pilbara district has produced the best asbestos in the world.

Mr. Lutey: And the demand is increasing.

Mr. LAMOND: It has brought as much as £200 a ton in London. That class of asbestos is not used in Australia, but there is a good demand for it in England. The inferior class is worth from £20 to £30 per ton. That is the kind used in Australia, and it is that class that comes from South Africa free of duty. Perhaps it would be a good idea, while the boring plants are in the Pilbara district, if the Government put down a few boreholes in the Marble Bar and Bannock centres to prove whether the gold-bearing ore lives at depth. It has been the custom in the past when the surface ores have been rich for the companies or prospectors to work down to water level and then, owing to the cost of production, to abandon the shows. Very little has been done since. Generally speaking the prospectors cannot

afford to purchase the plant necessary to cope with the water after going down 80 or 90 feet. Tin mining is something like gold-mining and pretty flat. That is due chiefly to the drop in the price of tin. During the past few months 60 or 70 tons of machinery were brought into the district with the object of working the lower grade alluvial patches. Unfortunately, the price of tin has gone down, and some of the prospects which looked fairly bright a few weeks ago, have, for the present, been abandoned. I thank the Minister for the very valuable assistance he has given to the Braeside district.

MR. CHESSON (Cue) [10.15]: I wish to express my appreciation and gratification for the action of the Government and the Minister, and for the sympathy and assistance they have given to the mining industry. I also thank the officers for the courtesy and consideration they have at all times meted out to members who have gone to them with different cases. I refer particularly to the Under Secretary and the officers under him, and to members of the Geological Department. All those officers have been most courteous and most willing to render assistance. The Government have done a great deal for the mining industry through the Mines Development Vote, through the Prospecting Board and through the carting subsidy to prospectors, as well as through the free assays of ores. Any miner who has a proposition can get his ore assayed free and determine by analysis what the gold contents of the stone are. The department has done everything possible to assist not only the prospector but mining companies. Money has been advanced to big companies to assist them in developing their mines. Every assistance has been afforded for the fostering of the industry. Diamond drilling and boring have also been done extensively. We know what has occurred at Wiluna. The eyes of the world are centred upon that part of the goldfields. It is realised, with the big development going on there, that Wiluna must have a great future. No one who has been through the mine can fail to realise that the company has spent a large sum of money upon its development.

Mr. North: How long will the railway take to construct?

Mr. CHESSON: I believe it is intended to push on with it as quickly as pos-

sible. Wiluna cannot do much without a railway. I take a very optimistic view of the future of the goldmining industry, especially as it is seen in the Murchison. Reidy's has been materially assisted by the Government. I think the shareholders are now displaying more sympathy towards the management. Before long that mine should be on the map. It has constantly been written down in the Press. The wild-cat column of the "Bulletin," has repeatedly contained statements indicating that the optimism of the manager's reports was due to a desire to have the calls paid by the shareholders. It was said that these reports were misleading. As a result of these statements over 50,000 shares were forfeited in Adelaide. The manager continued operations and went without his salary for a considerable time. A fairly large quantity of ore was treated and some machinery was placed on the mine. The whole of the 50,000 shares have been taken up by people in Western Australia, and of the 135,000 share in the company over 80,000 are now held in Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: More than half of them.

Mr. CHESSON: Yes. Recently a meeting was held in Perth and the shareholders decided to send someone across to South Australia to induce the directors to transfer the directorate to Western Australia. I am satisfied that with the quantity of ore treated and the development that has already taken place, Reidy's will develop into a big mine and will employ a lot of labour. I have some figures I wish to deal with to indicate the position of the property. The company has been treating ore from the mine for over two years. A water supply was obtained two miles away and two miles of piping and a decent plant were installed in order to pump the water. When the company took over from the vendor £850 was owing to the Government. The company paid off that mortgage and borrowed a further amount to put down the pipe line. That further money has been repaid and still another amount has been borrowed to put down the main shaft, which has been sunk 100 feet. It is 12 feet by 4 feet in the clear, and is closely timbered. The greatest part of the third loan has already been paid off. About a quarter of a mile from the mine a small plant had been put up by prospectors at the outset of the operations. The company has treated over 11,200 tons of ore,

which was put through that plant for an average recovery of 41s. 5d. per ton. It was never suggested at the time that the company would be able to pay dividends while utilising the old plant. It was used by the company merely for developing the proposition and to treat the ore taken from the drives and winzes so as to prove conclusively to the shareholders that, with the advantage of an up-to-date plant later on, they would have a really good mine. The plant utilised for treating the ore was devoid of all labour-saving appliances and, in view of the newspaper attacks I have already referred to, the capital necessary for procuring a mill that would be a more economical proposition was not forthcoming. As a result, the small tonnage that could be treated has yielded little profit. The present position of the mine is briefly as follows: A main shaft 12 ft. by 4 ft. has been sunk to the No. 1 level, close timbered and centred with a ladderway. A vertical prospecting main shaft has been sunk to 190 feet and levels driven from it north and south to a depth of 96 ft. and 164 ft. At the bottom of the shaft which has passed from the oxidised to the sulphide zone, the lode has been crosscut and shows a width of 6 ft. with 40s. values. The No. 1 level has been driven a total distance of 425 ft. and the No. 2 (164 ft.) level 438 ft. with an average width of 8 ft., and a value of 41s. 6d. per ton. It has not been proved that the full length of the ore shoot has been determined as there is ore in both the north and south faces of the drive.

Hon. G. Taylor: Quartz or lode?

Mr. CHESSON: Lode. There is also payable ore in the Emu South, which is 1,500 ft. away. The shaft has been put down 154 ft. and payable ore has been found. So that shows there is 1,500 ft. of the same lode. Diamond drilling has been carried out there and the ore that has been crushed has come from all the development faces and the stopes above No. 1 level. No. 2 level is intact except for a leading stope in the south end 110 ft. long. At 30th June last the ore reserves opened up down to the No. 2 level were estimated to be 24,385 tons worth 43s. per ton. In April last the Mines Department put down a series of bores to prove whether the gold contents of the lode persevered into the sulphide zone. Altogether five bores were put down and cut the lode at depths varying

from 270 to 500 ft. below the surface. These bores were put down entirely under Government supervision. The cores were locked away by the diamond drill manager and sent by him sealed to the Government Petrologist for determination. After his examination the cores were sent to the Government Analyst for assay. These assays gave returns of a value varying from 35s. to 53s. 4d. The bores were put down to depths varying from 262ft. to 503ft. and the angles of depression ranged from 45 degrees to 60 degrees. The results of the assays were as follows:—

| No. of Bore. | Angle of Depression. | Depth of Bore. | Calculated Vertical Depth. | Width in Bore. | Lode. Calculated width between Walls. | Value shillings. | |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | | | s. d. | |
| 1 | 45 | 371 | 262 | 10 3 | 7 3 | 35 0 | |
| 2 | 60 | 423 | 370 | 17 0 | 8 0 | 43 3 | |
| 3 | 60 | 487 | 404 | 8 0 | 6 0 | 40 3 | |
| 4 | 60 | 581 | 503 | 12 0 | 10 0 | 53 4 | |
| 5 | 60 | 422 | 365 | 23 0 | 14 0 | Not determined. | |

The manager considers the No. 1 bore is in the extreme southern end of the main ore shoot and that this accounts for the lode being smaller than the average. The width and value, however, constitute a payable ore body. He is also of opinion that No. 3 bore probably pierced the lode but here again a payable ore body was disclosed. No. 2 and No. 4 bores show a splendid body of ore and it is most gratifying to the gold mining industry, the Mines Department who carried out the boring, and to the shareholders in the company that the values in the deepest bore, estimated at 503ft. vertical, are the best encountered and worth 10s. a ton more than the average proved values of the upper levels. Mr. Mathers, the manager, estimates the reserves opened up and the ore indicated

by the diamond drill at a total of 100,000 tons of a recoverable value of 40s. per ton. On the assumption that the proved shoot goes down at the same width and length as disclosed at the No. 2 level, the surveyor for the company estimates that the reasonable expectation of ore to the 500ft. horizon—the deepest point at which the lode has been proved by the drill—amounts to 155,700 tons of a recoverable value of 40s. Estimating the cost of mining and treatment at 25s. per ton, this shows a gross profit of £86,775, and after providing £14,275 to liquidate the existing debt on the mine, something under £4,000, installing an efficient treatment plant and sinking the main shaft, £72,500, or 10s. per share will be available for dividends to the shareholders. This takes us to the lowest point at which the present chute has been proved, and though it is never safe to prophesy unless you know, the values in the deepest drill hole and the width are so satisfactory that the future of the deeper levels may be looked to with every confidence by the shareholders.

Mr. Marshall: The shareholders in that company have no appreciation of the values they possess.

Mr. CHESSON: At the 164 ft. level there has been 500 ft. of driving and over 11,000 tons have been treated through the mill, the recovery costing 41s. 6d. It is practically a vertical lode with an average of 8ft. on that level, and with values extending to both ends. No doubt the estimate given here is a very conservative one. Having been present at the meeting and seen the report put before the shareholders he other day, I feel confident there will be no difficulty in developing that proposition.

Mr. Marshall: They want a battery first.

Mr. CHESSON: First they want an up-to-date treatment plant, and then to continue the main shaft down so that they may work the ore in the oxidised zone, and have other levels opened up in the sulphide zone. I have talked over the matter with the State Mining Engineer, and I find there is nothing refractory in the sulphides. Taking the cores from the diamond drill, I think the estimate given by the surveyor, Mr. McCartney, is fairly conservative one.

Mr. Marshall: Have you any idea of the actual ore reserves they have?

Mr. CHESSON: Yes, I can give you those figures. There are 24,000 tons developed from the 164ft. level to the surface.

Mr. Marshall: They are badly in need of a treatment plant.

Mr. CHESSON: That is so. Since the facts have been placed before the shareholders, I do not think there will be any difficulty in getting in the necessary calls to provide for a treatment plant and the sinking of the main shaft. One of the leading mine managers has gone up to report. I am satisfied that the mine will stand any investigation.

Mr. Marshall: It is as good a proposition as there is anywhere in the State.

Mr. CHESSON: The South Australian people have not shown confidence in the mine, but the manager has shown every confidence, because for three years he went without his salary. I wish to refer to the Big Bell proposition, one of the biggest in the State. There the lode is 120 feet and has been sampled over 1,000 feet. The values are a little low, but I am optimistic regarding those to be disclosed by the diamond drill. I again thank the Mines Department for the assistance they have always given me in respect of every genuine proposition I have put before them.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [10.36]: It may seem like temerity on my part to speak on mining, but I have lived on the goldfields, and in one small corner of my electorate a good deal of mining development is going on at present. I had hoped that the Minister would be able to give us some information about Westonia, the corner I refer to. The mines there are opening up with great promise. The syndicate that took up the big mine has been able to carry out all its obligations to the Government and has paid up out of the proceeds from the mine. Development is going on apace, and I hope for something very good in that district before long. It was pleasing to listen to the Minister when he told us about Wiluna and the Horse-shoe and the Hidden Secret. His reference to ancient geological history was very interesting. He mentioned that the mile of hill at Kalgoorlie was once so much higher than it is to-day. I think he said that no deep alluvial had been traced there. But what about the Ivanhoe venture?

The Minister for Mines: That is not running north and south.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I was on the goldfields at the time, and I have a very lively recollection of the deep alluvial trouble. As to the Sons of Gwalia mine, the figures quoted clearly indicate that efficiency has been carried out on that property. It should give the Kalgoorlie authorities food for reflection. The Sons of Gwalia is situated 534 miles from the coast, whereas Kalgoorlie is only 375 miles, or 159 miles nearer to the source of supplies. It was good to hear the Minister's report as to the great improvement in the position relating to miners' complaint. It was a very sad tale the Minister had to tell us last year, but it was felt that the first investigation probably would give the worst results. That is turning out to be correct. As regards oil, I have been looking through my diary and I find I marked the 25th August as a red-letter day—"Freney's struck oil; the greatest thing since Coolgardie." If there is oil in any quantity and it turns out to be a payable proposition, it will be one of the finest things that has ever happened in this State.

Mr. Marshall: There is every justification for hoping that it will be so.

The Minister for Mines: My word there is!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I am looking forward to the time when all that country away up the Murchison will fulfil the great expectations entertained of it. Before I left the Old Country I had heard a lot about that part of Western Australia. I had read of the explorations of Mr. Calvert, but apart from what I had read, when I landed here in 1894 I came into contact with many people who spoke most hopefully of the Murchison and considered it would prove to be one of the greatest fields of all. Perhaps it might yet prove to be one of the greatest if we could only get the Federal Government to reduce the tariff. It is the tariff that is strangling the industry. If we could only get the people in the Eastern States to realise how the high tariff is murdering the mining industry and thus secure a reduction of the duty on requisites that would make possible the utilisation of low-grade ores prosperity would undoubtedly follow.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.44 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 6th November, 1928.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Bills: City of Perth Superannuation Fund, report of Select Committee | 1616 |
| Dog Act Amendment, returned | 1616 |
| Wheat Bags, report | 1616 |
| Water Board Act Amendments, 2R. | 1616 |
| Police Offences (Drugs), 2R., Com. Report | 1619 |
| Electoral Districts Act Amendment, 1R. | 1619 |
| Jury Act Amendment, 2R., Com. Report | 1620 |
| Profiteering Prevention, 2R. | 1620 |
| Group Settlements Act Amendment, 2R. | 1630 |
| Bunbury Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 2R. | 1651 |

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

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SUPER-ANNUATION FUND.

Report of Select Committee.

Hon. A. Lovekin brought up the report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the City of Perth Superannuation Fund Bill.

Report ordered to be printed.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—WHEAT BAGS.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.3] in moving the second reading said: The Water Boards Act and its amendments do not go far enough to meet conditions that have developed during the last few years. The existing legislation provides for (a) water supplies to towns; (b) reticulated water supplies from the Goldfields Water Supply main and (c) reticulated water supplies from isolated schemes. These provisions fail to cover the whole situation. There is a never-ceasing demand upon the Government for other water supplies throughout the agricultural areas, and