

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 27th March, 1929.

	Page
Questions: Tubercular cattle ...	77
Workers' compensation, Timber industry ...	77
Labour for Government works ...	77
Karlgarin-Lake Grace railway project ...	78
Dwarda-Narrogin Railway ...	78
Committees for the Session ...	78
Leave of absence ...	78
Bill: Redistribution of Seats, 2a., Com., 3a. ...	78
Adjournment, Special ...	107

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

QUESTION—TUBERCULAR CATTLE.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Agriculture: Is there any intention of introducing the system of "Tubercle-Free Herds" into Western Australia?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: Under the Dairy Cattle Compensation Act steps are already being taken in the direction indicated in the question as far as the herds in the metropolitan area are concerned, and further, regulations under the Stock Diseases Act prevent the importation of stud cattle unless accompanied by a certificate of tuberculin test by a qualified veterinary surgeon. Future action in a wider field will be determined by the experience gained in the work now proceeding.

QUESTION—WORKERS' COMPENSATION, TIMBER INDUSTRY.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has his attention been called to a statement appearing in the "Daily News" of Monday last, headed "400 per cent. rise for workers' compensation; £1,000 for toes"? 2, If so, what does he propose doing to save the timber hewing industry?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, I have read the statement referred to, but not all the figures quoted are correct. The increase in the premium rates was 100 per cent., and not 400 per cent. as stated in the article. It is understood that the private insurance companies are refusing to cover timber hewers, and that the State insurance office is receiving practically the whole of this class of business. An analysis of the claims indicates that a large percentage of

the claimants are foreigners or of foreign extraction. It has not been found necessary to increase the premium rates on the State Saw Mills. 2, It is not admitted that the timber hewing industry is in danger, but the position, as indicated in reply to Question 1, is being investigated.

QUESTION—LABOUR FOR GOVERNMENT WORKS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: In view of the indefiniteness of the position in the public mind in respect to the employment of workers for Government undertakings, will he inform the House regarding—1, the method of engagement. 2, Position of unemployed in country, and also outer suburban districts, desiring work on Government jobs, and conditions to which they must conform? 3, In making the statement will he advise—(a) Whether it is a condition precedent to employment that the applicant possess a union ticket; (b) if so, is it essential that membership of any particular union be held; (c) if (a) is answered in the affirmative, what is the minimum period of membership insisted upon and the cost involved? (d) Is it obligatory on the part of the residents outside the metropolitan area, when seeking Government labour, to attend at the Government Labour Bureau? (e) To what extent is consideration extended to local residents when country work is being undertaken? (f) Is it the intention of the Government to give consideration to the establishment of a local bureau to be open one or more days a week when a large work, as, for instance, the Canning water scheme, is in hand?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, All men for Government work must be engaged through the State Labour Bureau. In selecting men for this work preference is given as follows: (a) Financial members of a trades union; (b) men with dependants in Western Australia, according to the number of their dependants; (c) men who have been longest out of work are selected before those just recently unemployed. 2, Where possible, all applicants for work must register at the nearest State Labour Bureau. There are branches of the Labour Bureau in all the principal centres throughout the State, but if it is impossible for an applicant for work in the country to

attend at any of these bureaux, personal registration is not insisted upon. 3, (a) Yes; (b) no; (c) there is no stipulated period of membership, and the cost of membership varies in the unions involved according to whether the contribution is a weekly, monthly, quarterly or yearly one; (d) no; (e) when men are required for any work, the Labour Bureau obtains advice as to the number of local unemployed, and the number of local men to be engaged is decided by the Labour Bureau; (f) no.

QUESTION—KARLGARIN-LAKE GRACE RAILWAY PROJECT.

Mr. DONEY asked the Premier: In respect of the proposed Karlgarin-Lake Grace railway, can he yet give any information as to date of commencement of survey?

The PREMIER replied: Not yet, but it is probable that a survey party can be made available in the near future.

QUESTION—DWARDA-NARROGIN RAILWAY.

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has any decision been arrived at, and if so, what is it, with respect to compensation for land resumed along the Dwarda-Narrogin railway? 2, Can he state a date for the settlement of the compensation claims?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1 and 2, The land has not yet been resumed, but plans are now being prepared, and it is anticipated the "Gazette" notices will be issued by the end of next month, when claim forms will be immediately forwarded to all landholders concerned, and the provisions of the Public Works Act will then be carried out as claims are received.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motion by the Premier, Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Library Committee—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Corboy, and Mr. Angelo.

Standing Orders Committee—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Hon. W. J. George, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Latham.

House Committee—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Chesson, Mr. Teesdale, and Mr. Stubbs.

Printing Committee—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Panton, and Mr. J. MacCallum Smith.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. North, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Hon. W. J. George (Murray-Wellington) on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [4.40]: In approaching this matter I want to say, at the outset, that after a good deal of consideration and mature judgment I have come to the conclusion that the Bill is decidedly unfair to the agricultural areas. The "West Australian" a little time ago stated that the Bill was unduly generous to the metropolitan area. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) last night went to considerable pains to read extracts from the speeches of various members of the Country Party who spoke on the second reading of the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill in November last. I want to make my position clear to the House and to the country generally, and so will follow the example of the member for West Perth and read what I had to say upon that occasion. My speech was delivered on the 1st November last, and will be found on page 1586 of "Hansard." What I said was as follows:—

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 Yorkraking 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 got 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.

That is what I said on that occasion.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You had better say the same thing again now.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Since 1911 the increase in the country districts has been over 50 per cent., whereas the increase in the metropolitan area has been under 50 per cent., slightly under. Those areas had an increase in population, in output, and wealth production. Since then it was thought by the previous Premier, Sir James Mitchell, that an extra seat could be allocated to the country districts. It is now proposed that the five seats from the goldfields should be put into the metropolitan area and nothing given to the country districts. We appear to be following the example of the Eastern States, where the people have bitterly regretted building up big city centres which have a great pull over the affairs of State. Melbourne and Sydney practically rule the destinies of Australia as a whole. The pull is concentrated mostly in a little piece of the Commonwealth in the south eastern corner, and apparently the rest of Australia can go hang. We too in this State seem rapidly to be approaching that same state of affairs. I was rather distressed during the debate to note that certain city members spoke with the venom they did concerning the action of members on the cross benches. The Leader of the Country Party has only been imbued with an intense and earnest desire to get fair play for the agricultural areas. We are not seeking anything that is out of proportion. We say that the increase in population in the country districts entitles them to increased representation. The Leader of the Country Party has told me that he has no desire to wreck the Bill. All he wants is a redistribution on a fair and equitable basis. He quoted figures to show the discrepancy between the position indicated by the Electoral Department and that by the Statistical Department. There is a certain amount of justification in our protest against the present representation accorded to the coun-

try districts and with regard to the discrepancy in the figures. On one occasion the Minister for Railways said he presumed there were about 8,000 foreigners in the State. We know the number must be double that.

The Premier: There are approximately 17,000 foreigners here.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Some of them are naturalised.

The Premier: Yes.

The Minister for Railways: When did I say that?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Last November. I presume some of the 17,000 foreigners are in the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Mines: Very few.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I suppose they are in the State timber industry.

Mr. Lindsay: A certain number are at Wanneroo.

Mr. Sampson: A large number of trades have insufficient numbers of our own people.

The Minister for Mines: Have you any foreigners running country papers?

Mr. Sampson: Not yet.

The Minister for Health: You soon will have.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I admit there is a certain proportion of foreigners in the agricultural areas, but they are mostly to be found in parts where clearing is going on. I do not think a large proportion would be found in the timber district.

The Minister for Mines: There are about 11,000 in the South-West.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It is often difficult for the Government Statistician to arrive at correct figures.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He gets them from the department and is not responsible for their preparation.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: He gets them from the large centres and from the departments, but appears to arrive at his conclusions in guess work fashion. The member for Toodyay, when speaking last year said—

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 proves 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 has 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, 105,566 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 6,231 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 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. There must be 8,000 or more foreigners in this State.

Mr. Lindsay: 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 at 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. 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.

For years we have said there must be a redistribution of seats, and we have called out for it. The Leader of the Country Party has spoken most emphatically in support of that, and no doubt by his vote will follow up his protest against the number of seats allotted to the agricultural areas. I intend to support the Bill. Several members representing the goldfields, who time after time have really had a walk-over in their elections, will in future have to fight for their seats just as members of the Country Party have to do, and the best man will win. That is more fair than the present arrangement. The Leader of the Country Party does not want to defeat the Bill, but desires that the report should be sent back to the Commissioners.

The Premier: It is necessary you should explain what he did say, for he did not make himself clear.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It is not always a question of what a member says in the House.

Mr. Lindsay: It is what he thinks.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Some member keeps on saying something that another man has said or intended to say, and comes to believe that it is what the other member did say.

and it is gradually assumed that those are indeed the remarks made by the member in question. Last November I entered my protest against the lack of attention paid to the agricultural areas, and I repeat it to-day. A redistribution of seats is necessary, but the Government have not dealt as fairly with the agricultural districts as they might have done. The Premier may say there are so many foreigners in the State and that they account for the discrepancy in the figures. I guarantee that in the Avon electorate there are 1,000 persons who are not on the roll. During the ensuing months I intend to see that most of them are placed on the roll. As Country Party representatives we know that many names are not on the roll. Although the Premier and the Minister for Railways have said it is intended to enforce the compulsory provisions of the Act, I have not yet seen any activity in that direction. Between the figures given by the Electoral Department and those given by the Statistical Department there is a discrepancy of 14,305. In the metropolitan area the difference is only 998. This suggests there has been a pretty good canvass there. We know that the same house to house canvass has not been made in the agricultural areas, and it is largely due to the activity of members that the rolls there are as good as they are. I wish also to express my opinion that the quota applying to central goldfields seats is wrong, though it is too late now to attempt to alter that feature. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy), to take one example, can get up in the morning, after sleeping in his own bed, and visit any part of his own electorate before lunch. Again, the Premier can get into a sleeper, be in Kalgoorlie by lunch time, and visit any part of his electorate during the afternoon. No one would have the temerity to compare the position of a member representing what I may term a goldfields metropolitan seat with the position of either the member for Murchison or the member for Kanowna. It is utterly wrong to place crowded centres on the same footing as widely-spread and scattered areas. Certainly I feel keenly on this matter. The position to-day, under the old regime, is unsatisfactory. Though I shall vote for the Bill, it will be very reluctantly; and I do not intend to vote in support of a continuance of the present state of affairs. Having made an analysis of the debate which has taken place, I have

been astounded to see how little time has really been spent on its discussion; and three-quarters of that time has been occupied by this side of the House. We have heard very little indeed from the other side. We expected that some hon. members opposite would be up in arms against the measure, but so far they have been very quiet on the subject. I think everyone now knows where I stand.

MR. CHESSON (Cue) [5.3]: I agree with some members of the Country Party who have spoken on the Bill. Before the boundaries of Assembly electorates were re-adjusted, the electoral rolls should have been brought up to date. It is true that we have compulsory enrolment, but in the outlying districts there are not the facilities for enrolment which obtain in the city or in fairly large towns. Travelling around the stations in the back parts of the State, one never sees any claim cards. I acknowledge, naturally, that any person sufficiently interested can write to the Electoral Department and be supplied with a claim card; but if there were facilities on the stations for enrolment, the people there would enrol freely. If the city people were situated similarly to outback residents, many of them would be off the roll. Mail communication with stations is probably once a fortnight, and so one can easily understand why so many people out back are disfranchised. I repeat, in the first instance we should have endeavoured to bring the rolls up to date. The present Commissioners were appointed under the 1923 Act, and with practically the same powers as the previous Commissioners. When last session's Act was passed practically without opposition, I understood that the Commissioners to be appointed would also readjust the boundaries of Council provinces. We find that the Commissioners were not empowered to do that, although the terms of their commission were the same as those of the last. I realise, further, that difficulties will be encountered when proposals are introduced next session to adjust Council boundaries. For one thing, there will be difficulty in getting such a measure passed by another place. Time and again Bills sent from this Chamber to the Council have failed to reach the second reading stage there. I realise what will happen when next session's Bill goes forward. Measures passed by the Assembly for the reform of

the Council have hitherto received scant attention in another place. The proposed Bill will receive similar treatment. Another place has the last say in respect of practically every measure. In my opinion, the one readjustment hinges on the other. What applies to Assembly readjustments applies also to Council readjustments, and therefore the one should be contingent upon the other. Further, it was understood that when five Assembly seats were above or below the quota, the officers of the Electoral Department would automatically readjust the boundaries. At present a great deal of development is going on in various parts of the State, and probably a considerable proportion of our population will move to new centres. It is 18 years since the last redistribution of seats was made, and probably another 18 years will elapse before there is a further redistribution. What possible chance, then, have new centres of population now being created of obtaining due representation? Before the Meekatharra railway is finished, the Government will have spent £324,000 in that district. Let hon. members take note of the developments now occurring at Wiluna. The mining company there are embarking on a housing scheme for the whole of their employees, married and single; and they intend to employ a large number of people. With Wiluna continuing to develop as it is doing, there will shortly be 5,000 people at that centre. Wiluna itself then will be entitled to a member. Again, take the developments in the Cue electorate. Reidy's mining proposition is under option to a big company, which, according to the prospectus, will have a working capital of £50,000. Anyone acquainted with mining matters will know that a large number of men must be employed at Reidy's. I say without fear of contradiction that the bores put down at the 'Big Bell' gave the best results that have been obtained for a long time. The values are such as to show that there must soon be a large population in that district. The Bill proposes to merge Cue and Meekatharra into one electorate—two places with every prospect of a large population in the near future. These mining propositions cannot be worked on a small scale. They must be worked on a large scale, and they will employ large numbers of hands. Had this Bill come forward two years later, I am sure

that in the Cue electorate I would have had my quota, and that Wiluna by itself would have had more than the quota. In the absence of provision for automatic readjustment of boundaries, I intend to vote against the Bill. I fully realise it may be said that self-preservation is the first law of nature, and that I am voting simply to save myself. However, seeing the developments that are in progress and in the absence of automatic readjustment of boundaries I consider myself entitled to give consideration to the people who gave me political birth.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What if everybody said that?

Mr. CHESSON: Those people had the opportunity of turning me down, and I have been returned time and again. When a Bill means that at a time of good developments the Cue seat is to be merged in the Murchison, I shall be found voting against the measure. I repeat, I shall consider the people responsible for my political birth. I take no notice of the instruction that has been given by the metropolitan Press how to vote on the measure. That instruction does not concern me in the least. I am concerned about my electors. I am not concerned whether five seats are to be added to the metropolitan area or to other areas. Two seats practically are to be taken from the Murchison. If anybody can show me the community of interest between Mt. Magnet and Leonora, I shall be glad to learn what it is. The Sandstone line is the nearest line, and the service is fortnightly. In view of the distance from Sandstone to Leonora, I say there will be more community of interest when the line to Wiluna is completed. Again, what community of interest exists between Mt. Margaret and Esperance? For the life of me, I cannot see any suggestion of community of interest between Mt. Margaret and Esperance? I will not take up any more of the time of the House in debating the Bill at greater length. I have stated very definitely what attitude I shall adopt regarding the measure, and I shall vote against the Bill.

MR. COWAN (Mt. Leonora) [5.16]: Like other members who have spoken, I feel I am justified in voicing my opposition to the Bill, because of the form it has taken. I will deal only with that portion of the State with which I am well acquainted. During the debate last night one hon. member said that it was not fair to discuss the work of the Com-

mission. For my part I shall avail myself of the privilege of doing so. It is proper that we should exercise our right to criticise any work that is of such importance to the State and to the people generally. Particularly do I feel it incumbent upon me to voice my criticism of the way in which the Bill has been drafted, when I find that Leonora is surrounded by Mt. Margaret on one side, by Cue on another, and by Menzies in another direction. We considered that Mt. Leonora was a central seat. I was under the impression that one of the greatest factors to be considered by the Commission was the question of community of interest. In addition there was the means of communication existing between different parts of the country. When I find that Mt. Margaret, which is right out in the back country, has been extended so as to be associated with Esperance Bay, I cannot for the life of me see where the question of community of interest enters into it at all. On the other hand, the Cue electorate extends up to the Murchison and portion of the Menzies constituency goes down to keep the name of good old Pat Hannan on the map. Thus, we have Leonora left as an orphan of the back country; no one wants her; she has to be adopted by Mt. Magnet, which is at least 250 miles away from Leonora. Where can there be any community of interest in such circumstances? There is no railway communication between the two sections. When I was elected to my present position, I gave my constituents an undertaking that, to the best of my ability, I would look after their interests on every occasion. I shall honour that promise by opposing the Bill. Like the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson), I noticed that a certain section of the metropolitan Press, when commenting on the Bill, stated that if the measure were defeated, any member who supported the present Government but voted against the measure, would be asked some awkward questions when next he came before the electors. It is just possible that I may be facing the electors at the next general election, and it is certainly a pronounced fact that I have every intention of opposing the Bill. At the same time I know of no reason why I or any other goldfields member should be ashamed to face the electors on the next occasion. I am responsible only to those who placed me in my present position, with respect to any vote I may cast on the floor of the House. That being

so, I am not concerned at all with any criticism that may be indulged in by the metropolitan Press. Owing to the activities that are being undertaken at Wiluna, there is a brighter prospect for mining in the back country at present than for many years past. We all hope, and expect, that Wiluna will prove to be a successful field. Should that be the result of the operations there, many other old mines that had to be closed down on account of treatment problems will be opened up again. I am certainly not going to cast a vote that will sacrifice any goldfields seat at the present time for the sake of giving further power and greater centralisation to the metropolitan area. I shall not agree to five new seats being provided for this part of the State. I am fully aware that there are a large number of pioneers to be found in St. George's-terrace. If they were taken five miles away from the Town Hall clock, they could not find their way back, and yet we are asked to give them more representation! People are urged to go into the back country, where there are wonderful possibilities. I am pleased to be able to acknowledge that there are wonderful possibilities in the back country, but when we ask people to go out and develop that country—

Mr. Withers: Then they lose their representation in Parliament!

Mr. COWAN: That is the way we encourage those people; we rob them of their representation in this House! Is that any form of encouragement for men who are battling in the back country?

Mr. Latham: The metropolitan people are trying to do with those in the back country what Sydney and Melbourne are doing with Western Australia.

Mr. COWAN: Many of the industries that are flourishing in and around the metropolitan area owe their very existence to the goldfields and the outlying districts of the State. While I am member of this House, I intend to do my best to hold on to the few remaining seats we have for the goldfields.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [5.23]: One of the points I have noticed, and have been utterly unable to understand during the course of the debate, is the outlook possessed by those members who say that the Bill is not a fair one, that it is not what they want, that they do not like

it, and yet they will support it. I cannot understand that sort of thing at all. I share the common interest shown in this very fascinating Bill. It is a great pity it is not as fair as it is fascinating. We have waited a long time for the Bill and therefore it is all the more to be regretted that it is not more generally acceptable to hon. members. It is a pity it is not fairer and of a more permanent description, so far as such a Bill can be permanent in view of the changing face of the State, and I am sorry it does not give an equal measure of justice to every section of the community. I suppose that every member will freely admit that the three quite wise and honest gentlemen who undertook the task have given of their level best in their laborious preparation of this most important Bill. The result is that, though they have been true enough to their instructions, the Commissioners have provided a Bill that is a long way from being a good or useful measure. That is largely, I suppose, on account of the restrictions imposed upon the Commissioners, and because of the rotten foundations on which they were told to frame a Bill. There seems to be an opinion prevalent amongst a section of the Opposition members that it is incumbent upon our honour to accept the Bill just as it stands. With all due respect to those hon. members, such a suggestion seems to me to be highly preposterous. It is true that we delegated a certain definite task to the Commission, but just as assuredly we retained the right to supervise and amend, if we deem it necessary, the fruits of their labours. Admittedly, the three Commissioners were qualified to undertake the task. There is not the slightest doubt about that. But what about the 50 members of this House, with their aggregation of electoral wisdom and their wide experience in matters of this description, to say nothing of their vital interest in such a measure? Surely members must be qualified to amend the work of the Commissioners should they deem it necessary to do so. They could even go to the extent of destroying the Bill if they saw fit. I cannot agree for one moment that it would be improper for us to deal with the Bill as we consider best in the interests of the State. I cannot agree that we must decline to discuss the Bill because it happens to be of great interest to members personally. I was

not a member of this House at the time, but the newspapers enable me to recall the fact that three years ago, when members had before them a Bill to increase their salaries, they then considered a Bill in which they were personally interested. I do not know that there was any disinclination on the part of the House to deal with that particular Bill. There are some members here who seem to lose sight of the fact that the Bill is intended to become an Act of Parliament. We would imagine from the speeches of some hon. members that the measure would be designated as an Act of the Commissioners. On the other hand, as the Bill is an act or action of Parliament, we surely are entitled to do what we consider best with our own measure. As to whether the measure meets with the approval of the electors in the agricultural areas, I can definitely say that it certainly does not meet with the approval of my constituents. It meets with their most definite disapproval. I have discussed it with some fifty odd electors in my constituency, and I found only about half a dozen who were prompted to voice an excuse for the Bill. Probably the most potent argument regarding that phase of the Bill to which my party takes exception, found expression in the figures supplied by the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson). He pointed out, and I do not remember anyone disputing his statement, that there were 14,335 electors in the rural areas whose names did not appear on the rolls. On the face of that it would seem that the country areas are entitled to four new members.

Mr. Withers: If those names were put on the rolls, we would be accused of stuffing them.

Mr. DONEY: That statement was not disputed yesterday. Instead of the country members being increased by four, we are asked to agree to four extra members for the metropolitan area. I cannot see any sense or fairness in such proposal. In my own electorate I should say that on a most conservative basis at least 500 people are not enrolled, and I can quite imagine that the same condition of affairs exists in other electorates.

Mr. Davy: Are those 500 supposed to be all men?

Mr. DONEY: Men and women.

Mr. Davy: And children?

Mr. DONEY: I do not think children come into the argument. I most intensely dislike the Bill because of its tendency towards centralisation. On that score alone it must be resented by primary producers, be they engaged in mining, pastoral or farming pursuits.

Mr. Latham: That is what the Press like.

Mr. DONEY: The Bill seeks to put in the hands of members representing metropolitan constituencies such power as will enable them to control the rural areas, and for that matter the whole State. That, to my mind, is definitely wrong and the Bill perpetuates that wrong. It is quite correct to claim that there are strange and stupid electoral anomalies existent on the goldfields, but I cannot for the life of me see that it is right to rectify those anomalies at the expense of the rural areas, especially since by so doing we shall be bringing into being another set of anomalies as strange and stupid as those to be abolished. Members of the Country Party regard themselves as the custodians of the interests of the country districts. Having regard to that fact I consider it to be a highly immoral procedure to trade away our future strength for just the mere possibility of some immediate gain. To help the enemy—if I may use the term—so to entrench himself that by-and-bye he may be immune from successful assault is not likely to commend itself to anyone with common sense. I consider that we country members need to be constantly on the alert to maintain the relations between the city and country at precisely their proper economic balance.

The Premier: The city man is just as good a citizen as is the man in the country.

Mr. North: And just as necessary.

Mr. DONEY: It is essential that we in Western Australia should not permit to arise here a situation similar to that existent in the capital cities of the Eastern States. On the other side of the continent we have the disquieting spectacle of hugely overgrown Sydney and Melbourne sucking the life-blood out of their respective States. We do not want Perth to become such as that. Sydney and Melbourne control the situation over there, and control it to the disadvantage of all. There should certainly be no repetition of that state of affairs in Western Australia. Some people have strange ideas as

to the position of Perth in the general scheme of things, and it is time we recognised that Perth is here for the general convenience of the State. She is a servant of the State, and is expected to use herself for the advancement of the State. We cannot permit Perth so to grow as to govern this State. If we give to the metropolitan area a big stick in the shape of five additional seats, no doubt the metropolitan area will not scruple to use it.

The Premier: Can you point to any occasion when metropolitan members have voted against anything for the well being of the country districts?

Mr. DONEY: I am bearing in mind that there is antagonism, unspoken possibly but none the less definite, between metropolitan and country areas.

Mr. Richardson: And the antagonism always comes from the Country Party, not from the metropolitan members.

Mr. DONEY: That is the hon. member's opinion.

Mr. Richardson: It is my opinion.

Mr. Davy: There is a greater number of country representatives, you know.

Mr. DONEY: I would not mind arguing that point with the member for West Perth. If I may be permitted to proceed with my remarks, let me say that Perth should not be allowed to grow beyond the point where it is useful. The bigger Perth grows, the more it costs the country to keep. This is a point the Premier will possibly appreciate, that we need our surplus wheat and wool for export and debt payment purposes and not to feed and clothe an inordinately overgrown Perth. For the national good, for her own ultimate good, Perth must not be allowed to increase in representation, in mere size or in strength beyond its usefulness.

The Minister for Works: Not grow beyond its usefulness!

Mr. DONEY: I give that opinion quite seriously. The Bill is intended to provide for a redistribution of seats in order to give a more equitable representation of the people. The question is, will the Bill, if passed into law, secure that result? I do not think it will, and naturally I am definitely opposed to it. I imagine that members have already gathered so much from my remarks. If the five seats must be taken from the back country—and no one doubts the correctness

ot so doing—then other things being equal, and it so happens they are equal, those seats should be retained in the country in common fairness to the country. But just because all the good things of life seem to have a habit of gravitating towards Perth—higher and easier education, the best of entertainments and the lighter pleasures of life, transport facilities and modern domestic comforts, etc.—it is not to say that everything should follow suit. In this case there are five seats under offer, and despite the obvious defects of the country areas a certain section of the Opposition want the lot, and they even have the cast-iron nerve—it would be amusing if the result of the passing of the Bill were not so tragic—to turn round and solicitously advise the Country Party for their own good to take the Bill lying down. I do not think we are likely to oblige. Still, in spite of all this, I believe wholly in the bona fides of the contending parties in this debate. I know human nature is such that it is possible for all of us to be unconsciously blinded by our own selfish interests, and I am always ready to include myself amongst the biggest sinners in that respect. Nevertheless I want no one to think I shall benefit by the rejection of this Bill. I definitely shall not. Contrariwise it would suit me if the Bill were passed into law, since it would result in my having a very much easier time in the shape of less work and less expense. At present I do not get one tiny bit of leisure in the work of representing my electorate. I have heard certain members of the Nationalist Party take credit to themselves because they are not squealing about the Bill. Of course they are not squealing; they have not been hurt. I notice, by the way, that it is very easy to gauge the effects of the Bill on the three parties in this House. With Government supporters it seems to be a matter of complete indifference; so far as the Nationalist Party are concerned, of hot support; and in the case of the Country Party of complete dissatisfaction.

Mr. Lindsay: No, that is not quite right.

Mr. DONEY: Perhaps not "complete" dissatisfaction; I recall the word "complete." My idea of equitable representation is to have quotas based as follows: one vote in the North-West to equal two votes in the outer settled areas; two votes in the outer settled areas to equal four votes in the agri-

cultural areas, and four votes in the agricultural areas to equal eight votes in the metropolitan area—

Mr. North: Democracy, eh?

Mr. DONEY: With due provision for growth of population in those parts where growth seems likely, and also with power to the Commission to apply special quotas in special cases. A necessary preliminary, of course, is that the rolls should be thoroughly purged. Now just a word in conclusion. If this Bill had been a fair Bill, I imagine that it would have received the support of all parties. It would certainly have received my support. As it is, I am desirous of its rejection in the hope that, in due course, it may, shorn of its inequities and inequalities, again be submitted to this House.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.41]: A peculiar argument seems to have arisen during the debate in which the interests of the country have been compared with those of the city. I regret that anything of the kind should have been introduced, because a member of Parliament, in addition to representing specially his own electorate, should also represent the whole State.

Mr. North: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: We are trying to protect the interests of the whole State.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have the honour to represent an agricultural district.

Mr. Chesson: Oh, have you?

Mr. Latham: The Commissioners did not quite agree with that. They said quite a lot of people living there travel from the city.

Mr. SAMPSON: They said that, because Swan is in close proximity to the city, they had allocated the largest number of constituents to that electorate. That seems to be a reasonable and proper thing to do.

The Premier: Because the hon. member was better able to represent a larger number than were some other members.

Mr. SAMPSON: My native modesty did not enable me to read that into the report.

The Premier: That was in the minds of the Commissioners.

Mr. Latham: The Commissioners said Swan was largely composed of city workers.

Mr. SAMPSON: No one will say that I have not done the utmost in my power for any and every part of the State. Members as a whole are particularly interested

in the agricultural districts. On the first occasion on which I had the honour of speaking in this House I said that if we looked after the country the city would look after itself. That is a fact.

Mr. Thomson: And you propose to do it by robbing it of its representation.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe I can show the hon. member that opposition to the Bill will not be in the interests of the State. We are Western Australians, and we are under an obligation to do what to us seems best for Western Australia as a State. In saying that, I do not wish to imply or cast any doubt on the principles or honour of those members who oppose the measure. I say that the Bill is not all I would like it to be, and naturally I would prefer that the agricultural districts should receive greater representation, but this is the best Bill we can get for the time being at all events, and surely it is better to take half a loaf than to get no bread at all.

The Premier: I say they are getting a full loaf in relationship to citizens in other parts of the State.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not quite sure that the Premier is correct there, because the country is growing, and it seems to me that it has not received the representation it should have in view of the importance of the agricultural industry and the steady decline of goldfields population. Let us consider the position that will be brought about if the Bill is carried. It will have the effect of wiping out five goldfields electorates—Coolgardie, Cue, Menzies, Leonora, and Mount Margaret, as separate electorates.

The Minister for Mines: It will not wipe out Coolgardie.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, as a separate electorate. It will reduce the number of seats on the goldfields by five.

The Minister for Mines: Coolgardie is not one of the seats that will go.

Mr. SAMPSON: Coolgardie will lose its separate identity; it will become part of Yilgarn-Coolgardie. The result will be a reduction in the number of goldfields members by five, and I will repeat them in spite of the Minister for Mines.

The Minister for Mines: No, don't; we know them well.

Mr. SAMPSON: And I will give the number of electors in the five.

The Minister for Mines: We know that too.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am aware that everyone knows the numbers by heart, but I may be permitted to quote them for the last time. These are the figures—859, 463, 279, 670 and 415, giving us an aggregate of 2,681. On the other hand, it is proposed to provide five additional metropolitan electorates which, with the mean number of electors of 6,531 will represent a total of 32,655. If we defeat the Bill, the present boundaries must continue. There is no logic in declaring that if we cannot get everything we want we will not take anything at all. That would not appeal to your logical mind, Mr. Speaker, or to the mind of any member of the House. I cannot follow the arguments that have been advanced against the Bill. If the Bill be rejected, we shall continue to have held up before us those dreadful anomalies of Menzies with 279 and Canning with 19,221.

The Premier: Poor Menzies again!

Mr. SAMPSON: Is that not a shocking thing to contemplate? Yet we find members using arguments in favour of the rejection of the Bill. Briefly, I have set out where I stand. I regard it as my duty to support the Bill. Time after time, hundreds of times in fact, the position in respect of the electorates in Western Australia has been referred to as one of the greatest electoral scandals in the Commonwealth. The position has been brought about by the decline of the goldfields population. I trust that members will vote for the Bill and, as far as it will permit, we shall then alter the position as it exists to-day. Unquestionably, the Bill will make for more equitable representation and I honestly believe that the State will be the better for that more equitable representation.

MR. C. P. WANSBROUGH (Beverley) [5.51]: My remarks in connection with the Bill will be brief. Previous speakers have approved of the boundaries; I have no complaint to make with regard to my own electorate, and I agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat that this matter should not be approached from the point of view of the member, but should be looked at in the interests of the State. I draw the attention of the House to the middle map on the wall and to the small portion in the centre measuring 7 inches by 1½ inches and cover-

ing an area roughly 70 miles long by 15 miles wide. That territory has four representatives and I would compare it with the area surrounding it, also returning four members and in size roughly 750 miles square. I ask members whether that is a fair proposition.

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I say emphatically it is not. There is even a greater anomaly when we compare the metropolitan seats with the country seats. It is because of these anomalies that I cannot support the Bill. I am not going to be a party to establishing a precedent on the population basis as against the primary industries and community of interest. I would rather continue the present anomaly which has been brought about by the national decline of one primary industry—gold mining—than assist to establish another anomaly which must be detrimental to the existing primary industries and which have been brought to this stage by the efforts of individuals, approved by the Government.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: How many farms do the town people own?

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I am not speaking of farms; I am saying that I do not intend to be a party to creating another anomaly by giving the metropolitan area increased representation over the country districts, which, since the last redistribution, have increased in ratio almost to the same extent as has the metropolitan area. If for no other reason, I intend to vote against the Bill. We previously entered our protest against the Electoral Districts Act when it was before us last session, and anything I can do at this stage to emphasise that protest I shall do, even to knocking out the Bill. Last night the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) indulged in a gibe against the Leader of the Country Party. But he and some of his friends sitting around him have shown us that it is their intention to grab with both hands the proposal that has been submitted by the Government in the hope that they will benefit by the re-shuffle, benefit to the extent of increasing their strength in this House. They lose sight of the country's interests in the glamour of the city's prospects. We, the members of the Country Party, stand for those whose interests are in the country. Thus we stand for the State as a whole. Under the Bill the country interests are not getting a fair deal. Therefore, it is my intention to oppose the second reading.

MR. FERGUSON (Moore) [5.56]: It is my intention to vote against the second reading of the Bill. As one who on more than one occasion has expressed a view that the time has long gone by when we should have a redistribution of seats, I desire to explain my reasons for opposing the Bill. In the proposed redistribution we have a considerable number of anomalies. Reference has been made to the small electorates on the goldfields and my friend the member for Menzies has had many a gibe hurled at him because of the comparative handful of electors he represents. It would be preferable for the future of the State to go on with the existing anomalies, at any rate, for a few years, rather than create new ones which would be harmful to the country districts. I would prefer that the Menzies electorate, with its 300 odd electors, and Canning, with its 19,000, should remain as they are at the present time rather than take away from the goldfields five seats and give them to the metropolitan area. It seems to me that the proposed redistribution scheme is something in the nature of an unholy alliance between those members who represent the thickly populated metropolitan area and the thickly populated central goldfields areas. Now we have the position of giving a quota of 2,000 to the goldfields and pastoral areas. On the face of it, that is distinctly unfair. I heartily approve of the pastoral areas having a quota of 2,000, but for the central goldfields to have a quota of 2,000 and the agricultural areas a quota of 4,000 seems to me to be manifestly unfair. Take an electorate such as that represented by the Premier or by the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies. Those gentlemen have a daily train service to their electorates and when they arrive there they have no trouble, with the aid of a motor car, in reaching any part of the electorate in half an hour. If I desire to go to portions of my electorate I get there only by means of a train which runs three times a week, and when I do get there, it will take me a month to drive around it in a car. Thus it will be recognised that the task of representing an electorate such as mine is much heavier than that of representing a goldfields constituency. So to that extent I heartily disapprove of the quota that has been arranged. The number that has been allotted to the metropolitan area must of course be larger than that in scattered districts. But

no comparison can be made of the work that devolves upon a member representing such a district. In the metropolitan area the electors can get in touch with their member in five minutes. Moreover, they live at the door of the administrative offices of the Government, and so have much better opportunity to get their wants attended to than have those living 200 or 300 miles from the seat of government. The foundations on which this report was based are absolutely rotten. It is not right that the House should accept a report that has been built up on such rotten foundations.

Mr. Davy: Why did not you say they were rotten when the Electoral Districts Bill was before Parliament?

Mr. FERGUSON: On the second reading of that Bill I moved that the debate be adjourned. The Leader of the House refused to agree to that. I was not prepared to speak on that occasion.

Mr. Teesdale: You had not got your orders then.

Mr. Thomson: Evidently you have got yours. You ought to talk!

Mr. Teesdale: I will give you something when I get a chance to talk.

Mr. FERGUSON: I moved that the debate be adjourned so that the Leader of the Country Party might have an opportunity to express his views.

The Premier: There was ample opportunity for discussion. Why should the business of the country be hung up until the hon. member should get back?

Mr. Thomson: You have done it before for others.

Mr. FERGUSON: It is usual for country representatives to attend the agricultural shows in their electorates. The Leader of the Country Party was at the Katanning show when the Bill was being discussed. That Bill was before us only three days.

The Premier: It was here as long as it was necessary to be here. It went through only when no one else wanted to discuss it.

Mr. FERGUSON: The hon. member was attending the principal show in his electorate.

Mr. Davy: But you were present to carry on.

The Premier: This is an eleventh hour discovery that the foundations are rotten.

Mr. FERGUSON: There is no eleventh hour about it. I have discussed the proposals with a good many of my electors, and I have not found one that approves of it. The House will acquit me of having any axe to grind, because the boundaries of this proposed re-distribution suit my convenience much better than do the existing ones. But members ought to be above taking the view of their own personal convenience; they should consider the interests of the State. My view is that the back country has not been treated rightly, and on that account I will oppose the Bill. I have been amazed at the number of members who have risen and declared that the Bill is not as good as they would like it to be, notwithstanding which they will support it. For my part I am going to oppose anything that I think is not in the best interests of Western Australia.

MR. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [6.5]: I should not have had anything to say but for the remark made by the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson). I fully recognise that in about two and a half minutes' time the hon. member or some of his crowd will call attention to the fact that I should not say anything on this Bill, because it gives me a safe seat. I never asked that my seat should be made safe. It would have suited me quite well if they had shifted my boundaries, for then I could have got some of my stalwart labour friends up there to give me their support, which I am sure they would have done. In 12 years' experience of Parliament I have never heard such petty, despicable howling as we have heard over this Bill. Numbers of members of the Country Party who have spoken on the Bill started off quite impartially, but before speaking for two minutes their own petty, little, crawling, personal matters came into it and one could see that they were afraid of losing their seats. Even the Leader of the Country Party is not too sure that he can get through. At the next elections he will have the time of his life in trying to get back to this Chamber. Just now he is inclined to insult everybody.

Mr. Latham: On a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in imputing motives.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know what the hon. member has imputed. So far as

I can gather, his is not a personal reference directed at any individual member, but a general reference.

The Premier: That is so, it is general.

Mr. TEESDALE: The member for Williams-Narrogin and the member for Mt. Margaret—

The Premier: Now you will get into trouble if you start to particularise.

Mr. TEESDALE: The member for Williams-Narrogin particularly called attention to the fact that the proposals suited him. He was speaking on principle, for the good of the State at large. The proposed redistribution did not affect him at all. Everybody knows why he opposes the Bill. It is because of that meeting the other day when Lord God Almighty Padbury came up and gave them all their orders.

Mr. Thomson: On a point of order: I ask that that statement be withdrawn. It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. TEESDALE: You are not Padbury.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection has been taken to a statement. What are the exact words objected to?

Mr. Thomson: The hon. member said that Mr. Padbury came up here and attended our caucus meeting.

Mr. TEESDALE: I did not.

Mr. Thomson: Well, he said that Mr. Padbury came up and gave orders. That is offensive, and I desire that it be withdrawn.

Mr. TEESDALE: May I explain that I did not mention—

Mr. SPEAKER: No. Objection has been taken to the statement.

Mr. TEESDALE: Very well, I withdraw.

The Premier: He was here, but may not have given any orders.

Mr. TEESDALE: It is well known that the gentleman was here, and he did not come here by way of a joke.

Mr. Doney: I want to take exception to a previous statement by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: We cannot go back.

Mr. Doney: Well, I ask whether I would be in order in calling the hon. member a liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will not offend the House by making any such statement or even suggestion.

Mr. TEESDALE: He would not have done it 15 years ago.

The Premier: You might even say ten years ago.

Mr. TEESDALE: Yes, I will say ten years ago. I cannot but express my opinion that those members who have spoken against the Bill have invariably opposed it because they are frightened of losing their seats; and those not frightened of losing their seats have had their orders. No member can take any exception to that, for the reference is general.

Mr. Doney: Personally I have no fears in the matter.

Member: He is not right, anyhow.

Mr. Thomson: No, he is what the hon. member would like to call him.

Mr. TEESDALE: You are very good in calling old men names.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope members will have some respect for the House, if not for themselves.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, Sir, I desire to withdraw that remark of mine.

Mr. TEESDALE: I regret that this debate probably will be sent all over the world and people will come to the conclusion that the majority of members, especially of the Country Party, are very thick-skinned, and in addition are afraid of losing their political skins. In consequence they are trying to defeat the Bill, although they never made the slightest fuss about it when the Electoral Districts Act was first introduced.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [6.10]: I have a few remarks to make.

Mr. Panton: Well, do not forget to mention Menzies.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I apologise for having no intention of mentioning Menzies; because already Menzies and Canning have been mentioned so very often. I wish to make myself as clear as I possibly can. After the last speaker, one taking up the attitude I have taken up must do so in fear and trembling. The member for Roebourne has accused every member who is not in favour of the Bill of having some ulterior motive and of receiving instructions from somebody.

Mr. Teesdale: Have you, too, joined the Country Party?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I want to tell the hon. member that I will vote against the second reading of the Bill, that I have not received instructions from anybody, but

that I have had pressure put upon me to vote for it. There you are! That cannot be contradicted.

Mr. Teesdale: A terrible state of affairs.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I want to tell the hon. member that he does not know everything, much as he may know. It is very fitting that the member for Roebourne should accuse any other member of recording a vote to save his skin, merely because that member is opposed to the Bill. Also it is extremely discourteous of the hon. member while in a safe corner untouched by the Commission to point the finger at other members who have been seriously touched.

Mr. Teesdale: I prepared for you.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I would not have made these remarks but for the unbecoming and uncalled for statements by the robust member for Roebourne.

The Premier: Never mind, he will grow yet.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I cannot let the Bill pass without giving reasons for opposing it. Could anybody look at the map and ask whether I, the member for Mount Margaret, having represented that electorate for 28 years, would be justified in voting for a Bill which places all my electors except 30 into the Kanowna electorate, which takes in Esperance?

The Premier: What is the total there now?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is 380.

The Premier: The area looks a lot, but the numbers are not so impressive.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The electorate is all the more difficult to represent on account of its small numbers. The Premier draws from me a comparison with that tiny little area on the map, having about 8,400 voters and four representatives. One could cover that area with a blanket. Now take the other area.

The Premier: The Bill is not to give representation to square miles; it is to give fair representation to the people of the country. People, not square miles, are the basis of it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Act of 1923 gave certain directions to the Commissioners. First there was physical features, then there was community of interest, and then transit. All those things had to be taken into consideration.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Before tea I was drawing attention to the boundaries laid down on the map for the Kanowna electorate, which embraces Mt. Margaret. In my opinion these boundaries are not in keeping with the directions laid down in the Act. The Act provides that the Commissioners shall give due consideration to community of interest, means of communication and distance from capital, physical features, and the existing boundaries of districts. Can anyone tell me that there is any community of interest between the people of Laverton and those of Esperance? Laverton is about 586 miles from Perth. It is 580 miles from Perth to Esperance, and 727 miles from Perth to the South Australian border. It is 375 miles to Kalgoorlie from the starting point. A person would have to travel 1,568 miles from Perth on the outward journey before he could reach the railhead on each of the lines in the present Kanowna electorate. No one knows one portion of that electorate better than you, Sir. You must have realised during the last campaign the difficulty of getting through that portion of the Trans-Australian line which goes about 442 miles from Kalgoorlie to the South Australian border. There are 18 to 20 stations on that line, and a candidate would necessarily have to visit each of those stations. It would take several days, catching a train each day, to reach the other end. There is a train known as the tea and sugar train. If it be, Sir, that you and I are contesting that seat, this would be a very appropriate train for us to go by. If it happened to be a beer train, I do not suppose we would get many votes along that line, for people would think we were there to move for prohibition. I cannot see any community of interest between the top area—Eristoun—and Esperance, if I am any judge of the auriferous country of Western Australia. I might as well be told there is community of interest between Nedlands and Albany. The railhead on the one hand is at Laverton, and candidates have to go 100 miles further to address their electors. They have to go between 80 and 90 miles out from the railway to all portions of Mt. Margaret now attached to the Kanowna electorate. It is a most unwieldy electorate. One is expected to say that the Commissioners have taken into consideration the points laid down in the Act when arranging the boundaries for this part of the State.

Mr. Sampson: The number of electors also had to be taken into consideration.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: On the map there is a small portion marked "Inset." Within that area are 8,440 voters. Look at the area of four of the constituencies. On the map we find they are about 6ft. by 6ft. in size, and others are 8in. by 1½in. Take the Hannans electorate, one of the four I could cover with a blanket. According to the report of the Commissioners, this had 578 electors, or 1,427 below the quota. To make up the anticipated difference between 578 and 1,826, the Commissioners took portions of other electorates, namely from Menzies and Kalgoorlie. The Hannans electorate could well have been cut out and Coolgardie left. When the instructions were given to the Commissioners, no one anticipated that they would carve up Mt. Margaret, Menzies and Leonora in the way they have done. There is no community of interest between Mt. Magnet and Leonora.

Mr. Sampson: Not in a pastoral aspect?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No, nor in a journalistic aspect. Anyone going to Mt. Magnet has to go along the Wongan Hills or Geraldton line for a great distance, and then come back and go through Kalgoorlie, Menzies and Leonora, unless he goes across country by motor or some other conveyance.

Mr. Sampson: I have been over that country recently.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But for a different purpose from what I have been over it.

Mr. Panton: After you had pioneered the track.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am justified in arguing that the Commission did not carry out their duties in accordance with the instructions laid down. They have put Mt. Margaret, Menzies and Leonora into areas which are not arranged in the best interests of the electors or of the State. If they had known a little more of the country they would have made the division in a more satisfactory manner. No one dreamed when we passed the Act that those three electorates would be dissociated from each other. It was the general opinion that they must go into one, and draw their quota from the Kalgoorlie area. When the Bill went through last year you, Sir, were in the position I was in when the Bill of 1923 went through. In 1923 I was in the position of Speaker. I was silent on the matter, but I had to fight that silence at the last election. The member for Menzies (Mr. Panton) came into my electorate and told my electors in my hearing—he did not want to say anything behind my back—

that "the member for Mt. Margaret who has represented you all these years supported the Government that brought down a Bill to take from you two-thirds of your political power, and to give you one member for three electorates. Now he comes to you and asks you to return him again. Can you return a man who will vote your political freedom from you to that extent?" It would ill-become me, having had the confidence of my electors for 28 years, to sit in silence on this question, when their electorate is being attached to a portion of the State that is not in sympathy with them. For that reason alone I am justified in emphasising my protest against this Bill. There are other considerations too numerous for me to deal with to-night. We heard the member for Leonora in no unmeasured terms dealing with the matter. As a new member he acquitted himself in good style in defence of his people. I think he did exceedingly well. I am glad when members will stand up for the people who have stood up for them. No one will take the seat from the member for Northam. It is perfectly safe.

Mr. Sampson: He would be a good man who would wrest it from him.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is always safe.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Bill may favour certain members by making their seats more safe for them than they are now. If they support the Bill I am not going to accuse them of ulterior motives or of supporting the measure for personal reasons.

The Premier: You are only complaining that it has made yours unsafe?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am not complaining about that. No matter who represents my old electorate, it cannot possibly be said that there is any community of interest between it and the people of Esperance. I believe that if you, Sir, were at liberty on the floor of the House, you would back up that statement. There is no community of interest between Mt. Magnet, Leonora and Menzies. Those three places are portion of the electorate which I represented years ago. In the early days, 27 or 28 years ago, they were all in the Mt. Margaret electorate. However, I will not stress that point. Let us take that small place shown on the map hanging on the wall of the Chamber. When one comes to look at it, it is a remarkable piece of drawing. Seeing the beautiful curves, one would think that these Commissioners were artists.

The Premier: There is an artistic touch about it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes. It is only by comparison that we judge things. Now let us cast our eyes upon the large map on the right and observe the ragged Forrest electorate.

Member: It is like a teetotum.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It starts about 30 miles away from Perth and winds up in Sussex near Kirup. Then the member for the district toboggans down and gets a sea breeze on the coast to recuperate. That Forrest electorate is a scandalous thing, according to the map. In 1911 the Collie electorate was somewhat similar in nature to the proposed Forrest electorate. Still, however bad the Collie electorate was, it had nothing at all on this Forrest electorate. The party with which I was then associated went to the country on that political rascality of the Government of the day, and won all along the line. The then Government had grid-ironed the electorates so that the people of Western Australia recognised it as the most scandalous piece of gerrymandering in the public life of any country. The electors were perfectly satisfied that the Wilson Government had not the confidence of the people, and turned them down in very good style. I wish to remind the Premier that all the Governments I have known in Western Australia, even the last Forrest Government, were unfortunate in connection with their redistributions, were defeated at the general elections following upon redistribution. That has been the fate of every Government here. Therefore, the passing of a Redistribution of Seats Bill is rather a bad omen for a Ministry. But when we find boundaries such as those of Forrest and those on the Golden Mile and in the case of Kanowna, it is about time we took some notice. Now I come to the Nelson electorate. The member for that district pointed out yesterday that there was a discrepancy; that in the report of the Commissioners the seat was placed on a wrong basis. The first column mentions the enrolment at the 31st December, 1928, and on that enrolment the Nelson electorate had 4,888 voters. As a matter of fact, there were at that time over 5,000 voters on the Nelson roll. The Commissioners gave the district credit for 4,888 votes, the actual number being 5,374. I rang up the Electoral Department to-day, and

they practically confirmed the statement of the member for Nelson. They gave me an explanation, and I want hon. members to follow this because the Electoral Department would appear to have been negligent, or to have informed the Commissioners wrongly, or else the statement of the Electoral Department was misinterpreted by the Commissioners. The explanation is that between the 30th June and the 31st December, 1928, there were 1,123 names struck off the Nelson roll—in six months—and 223 added. One knows full well that it is not possible in a growing electorate like Nelson, where group settlements have been located, to wipe off 1,100 odd names in the last six months of last year while only adding 223. Notwithstanding that, the Commissioners give the Nelson electorate credit for having 486 fewer electors than the number beyond doubt on the roll. In spite of that fact it is stated that anyone voting against the Bill is voting against the best interests of the State and voting for his own personal interests. How could the member for Nelson go back to his people after supporting a Bill based on such figures?

Mr. Lindsay: Why speak of the member for Nelson?

Mr. Sampson: That matter can be rectified.

Mr. TAYLOR: Anything can be rectified so far as the member for Swan is concerned. In connection with this redistribution of seats, four fundamental instructions were laid down for the guidance of the Commissioners—community of interest, means of communication, distance from capital and physical features, and the existing boundaries of districts. The existing boundaries of the Nelson electorate contain 486 more voters than it is given credit for. The member for Nelson pointed out that the Commissioners had started from the wrong base line, that had they started from the south and worked up they would have made a better job of it. The hon. member was honestly entitled to make that statement. It is unreasonable for members to hold that I would be justified in supporting the second reading of the Bill. I cannot bring myself to support it. I realise that the present boundaries of electorates are not what they should be. I realise that the State is capable of being divided into 50 electorates which would be fair and equitable to the

people and to this Parliament, but that carving-up which we see on those maps is not fair and equitable. It cannot be justified, and I hope the Bill will be defeated. I do want to remove any idea that those who are supporting the Bill are doing so for personal reasons, and that those who are opposing it are doing so for personal reasons, believing their seats are shaken. I know members who have indicated that their seats are rendered safer by the Bill, but that they consider the Bill is not fair and that therefore they will not vote for it. The accusations thrown at members right and left about ulterior motives are in no way justified. I am amazed that certain members, who are not affected by the redistribution, should take up such an attitude, I have entered my protest, and I will carry that protest further by opposing the second reading of the Bill.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [7.57]: While not wishing to delay the House, I must express my view that the previous speaker's remarks have quite a lot to justify them. At the same time, I realise that the Premier will have an easy task in replying to the statements which have been made. Although we are here to confirm or reject the report of the Commissioners, each member should have the courage to say exactly where he stands on this occasion. It has been suggested that those members who are going to suffer do wrong to oppose the Bill. Those whom the measure favours have very little to say on it. That has been noticeable throughout the debate, except as regards the Country Party. I do not know that the Bill makes much difference to any country seat. The mistake made lies in having passed the last session's measure before we received the report of the Commissioners. Many members were silent on that occasion, realising that the Premier in all sincerity, like the present Leader of the Opposition when Premier, brought down a Bill for the readjustment of the electoral boundaries. That Bill gave a basis upon which to work, and if that basis has been adhered to the report should be confirmed by this Chamber. In the first place we said that we would appoint Commissioners. Then it was debated whether the Commissioners should report to the Chamber, or whether their report should be accepted as final. Now we have to decide whether we are

satisfied with the Commission's report, or with our electorates as they stand.

Mr. Lindsay: Are we satisfied that the Commissioners have carried out their instructions?

Mr. WITHERS: They have done so to a certain extent, but, as the member for Mr. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) has pointed out, community of interest has not been considered as it should have been. The Forrest electorate just about takes the place of the Collie electorate under the 1923 redistribution. I am not much concerned about what has been put into my electorate, but I ask why I should be taken a distance of 40 miles to pick up 370 electors when Forrest comes within seven miles of my boundary? Why take me to the capital of the Sussex electorate? A group settlement or two have been placed in the Bunbury electorate, and those settlements have no community of interest whatever with Bunbury. So far as Bunbury is concerned, I can have no dealings with those people 30 or 40 miles away from Bunbury and only six or seven miles from Busselton. The South-West portion should have been taken as from Albany and worked upwards. The member for Collie has lost the Busselton area and the Margaret River area.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But it is still in Western Australia.

Mr. WITHERS: It is all very well for the member for Northam to interject. His seat has been made safe, and he can sit back and support the Bill. He told us that the Bill was not as good as that which he brought down in 1923, but that he was prepared to support the measure. What is the good of talking about personal interests?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think the hon. member talked about that and said he was only concerned about his own electorate.

Mr. WITHERS: It is no wonder that people are not in favour of the Bill.

Mr. Teesdale: At any rate the member for Northam had nothing to do with working it this time.

Mr. WITHERS: I did not suggest that it had been worked. I have the courage of my convictions, but I doubt if some of those who sat behind the member for Northam when he was Premier showed the courage of their convictions at that time. The Premier intimated that the Bill was a non-party measure, and I am dealing with it from that standpoint. I am not worrying because 300

additional electors have been added to my district.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you have already indicated that you are worrying.

Mr. WITHERS: I say that those 300 could have been added from an area much closer to my boundaries.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If we allow you to mark your own electorate, will you support the Bill?

Mr. WITHERS: I do not want to mark my own electorate. I do not see why Donnybrook should have been put in the Forrest electorate. I do not know that I have any community of interest with other parts of the Sussex electorate that have been added to my electorate. I do not think the boundaries have been fixed in the best interests of the people there, particularly seeing that Bunbury has not the same interests as the areas near the Busselton end. The member for Forrest has an electorate that extends as far as the Peel Estate; and yet we hear talk of community of interest! There is none evidenced in some of the electorates. In that instance we will have the spectacle of two members of Parliament travelling by the same train both getting out at the same railway station, one to proceed to look after the interests of his constituents on one side of the line, and the other to attend to the affairs of an electorate on the other side of the line.

Mr. Thomson: And that is community of interest!

Mr. WITHERS: That is so. I claim that the redistribution is not equitable. Certainly the position of the Bunbury electorate has not been improved. The member for Forrest will have to travel 30 miles round from Collie through Mumbulup. I do not think the members of the Commission know the geography of that part of the State very well, or they would not have fixed the boundaries of the electorates down there in such a fashion. I am not concerned about some of the contentions that have been raised by those who support the Bill. Under the old Bill there were 21 agricultural seats provided for and if the present Bill be passed, there will still be 21 agricultural seats. Thus the Country Party will have just as much representation under this Bill as under the old one.

Mr. Latham: We shall be no worse off.

Mr. Thomson: I did not object to the Bill on that score.

Mr. WITHERS: But that is the position. I think some members who have opposed the Bill have been perfectly justified in the objections they have raised. Although the population in the Mount Margaret and Cue electorates may be small to-day, the prospect of development in those areas was never greater than it is to-day. If Wiluna should open up well, there is no saying what will happen in those parts. It is well known that if there is considerable development in mining, pastoral or agricultural pursuits in one electorate it is almost certain that corresponding development will take place in other parts at the same time. I have no doubt that members who are elected to Parliament next year will be able to say that the boundaries could well have been fixed on a much different basis altogether.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That sort of thing can always be said.

Mr. WITHERS: The Premier pointed out that the Commission had been faced with a Herculean task. I think they went about the work in a higgledy-piggledy fashion. I do not know how they arrived at some of the boundaries. I would instance the Wagin seat.

Mr. Thomson: That is a puzzle to me.

Mr. WITHERS: It is certainly a Chinese puzzle. I do not think the work of the Commission has given satisfaction at all, and I will oppose the Bill.

MR. KENNEDY (Greenough) [8.7]: Last session Parliament decided that the existing electoral boundaries were not adequate, and we appointed a Commission to revise the boundaries of 16 constituencies, having excluded the four North-West seats. I do not know that we need traverse any of the ground that should have been dealt with when we considered the measure that led to the present Bill. I have no personal grudge against the measure. Greenough was not looked upon as a Labour seat in years gone by, but I won it for the Labour Party in 1924. I shall have something to say about the present boundaries. Before the Commissioners commenced their task of revising the boundaries, the electoral rolls should have been brought up-to-date by a thorough canvass throughout the State. That was not done. In some places it was done but not by the Electoral Department, but by those interested in party politics.

There was no revision of the rolls in respect of the greater number of the electorates. The Commissioners have reported that 1,000 votes were taken from Greenough and added to Geraldton. I am conversant with the whole of the Greenough electorate and the whole of the area from Murchison River to White Peak. I claim that only 700 votes have been taken from Greenough and put into the Geraldton electorate. I carefully analysed the returns available in 1924 and again in 1927. I am aware that no great increase in population has taken place in those parts, and I am positive I am correct when I say that only about 700 votes have been added to the Geraldton electorate. The Commissioners in their report claim that Geraldton will have a quota of 3,845, whereas Greenough will have a quota of 3,659. I claim that another 400 should have been put on to Greenough before the boundaries were revised. Then again, I do not think the Commissioners took into consideration the rapid development and progress of the agricultural areas of the State. If there is one electorate in the State that is rapidly progressing along those lines it is Greenough. Just outside my boundaries there have been survey parties out for 12 or 14 months dealing with an area of first-class land that will provide 600 or 700 farms in the near future. Another party is operating between Mullewa and Pindar east of the Wongan Hills railway, extending out towards the rabbit-proof fence. They are engaged upon classifying land there too.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is going on all through the agricultural districts.

Mr. KENNEDY: That is not so. The hon. member cannot put another farm into his little compact electorate. If hon. members look at the map that has been prepared in connection with the redistribution of the electoral boundaries, they may think that no one is living in the Greenough electorate at all. On the other hand, in the vicinity of the Elanding-Northwards railway thousands of acres of land are being classified today.

Mr. Lindsay: That land will be in the Mount Marshall electorate.

Mr. KENNEDY: No, it will be in the Greenough electorate. One part of the duty of the Commissioners was to have regard to community of interest. I claim that regard has not been had to that consideration

in the revised boundaries of the Greenough electorate. For many years past members of Parliament have agitated from time to time in favour of the Government of the day purchasing the Midland Railway Company's concession. Up to the present no Government have done so. If community of interest were taken into consideration, there would be one or two more members representing Midland Railway Company areas. We say that people who have land in the area served by the private railway should have consideration. They should not be allowed to pay higher freights and fares than settlers residing alongside Government railways.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That must be done with the permission of the Government.

Mr. KENNEDY: That is not so. The fares on the Midland Railway Company's lines have been higher for the second-class passengers than have been those charged on the Government railways.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They have to take our rate book.

Mr. KENNEDY: The company do not do that at all; the hon. member is wrong. The second class fares on the Government railways are 1¼d. per mile, whereas the second-class fares on the Midland Company's line work out at 1½d. per mile. That has been the position ever since the formation of the company.

Member: Quite correct.

Mr. KENNEDY: Then we have references by members to the position of settlers on the land who have to shoulder the burden of increased fares and freights compared with that imposed upon the settlers on Crown lands. The increases during the last 12 or 18 months, having regard to community of interest between the agriculturists in the Midland Company's areas and with those settled along the Wongan Hills line in their immediate vicinity, have been appreciable, and the people in the Midland areas have not the advantage of assistance from the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What has that to do with the question of community of interest?

Mr. KENNEDY: The people of this State should live under the same social laws and those who are settled on the Midland Company's lands should not suffer through

lack of the advantages available to settlers on the Government side of the concession.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Midland settler could have those advantages if he owned his land.

Mr. KENNEDY: That is not so, and the fact has been pointed out to Government after Government, but we get no further with the matter. I contend that Mt. Magnet should have been excluded from the redistribution and that the Cue electorate should be reinstated. The quota for the Greenough electorate has been considerably increased, and although one would think that the electorate had very few people in it, the fact remains that it is one of the richest pastoral areas of the State. More than that, the Greenough electorate will be the richest agricultural area in Western Australia once the Bill is passed. We find that Mt. Magnet, under this redistribution will be divided into mining and pastoral. Where do the mining and pastoral seats come in? Yet Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Hannans and Brown Hill, over all of which a can of water could be thrown, each has a seat. The whole thing is absurd. Why was not the large area of pastoral country from Pindar to the Murchison River, containing 15 or 16 stations and some of the best in the State, included in order to bring up the quota? That area could have been included in Cue with Mt. Magnet. There is no community of interest preserved in attaching Leonora to Mt. Magnet. I do not think the Commissioners have carried out their work satisfactorily. I have nothing to say against the Surveyor-General personally. He understands his work, and he knows of the rapid development taking place in the Greenough district just outside its present boundaries. He paid a visit of inspection to the district a few months ago and he knows that his surveyors are carrying out important work down the other line. The same community of interest does not exist between settlers on the Midland Railway Company's concession and those on Government land at Wongan Hills. Yet a member is to be asked to represent all those farmers who are carrying different burdens. It is monstrous. We are to have a large electorate, 300 or 400 miles in length, and from 100 to 200 miles in breadth containing thousands of acres of unalienated Crown lands and we are told that the anticipated enrolment in the proposed district will be only 3,659.

From the aspect of community of interest I do not think I can support the Bill. I have just as much chance of winning the Greenough seat on the proposed new boundaries as on the old ones, but I claim there is no community of interest between the Midland and Wongan Hills settlers. How is a member to represent people who are working under such entirely different conditions? What is he to do? He has to mislead one set of people or the other. I am not prepared to do that, and I shall oppose the Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon P. Collier—Boulder—in reply) [8.18]: I think I am not exaggerating the position when I say the debate has been characterised by a wealth of irrelevancies. All kinds of side issues have been introduced that have really nothing at all to do with the Bill, and I regret very much that members of the Country Party, or a number of them, have taken occasion to raise a cry between the citizens of this State. They have raised a cry of the citizens of the country districts against those of the metropolitan area. Listening to the remarks of some members one would imagine that the men and women who make up the population of the metropolitan area were Outlanders—that they were not of our own race, breed, or blood at all but belonged to some undesirable, foreign, alien and enemy country. It is a deplorable thing that men have no better argument to advance in support of their views than to try to raise this wretched paltry cry of country against the town. One would imagine that the citizens of the metropolitan area were the enemies of the people in the country.

Mr. Brown: They are living on the country, anyhow.

The PREMIER: Living on them! Nonsense! Every citizen who is engaged in a useful occupation—and all occupations are useful—is doing his fair share towards developing this country and producing the wealth of the country. Does the hon. member think that the man engaged in producing wheat on the farm is the only contributing factor to the production of wheat? Are not the man who drives a locomotive and brings it to the seaboard, the man who handles it into the ships and all the citizens who supply his wants contributing to the production of wheat equally with the man who ploughs the land! This pettifog-

ging cry of country against the town! It is deplorable to hear it raised in this House. It is an assumption—I might say an arrogant assumption—by members of the Country Party that they and they alone represent the men on the land and the people of the country districts. Why, members sitting on this side of the House and the direct Opposition represent the farmers and the people of the country districts just as much as do members who come from the agricultural areas, and I would remind those members that a great part, in fact the greater part of the money that has developed the agricultural areas has come from men resident in the metropolitan area. There is hardly a business man in the city of Perth, professional or otherwise, who has not an interest in the agricultural areas, a direct material interest, and many are putting nearly all their income derived from their business in the city into the development of the country districts. I think it is about time members realised that fact and tried to get out of their little narrow circle that they are the godfathers and the people alone who are doing the work for the agricultural districts. I want to say, too, that in all the years I have been in this House it has been the men from the metropolitan area, the men they have been criticising, who have governed this country and passed legislation that has enabled the agricultural areas to develop. I have never in all my long experience known such men to oppose any proposal that would have for its object the development of the country districts. Men who represent metropolitan constituencies have for years past sat on the Government benches and introduced legislation and carried out administration for the benefit of the country districts that has enabled them to develop to the extent they are developed to-day. So I say it only shows the poverty of the case against the Bill when they have to raise this cry of country against the metropolitan area. If I were inclined to be personal I could point to the fact that many members who do not belong to the Country Party have an infinitely greater material interest in farming than many who call themselves country members and represent country districts. Some who entered the towns of the agricultural districts and started business in the towns and lived in the towns might be said to be

living on the farmers just as much or to an infinitely greater degree than are citizens of the metropolitan area, because such men carried on their business in the towns and drew their incomes from the farmers and were not themselves farmers at all. Although I am not a metropolitan member and do not incur the odium of the Country Party, I resent their attitude on behalf of metropolitan members and citizens generally of the metropolitan area. The members of the Country Party are opposed to this Bill for various reasons—well, alleged reasons, I will say. They are not satisfied with the report of the Commission. Why is that so? They are disappointed. They are opposed to the Bill because it does not give any additional representation to the agricultural areas.

Mr. Brown: That is so.

The PREMIER: I am glad to have that statement confirmed. Well, those members have been asleep for the past five months. The time to put up a fight for greater representation of the agricultural areas was when the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill was before the House last session.

Mr. Brown: But you would not agree to any alteration.

The PREMIER: I have listened carefully to the debate and not one member has made out any case at all against the work of the Commission. If there is anything wrong with this Bill and the report, the fault lies with the Bill of last year.

Mr. Latham: That is so.

The PREMIER: The Commission have undoubtedly done their work well.

Mr. Thomson: With the figures supplied to them.

The PREMIER: Two members have said it was because of the rotten basis, and by that they mean the amendment to the Electoral Districts Act of last session, the basis on which this report was drawn. But both those members sat silent in this House when that so-called rotten Bill was going through. Neither of them had a word to say against that rotten Bill. How are country members going to justify themselves to their constituencies? I include in this nearly every member of the party. There was a mild, halting timid protest made by some of them. As a matter of fact, the Leader of the Country Party and one of his colleagues have, during this debate,

complained that the Bill of last session went through in two days.

Mr. Thomson: No, in three days.

The PREMIER: Well, in three days. Could it have a better commendation?

Mr. Thomson: No, it could not.

The PREMIER: The very fact that a Bill laying down the basis upon which the electoral districts of the State were to be determined went through in three days is the best possible proof that there is very little fault to be found with the Bill.

Mr. Thomson: That is a matter of opinion.

The PREMIER: It is not a matter of opinion at all. If members had any serious fault to find with the Bill, it was their duty to fight the Bill at that time. But they did not do it. They allowed it to go through in three days—the second reading debate, the Committee stage, the whole lot in three days—and no serious opposition was offered to the Bill.

The Minister for Justice: And no all-night sittings, either.

The PREMIER: No. Some of those members say now that they did not know the result was going to work out in the way it has done for the agricultural districts. The member for York (Mr. Latham) and others say it is not fair to the agricultural districts, which ought to have more seats. Not one member was under any illusion in that regard. Everyone knew perfectly well the number of seats the agricultural areas would have.

Mr. Thomson: And protested.

Hon. G. Taylor: The measure said so.

The PREMIER: I said so. Members knew perfectly well. As a rule I do not quote myself in this House, but permit me to do it on this occasion. In explaining the Bill on the second reading I said—

Let me illustrate how it will work out. There are enrolled as on the 24th of this month, six days ago, a total of 214,689 electors. Of that number 108,866 are in the metropolitan area, more than half. Under the proposals of the Bill the mean or average number of electors in the metropolitan area will be 6,404.

As a matter of fact, it worked out as 6,521, so I was pretty near to it.

The minimum, allowing for the one-fifth below, that under the Bill there could be in any metropolitan district, would be 5,124. On the other hand, the maximum, the one-fifth above, would be 7,684. The number of members would be 17.

That is what I said then. Seventeen seats. I gave the quota which I said would be 4,031 and it has worked out at 4,074. Then I went on to say—

In the agricultural districts the number of electors is 86,749, and there the mean or average number in each electorate would be 4,131—as against 6,404 in the metropolitan area—with a minimum, again one-fifth below, of 3,305, and a maximum of 4,957. The number of seats will be 21.

Mr. Thomson: We objected to it.

The PREMIER: Never mind; I will deal a little later on with the strength of your objection. I went on to say, when dealing with the mining and pastoral area—

The number of members will be eight, or a reduction of five on the present number.

And eight it is. That was made perfectly clear on the second reading. It was well known to the members opposite that the number of seats in the agricultural districts would be 21. Why did they not put up a fight then against this unfair representation of the agricultural districts? They sat almost silent and allowed the Bill to go through in three days.

Mr. Thomson: We did protest.

The PREMIER: Protest! If I had been protesting, believing that the Bill was going to work an injustice, I could have held it up for three days. What sort of a fight did the hon. member put up? What sort of a protest was it? The whole thing went through in about one day.

Mr. Richardson: It was a very feeble protest.

The PREMIER: It was worse than feeble. It is no use saying now that the report of the Commission is unfair to the agricultural districts.

Mr. Thomson: It is unfair.

The PREMIER: And it is so unfair that when the Bill was going through the House, the Bill laying down the basis of representation, the hon. member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) thought it more important to attend a show in the country than to remain here to fight.

Mr. Thomson: You were unfair—

The PREMIER: He went to the country rather than fight the iniquitous measure that was being then considered!

Mr. Teesdale: He was looking after the spring onions.

The PREMIER: An iniquitous measure that was going to deny representation to the people he represented!

Mr. Thomson: You were unfair; you refused to give us a show by adjourning the debate.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear such nonsense in your life? Because the hon. member regarded it as of greater importance to attend an agricultural show in the country instead of attending to his duty in this House, he now declares that I should have adjourned the consideration of the Bill until his return.

Mr. Thomson: You did that repeatedly for the hon. gentleman sitting there (pointing to the Opposition) and you refused us the same privilege.

The PREMIER: What nonsense! The hon. member says I should have held up the business of the House, and an important measure such as that, while he attended a country show! If the hon. member believes what he has been saying—

Mr. Thomson: I believe it all right.

The PREMIER: Why did he wander away to a country show? He knew that the Bill was coming in for discussion and he left the fight to his colleagues. Now he complains that they did not put up very much of a fight.

Mr. Thomson: Any way, I am protesting now.

The PREMIER: Of course! I do not like to impute motives as the grounds for the protest. But there it is. As I have said, the Commission has given us exactly what we expected, and the very fact that the hon. member put up no fight against the Bill shows he is not very sincere in the opposition his party are displaying. The member for York (Mr. Latham), who is now opposing the Bill did not oppose last year's Bill. Some parts of his speech have been quoted, but I intend to refer to some of it also. He said:—

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.

To-day he says it is not better than the existing state of affairs, and he wants the existing state of affairs to continue.

Mr. Latham: When I said that I thought you would allow me to make a small amendment to the Bill.

The PREMIER: Oh, of course!

Mr. Davy: He said then that the Bill as it was, was far and away better, not what he proposed to make out of it.

The PREMIER: The member for York knows well that when the Government bring down a Bill of such importance, amendments are not accepted.

Mr. Thomson: I thought it was a non-party measure.

The PREMIER: The hon. member thinks a lot of foolish things. The member for York went on to say—

I have a good deal of faith in the Commissioners under the existing Act, and for my part I 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.

Mr. Teesdale: Help, help!

Mr. Latham: That was a true prediction.

The PREMIER: I ask members to listen to this also—

I think the decision of the Commission should be final and that we should stand or fall by it.

Last year he wanted us to stand or fall by it; to-day he says that he does not trust the Commission.

Mr. Latham: I have not said that; you are generally fair.

The PREMIER: He declared that we ought to stand or fall by it. Further on he said—

We on this side have a great deal of confidence in the Commissioners and are prepared to leave it all to them.

Mr. Latham: I am glad all this is creating a great deal of amusement.

The PREMIER: The hon. member went on—

I am prepared to ask them even to fix the boundaries. We would accept them without seeing them, provided, of course, we had better representation for the agricultural areas.

Mr. Latham: There are no laughs now.

The PREMIER: I showed precisely what representation the agricultural areas were going to have.

Mr. Latham: We thought you were going to alter that.

The PREMIER: You thought! He also said—

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.

The hon. member was prepared to leave the whole thing to the Commissioners and there would be no wrangle. To-day he says it is all wrong, that he has lost faith in the Commissioners, and he is going to vote against the Bill.

Mr. Latham: I had faith in the Premier giving me four instead of three.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knew better than that. There cannot be any sincerity in the opposition of members on the cross-benches opposite. From their point of view now everything is wrong. As a matter of fact I am not giving any confidence away when I say that every member of the Opposition and of another place, as well as the Press and circles generally opposed to us, were surprised at the equitable and liberal character of last year's Bill. They did not think the Government would produce such a measure. They had the utmost confidence in it, and now it is proposed to reject what they thought was so liberal six months ago. Let me now deal with the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor). The hon. member had his eye on the map on the wall and talked about the areas, finding infinite fault with the work of the Commission. Generally he condemned the work of the Commission. He found fault with the manner in which they did their work and he made a long speech in which he did me the honour to quote what I said last year. Let me quote what he himself said—

We must be honest and admit that the present boundaries are anything but fair.

Hon. G. Taylor: I said that to-night.

The PREMIER: Yes, and you are going to stick to them, stick to the boundaries that are "anything but fair." Then he went on to say—

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.

Now he wants to continue that appalling state of affairs for a further number of years. He went on—

In some cases the numbers are down to 200 or 400 and they go up as high as 16,000 or 18,000. That is not fair representation.

That is what the hon. member wants to continue now. He added—

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 the Bill as I saw the weakness of the other Bill. 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.

What a prophet he was about his own attitude! "Members will show their dissatisfaction!" Then he went on—

We shall have the same deplorable debates on the recommendations as followed in the other case.

The most deplorable is the hon. member's speech to-night.

Hon. G. Taylor: Oh no, no.

The PREMIER: He said it was a deplorable thing to criticise the recommendations of the Commission.

Hon. G. Taylor: Can you point to community of interest between Mt. Margaret and Esperance? Be honest; you cannot do it.

The PREMIER: But the hon. member said the point raised by the member for West Perth was that we should embody in the Act of last session a provision that the recommendations of the Commission should become law, and that they should not be subject at all to any alteration in this House. The hon. member endorsed that view. He was prepared to trust to the Commissioners and accept their finding. But to-night he points out that the Commissioners have done their work all wrongly. So in that case he would have saddled on to the country something that was improper and unfair.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are saddling it on to the country now.

The PREMIER: Was there ever a greater inconsistency than that revealed by the hon. member's attitude?

Hon. G. Taylor: But there is no community of interest.

The PREMIER: That brings me to a point that has been stressed very much, in regard to large areas. We are invited to look at the plan of Mt. Margaret, and then our attention is drawn to some comparatively small area. In this connection members representing large areas have stressed the difficulties of their position in carrying out their duties. We have been told over

and over again of the hardships members have to endure in travelling long distances in going around their electorates.

Mr. Thomson: You yourself have used that argument.

The PREMIER: One would imagine that it was our responsibility to provide a Bill having regard to the comfort and convenience of members. The essential bedrock principle in a Bill of this sort is the rights of the electors, the people of this country, not the convenience or inconvenience of members.

Mr. Thomson: We try to safeguard the interests of the country.

The PREMIER: If our attention is drawn to a large area which has only one member, and on the other hand to a small area with only one member, scant regard is paid to the fact that representation in Parliament is based, not on square miles, but on population. We do not give representation to great empty areas. The people have to be there; a fair proportion of the people of the State must be in any given area before that area is entitled to representation. The hon. member said he could not vote to deprive of their representation those who put him into Parliament years ago. The fact is that those people are no longer there. They have gone to swell the population of some of the larger districts. So in voting against the Bill the hon. member is denying to many of the very people who put him into Parliament, but who now reside in other areas, the rights of citizenship and representation in this House. No matter how we might talk about areas and means of communication, we are not justified in departing from a real logical basis—may I use the term democratic basis?—the principle of one vote one value, we are not justified in departing from it to a greater extent than we did in the Act of last year. There are more things involved in representing the people than merely going around travelling through a constituency, visiting the electors, shaking hands with them and attending to their wants, if possible accompanied by departmental officers. Over and above that there is the making of laws in this House, laws which the citizens have to obey.

Mr. Davy: That is 99 per cent. of a member's job.

The PREMIER: Yes, 99 per cent. of a member's job is the making of laws in this House.

Mr. Thomson: I think 99 per cent. of a member's job lies in imposing additional burdens on the people.

The PREMIER: I said making laws. You cannot impose additional burdens without making a law. That brings me to the point that if Parliament is concerned in placing burdens on the people in the way of additional taxation or in other ways, it is essential that the people outside should have a fairly equal voice one with another in the making of those laws.

Mr. Thomson: We want the people outside to have the opportunity.

The PREMIER: Your troubles about the people outside! I say that where you give an exceptional value to one man's vote, that is to say, you give him five, 10, 20 or 50 times the voting value of another man, and that other man has to obey the laws and pay the taxation imposed upon him, it is unjust. And there is that principle which should never be lost sight of, namely, the people's right; not a member's convenience in travelling, but that the people who have to obey the laws and pay the taxation we impose upon them should have a fairly equal voice one with the other in the representation in this House. That is the essential bedrock principle of the whole thing.

Mr. Marshall: What about the other House and its franchise?

The PREMIER: That is another question. The Act of last year, upon which the Bill is based, is a fair one.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about all the people voting on your side?

The PREMIER: I am stating my views in regard to them. When we talk about boundaries and community of interest, is it expected that 50 electorates in this State could be drawn chess-board fashion in perfect squares, and that for every little group, 15 here or 20 there, we would be able to arrange community of interest in every constituency?

Mr. Stubbs: Where would you get finality?

The PREMIER: It is utterly impossible. Community of interest has been mainly observed, but it would be impossible to carry it through to perfection.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then there is the distance from the seat of Government.

The PREMIER: Yes, and the means of communication. But the constituencies must have the voters, and in a number of instances the voters are not there. Hence I say that the Commissioners have done their work well. The fight put up against the

Bill ought to have been made when the Bill of last year was going through. I say again that for those who carry on the affairs of this country outside, working in their various occupations, and who have to live under the laws we make, and pay the taxes we impose upon them, there should not be too great a discrepancy between their voting strength, between one citizen and another; there should not be too much discrepancy between the influence they are able to bring to bear in making of the laws of the country. I hope the Bill will be carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill requires an absolute majority of the House to carry it.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	16
				—
Majority for	10
				—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Barclard	Mr. Millington
Mr. Clydesdale	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Coiller	Mr. Munro
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Kennelly	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lamond	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Mann	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Doney	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. C. F. Wansbrough
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Withers
Mr. Latham	Mr. Pantou

(Teller.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The ayes having an absolute majority, the question is carried in the affirmative.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—Short title:

Mr. LAMBERT: I move an amendment—

That after the word "proclamation" the following be added:—"Provided however that

no such proclamation shall be made until such time as the existing boundaries of the ten electoral provinces as designated by the Redistribution of Seats Act 1911 shall have been adjusted by Parliament."

I inserted the word "further" because of the rather harsh interpretation the Speaker put upon the word "readjust" the other evening. It is essential we should seek to ensure an equitable readjustment of the provinces. Having passed the second reading of the Bill, we are now justified in asking another place to readjust their boundaries before it is proclaimed an Act. They should be called upon to do what we have shown our willingness to do. In 1911 in the Central Province there were 2,374 voters, and to-day there are 5,360. In the East Province the figures are respectively 4,111 and 8,692; in the Metropolitan Province they are 8,112 and 7,838; in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province they are 8,271 and 21,848; in the North Province they are 580 and 665; in the North-East Province they are 2,740 and 3,009; in the South Province they are 3,313 and 3,300; in the South-East Province they are 3,000 odd and 7,600; in the South-West Province they are 2,400 and 7,000 odd, and in the West Province they are 4,700 and 8,100. If there is justification for re-adjusting the boundaries of the Assembly there is greater justification for doing so in the case of the Council.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Government have promised to do that.

Mr. LAMBERT: I want to ensure that when the legislation is brought in, another place will pass it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The two Houses are not equal in power.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Legislative Council showed their excessive power by rejecting a considerable number of Bills brought down by the hon. member himself. It would amount to a political scandal if we passed this Bill without embodying in it some obligation upon the Council to amend their own boundaries. My object is to compel them to do this.

Mr. Richardson: Probably they would knock out the whole Bill if it were amended in that way.

Mr. LAMBERT: That would be their responsibility. I have shown the anomalies that exist between a number of the Provinces that abut upon each other. We must not miss this opportunity to show the Council that they must play their part in the matter

as we have done in the case of our own electorates. Probably the member for Northam does not want to see the boundaries altered.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course I do.

Mr. LAMBERT: I cannot be a party to allowing another place to deal with our boundaries while they allow their own to remain unaltered. We should see that the Council do not shirk their responsibility.

Mr. Davy: And we are to shirk our jobs until they do theirs?

Mr. LAMBERT: I have never been a party to that sort of thing. We have not shirked our job.

Mr. Davy: You are asking us to say that to the Council.

Mr. LAMBERT: This Bill will not come into operation except by proclamation. There is no intention whatever of bringing it into operation before the life of this Parliament expires, and so another place will have ample time to put its affairs in order. Surely members on this side of the Chamber recognise the great need for seeing that when the boundaries of provinces are adjusted, it is done on an equitable basis. The interests of all the provinces are identical, and yet we see great variation in number of electors between the metropolitan province and the metropolitan-suburban, for example. I do not know that I shall be able to find language strong enough to express the keenness of my disappointment if hon. members miss this opportunity of ensuring that the Legislative Council does its duty not only by members of this House but by the people of the State.

The PREMIER: I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment. In the first place it would mean that we would not be able to give effect to the Bill at all for the next elections. We should have to wait until the opening of the next session to bring down a Bill giving effect to the hon. member's desires regarding the boundaries of Legislative Council provinces.

Mr. Lambert: We are in session now.

The PREMIER: Then we should go on well up to Christmas, and it would be impossible to have the boundaries fixed and rolls prepared in time for the elections.

Hon. G. Taylor: You mean the May election for the Upper House?

The PREMIER: No; our own elections in March. Members would be in a position of uncertainty almost right up to the eve of the elections as to whether we would proceed

upon the old lines or upon new lines. The whole position would be intolerable for members, apart altogether from the difficulty of preparing rolls. No move could be made by candidates, and the whole position would be one of complete uncertainty.

Mr. Lambert: Why not call a special session to deal with the Council provinces?

The PREMIER: I do not know that another place would refuse to make alterations in the boundaries of provinces. I think members of another place would find it inconvenient not to make some alterations. If they refused to agree to any alteration we proposed in the Bill to be introduced next session, there would be considerable confusion, because the Council boundaries would not be coterminous with ours. I do not know that we need anticipate that members elsewhere would refuse to agree to any such alteration. Altogether we would be doing the right thing by disposing of this Bill and then putting upon another place the responsibility next session if they should refuse to consent to any reasonable measure adjusting the boundaries of provinces.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	28

Majority against 15

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Latham
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Maley
Mr. Doney	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Chesson
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Fanton
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Mann	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. McCallum	Mr. A. H. Wansbrough
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilcock
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. North
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2—Electoral districts schedule:

Mr. THOMSON: As the Premier said when he was occupying the position of Leader of the Opposition and when the corresponding clause was reached in the last Bill of this nature, if the clause is passed the Chamber will be committing itself to the schedule. Some of us have been twitted with not doing our duty because we did not speak for hours against a measure in which we do not believe. In my opinion it is unnecessary to obstruct in order to prove one's opposition to a measure. As regards this Bill there has been considerable misrepresentation, especially so far as I personally am concerned. It has been suggested that members of this party have received instructions. When members occupying these cross benches stand up for what they believe to be right and in the interests of the people they represent, some hon. member will say, "You have received your instructions: you must do as you are told." On a purely non-party question a member of the Labour Party happened to agree with us, and it was called an alliance. What about the alliance in the voting to-night?

The CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member discussing the clause?

Mr. THOMSON: The clause takes away from the country districts that fair representation to which they are entitled. The clause is the Bill. In view of the vote that was taken to-night, I know I am in a hopeless position, but I do not desire to give the Premier an opportunity to say that I was negligent and remained silent while an important measure was passed. He was grossly unfair in his attitude.

The Premier: On a point of order. The member for Katanning has not touched the clause, and is talking about gross unfairness. I ask that the hon. member be kept to the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not discussing the Premier.

The Premier: If the hon. member reads the clause, he will see that he cannot roam all over the place. He is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak to the clause, and not generally.

Mr. THOMSON: I want to draw the attention of hon. members to what the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, said at a corresponding stage of the

Bill that was dealt with in 1923. He quoted "Hansard" to-night; let me quote his statement from "Hansard" as well—

Seeing that this clause represents the whole Bill, the Committee should have some explanation from the Premier as to what has taken place here and elsewhere.

In view of that I am justified in endeavouring to have the clause defeated on this occasion. I hope members will defeat it. I again draw attention to the discrepancy between the figures which the Commissioners had as a basis for the redistribution in the metropolitan area and those available in respect of the country districts. Seeing that there was a discrepancy of 14,305 votes in respect of the agricultural districts and only 998 votes in respect of the metropolitan electorates, I contend that we have no right to pass the Bill. The Premier endeavoured to hold me and the Country Party up to ridicule.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is getting away from the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I want to draw attention to the fact. The Premier did not reply to the figures I quoted during my second reading speech, and I challenge him now to do so.

The Premier: You are brave!

Mr. THOMSON: If the Premier could have replied to my statement, he would have done so.

The Premier: It was not worth replying to.

Mr. THOMSON: A difference of 14,305 votes, and yet it is not worth replying to! Yet the hon. member says that the Bill represents justice, and has talked about giving a fair deal! The Bill does not give the country electorates a fair deal at all, and that in itself should justify the Committee in determining that further consideration should be given to the measure. Because we stress the position of the country electorates, we are charged with cringing and crawling in an endeavour to set up the metropolitan area against the country districts. It is easy to go with the tide, but it is not always so easy to stand up for what one considers right when he knows he is in a minority. The Press have told us in their leading articles what we should do and have asserted it would be unthinkable to vote against the Bill. I specially appeal to the Press to make the figures

available to the public so that they will know why we voted against the Bill. I wish to emphasise the discrepancy against the country districts which is 14,305, whereas the difference in the metropolitan area is only 998. I shall go throughout the country districts and repeat the statements I have made here, that the country areas have not received a fair or just deal.

Clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	28
Noes	11
					—
Majority for	17
					—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Mann	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. McCallum	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Millington	Mr. Willcock
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munzie	Mr. Panton

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Latham
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Doney	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Griffiths	

(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Schedule:

Mr. FERGUSON: I wish to refer to one matter in the schedule.

The Premier: Do you intend to refer to the name of an electorate?

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes.

The Premier: I am sorry; I am afraid we cannot deal with the Schedule because Clause 2 sets out that the electoral districts shall be designated by the names mentioned in the Schedule. I intended to refer to the matter myself.

Mr. FERGUSON: Can I move to have Clause 2 recommitted?

Mr. THOMSON: I hope the Premier will agree to allow the hon. member to give

reasons for wishing to alter a name in the Schedule.

The Premier: I have no objection to consideration being given to a name, but I do not know whether it can be done now.

Mr. FERGUSON: Cannot Clause 2 be recommitted?

The CHAIRMAN: Not at this sitting.

The PREMIER: I think the hon. member might raise the point in another place. I will offer no objection.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Standing Orders be suspended for the purpose of passing the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That will require leave being given by an absolute majority.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, the question is carried.

Third Reading.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required for the passage of the third reading.

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

Ayes	29
Noes	14
			—
Majority for	15
			—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Barnard	Mr. North
Mr. Collier	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Panton
Sir James Mitchell	

(Teller.)

NOMI

Mr. Brown	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Maley
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. C. F. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)
Mr. Latham	

Mr. SPEAKER: By an absolute majority the question is resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Wednesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 3rd April, 1929.

	Page
Petition, loyalty	107
Bill: Redistribution of Seats, Standing Orders suspension	107
Return, Light land applications	107
Bills: Hospital Fund, reconst., report, &c.	107
Redistribution of Seats, all stages	116
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, Com., etc.	121

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

PETITION—LOYALTY.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I desire to present a petition embodying the memorial presented to Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York on the occasion of their visit to this State some time ago, and Their appreciative reply thereto. The petition is signed by 107 and the mem-

orial by 3,239 representative citizens. Amongst the 3,239 signatories of the memorial, I am informed, are a large proportion of returned soldiers. The petition expresses the most loyal sentiments and it was felt that at this stage those sentiments might very appropriately be embodied in such a document because of the Centenary celebrations in which we are engaged. The petition is in conformity with the rules of the House and I hold the certificate of the Clerk to that effect.

Petition received and ordered to be laid on the Table.

BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Chief Secretary resolved: "That in the event of a message being received from the Legislative Assembly transmitting the Redistribution of Seats Bill, so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to be passed through all stages in one sitting."

RETURN—LIGHT LAND, APPLICATIONS.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East)
[4.35]: I move—

That a return be laid on the Table showing—1, Number of applications, each of more than 2,500 acres, for light land that have been received each year since 30/6/24. 2, Number of such applications that have been approved in each year. 3, Number of such approved applications that have been accepted. 4, If land tax has been imposed on any of the accepted approved applications?

The moving of the motion, I take it, is purely formal. The Under Secretary of Lands informed me that the return was being prepared, but that some time would be required to complete it.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—HOSPITAL FUND.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, Bill re-committed for the further consideration of Clauses 1, 2, 4, 5 and 16.