ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th December, 1913.

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

STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to present the report of the Standing Orders Committee in accordance with the resolution of the House dated 4th November.

Report read.

Mr. SPEAKER: I recommend that a motion be moved that the report be printed. I do not think it desirable that the House should take the matter into consideration this session because the urgency for the amendment has passed, the Estimates having been dealt with by the House, but if the report is printed the matter can be discussed by the House next session.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS ordered, that the report be printed.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: By-laws of following roads boards:—(a) Murray, (b) Melville, (c) Avon.

By the Minister for Lands: 1, Annual report of the Charities Department to 30th June, 1913. 2, Annual report of the Surveyor General to 30th June, 1913.

QUESTION—LICENSES TO COLLECT TURTLES.

Mr. MALE asked the Premier: 1, Is it correct that the Government have leased 300 miles of coast line for the right to collect turtles? 2, To whom has this coast line been leased? 3, When was it leased, and for what term? 4, What annual rent is being paid? 5, Is the lease an exclusive one, and does it prevent any other person from collecting turtles?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Premier) replied: 1, (a) Two exclusive licenses to farm and collect turtles (not being hawks'-bill turtles) have been issued over the coastal waters, including the coastal waters around certain islands, from the North-West Cape to Cape Lambert. (b) One license extends from the North-West Cape to Cape Preston, and the other from Cape Preston to Cape Lambert. 2, The exclusive licenses, as per Answer 1, have been granted to Mr. H. Barron Rodway. 3, (a) Exclusive license from North-West Cape to Cape Preston granted from 1st January, 1912. Exclusive license from Cape Preston to Cape Lambert from the 1st January, 1913. (b) The term of each license is seven years. 4, From North-West Cape to Cape Preston, £100 per annum; from Cape Preston to Cape Lambert, £50 per annum. 5, Yes, for sale, with exception of hawks'-bill turtles.

QUESTION—STATE ENTERPRISES, BALANCE SHEETS.

Mr. MONGER asked the Premier: When do the Government intend to furnish balance sheets of the operations of the State Steamships and other State enterprises?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Premier) replied: The State Steamship balance sheet will be completed tomorrow by the Colonial Secretary's Department, and will then be handed to the Auditor General; and as soon as the statement is audited, it will be submitted to Parliament. The Moola Bulla Station, Ferries, and Dairies balance sheets are not yet completed, but the work is being expedited. The State Hotels balance sheet will be ready in a week for audit; and will be submitted to Parliament when passed by the Auditor General. The balance sheets in connection with the meat supply were first furnished to the Auditor General on the 20th September, 1913, but have been referred back, and are now in the hands of the Hon. Minister for Agriculture for decision on certain questions raised by the Auditor General. When these points have been settled the balance sheets will be submitted to Parliament. The balance sheets in connection with the Boya Quarry were sent to the Auditor General some weeks ago, and have been returned by him with certain queries, and the accountant of the department is now conferring with the Auditor General in regard thereto. With reference to the Fremantle Workshops, it will not be possible to furnish a balance sheet to 30th June, 1913, in accordance with the Government Trading Concerns Act. A statement of receipts and expenditure to 30th June, 1913 (the date on which the Department of Agriculture took control) is now being compiled.

QUESTION — RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, EXPENDITURE.

Mr. MONGER asked the Minister for Works: What was the total expenditure, irrespective of rails and fastenings, upon the Coolgardie-Norseman, Tambellup-Ongerup, and Northampton-Ajana railway lines?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The hon. member should move in the usual manner for a return to be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTION — PLEURO-PNEUMONIA AT YANDANOOKA.

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it correct that an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia has occurred at Yandanooka? 2, If so, when did this disease make its appearance? 3, How many cattle are affected? 4, What steps is he taking to deal with this terrible disease? 5, Has he placed the whole of the cattle on the estate in quarantine?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Traces of pleuro have been discovered in cattle recently sent from Yandanooka, but this cannot be termed an outbreak. 2, It first made its appearance about seven years ago, and the recent cases were noticed during November. 3, About 10. 4, Having the cattle carefully watched and keeping all that show any traces of illness rigidly isolated. 5, No. This step is not considered necessary.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

BILL—BOULDER LOTS 313 AND 1727 AND KALGOORLIE LOT 883 REVESTING.

All stages.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath) in moving the second reading, said: In submitting this measure to the consideration of the House I do not anticipate that any objection will be offered. The position in regard to the first two areas, Boulder town lots 313

and 1727, is that they were originally held by the organisations which were later federated under the combined title of the Federated Miners' Union, and in accordance with the practice at that time they were vested in trustees. So long a period of time has elapsed since those trustees were appointed that some of them have left the district and efforts which have been made to secure their signatures have absolutely failed. The position in regard to the first two lots is that the areas are now held by the Federated Miners' Union, which was formed by a voluntary amalgamation of the two organisations, the Amalgamated Workers' Association and the Amalgamated Miners' Association. The amalgamation was brought about in a perfectly legal fashion and the fullest possible evidence was brought before the Registrar of Titles that all the steps had been legally effected. It was desired by the officers and members of the Federated Miners' Union that these blocks should be legally brought under their control, and representations were made, first to the Lands Department and afterwards to the Solicitor General, for this to be brought into effect. It was the opinion of the Solicitor General that the matter could be fixed up by revesting these lots in the trustees for the Federated Miners' Union, but the Registrar of Titles has taken exception to this and has given his opinion to the Solicitor General. He expresses the opinion that he would not be justified in issuing a title unless he was authorised to do so by an Act of Parliament. The result was that the matter has occupied the attention of different departments for a considerable period and complaints were received from the gentlemen acting on behalf of the Federated Miners' Union that they could not reach finality. The file I have here has been built up and, although the Solicitor General still holds the opinion that there is no need for an Act of Parliament, I felt it would be infinitely better to have the question decided once and for all, and comply with the opinion of the Registrar of Titles that a Bill should be introduced in order to make the legal position absolutely sure. A precisely similar condition of affairs obtains in regard to Kalgoorlie town lot 883. When this lot was first issued it was to a body known as the Goldfields Trades and Labour Council. It was held by them under trustees for a very considerable period, and in this case also the signatures of the whole of the trustees could not be obtained. The Goldfields Trades and Labour Council has now been merged into the Australian Labour Federation, and the goldfields division of that organisation was brought about by a voluntary amalgamation of the bodies that previously constituted the Goldfields Trades and Labour Council and the unattached bodies not then affiliated therewith, but who have since given in their adhesion to the Australian Labour Federation. When this Bill is enacted it will mean that a lease at a peppercorn rental, for the term originally granted, will, in the case of the Boulder town lots 313 and 1727, be granted to the Federated Miners' Union, and in the case of lot 883 it will be granted to the Eastern Goldfields district of the Labour Federation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I suppose that the lease will be issued for the term of the original lease? The whole of the blocks, I suppose, are held under lease to-day and not under fdeehold?

The Minister for Lands: They are held under lease.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: As long as the conditions are the same and the same people enjoy the use of the blocks, there can be no objection.

The Minister for Lands: They have changed their name and extended their scope.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The people interested, I suppose, are agreeable to the change?

The Minister for Lands: Absolutely.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There can be no objection then.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): In further explanation I may say there would have been no difficulty in securing certificates from gentlemen, for instance like Mr. Dodd, who at the time

was secretary of the A.M.A. and afterwards secretary of the federated organisation. It was a voluntary act and by the acquiescence of both organisations. There is not the slightest difficulty or fear of any question being raised. The Solicitor General was perfectly satisfied, but the Registrar of Titles, and I commend him for exercising the utmost care, thought otherwise. In view of the stand he took I thought it would be better to legalise the matter in a way in which it could not be disputed.

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

The Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Bills of Sale Act Amendment.

2, Factories Amendment.

Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES REDEDICATION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath) in moving the second reading said: In introducing this Bill on the second reading I propose to explain just the nature of the alterations which are sought to be made and the reasons for them, and to arrange for the Committee stage to be taken at to-morrow's sitting. The measure, of course, is one that represents the primary step that has to be taken annually to ratify the change of purpose of class A reserves, and it is left until the end of the session to include all that come under the notice of the Lands Department during the preceding 12 months. In the case of the first reserve, referring to the change of purpose of reserve 9286, the reserve was set apart for park lands and drainage, and was vested in the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council. The land was required for the new service reservoir at Kalgoorlie and it was necessary to include this in the Bill in order that the area may be devoted to the new purpose and the area, after the completion of the reserve, will be vested in the Minister for Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage. This was referred to the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council, as they were interested, and the controlling body at the time it was taken over for the new purpose, and they have agreed to the change of the purpose. The area is 74 acres 32 perches. In the case of reserve A 2102, this was set apart for a park and vested in the Midland Junction municipality, although it is within the boundaries of the Greenmount roads board district. The portion which it is sought to alter so far as its purpose is concerned represents an area of 16 acres 2 roods 30 perches. It contains a considerable amount of gravel which is very suitable for road making. The Midland Junction municipal council state that they can obtain road metal from this site more cheaply than they have hitherto obtained it elsewhere. The Greenmount roads board, within whose territory it is found, also wish to obtain gravel from this particular site, and it is therefore proposed to exclude it from the Class A reserve and vest it jointly in the Midland Junction municipality and the Greenmount roads board. It will be set apart as a reserve for gravel, and both these bodies will obtain their supplies therefrom. In the case of Reserve 8427A, this is a small alteration and is included in the very large area of country set apart as a caves reserve around the locality of the Yalingup caves. The residents of Yalingup desire that a hall site should be provided, and also that provision should be made for church sites, and two acres have been surveyed for this purpose in what is regarded as the most suitable position. If this position as reserved is approved, the hall site will be set apart at once, and

later on applications will be considered from those religious organisations who have already applied, together with those who may apply in future, and if their representations are accepted they will be able to obtain church sites on this particular reserve. The area is only two acres, and the alteration of the purpose of this small reservation is to meet entirely the convenience of the local residents in the vicinity of Yalingup. It will in no sense materially affect the caves reservation which has been made for the protection of the caves, and I do not think anyone will have any objection to offer. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I understand that the Minister will go into Committee on the Bill to-morrow. In the meantime, will he produce any maps which he may have in connection with it? After all, the Opposition is principally concerned to see the maps, because from those we can see what is happening. If the Minister will let me have the maps there will be no objection to the second reading going through.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

In Committee.

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

Clause 4—Quota and matters to be considered:

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved a further amendment—

That after "divided" in line 6 of Subclause 1 all the words be struck out to the end of the subclause and the following inserted in lieu:—"into forty-seven electorates in the following manner:—(2), The present electorates of Canning, Claremont, Guildford, Fremantle, North-East Fremantle, South Fremantle, Subiaco, Leederville, Perth, East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth shall constitute a division to be known as the Metropolitan Division to be divided into twelve electorates. (3), The present electorates of Albany, Avon, Beverley, Bunbury, Geraldton, Greenough, Irwin, Katanning, Moore, Murray-Wellington, and that part of the Nelson electorate as is not representative of the mining or timber industry, Northam, Pingelly, Sussex, Swan, Toodyay, Wagin, Williams-Narrogin, York, and Gascoyne shall constitute a division to be known as the Country Division, and shall be divided into twenty-two electorates. (4) The present electorates of Boulder, Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, Coolgardie, Cue, Hannans, Kalgoorlie, Kanowna, Menzies, Mount Magnet, Mount Leonora, Mount Margaret, Murchison, and Yilgarn shall constitute a division to be known as the Goldfields Division, and shall be divided into ten electorates. (5), The present electorates of Forrest and Collie, and so much of the electorate of Nelson as is mainly either representative of the mining or the timber industry, shall constitute a division to be known as the Timber and South-West Mining Division, and shall be divided into three electorates. (6) The total number of electors whose names appear upon the latest electoral rolls of each of the aforementioned divisions, due regard being had to the reduction or increase of electors in the case of the Nelson electorate by reason of any transfer of votes from that electorate to the division known as the Timber and South-West Mining Division, shall be divided by the number of representatives of each division and the quotient shall be the quota of electors."

The amendment was drastic and it might even violate the fixed principles previously referred to by the Attorney General; but the principles were not so very fixed after all. The Minister had said he was very determined to have equal electorates.

The Attorney General: No, I said the main principle was that each vote should have equal value.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Why have these single electorates if we were not to have

equal quotas ? Of course a variation was necessary in scattered constituencies. According to Mr. Nanson, in 1911, the metropolitan area contained 54,060 voters. In 1913 the number was 52,739 voters, or 4,261 less than Mr. Nanson had estimated, showing a reduction of 1,300 since 1911. The metropolitan area had now twelve seats, and the amendment proposed that the twelve should be retained notwithstanding the reduction in the number of voters. The metropolitan area was very easy to represent. Probably the Minister for Lands received more letters from his constituents in a week than did the representatives of the metropolitan area in a month. Twelve seats were as many as could be spared from the limited number of seats it was proposed to allot for the whole State. In regard to the country seats, Mr. Nanson had shown that there was 48,000 electors in the country in 1911. In 1913 the number was 47,400, or a decrease of 600. But even allowing that decrease there was an increase of 9,429 upon the estimate made by Mr. Nanson, upon which the boundaries had been fixed. Leaving out the Collie and Forrest electorates, the country voters were considered by Parliament to be entitled to 19 seats. Gascoyne has now been taken from the North and included with the country seats. There were in Gascoyne 1,771 electors, to which would be added 1,000 from the adjoining goldfields area by members who, we were told, did not wish to interfere with the representation. This gave a total of 52,200 votes, assuming that 1,000 would be added to Gascoyne from some portion of the Cue electorate. It was proposed to increase the seats in agricultural districts by two. The amendment would take from the country seats the electorates of Forrest and Collie. We would have an increase of 12,200 voters for the three seats, not an unreasonable thing to ask when one remembered the scattered nature of the country, difficulties of representation, and the responsibilities of the people on the land to this State. He confessed that the 22 seats would mean a quota of 2,281 votes, which to some members would seem a little low, but we must remember that in some electorates to-day the numbers were even less than that. It was reasonable to suppose that the increase experienced above the estimate of Mr. Nanson was but the forerunner of a very much larger increase throughout the country districts. This redistribution, like any other, was not for the moment, but must last for some time and we must anticipate what was going to happen to cover at any rate the next three years. The members representing Fremantle and the City must remember that agriculture was all important to State development. He proposed to add to Collie and Forrest those portions of Nelson whose interests were identical. The timber area and mining area of the Nelson electorate could be added to Forrest and Collie and there should be three seats to represent this district with a quota of 2,677 as against a quota of 3,500 now. The idea of special representation for special industries was admitted long ago. Special representation for the timber area was adopted long ago, and hon. members opposite had always supported that idea.

Mr. Bolton : You know that is incorrect.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : No objection had been made to special representation for the timber area, they only objected to the boundary lines of the Sussex area.

Mr. Bolton: What you say is very incorrect. Special representation of timber and coal was opposed by this side of the House every time it was introduced, especially at the last redistribution.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Within his recollection he had never heard members object to the Forrest electorate or the Collie electorate. The interests of these two electorates and the quotas he proposed to include were identical and were well worthy of special representation, just as much as the North-West, the goldfields, or the metropolitan area were really given special representation. Undoubtedly it was a great advantage for Collie to have a member in this House and it was a great advantage for Forrest, the timber electorate, to have a special representative. He believed community of interest

counted for a great deal indeed when it was a question of representation to those engaged in our primary industries. There could be no objection to his suggestion as it increased the representation from two to three, and to-day we had two members representing these two constituencies.

Mr. Bolton: You are taking off the workers from the Nelson electorate.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Forrest was represented by a member on the Government side and so was Collie. He proposed that the workers generally there should have an opportunity of sending a third representative to this House. It was perfectly patent to everyone that if there was to be special representation for the timber area the division lines could not be absolutely straight. Hon. members knew that the timber belt was spread over a vast area in the South-West with timber mills scattered about here and there, and where one gave special representation to a special industry one had to include the area that industry specially covered. The workers in our timber mills had little in common with the men who produced down in the South-West adjacent to them. Timber workers were specially interested in the Arbitration Act, the Workers' Compensation Act, and the Truck Act, and they wanted representation here to voice their views in connection with these matters that were all important to them. The agriculturist was not quite in the same box, and his representation should be somewhat different. It was because he believed special representation had always received the sanction of this House in regard to mining and timber that this representation should be increased to a growing industry.

Mr. Bolton: To cut away the workers from Nelson is a bit of gerrymandering.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The existing boundaries of Nelson would not be the new boundaries. There was no guarantee that any boundary existing to-day would be a boundary after the recommendations came in.

Mr. Bolton: Yo do not mention boundaries. You want to cut out all the workers from Nelson.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was surprising to hear the hon. member say that the boundaries would be the same.

Mr. Bolton: I never said they would.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member said they would be taken from the Nelson electorate.

Mr. Bolton: I said, "Take the workers from the Nelson electorate."

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the suggestion which he had submitted was carried, we would have 12 seats in the metropolitan area, ten for the goldfields, three for the South-West mining and timber, three for the North and 22 for the country.

Mr. Bolton: That is very good indeed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member realised that it was a question of satisfactory representation and not a question of making either party in this House safe.

Mr. Bolton: I deliberately say you are, by the alteration you suggest, doing that.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It would be just as much in order for him to say that the hon. member was not speaking the truth when he made such an assertion. The question was one of good Government and how to bring it about, and the hon. member could be assured that he (Hon. J. Mitchell) only cared about having the country governed by men who could control it satisfactorily, and who were representative of the people, and who also were capable of representing satisfactorily the interests of all concerned. The hon. member was concerned about getting a fourth seat for Fremantle. If the numbers justified that he (Hon. J. Mitchell) would like to see it granted.

Mr. Bolton: They do.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Fremantle district did not carry as many electors as the Metropolitan area. It had to be conceded that the agricultural districts were scattered as much as the northern districts, and the distances were great. The amendment which he had brought forward was moved so that members might have an opportunity of discussing it. Of course he did not expect to get the support of the Attorney General, and the House should be informed that the

Opposition as a party were not responsible for it. The amendment was entirely off his own bat, and hon. members in Opposition had a perfect right to vote as they desired in regard to it. In his opinion the amendment was a very fair one. The suggestion it contained was certainly better than that in the Bill. Of course if anyone had a better proposal to make he would be pleased to accept it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not surprising to learn that the hon. member had not consulted his party in regard to the amendment he had moved, and that he did not desire that his party should be held responsible for the amendment, for a more extraordinary, more astounding, or more audacious proposal was never introduced in the Legislative Assembly. It was utterly devoid of principle except that of reserving a certain membership for the Opposition side of the House. It had no ground otherwise to commend it, and in order to accomplish his purpose the hon. member would make the farming community the only community deserving of special consideration, and he would sacrifice other primary industries absolutely, and he put his knife into all other interests and all other aspirations wheresoever they might be. The hon. member did so without that semblance of honesty that one was anxious to find in persons occupying a public position. He said the Government had admitted his principle. That going uncontradicted to the world would make it appear that the hon. member had given to us what we ourselves admitted, and that he had given it a practical application. That would be the understanding of the general public, the man in the street. What were the facts? It was true that we had departed from the recognition of equal political power for every citizen to one portion of this State, that portion being the far North-West, not on the ground of any community of interest, but simply because of the isolation of that part of the State from the seat of Government. That was the only principle upon which the North-West received consideration under the present Bill. The fact that it was an important part of the State confined to no one particular industry in its possibilities, but capable of a vast number of possibilities, rich in all kinds of natural resources, the Government had given to that portion of the State special representation simply because it was so far away from the metropolis. What did the member for Northam wish to do? He desired to divide up the State into a very few interests, and he would give to the farmer the bulk of political power.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not the farmer, but the people living in the farming districts.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member should recognise that we did not give a district power to vote; it was the men and the women in it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They are all farmers.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member admitted that even in his farming district there was no genuine community of interests any more than there was between every interest in the State, from the far South-East to the distant North-West. There was community of interest within us all. We could not separate them? All were combining for the creation of wealth and the prosperity and the progress of the State.

Mr. Harper: The farmers find work for them all.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If it had not been for the mining industry, there would not have been work for the farmer. Let not the hon. member's inexperienced youth bubble forth in folly. There would be no work for the farmer of this country if there were not population for the farmer to feed. The member for Northam had constituted the farmer as the one alone entitled to the exercise of political power; all the others came second, third, fourth, and a long way distant. And let members consider the enormity of the hon. member's attitude towards a section of the community who had helped to create the State's prosperity. The hon. member took three seats away from the mining districts, and the taking away of those three seats inferred the worthlessness of the mining industry. We were to cut their political influence short, and curb their political

power. Yet mining was the primary industry that created the general wealth of the community, and it was in the track of the mining industry that every other prosperity in this State had developed. Not only in the work the miners had done, not only in the wealth they had created, not only in the towns they had built, had they been of advantage to the country, but by the example of their endurance, the evidence of their indomitable pluck, the proof of their stamina, the clear production of a chapter of that common sense that helped to build up nations, they had contributed to the stability of all portions of the State. Yet those were people who might be neglected. For whom? For people living in constituencies which voted Liberal.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is that why you reduce the agricultural representation?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Government started on the principle that all human creatures were men and women, whether they lived in pursuit of one industry or another. Everyone had a right to the same social and political opportunity and influence. That was the Government's basis, and they did not care whether a man lived in the north, south, or elsewhere, he was still a man. The only difference they made was that in order to give that equality it was necessary sometimes to create some species of handicap. The man who lived in Perth could visit a Minister's office every day in the week, but the man who lived in the far North-West could not go to a Minister's office, and had not the same political opportunities. Therefore, in order that he might be brought a little nearer the level, the Government said he should have representation in greater proportion than the voter in the metropolitan area. That was why the distinction was made in favour of the North-West. In every other portion of the State the quota was diminished as the distance extended from the metropolis. That was an application of the sound principle upon which the measure was based. The amendment of the member for Northam was in no sense a recognition of any principle except the determination to retain political influence and keep certain pocket boroughs. He would not say anything in disparagement of the farmers as farmers; he fully recognised the services they were rendering to the State. It was a noble work they were doing, but it did not justify him in saying that the farmer had any greater rights to social opportunities or power, or that the man who lived in the city was of no social or national value. He appreciated the work done by the farmer, but what constituted government? What was our aim when we gave people the right to exercise some intelligence, the better if that intelligence was trained, if it was disciplined by wide information, and if it was capable of grasping and considering all the questions likely to be submitted. Political power implied intelligence not circumscribed and narrowed in a political groove. This State did not consist alone of farmers, or farmers' interests, but comprised all interests that went to make up a complex community. And we were to so shape our laws, so construct our policy, and so administer the affairs of State that no interest should receive a preponderance of attention, no one section of the community should be specially spoon fed, no part of the body politic should have lavished on it all the wealth and consideration of those who governed the State, but so that all alike might flourish, and build up a harmonious organism, out of apparently conflicting interests. When we had analysed all human interests we came back to this, that they were human interests, that they were humanity's interests. The farmer cultivating the soil, the tailor making clothes, the teacher instructing the mind, the entertainer giving us some relaxation, all were parts of a great influence that made life tolerable, comfortable, and rich in blessings, that cemented all sections of the community, and made every interest inter-dependent with every other interest, all part of a living structure, having one great aim, the elevation of the people and the building of a nation. The man who had only one

string to his fiddle and could only play one tune on it and that never in accordance with scientific music and always with a scratch and a screech, the man who did that knew nothing of the great aim and purposes of legislation and the duties of a politician. That was the course taken by the member for Northam. One heard him on the platform, the scratch of the fiddle—the farmer. One heard him on every subject in the list of subjects, one scratch up and down—the farmer. The hon. member believed that by appealing to the farmers, giving them political influence and flattering their little vanities he might stem the tide that was rising in favour of humanity. The hon. member sneered at those who laboured in the forest cutting down timber for public utility.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who sneered at them?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member did. There was almost an audible sneer. He said they had nothing in common with the farmer. They were an isolated group: they should be herded together and put in a yard and kept by themselves. Timber hewers, let them have a vote, but take everybody away from them. The farmer must not touch them. Let them be just by themselves. Was not the timber hewer a worker?

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who said he was not?

[*Mr. Male took the Chair.*]

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member in effect said he was not. For the purposes of the measure the hon. member would isolate these people and would try to make out that they had nothing in common with the farmer. The timber hewer had this in common with the farmer; he was a toiler. The farmer had his aspirations and hopes, and the same aspirations and hopes were in the breast of the timber hewers. The farmer had his domestic affection, and the timber hewer had the same. There was just the same elements which constituted the human being, in the timber worker as there was in the farmer. One worked as hard and as long as the other. One was as much a prey of the elements as the other. They had the same qualities; their hearts beat in the same way. He (the Attorney General) objected to divide this State into a lot of little colonies, a colony of coal miners, a colony of farmers, and a colony of timber hewers. The hon. member would be content with that because it was increasing the idea of the Labour party, but there was not one grain of logic in the hon. member's proposal; not one grain of commonsense logic in it. There was no basis of logic at all. The hon. member must see that he would take one section of the community and give them political power at the expense of every other section.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That was what you did yesterday.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; yesterday he had stated the reason which was consistent with the principle laid down in the measure we were considering. On broad grounds we had said that every man should have equal political power; every man because he was a man. There were some places where a man, though theoretically he had the power, could not exercise it, and when one came to test the matter we must see what practical political power he had and he (the Attorney General), said that the man in the metropolis had more power than the man in the back blocks.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Then we are agreed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, the hon. member would curtail the power of the man in Perth, he would go a little outside, 40 miles from Perth, and give augmented power. He would go a little further, and give more power still. There was no consistency in that. He (the Attorney General) had only one principle.

Mr. Elliott: There are three principles in the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Community of interest was put last because it was least. Community of interest would only come in when none of the other elements would turn the scale. Our principle was distance from Perth; that was

the main principle. The direction in the Bill was that that had to be taken first. In order to give boundaries to an electorate physical features could be taken into consideration. When no injury was done community of interest could be considered. The principle of the measure was access to the capital; the power of exercising political rights one had.

Mr. Elliott: That was one.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was all. The others did not come in until that was exhausted. He did not believe the member for Northam cared one iota what became of his amendment. He knew it could not be carried. He had not taken his own party into his confidence, he had consulted no one. The hon. member admitted this was his own idea.

Mr. BOLTON (South Fremantle): There was one part of the speech of the deputy leader of the Opposition which appealed to him, and that was the first and the last sentence. The hon. member started with an abject apology for introducing his amendment, and he finished his remarks by repeating that apology. No doubt the hon. member had in his mind the treatment his party received when introducing their gerrymandering Bill last session, and the treatment which they experienced at the hands of the people at the general election. This amendment was some of the old gerrymandering we had had from the Wilson Government before the last election, except that this time it was fathered by the member for Northam, who had said that the voters in what he termed the country electorates had increased by 12,000. As a matter of fact, five of the principal of these electorates had lost 534 electors during the last two years. This was shown in the *Statistical Abstract*, the electorates which had lost voters being Irwin, Moore, Katanning, Pingelly, and Sussex. Notwithstanding this, the hon. member had declared that the country electorates had increased by 12,000 and therefore were entitled to greater representation. The scheme propounded by the hon. member for giving this increased representation contemplated the distribution of 49,200 electors among 22 seats, which would give a quota of 2,236. From that was to be deducted the working men in the Nelson electorate, whom the hon. member desired should not mix with the farmers, the object being, of course, to render the Nelson seat anti-Labour, while making stronger the Collie and Forrest electorates, which the Liberals could never hope to win. If, say, 1,000 were taken from the 3,102 electors of Nelson, a quota of 2,190 would be furnished for the country group. But the hon. member had the audacity to say the quotas should be 2,190 for the country and 4,390 for the metropolitan district. Could anything be more absurd? The hon. member had declared that country members had difficulty in getting to the seat of Government. It was to be remembered that the electorate of Moore was within nine miles of the capital City while that of South Fremantle was 13 miles away; yet Moore was to have 2,190 as a quota while the quota of South Fremantle was to be 4,390. Again, where did the community of interest come in as between Albany and Avon; what had they in common, and why had all the ports been put into the country group? Simply, of course, to bring up the quota a little. The port of Fremantle had some community of interest with the electorates of Moore and Irwin and Avon; but Fremantle was to be included, not in the country group, but in the metropolitan district. Clearly community of interest was to be considered only when it suited the Liberal party. The three electorates of Beverley, Irwin, and Sussex combined contained 5,120 electors, while East Perth alone had 5,201 electors, in face of which the member for Northam proposed that the present representation for the metropolitan area should be continued, while that of the country electorates was to be increased by two. A member of the country party had declared to a want of sincerity in the Liberal party.

Mr. Harper: On a point of explanation, I repudiate the statement that I said there was a want of sincerity in the Liberal party.

Mr. BOLTON: No reference had been made to the hon. member. However, the statement had been made by leading men in the Liberal movement that it was a want of sincerity on the part of the Liberals which had made it necessary for the farmers to form their own party. The difference between the country group and the goldfields group as provided in the amendment was very marked, although the country electorates were not so far away from the centre nor as scattered in population as were the goldfields. The hon. member had proposed a quota of 2,301 for the far distant goldfields as against 2,190 for the country electorates. Why such a disparity? This again showed a want of sincerity and went to prove that the whole amendment was nothing more nor less than kite-flying with a kite of the hon. member's own making.

Mr. McDOWALL: The audacity of the amendment moved by the member for Northam compelled him to say a few words on the question. It was scandalous that an attempt should be made to gerrymander the seats in this fashion. The hon. member proposed to put the goldfields seats into ten, including the Golden Mile, and proposed to put 20 agricultural seats into 22; and, in order that he might increase his quota to 2,280, the hon. member had put the out ports in with the agricultural districts, which brought up the quota to the desired mark. The most scandalous feature of the amendment was in connection with the goldfields. According to the 1913 roll the Belt had 15,966 electors and the six scattered seats 12,114, making a total of 28,080 electors. To that the hon. member had added Cue, with 1,544, Mt. Magnet 2,348, and Murchison 2,161 voters, making a total of 34,133, or a quota of 3,413 in the scattered mining fields as against 2,280 in the agricultural seats. It was simply one of the most scandalous proposals that could possibly be made. The line of reasoning used by the hon. member was that Mr. Nanson made certain suggestions in 1911, but Mr. Nanson's figures were altogether wrong in connection with the agricultural districts, and had it not been for his figures being wrong the redistribution of 1911 would have been a far greater scandal. The gerrymandering that was attempted now by this amendment was going to give the goldfields a 3,413 quota as against 2,280, and that equalled, if it did not exceed, the gerrymandering of 1911. It was advisable to ascertain just what the estimates were in the redistribution of 1911, what the figures were according to the roll of 1911, and what they were on the 30th September, 1913. He further desired to show that the agricultural districts had practically been stationary. There had been no great advance in the agricultural districts during the last two years. Perth was estimated at the time of the redistribution to have 4,500, and the figures actually came out at 4,663. On the 30th September last they were 3,792. East Perth was estimated at 4,500, in 1911 there were 5,015, and in 1913, 5,201; North Perth, estimated 4,600, in 1911, 5,236, and in 1913, 5,002; West Perth estimated 4,400; in 1911, 4,509, and in 1913, 4,225; making a total in that group of 18,220 in September, 1913, as against 19,423 in 1911. There had been an increase of 186 in East Perth, and decreases in Perth proper of 871, North Perth 234, and West Perth 284, or a net decrease of 1,203 in those constituencies from 1911 to 1913. Fremantle, estimated to have 3,900, had in 1911 3,541, and in 1913 3,708; East Fremantle, estimated 3,800; 1911, 4,037; 1913, 4,274, increase of 167 and 237 respectively; South Fremantle, estimated 3,800; 1911, 3,841; 1913, 3,872, an increase of 31, making a total increase in the Fremantle group of 435 during the last two years. Turning now to the suburban electorates, Leederville, estimated at 4,100, had in 1911 4,780, and in 1913 4,588, or a decrease of 192; Canning, estimated 4,200; 1911, 4,046; 1913, 3,995, a decrease of 51; Claremont, estimated 4,250; 1911, 4,429; 1913, 4,373, decrease 56; Guildford, estimated 4,500; 1911, 4,932; 1913, 4,839, decrease 93; Subiaco, estimated 4,450; 1911, 5,031; 1913, 4,816, decrease 215. In that group of seats there had been a decrease of 607 during the two years. For the four goldfields

seats the estimate had been 17,000, and the actual figures had been in 1911, 16,810, and in 1913, 15,966, or a decrease of only 844. The quota for the Golden Mile at the present time was 3,991. For the six scattered mining seats the estimate had been 13,550, whilst the figures in 1911 had been 13,749, and in 1913, 12,114. There had certainly been a decrease of 1,635, but at the same time the quota was now 2,019. Let hon. members compare that quota in those out-back distant places with the quota in certain agricultural centres, as for instance 1,695 in Sussex. The proposal to cut up three seats and give the goldfields a quota of 3,400 was a most audacious and outrageous one. He had never heard of anything so scandalous. The Murchison group had been estimated to contain 6,725, and on the roll in 1911 there were 6,771, and in 1913 6,053. Notwithstanding that Cue had only 1,544 electors the actual quota in those districts was 2,017, yet ruthlessly those three seats were to be cut out and placed amongst the mining seats of Coolgardie and elsewhere. Pilbara, estimated to have 1,200, had in 1911 1,131, and in 1913, 1,091, a decrease of only 40; Collie, estimated 2,700; 1911, 3,914; 1913, 3,528, decrease 386; Forrest, estimated 2,700; 1911, 3,523; 1913, 3,504, decrease 19. Those districts had gone ahead to a very great extent; at any rate, they were much in advance of the quotas set forth by Mr. Nanson, yet their extra population was not taken into consideration by the mover of the amendment. The member for Northam proposed to put four outport and large country town seats in with Gascoyne, four South-West seats, three Midland seats, and eight Great Southern and Eastern seats, making a total of twenty. The hon. member was increasing this by two, and giving a quota of, as he stated, 2,280, and he was going to give a goldfields seat a quota of 3,400 as against that absurdly low quota in the agricultural districts. Such a proposition did not bear investigation for a moment. The member for Northam had made a great point of the increase of about 10,000 in the agricultural district from the time of Mr. Nanson's estimate, but the estimate had really nothing to do with the question. The Liberal Government had made a mistake in their roll at the time, and that mistake had saved them, otherwise the gerrymandering which took place at the last redistribution would have been ever so much worse. It was the imperfect rolls that made a redeeming point in connection with that redistribution. If the figures had turned out as Mr. Nanson had estimated, the redistribution would have been most outrageous, but fortunately the rolls had varied considerably from the estimates. In the 1911 scheme the outports and large country towns, consisting of Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, and Northam, which were estimated to contain 9,600, had on the rolls in 1911 11,363, and in 1913, 11,209. Albany had increased by 81, but there was a net decrease of 154. The pastoral districts, estimated to have 3,700, had in 1911 4,632, and in 1913 4,460, or a net decrease of 172. Roebourne had increased by 301. Even in those far Northern seats there was an actual quota of 1,486, according to the September roll, and in the outports and country towns 2,802. The member for Northam added those in with their large quota to his small agricultural districts, in order to make their quota more reasonable, and the goldfields were treated scurvily. Going into the figures in detail, it would be found that the only serious miscalculation made by Mr. Nanson was that the agricultural belt had been under-estimated by nearly 10,000 voters. Taking the South-West portion of the State, one found that Nelson was estimated at the time of the last redistribution to contain 2,100 voters; it actually had 2,954 in 1911, and in 1913 it had 3,102, or an increase of 148 Sussex was estimated to contain 1900; it had actually 2,256 in 1911, and in 1913 1,695, a decrease of 561. Murray was estimated to have 1,700, and in 1911 it actually had 2,207, while in 1913 the number was 1,994, or a decrease of 213. Swan was estimated to have 2,100. In 1911 it had 2,549, and in 1913 2,497, or a decrease of 52.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not on the estimate.

Mr. McDOWALL: The decrease was from the 1911 to the 1913 roll; the estimate was nothing. The estimate was not a fact, but the roll of 1911 was a fact. Taking the Midlands, one found that Moore was estimated to have 1,400, in 1911 it had 2,425, and in 1913, 2,327, or a decrease of 98. Irwin was estimated to have 1,400, it had 1.622 in 1911, and 1,661 in 1913. Greenough was estimated to have 1,600, it had 2,020 in 1911, and 2,089 in 1913. The total for the Midlands in 1913 was 6,077, compared with 6,067 in 1911, or an increase in that belt of 10. Yet we had it constantly preached to us that the goldfields were going down, and that the difference was being made up by these agricultural districts. Taking the Eastern and Great Southern division, one found that Toodyay in 1911 had 3,494, and in 1913 3,499, an increase of 5; Avon had 3,145 in 1911, and 3,071 in 1913, a decrease of 74. York was estimated to have 2,000 at the time of the last redistribution, it actually had 2,588 in 1911, and in 1913 2,559, or a decrease of 29. Beverley was estimated to have 2,000, it actually had 1.707 in 1911, and now had 1,765, or an increase of 58. Pingelly was estimated to have 1,800, it actually had 2,194 in 1911, and now had 2,182, or a decrease of 12. Williams-Narrogin was estimated to have 2,000, it actually had 2.956, and now had 3,046, an increase of 90. Wagin was estimated to have 1,800, it actually had 2.103 in 1911, and in 1913 it had 2,195, an increase of 92. Katanning was estimated to have 2,000, but had 2,472 in 1911, and now had 2,538, or an increase of 66. The figures proved that in the Eastern and Great Southern division there was a net increase of 196. Mr. Nanson estimated that the agricultural districts contained 27,800 electors. They actually contained 36,692 in 1911, but in 1913 they contained 36,220, showing a net decrease of 472. He had not had the least intention of saying a word in connection with this matter, but the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Northam was of such a glaring character that he could not refrain from saying a word or two in opposition to business of that kind. The hon. member said we were going to tell the commissioners what they were to do, and that it was all wrong. The Government, however, brought a Bill forward for 47 seats, and gave the commissioners a free hand, so far as those 47 seats were concerned. If the amendment was carried, would it be any use having the commissioners at all? The amendment would almost amount to fettering them so that they could not move in any direction whatever. With regard to supporters of the present Government in the scattered goldfields districts, let him show how the Bill affected them. It meant a quota of about 2,450. Now in these scattered districts the electorate of Coolgardie was the only one that had the quota. Coolgardie had at present 2,532, Kanowna 1,947, Menzies 1,321, Mt. Leonora 2,117, Mt. Margaret 1,870, Yilgarn 2,327. Coolgardie was the only seat of that lot which had the minimum quota. Therefore it meant that these seats must be re-arranged. There were not sufficient to give us the quota, and one of them must go out. It was the goldfields people who should complain about this Bill; people who sat solidly behind the Government were likely to be injured by the measure. He had no hesitation in making that assertion, as it was borne out by the figures, but it must be recognised that a redistribution of seats had been promised, and it could not possibly take place without interfering with the rights and privileges of someone. Mr. Nanson, in his estimate made a mistake of about 10,000 electors. It was just possible that in this instance a mistake of that kind might be made, but, even if the quotas were ever so large according to the hon. member for Northam's amendment, there could be no redress. The proposal of the hon. member was unfair and unreasonable in every shape and form. There was no justice in it, not anything that was reasonable. We had already agreed to everything in reason. We had agreed to allow the quotas to come up to 2,450. Did hon. members opposite want their quotas to come down and those of the Ministerial members to go up? The member for Northam apparently only wanted to legis-

late for a small portion of the country. The agricultural districts had ample seats at the present time and they were really well represented. It would now be outrageous to take three seats from the goldfields. The hon. member for Northam interjected that those were the minimum quotas, and that they might be exceeded. Attention might be called to the fact that it was estimated on the occasion of the last redistribution that Moore would have 1,400, Irwin 1,400, and Greenough 1,600, and he impresed upon members that the farmers always got the minimum quota. Let us compare those places with Coolgardie with 2,450, Kanowna with 2,400, Menzies with 2,300, Leonora with 2,300, Mount Margaret with 2,125, and Yilgarn with 1975. The minimum quota on the occasion of the last redistribution was given to the agricultural districts. The minimum in the proposed redistribution was almost sure to be given to the agricultural districts. The good sense of the Chamber would never dream of consenting to such an amendment as that proposed by the member for Northam. It should be relegated to the obscurity it so richly deserved.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the Bill went through as it was drafted the agricultural districts would lose three or four seats. Why should the Attorney General object to the treatment he (Mr. Mitchell) proposed to mete out to the goldfields when he applied the very same treatment to the agricultural districts where such treatment was not justified?

The Attorney General: I am applying the same treatment to the goldfields and to the agricultural districts.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Under the proposal of the Attorney General the agricultural districts would lose three or four seats.

Mr. Underwood: Why should they not?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The proposal which he had put forward was in plain words. The Attorney General's Bill was somewhat obscure because the matter would be left to the commissioners. He realised that the intention was to take away representation from the growing industry of agriculture. The amendment he had put forward was perfectly honest and there was no intention other than to bring about for the country the best possible representation.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. UNDERWOOD moved an amendment—

That in lines 2 and 3 of the proviso the words "comprised within the existing electoral districts of Kimberley, Roebourne, Pilbara, and Gascoyne" be struck out, and the words "situated north of the Tropics of Capricorn" be inserted in lieu.

The alteration was consequential on the amendment carried the other day. The difference in wording served to show a little more clearly what was meant.

Amendment passed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The directions to be given to the commissioners, as shown in sub-clause 3, were in the wrong order. Instead of "means of communication and distance from the capital" being the first direction it should be the last, while "community or diversity of interest," instead of being in the third place, should be in the first. With a view to effecting this alteration in the order he moved an amendment—

That all words after "to" in line 2 be struck out.

If the Committee agreed to strike out these words he would then move the insertion of other words which would place "community or diversity of interest" in the position of first direction to the commissioners.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: All the debates up to the present had been around this very point, and consequently it was unnecessary to have any long debate upon the amendment; in fact it would be a waste of time to debate it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We were here to debate these questions. Community of interest was of far more importance than means of communication and distance from the capital.

Mr. HARPER: The amendment was of the utmost importance. Community of interest should be the leading direction for the commissioners. Certainly it should not be the third in order.

The Attorney General: Be very thankful that it is there at all.

Mr. HARPER: It would be very extraordinary if the principle were not included among the directions. Districts devoted to primary production ought to have priority over all other parts of the State. It was important that community and diversity of interest should have a prominent place in this scheme. The agricultural industry should have prior consideration above all. Although he was a property owner in the city, he knew that his city interests would not be worth much but for the development of the country. The people in the towns were only living on the producers in the country.

Mr. TURVEY: The attitude of Opposition members on this question compared strangely with their attitude when discussing the representation of the North-West. They had recognised that the North-West was entitled to special consideration because of its limited means of communication and distance from the capital, and now they were opposing the Government in proposing that means of communication and distance from the capital should have consideration before community or diversity of interest. There was a diversity of interest even in the Swan constituency, in which were to be found agricultural, horticultural, timber, quarrying, and brick making industries. It was hard to say where community of interest would start and where it would end, and after all if means of communication and distance from the capital were to be placed first, they would give to the outback country districts the increased representation that was sought. Provision was made that the commissioners might vary their quota to the extent of 20 per cent. above or 20 per cent. below, which meant that an increase of 50 per cent. could be given.

Member: Forty per cent.

Mr. TURVEY: If the quota were 3,000 and 20 per cent. below was the lowest, and 20 per cent. above was the highest, it would mean that the furthest out agricultural districts would have the smallest number, whilst the electorates closer in to the city could have exactly 50 per cent. more electors than those country districts.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: This clause was practically the crux of the Bill, and he differed from its provisions for the reason that the effect of the clause would be that certain members would be taken away from the mining and agricultural districts and increased representation given to the more populous electoral districts in the metropolitan area. It had been pointed out by the member for Swan that the agricultural districts had nothing to be afraid of, and that owing to the commissioners being able to vary their quota by 20 per cent. above or below, the agricultural districts would get an increase. If the hon. member went into the figures he would discover that he was totally wrong, because even if the maximum quota were allowed to the metropolitan area, namely, 3,600 votes, that area must have an increase of at least two members. Upon that point he wished to enter a protest.. He had no desire at this stage of the history of the State to see a drastic alteration made in the representation of the more sparsely populated portions of the State to the extent he had indicated. The agricultural districts would be worse off by one member than they were before the passing of the 1905 Act, notwithstanding the fact that the electoral population in the agricultural areas had increased by something like 20,000 electors. This would mean an entirely new principle of distribution of electoral representation, and the Government should put up a better case before altering the system contained in the present Act. He had no objection to an amendment of the boundaries of some of the present electorates. There were undoubtedly some anomalies where electorates contained more electors than the quota originally provided, but the Government should hesitate about introducing entirely new principles which would mean the disfranchising of many electors, particularly in agricultural and mining districts.

Mr. Price: We do not disfranchise any one.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Increased representation was to be given to the metropolitan area, but he failed to see that any dissatisfaction had been shown by the electors in that area. He felt sure the common sense of the people resident in the metropolitan area would tell them that if their area was to progress we must develop to the fullest extent the primary industries. The country member had a good deal more work to do than the metropolitan member. He had to keep very closely in touch with every part of his electorate, which sometimes covered a very wide area, new centres were springing up day by day, educational and other facilities were constantly required, and he had to attend to all the little local wants which in nine cases out of ten the metropolitan member had not to worry about. He wished again to enter his protest against any diminution in the number of members from the country districts. He would go even so far as to oppose any unreasonable reduction from the goldfields.

Mr. Thomas: Would you go so far as that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Was the hon. member for Katanning in order in going back and discussing generally the clause after we had amended it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member had a perfect right to discuss the adoption or rejection of a clause, but no right to traverse over again arguments that had been used and points that had been settled and decided. We had decided two points, as to the quota and as to the order in the directions. Any arguments why the Committee should not accept the clause would be in perfect order.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Could not the hon. member discuss generally the clause we were now asked to pass into law as amended?

The CHAIRMAN: So long as the hon. member used arguments for the rejection or the adoption of the clause it was possible for him to proceed.

Mr. Underwood: What about tedious repetition?

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Taking away these seats from the agricultural and mining districts and giving them to metropolitan districts would not be acting in the best interests of the country. One member had expressed surprise that he (Mr. Piesse) would leave the number of mining districts as at present.

Mr. Thomas: No, you said you would reduce them a little.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: This Bill provided for a reduction from 13 to 12. He would go so far as to leave the number at 13, as he honestly believed we had every good reason to expect a revival in the mining industry. So far as the agricultural and scattered electorates were concerned the Government should hesitate before bringing about any further disabilities in the direction indicated in this clause.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The principle was a clear one, and he was not altogether opposed to this Bill, but he would have preferred an amendment to provide that the quota could be increased or reduced by 25 per cent. instead of by 20 per cent.

Clause as amended put and passed.

Clause 5—Report:

Mr. MALE: It was provided in paragraph (a) of Subclause 1 that the commissioners should forward a report of their division specifying "the quota of electors." We had already definitely fixed the quota of electors, and it seemed hardly necessary to ask the commissioners to report on it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The paragraph was necessary as provision had been made for the commissioners to vary the quota according to the distance from the capital, etcetera, and so on.

Mr. MALE: If the paragraph meant the quota for the particular district which they decided, would it not be clearer to make the paragraph read "the quota of electors for each district"?

The Attorney General: It is perfectly clear without it.

Mr. WISDOM: A slight alteration would make the paragraph perfectly clear. "Quota" did not mean the quota for each district, allowing for the margin of 20 per cent. above or below, and that, he took it, was what the member for Kimberley wanted and what the Attorney General wanted also.

Mr. MALE: We were providing in paragraph (d) for the number of electors in each district, and the Minister made an unnecessary remark when he said that the effect of any alteration which might be made would be an insult. The Opposition had a right to suggest alterations without those alterations being regarded as being insulting to anyone. The Attorney General's explanation was not correct. The quota was not the number of electors in each district; it was the number of electors in the whole of the State.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was absolutely unnecessary to change a single word in any paragraph of the clause.

Mr. Male: I think so too, now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then no more need be said.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Future redivisions:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In a previous clause it was provided that the redistribution should come into force on a date to be fixed, not later than October, 1914, and then we made provision for further divisions in accordance with Clause 6. If that was the case when would the Bill be introduced to Parliament, or come into force?

Mr. MALE: The clause set out that the State might be redivided into electoral districts by commissioners in the manner before provided, whenever directed by the Governor by proclamation, pursuant to a resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly. Was it advisable or was it usual for a redistribution of seats to take place simply by a resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly? Was it not customary for matters of that nature to be passed by both Chambers? This Bill would have to go before the Legislative Council; it was a matter which affected the Legislative Council as well as the Legislative Assembly, inasmuch as there was a provision here for altering the Council provinces.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was not a redistribution. Even if this Bill received the Royal assent we might never have a redistribution following upon it. After the report came in it would be laid before Parliament or it might be gone on with, and the Bill which which might be introduced might be rejected. When it came to a redistribution, then both Houses would have to take their part. This clause simply provided that the machinery for delineating the boundaries should be a standing provision. The commissioners could be called into being and set to work by a simple resolution of the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I think both Houses should be consulted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Let the Legislative Council amend their own clause dealing with their own House.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Both Houses should have a hand in this matter.

Hon. H. B. Lefroy: A redivision might mean a redistribution.

The Attorney General: No.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Redivided was a very wide term. It might mean the shuffling up of the whole of the electoral districts of the State, and the State might be divided again by commissioners pursuant to a resolution of the Legislative Assembly. Parliament should decide that and Parliament consisted of both Houses. The Legislative Council should certainly have a voice in this matter.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Each House was left to itself. The Legislative Assembly would have no power to pass a resolution saying that the Council should pass such a redistribution. We could not deal here with the reform of the Upper House. The custom was that reform affecting the Legislative Council must arise in the Legislative Council cil. The same principle applied to the Legislative Assembly. As to how we should hold our seats, as to the size of our seats, or how many electors we should represent, the Legislative Council had no say. We must originate reforms for our own body and therefore we were following a well recognised, time-worn, constitutional principle. This redistribution was for Assembly seats, and therefore it was our bounden right, not a mere privilege or caprice, but our right,

established by long precedent and custom.

Mr. MALE: We were instructing these commissioners not only to make a re-division of the Assembly districts, but we were also asking them to make a recommendation for the readjustment of the boundaries of the electoral provinces.

The Minister for Works: Is that not absolutely essential?

Mr. MALE: We were, therefore, doing something which the Minister told us we had no right to do.

The Minister for Works: It is only a recommendation.

Mr. MALE: The whole thing was only a recommendation, but we were asking for a recommendation, not only affecting the districts which were represented in this House, but also affecting the provinces which were represented in another place, and it should be necessary for both Houses to have a say in the matter. For the purpose of testing the feeling of the House on this particular point he would move an amendment—

That in line 4 the words "Legislative Assembly" be struck out for the purpose of inserting "both Houses of Parliament."

Point of Order.

The Attorney General: On a point of order: the amendment is absolutely against the Constitution Act. We cannot allow the other place to have a say in the constitution of the Assembly. One of the dearest principles which has been fought for all through the centuries is that to preserve the autonomy of each Chamber, and once we allow another place to veto our right to have a map drawn showing the lines on which it is deemed necessary to redistribute the seats, we will have sacrificed all our constitutional rights. What we are doing in this measure is merely to ask that commissioners should for our guidance draw up boundaries of our electorates. When it comes to a Redistribution of Seats Bill that will be an entirely different matter; we then will be trying to enact a law and both Houses and the Government will have a say in it. But the amendment would give another place a say in our own constitution, and therefore it is entirely out of order.

Mr. George: All will agree with the Attorney General in the desire to preserve the privileges of the Chamber. But in an earlier clause the Bill seeks to deal with the other House.

The Attorney General: It does not.

Mr. George: But the Bill makes reference to an alteration of the electoral provinces. Is the Attorney General ignoring the fact that Clause 6 makes provision that the commissioners should consider the readjustment of boundaries of the electoral provinces? Underlying the Bill is the intention to deal with the Legislative Council if it is found possible. There is sufficient justification for the amendment. If the commisioners put in a recommendation in regard to the electoral districts and electoral provinces, some action will have to be taken in this House and in another place also. Once the report of the commissioners comes in embodying a recommendation for the alteration of the provinces, some action will have to be taken. If I thought the amendment would infringe the privileges of the House I would oppose it.

The Attorney General: The clause referred to by the hon. member in no way affects the rights and privileges of another place. If it did, it would be out of order. The justification for the clause as it stands is that it has to go before the other House and will be considered by them, and therefore it infringes no privileges. The Bill deals only with the bare report; it has no legislative qualities nor does it by any means bind anybody. It is only in the nature of securing information. It provides merely that a report shall be laid before both Houses. The Bill that will follow the report will come before both Houses. Clause 6 is merely a direction for the Government to introduce a Bill which will go through the usual course of a Bill. But the amendment is a principle which would permit the other place to dictate to us as to whether or not we should have a

redistribution of seats. That is absolutely unallowable. The most permanent recognised principle of our constitutional law is that each House shall have its own constitution. The moment that is infringed, chaos and confusion will follow. This question ought to be placed before the Speaker.

The Chairman: The Attorney General is placing me in an awkward position. If I give a ruling as to whether the amendment is admissible, and that ruling is accepted, then the question will not go to the Speaker. The only way to get it to the Speaker will be for me to give a ruling and for the Attorney General to move that the ruling be disagreed with.

The Attorney General: The only reason for suggesting that it should be referred to the Speaker is because the question most vitally affects the constitutional safety of the Chamber. However, I will take your ruling on the point. There is a difference between the reports which will be laid before both Houses and the power of this House to originate its own legislation. The reports in both instances will be laid before both Houses, but the preliminary step for a redistribution of seats must originate in this Chamber, and therefore it is legitimate that the resolution of this Chamber should be sufficient. If a resolution of another Chamber should be to the effect that the Assembly must not have a redistribution of seats it would be nothing short of a declaration of war as to the relative powers of the two Houses. We have the management of our own business and can say when we will or will not bring about a redistribution of seats. The Bill provides that by a resolution of the Assembly we should set in motion the machinery of the Bill and then, of course, the reports would follow. The reports are laid before both Houses and the Bill is brought forward. We have still the right to say whether there shall be a redistribution of seats, but if we accept that amendment we give to another place the right to say that, notwithstanding we think there shall be a redistribution, we shall not have it, and that would allow another place to say whether or not we should have a change. That is contrary to the Constitution.

The Chairman: The trouble is, if I rule against the Attorney General he will move to disagree to my ruling, and if I rule against the member for Kimberley he also will move to disagree.

Mr. George: Do I understand that the Attorney General disagrees to your ruling?

The Attorney General: I have raised the point.

The Chairman: I am going to ask the Committee to allow me to submit the matter direct to the Speaker without my giving a ruling.

Mr. George: There is something more than that in this question. The objection raised by the Attorney General is that the amendment moved by the member for Kimberley is out of order. The Minister has not quoted a Standing Order to show that it is out of order, but has simply quoted precedents. I submit there can be no disputing your ruling, because you are not asked for a ruling. In any case if the Attorney General disputes your ruling he has to show cause, which he has not done yet.

The Chairman: I see only one way out of this difficulty and that is for me to rule the amendment in order. Then I shall take no exception to the Attorney General moving that my ruling be disagreed to, and I shall then submit the matter to the Speaker.

Dissent from Chairman's ruling.

The Attorney General: I move that your ruling be disagreed to on the ground that the amendment is unconstitutional and an infringement of the rights of the Assembly.

The Speaker took the Chair.

The Chairman having stated the dissent.

The Attorney General: To understand the point that is raised I shall have to read the clause we are considering. Clause 7 deals with future redivisions by commissioners not with the enactment of any law, and says—

> The State may be redivided into electoral districts by commissioners, in the

manner hereinbefore provided, whenever directed by the Governor by proclamation, pursuant to a resolution duly passed by the Legislative Assembly; and, subject as hereinafter provided, this Act shall apply to every such redivision.

The hon. member for Kimberley has moved to delete the words "Legislative Assembly" and to substitute "both Houses of Parliament." A resolution then, for directions merely to the commissioners to redivide the boundaries of electorates, must be submitted to both Houses. In other words, this Bill being law, we could not possibly, if the other House said no or refused to pass a resolution, get a redistribution programme, plan or map drawn up. I submit that whichever House desires reform it has been the usual practice to recognise that the particular reform affecting that particular Chamber rests in that Chamber. We know there are certain Bills which must originate in this Chamber, and that the other House cannot deal with them at all. That is one of our privileges. In like manner here are certain matters which the House of Lords in England, from which we take our pattern, claim the exclusive right to deal with and one matter which each House claims the right to deal with is in regard to its own procedure, Standing Orders, and so on. This matter which affects us vitally affects our seats and presence here, and our whole constitution, yet we are told we cannot take preliminary steps to get guidance for that purpose unless the other House gives us permission. The other House in that event could keep us forever from a redistribution. However iniquitous the position might be they could prevent us from altering it. The Government have the obligation placed upon them to lay before both Houses the report and then Clause 6 goes further to direct the Government that the Bill shall be introduced. It goes on in Subclause 2 to say, the Bill shall provide that, notwithstanding the alteration of the boundaries of any electoral province due to making them coincide with the altered boundaries of the divisions of the districts of the Assembly, every member of the Legislative Council shall continue to represent in Parliament the electoral province for which he was elected, with the boundaries assigned to it by the Act.

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest that since the Bill is not under discussion that the Attorney General should take the point which has been raised, namely, that the admission of this amendment is a violation of the rights and privileges of the Assembly and is unconstitutional. I would like to hear the arguments on those points.

The Attorney General: I was only anticipating arguments which were by inference raised, and which I know will be put to you subsequently. With reference to what is a well recognised principle I wish to point out that *May* on page 459 of the Eleventh edition states—

> As a general rule, Bills may originate in either House; but the exclusive right of the House of Commons to grant supplies, and to impose and appropriate all charges upon the people, renders it necessary to introduce by far the greater proportion of Bills into that House.

On page 460 he states—

> A Bill which concerns the privileges or proceedings of either House should, in courtesy, commence in that House to which it relates.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Commence.

The Attorney General: This is dealing with Bills, and I say the resolution is the starting of this very Bill which concerns us. It is not a Bill at all in itself. We have as much right by a resolution to appoint commissioners to delineate boundaries as we have to appoint a Royal Commission for any purpose by resolution of this House. In fact, the argument has been used that the Government have the power to appoint a commission, simply as the executive body of this House. The Government themselves could appoint the commission, but in deference we suggest a new procedure that the House itself shall be able to carry a resolution setting the Government in motion to appoint a commission to readjust boundaries, and whoever said in Parliament that before a commission is appointed by the Governor the other

Chamber must say whether they shall allow it or not? It is absolutely unprecedented and would be a curtailment of the liberty of this Chamber if this House cannot by resolution instruct the Governor to appoint a commission to draw a map for it if the other House do not give permission. It would be a sacrifice of our rights and privileges, and it is discountenanced by the history of the British Parliament as evidenced by the passage I have just read. The other Chamber must not have a voice in determining the free liberty of this Chamber to move resolutions and to act upon them. We must surely preserve to ourselves the right in days to come to have a map drawn for this Assembly without asking anybody. That right must not be curtailed by or made subservient to any Chamber. Hon. members opposite are proposing that the House shall be incapable of telling the Governor that they want another map with a view to have another redistribution of seats unless another Chamber acquiesce. It is most inadvisable that we should sacrifice our privileges in that manner.

Mr. Male: The point has been raised that my amendment will affect the privileges of this House. I would like to point out that the whole clause affects the privileges of this House, inasmuch as we could stultify ourselves in the future when we wanted to have a redistribution of seats. I contend that as this Bill affects not only the constitution of this House, but also that of another place, that their privileges are just as much at stake as our privileges are, and if we by this Bill are going to affect the constitution of another place then certainly they must have some say as to whether their place shall be affected or not. Under this Bill this Chamber passes a resolution to the effect that when a future redistribution is necessary the commission are to be asked to report not only on the new boundaries affecting this Chamber, but are also instructed that their report shall contain a recommendation for the readjustment of the boundaries of the electoral provinces into which the State is divided. If we readjust the boundaries of the electoral provinces we at the same time readjust the number of electors in those provinces, and that after all is all that this Bill does as affecting the Assembly. We instruct that the boundaries of the districts represented in this Assembly shall be altered, and at the same time we also alter the number of electors in the district. It has the same effect on both Houses, and I contend that the privileges of both Houses are affected in this Bill. If my amendment is not allowed to go in it simply means that we, the Legislative Assembly, can pass a resolution asking that the boundaries and the number of electors, represented within those boundaries, of the electoral provinces shall be readjusted. I contend that we have no right to do that any more than the Council would have the right to bring in a similar measure affecting the Assembly.

Mr. George: I do not propose to go into the various arguments that the Attorney General has placed before us, because I think they are entirely irrelevant to the question. The question submitted to you, Mr. Speaker, is this: Is any hon. member in order in proposing an amendment in Committee? The hon. member who has just spoken proposed an amendment which, so far as I am able to find, is not at variance with the Standing Orders of this House, and you, Sir, are asked to decide really an abstract question instead of the plain simple question of the right and privilege of every member of this House to move an amendment provided it is in accordance with the Standing Orders. If the Attorney General said this one was not in accordance with the Standing Orders, there might have been some debate on this question. But until this amendment has been proved to be outside the Standing Orders I think the whole of this discussion is out of order.

Hon. H. B. Lefroy: It appears to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kimberley in no way affects the privileges of this House. It is merely a question whether this amendment is in order or not. In my opinion it does not interfere with the privileges of this House. The Bill we have before us

affects both Houses of Parliament. Any redistribution which takes place must of necessity affect both Houses. The boundaries of the Legislative Council are regulated by the boundaries of the electoral districts for the Assembly. If the argument of the Attorney General holds good that the Legislative Council had no voice in the constitution of the Legislative Assembly, this House might alter the constitution as it affects the Legislative Assembly without submitting the matter to the Legislative Council. Our Constitution Act distinctly lays it down that no alteration in the Constitution can be made without submitting that alteration to the Legislative Council, and being passed by an absolute majority of both Houses, and afterwards receiving the assent of His Majesty. That does away with the Attorney General's argument that we have a perfect right to legislate with regard to our own constitution without reference to any other body. The question now before us is as to whether in the re-division of the electorates, the Legislative Council shall be consulted or not. It appears to me that this Bill affects both Houses and, therefore, as it does that, any redistribution must affect both Houses by reason that the boundaries of the Legislative Council are affected by the boundaries of the electoral districts of the Legislative Assembly. On these grounds I hold that the amendment of the member for Kimberley is perfectly in order.

The Attorney General: The whole confusion arises from hon. members confounding the Bill and an executive act which are two distinct things. The Government have the power at the present moment to appoint these commissioners without asking anybody's permission.

Mr. Male: And the Government shirk their responsibilities.

The Attorney General: It does not matter whether we shirk our responsibilities or not. The appointment of commissioners and the limiting of their functions have been put in this Bill for the sole purpose of guidance now and in the future. This Bill makes provision for the way in which advice shall be tendered, and the report of the commissioners or the recommendation of the commissioners has no more to do with the legislation which may be introduced subsequently than the laying of papers upon the Table of the House. It helps to form legislation, it is a guidance to hon. members and nothing else. The point is that even this House cannot direct the Government to do what it has the right to do now unless another place interferes. That is a distinct curtailment of our individual liberties. If this were a Bill to limit the powers of the other House or to alter the decision of that House in any way I admit it would have to go through both Houses. But to say that this House cannot obtain a report or recommendation without going through the two Houses is on the face of it absurd. A report is not a Bill. It is not legislation, it is only the obtaining of information. A commission is not legislation. The appointment of a commission is purely an executive function, which function is vested in His Majesty's Ministers. They can do that, and Ministers have the right to anticipate the approval of both Houses of Parliament, but in the course they are taking in this Bill they are not going to limit the executive functions of government or the inalienable rights of this Assembly. To say that the consent of the other place is required in a matter of this kind is absurd, and it is contrary to every precedent and practice. I only want to show that even in matters of legislation itself there are certain well recognised rules of courtesy that have been practised as long as parliamentary government has been honoured by that name. There are certain Bills which originate in this Assembly, and which would be rejected if they originated in the other House. There are also certain Bills that can originate in the other House, and which by custom have always originated there, and one of the Bills that is free for either House is that affecting the constitutional reform of itself, so to speak. If it is a reform affecting the other Chamber it is supposed to originate in that Chamber. If it is a reform affecting the Assembly it is supposed to originate here. That has been the time-honoured custom and

we should be departing from it if we altered it now. This does not go to the extent of a Bill. It only goes to this point; have we the sole right of saying when we shall get an opinion, how we shall get it, who shall give it to us and in what way it shall be delivered. Have we that right, and is that merely our right without asking any one's permission. If it is, then we are curtailing that right and, therefore, altering our constitutional methods if we ask another House to give its permission before we exercise what has been our privilege up to this moment.

Mr. Speaker: The objection raised by the Attorney General to the decision of the Chairman is that the admission of an amendment to this Bill moved by the member for Kimberley is a violation of the privileges and rights of the Assembly, and that it is unconstitutional. Anything to be unconstitutional must be something in direct opposition to the Constitution of the Parliament of Western Australia. The Attorney General has failed to prove that contention. He has quoted from *May* a passage which has relation not to the Parliament of Western Australia, but only to the Imperial Parliament, the Constitution of which is not a written one as our Constitution is, but a Constitution by which the business of Parliament is carried on by form, precedent, and custom. The passage the Attorney General read is as follows:—

> A Bill which concerns the privileges or proceedings of either House, should in courtesy commence in that House to which it relates.

It does not state that the Bill must and shall originate in the House which is concerned. The passage continues—

> But Bills affecting privileges of the other House, have, nevertheless, been admitted without objection. Amendments, however, concerning the privileges and jurisdiction of the Lords, have given rise to discussions in both Houses.

Even in the Imperial Parliament Bills affecting the privileges of the other House have nevertheless been admitted without objection. I could only uphold the contention of the Attorney General that this amendment is unconstitutional if the terms of the amendment and its objects were in direct opposition to the Constitution of the Parliament of Western Australia. Section 73 of the Constitution Act provides—

> The Legislature of the Colony shall have full power and authority, from time to time by any Act, to repeal or alter any of the provisions of this Act.

The Attorney General in his remarks stated that if this amendment be allowed the other House would have the right to veto legislation from this House concerning the distribution of seats in this Chamber. That contention is correct. The other House will have that right under this Bill. This Bill cannot become law unless it is passed by the other House. If it did not pass that House any attempt to make it law would be unconstitutional. I have no doubt in my mind that the amendment is in order, and should be admitted. I therefore support the ruling of the Chairman.

The Attorney General: Will you permit me to ask your ruling on a point which I think you have missed. The point is not has this body a right to make laws without the other House giving their assent and participating. I tried to make it clear, but even in the matters of Bills there are certain things that originate by custom in both Houses.

Mr. Male: On a point of order; is the hon. member disagreeing with your ruling or discussing it or merely making an explanation?

Mr. Speaker: The proper procedure would be to disagree with my ruling. I understand, however, that the Attorney General has a point to submit.

The Attorney General: The point I have raised has not been touched.

Mr. Male: Are you disagreeing with the Speaker's ruling?

The Attorney General: No, I am asking him to further consider the point if I put it more plainly. The point is that the amendment does not concern legislation at all; it is not a question of the right of both Houses to participate in legislation affecting the privileges of

either. That is governed by the clause But my point is this, and I would draw special attention to it: that the Bill we are considering only makes provision, not for legislation, but for a report to be sent to the Governor.

Mr. Wisdom: It is always a Bill, just the same.

The Attorney General: The Bill provides for obtaining information in a given way. That is all. It enacts nothing, legislates nothing, it is not in any sense of the word a Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General is wrong in proceeding to argue the question. The Minister has used that argument before.

The Attorney General: That is the whole point. It is not legislation. This House has always had the power, and there is no power outside the House to prevent it—constitutionally our House has the sole right to get information in any way it may direct.

Hon. J. Mitchell: So has the other House.

The Attorney General: So has the other House. We should have no right to prevent the other House from getting a commission or a select committee appointed. We could not do it. They get their information in their own way. This House has the right to get information which is not legislation.

Mr. Wisdom: Why did you not appoint a commission without a Bill?

The Attorney General: That is not the point. I am saying we have the right to do it. This House has the right to instruct, and therefore whatever power comes in to curtail that right is unconstitutional. To shear away the privileges of any members of this House is against the well known custom of the Parliament of Western Australia. There is no precedent in Western Australia for this innovation, and if it be adopted, curtailing the right of this House to pass a resolution giving instructions to the Ministry to appoint a commission—not to pass a Bill—if there be any curtailment of that, there is an infringement of the rights of members of this Chamber, and therefore a violation to that extent of the Constitution of Western Australia.

Mr. Speaker: I regret that the Attorney General should have argued the matter again, but I permitted him to state a further point, although I am convinced he previously stated it. Under the written Constitution of the Parliament of Western Australia, this House has the power to introduce any Bill, but that Bill cannot become law without the concurrence of the other House. The Attorney General argues that the Government have power to appoint commissioners. The Government have that power without approaching Parliament. Once the Government approach Parliament and introduce a Bill that Bill cannot become law without the concurrence of the other House; otherwise it would be unconstitutional. Therefore, under the Constitution Act, which is our only guide, our written Constitution, this amendment must be admitted, because the other House has to be consulted in the passage of this measure. Therefore I intend to rule that the Chairman's ruling is, in my opinion, the correct one.

The Attorney General: I am going to move to dissent from your ruling, but I prefer to do it by notice of motion, in order to give both of us time to look further into the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can give notice of motion to-morrow; this is not the time to give it.

The Attorney General: Then I shall do so to-morrow.

Committee resumed.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	13
Noes	.. .. ..	20
Majority against	..	7

AYES.

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

NOES.

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

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. GEORGE: The clause ought to be struck out altogether, for the Bill was complete without it. The previous clause contained everything required for the working of the Bill. The clause under discussion was redundant. The commissioners having fulfilled their duties, their report would be laid before both Houses, and on that report all the necessary action required for the redistribution of seats would take place, including the introduction of a Bill for the redistribution of seats. There was no reason whatever for the clause, for every provision it included was already provided earlier in the Bill. It was a redundancy not needed in the Bill, and was based on an altogether wrong principle. The policy of the party in power was that the second Chamber should be destroyed. That was their order from outside the Chamber, but not from the electors. Hon. members were simply carrying out the orders of that hidden caucus which met in the Trades Hall, and which aimed at subverting the will of the people. He wished the Opposition had power to interfere with this revolutionary business which the Government were bringing forward. He asked members on the Government side to for once release themselves from their thraldom, and realise that there was this redundancy, and also that if it had not been for the Legislative Council many measures which had passed this House with very little consideration would have become law, and the country would be in an even worse position than it was to-day. The clause should be struck out.

Mr. MALE: The Attorney General argued that it would be interfering with the privileges of the Assembly if we attempted to let another place have some say in our proceedings. If we had the power which was contained in this clause why were we asking for the power to be given to us, and if the Executive had power to appoint a commission why did they not do it? The commissioners were instructed to redivide in the manner "hereinbefore provided." He did not agree with the manner hereinbefore provided, but even if that manner were good to-day it might not be good in 10 years' time when the necessity for redistribution arose.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Parliament will be the best judges then.

Mr. MALE: Parliament would have no say in the matter. He strongly objected to the clause, which was going to do the North out of what was its proper representation in this Chamber.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In New South Wales there was a similar law, and when a redistribution was desired a Bill was brought forward appointing commissioners, and of course setting out any fresh provisions that might be necessary. The clause was objectionable, firstly because a special representation of three members was given to the North-West, although the quota would be only a little over 1,200. In three years' time the conditions in that regard might be entirely changed. It was also provided that the State should be divided into 50 electorates: but it might be that when we had a redistribution we would desire to reduce or increase that number, and Parliament should be consulted before any redistribution took place in regard to both those matters. It should be possible for Ministers to give both Houses of Parliament an opportunity of setting up the conditions. The machinery measure could stand, but assuredly it was desirable that the special conditions contained in this Bill should come up for reconsideration. It was undesirable to allow this House the right to say that redistribution should take place, without giving it the power to reconsider the conditions on which the redistribution should be conducted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was nothing in the contention of the

member for Kimberley, or the member for Northam, because, although it was provided that on a resolution of this House the commissioners should be authorised to redivide in accordance with the position then existing in the individual electorates, before that could be given effect to a Redistribution of Seats Bill had to pass, and every opportunity was given to Parliament to recast the Bill in accordance with the conditions then in existence. It was the same in New South Wales and Queensland. There was an Act setting out the general principles upon which redistribution should take place, but before the work of the commissioners could be given statutory effect to it was necessary that a Bill embodying that work should be passed through Parliament. Therefore, there was no question of tying the hands of Parliament and of preventing any recasting of the system of representation.

Mr. MALE: It was of no use having power to appoint commissioners to redivide the State into electorates if Parliament could not revise the instructions to the commissioners. If, later on, commissioners were appointed, their hard and fast instructions were contained in this Bill, and they would have to work under those conditions and not under conditions that might arise later on. If the clause were redrafted in such a manner as to leave it open to the House to not only appoint the commission, but also to alter the instructions as might be necessary it would be an improvement.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was true that Parliament must take the responsibility of seeing that the State was rightly divided into electorates and that the quota for each electorate was fair. This Bill set up the conditions on which redistribution would take place, and before we appointed commissioners at considerable cost to make these divisions Parliament should from time to time have the right to say what the conditions should be. The requirements of to-day would not be the requirements of three years' time, and before appointing the commission a short Bill should be put through as was done in New South Wales, where it was customary for the measure not only to authorise redistribution or dividing the State into electorates, but to name the commissioners. They further decided the number of seats into which the State should be divided.

The Minister for Lands: They do not alter the principle.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: These other matters were important surely. It should be imperative for Parliament to reconsider the conditions at the time a redistribution was to take place.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member for Murray-Wellington had evidently arrived at an entirely wrong conclusion that a resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly would be interfering with the privileges of another place, and further contending that the resolution should pass both Houses. The resolution however was only dealing with future redivisions. This measure provided for a Redistribution of Seats Bill which must come before this Assembly, and also go before the other Chamber. It was then that these alterations could take place if need be.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I wish to have the Bill recommitted with a view to moving an amendment to Clause 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will be able to move for the recommittal of the Bill at the next sitting.

BILL—LOCAL OPTION.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Place and day of polling:

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Was it proposed to take the poll in 1915? It would be a waste of money to take the poll if effect was not to be given to it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The view of the Government was that the poll should be taken in 1915. It was not a party measure, but personally he wanted the vote taken and effect given to it as soon as possible.

Mr. MONGER moved an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 1 the word "fifteen" be struck out and the words "fourteen on the occasion of the State general election" inserted in lieu.

The subclause would then read—"A local option poll shall be taken in every district in the year 1914 on the occasion of the State general election and in every third year thereafter." Unless the poll was taken on the occasion of some important event the proper number of electors would not record their votes.

Mr. O'Loghlen: They should abide by the result if they do not take sufficient interest.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The amendment would have his support. The poll should be taken on a day when we could get a full expression of opinion from the people.

Mr. TURVEY: Seeing that the Bill provided for a bare majority decision it was essential that the local option poll should be taken on the day of the general elections. If it was taken at any other time his experience led him to believe that the so-called fanatics in liquor reform, who were the most enthusiastic, would turn up to the poll in the greatest numbers, whereas the average man of the world when told that a local option poll was being taken would display no interest in it apart from the day of the general elections. While he believed in a bare majority he wanted to see as full a poll taken as could possibly be provided. We were told by those who were opposed to taking a poll on the day of a general election that it would overshadow other issues. He did not think that would be the case. Even if it did he saw no great harm in it. He was particularly anxious to see as many people as possible brought along to record their votes on this question.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was his intention to record his vote against the taking of a local option poll on the day of a general election. He did so for the reason which perhaps was somewhat hackneyed, that he did not want other questions to be clouded by this one. He had never shirked his responsibilities in this matter. His leanings were in the direction of temperance, but he was not going to have the whole policy of the country perhaps set aside by the taking of this poll on the day of an election. To-day in New South Wales extraneous matters were being brought in and in the zeal of party enthusiasm, in the very agitation which had been worked up, the people pinned their faith to one reform and forgot the others that the candidate might be advocating. If the question of local option, the question of the popular control of the liquor traffic in Western Australia was as important as we were led to believe, there should be sufficient interest and enthusiasm aroused by both parties to allow a fair poll being recorded. He was in favour of a bare majority and believed that if the people could send this Government about their business and put in another Government by a bare majority, then a bare majority should be sufficient to decide even the way in which the liquor traffic should be conducted. There were some districts to-day, notably Boulder, Kanowna, Menzies, and other towns on the goldfields, where a local option poll might result in the sweeping away of many licenses. At Boulder, where 30 licenses existed at the present time, perhaps if there were 15 a legitimate trade would be done. His desire was to see this question stand by itself, and if we decided on that course we would be doing what was best in the interests of the State as a whole. When an agitation was worked up and people's feelings were aroused, they were likely to forget the main issues before the constituency and were likely to go nap on the man who would pander for their vote. The liquor trade was in a sufficiently strong position to provide facilities for getting a fairly good poll and the people should not be allowed to vote on this question when they were in the throes of a general election.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Those who objected to the local option poll being taken on an election day must be trying to shirk something.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Ridiculous.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That was his opinion of the hon. member.

Mr. O'Loghlen: It is reciprocated too.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It was said that the people were likely to forget other reforms in favour of this one, but his experience of the people was that the reform they set their mind on was the one they wanted most, and that was the one they would be determined to get. Seeing that this was a Bill to refer the liquor traffic to the people for decision, the people should know what reform they wanted first. Would the member for Forrest arrogate to himself the power to say which reform the people should have first? If the people thought that one reform was better than eight others then the majority of the people must rule. It stood to reason that if there was one great reform which overshadowed all others, that was the one which the people would have first. The hon. member had stated that facilities could be provided to get to the poll if it were not held on an election day, but the ordinary individual knew perfectly well that whether we passed this or not, the people would have alcohol and there would be plenty for everyone who wanted it. After all it was a question of whether we would have licensed control of alcohol or whether the traffic should be illicit. If we did not control it by license then the people who wanted it would get it just the same. The ordinary person would not worry about going to the poll to vote for license or no-license because he knew he would get his alcohol in any case. The amendment would receive his support and he hoped that if we were going to make this the all-pervading question, a question that would be above all others, we should hold the poll on a day when all the people of Western Australia were voting. There was no argument why this vote should not be taken on the day of a general election.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: One point had not been touched upon and it was that from the economic point of view it would be wise to take this poll on the day of a general election. It would cost £8,000 to conduct a poll of this nature on an off day, and if we could save that money and get a better result, as undoubtedly we would by taking the poll on the day of a general election, it should be taken on that day. It was well within the memory of hon. members that even those momentous questions which were embraced in the Federal referenda only commanded a 25 per cent. vote on an off day. If such important questions could only command so small a poll under those circumstances the local option poll would also be very small on an off day. There was not the slightest doubt the liquor traffic represented a burning social question.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Then why will not the people come to vote upon it?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: For the same reason that made it of the utmost difficulty to get them up to even a by-election for a member of the Assembly.

The Minister for Works: It did not apply in Geraldton the other day.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: It did.

The Minister for Works: According to the member for Geraldton, there were twelve votes cast in excess of the total number of electors.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Undoubtedly the best day on which to take a poll of this sort would be the day set apart for the general elections. It was desired to have a good vote on this question and not anything which afterwards could be described as a catch vote. He would support the amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment could not be accepted. One of the chief aims of a measure of this kind was the education of the public. There could be no doubt that temperance principles would ultimately abolish the evil of the liquor traffic without any legislation at all, but it could only be done by education. On the occasion of a general election a thousand and one questions were discussed, and among them the issue of the local option vote would be obscured. People would vote upon it merely because

they found themselves at the polling booth, and not because they had any particular interest in the question. If, on the other hand, a specific time was fixed for the taking of a local option vote every person interesting himself in the question would be out to educate the public before the poll was taken, and energies would be concentrated upon interesting the public in the question of the liquor traffic, which on the day of a general election would be altogether obscured. His desire was to give the local option vote direct and isolated significance. Therefore, he contended that the poll should be taken upon a day apart from the general elections. It was unwise to have great national issues mixed up at election time.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: If only on the score of economy, he would support the amendment. From his experience as a returning officer he could say that on the day of a general election people would vote blindly on the question of liquor reform. The liquor traffic was not a burning question outside the towns, and the vote taken in a sparsely settled district would be of no value, while, on the other hand, the vote cast in big populous centres would operate to the detriment of the back country where, perhaps, licenses were necessary. The local option vote was of very little value at all as an indication of the feelings of the people in the back country in respect to the abuse of spirituous liquors. He had a temperance leaning, but in his opinion this was an expensive way of settling a question of this kind. He hoped the Attorney General would see his way clear to save the country the expense of £8,000 in taking a special vote, which he was confident would be of little value.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The very reason advanced by the member for Toodyay as to the lack of interest was the strongest argument against the proposal moved by the member for York. He found pleasure in opposing a proposal put forward by an unholy combination of the members for Subiaco, Pilbara, and York. One outstanding feature in the argument for the referendum was that it enabled the decision of the people to be taken entirely independently and distinct from the welter of questions usually decided at a general election. It was because of the opportunity for a direct expression of opinion in those countries that had adopted the principle, that the system had become so firmly established and was being advocated in other countries. As a matter of fact in the United States of America and Switzerland, where the principle was in force, referenda on important questions were frequently taken at times apart from the usual election for the local or Federal Parliament, and the interest taken by the people was not less by reason of that fact. The difficulty in this State was that the referendum, not having been established and generally understood, was not recognised by the public as the vehicle for the expression of their opinion, which it undoubtedly was. But once the opportunities for a free utilisation of it were extended in connection with this and other important matters, there would be no reason to complain of lack of interest. He was not saying that there were no questions which could be submitted at a general election, but there were more opportunities of shirking the issue when it was so submitted than when it was submitted separately. At a referendum one question was before the voters, but at a general election it would be impossible to make this the one question, and set aside all others. There were questions of legislation, administration, and finance that must be decided at the general election, and could not be set aside, notwithstanding the claims of local option.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: This would not monopolise the attention of the electors.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It would not entirely exclude all oher questions, but votes on this and other questions would have a mutually obscuring effect. It was for that reason he advocated the poll being taken independent of other questions at a general election.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The convenience of the public must be considered, and in a country with a scattered population it would be well nigh impossible to get a representative poll except at a general elec-

tion. He regretted that was so, because many of the people were already troubled enough in merely having to express their preference in regard to candidates, without having to also give a decision on special questions. In addition to the cost of £8,000 for taking a special poll, the people would be put to a considerable expense, as was always the case in getting people to the poll on any occasion. Taking everything into consideration it would be better to take the vote at the time of a general election. Until the people became more accustomed to the question they would not take a very keen interest in it, particularly if the issue was put to them on a day other than that of a general election. It was contended that heat would be imparted into the issue. He admitted that through the unfortunate attitude taken up by some people who advocated this cause, there might be unjustifiable abuse. He could understand that there were people who would go into electorates and endeavour by unfair means to affect the result. There were persons who would descend to the lowest depths, and public men had been vilely misrepresented and attacked by people who wanted temperance reform. Until quite recently he had never had any communication with any prominent member of the Alliance and he had never heard one word from the bulk of them favourable to liquor reform, although there were many things apart from the question of license or no license which were well worthy of the attention of those who interested themselves in the question of liquor reform. It was a pity they did not devote a little more time to reform in the traffic even if they had to devote a little less to this question of local option. Evidently the whole of their time was taken up in this question to the detriment of the other, whereas the other could be put into operation immediately and would be lasting, because no matter how much people favoured abolition it would be many years before that could be achieved but in the meanwhile a great deal of good could be done through better conditions being obtained in connection with the traffic. The amendment would have his support, mainly because the convenience of the people would be best considered by taking this vote at the time of the general elections.

Mr. ALLEN: Studying the convenience of the electors was a very important aspect of the question. Already some election always seemed to be cropping up in the metropolitan area, and it was a difficult matter to get people to the polls. If we were going to get an expression of opinion that was worth anything we should have the biggest possible poll. Apart from the question of the additional expense involved from having the local option poll on a separate day, we would get a better expression of opinion if the amendment was carried.

Mr. MONGER: One could not understand the objection from the Government and they could not be sincere in regard to the Bill. In the amendment a suggestion was made to take the poll practically at the earliest opportunity, certainly at an earlier date than was mentioned by the introducer of the Bill. If the Government were not sincere let them throw up the whole Bill and allow the measure introduced by the previous Administration to remain as everyone thought it would.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: So far as the country districts were concerned we were likely to get a better expression of opinion if the poll was taken on the day of the general elections. An increasing number of days were being occupied during the year through the multiplicity of elections, both Parliamentary and local government, and we should, in addition to considering the questions of getting the best possible result and creating interest in this important question, also consider the convenience of the electors, and take into consideration the aspect of expense. On those grounds the amendment would have his support.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Resolutions to be submitted:

Mr. B. J. STUBBS moved an amendment—

That Paragraphs (b) and (c) be struck out.

This would mean the striking out of the provision for the taking of a vote on re-

duction and increase. It would leave the issue to be decided as to whether the licenses would remain as they were or whether we should have no licenses, but it would not prevent an increase being obtained in a new district. There was a further clause which provided for a petition being signed for new licenses, and that would remain in the Bill. There seemed to be a general impression that we wanted to deprive people of licenses. What we wanted to do was to leave it so that the matter would be a clear cut issue as to whether the number of hotels should remain as they were or whether we should do away with hotels altogether.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment would curtail the power of the people to give full expression to their opinion, and if we were to have local option it was no good having it on one side only. If the people were to regulate the traffic we must give them the means to do so. There might be those who would want an increase and they would have the right to say so. There might also be those who would want a decrease and they too would have the right to express their opinion. The local option poll would have no purpose in it if it did not give to the people the right to regulate the traffic.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Would the Chairman explain how it would be possible for him to move an amendment to Paragraph (b) to provide that the hours for the sale of liquor in the district should be reduced.

The Attorney General: You can put that in a new paragraph.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: His desire was to insert it instead of paragraph (b).

Mr. PRICE: Would it be competent, if the amendment of the member for Subiaco was lost, for the hon. member then to move his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr. PRICE: The amendment to Paragraph (b)?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not go back after the amendment by the member for Subiaco to Paragraph (b) had been disposed of.

Mr. PRICE: There was an amendment that he (Mr. Price) desired to move, but according to the Chairman only one amendment could be moved to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: The only way out of the difficulty would be for the member for Subiaco to withdraw his amendment for the time being.

Mr. PRICE: The amendment he desired to move was also in Paragraph (b).

The CHAIRMAN: What was the nature of the amendment?

Mr. Price: I cannot state it until this has been dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN: Then it could not be taken.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: With the permission of the Committee he would withdraw the amendment to strike out Paragraph (c) and allow the House to deal with the proposal to strike out Paragraph (b) only.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was desired to make some progress and, therefore, he would oppose the withdrawal of any portion of the amendment. First we had the member for Northam taking a considerable time on this question, then the member for Subiaco started off, and now the member for Williams-Narrogin had awakened and he wanted to do something. These continual suggested alterations and amendments should be objected to.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Subiaco could not withdraw his amendment as the withdrawal had been objected to.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: This is a new procedure and it has been introduced since I have been in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: That was not correct.

Mr. MALE: When an amendment was put, it was "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause." If the House agreed with that we could not go back. It was absurd to say that that was a new departure.

The CHAIRMAN: Standing Order No. 184 read—

> No amendment shall be proposed in any part of a question after a later part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, unless the

proposed amendment has been by leave of the House withdrawn.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Would he be in order now in moving in the direction he had suggested, namely, to strike out Paragraph (b) with the view of inserting "the hours of the sale of liquor in the district be reduced."

The CHAIRMAN: We could not go back. The hon. member could move it as a new paragraph.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If hon. members were to be denied the opportunity of moving an amendment, there was no object in double-banking the paragraphs.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: On a point of order. The hon. member was questioning the ruling. It had been pointed out that where the Committee desired by a vote that words proposed to be struck out should stand part of the question no hon. member could subsequently move to amend those words.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could move a fresh paragraph; but the hon. member wanted to go back and delete certain words. That could not now be done.

Mr. PRICE: The position was that it was desired to move a further amendment to the same paragraph. The amendment moved by the member for Subiaco had been dealt with, and the ruling was that no further amendment could be accepted. Boiled down, it meant that if a member jumped up to his feet quickly and moved an amendment no other amendment could be moved.

The CHAIRMAN: On this occasion the amendment had been stated from the Chair, and discussed, and the only way to allow for the moving of a further amendment was to get the first one withdrawn. To that there had been an objecting voice, which was sufficient to prevent the withdrawal. The question therefore had to be put—"that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause"—and, that having been carried, there could be no going back.

Mr. PRICE: But two amendments had been proposed dealing with the same paragraph.

The Minister for Works: One was too late.

Mr. PRICE: The Minister seemed desirous of blocking discussion of the clause. One amendment had been proposed, and the second amendment was dealing with exactly the same subject, and was actually later in the clause than the first. Would not the hon. member be in order in moving his amendment, seeing that it dealt with a later portion of the clause, and not with the whole of the clause, as the earlier amendment had done?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by the member for Subiaco had dealt with paragraph (c) as well as paragraph (b), and, the greater comprising the lesser, there was no alternative.

Mr. WISDOM: In the first place it had been proposed to strike out two paragraphs. The question was put as to whether the words proposed to be struck out should remain part of the clause, and the Committee had decided that they should. That being so, we returned to our original position and were considering the clause as printed.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. WISDOM: Was it not possible, then, to amend either of these paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN: No. After it had been proposed to amend the clause, no further amendment could be taken, unless the first amendment was withdrawn. There was no power to go back except by recommittal.

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to follow paragraph (e)—"Provided that resolutions (A), (B), and (D) shall not be submitted to the electors until after the 31st December, 1920."

This would reinstate the provision of the 1911 Act, which granted to the holders of licenses ten years grace, by way of compensation. The licensees of these hotels should receive justice, and a fair meed of protection. We had a duty to the people who had vested their money on the understanding that no poll would be taken until 1920.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This amendment was the old provision of 1911. If the Committee carried the amendment it would be absolutely throwing the principle of local option overboard. If we were going to trust the people, why not trust them now?

Hon. J. Mitchell: I am quite willing, if you pay these license holders monetary compensation.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was the submission of the whole question to the people.

Mr. Wisdom: It is not.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Undoubtedly it was. We could trust the people to vote now for "increases," but we could not trust them to vote "No licenses" until seven years hence. The argument had arisen on the supposition that people would immediately vote "No licenses." He was afraid they would not; but, if the whole of the people did wish that, surely it was not for the Committee to stand in the people's way. If we could convince the people that they were benefiting, or that it was perfectly just that they should remain five years longer the people would vote that way, and get what they wanted. But if we were to ask the people to vote they should be able to vote now and not five years hence. It stood to reason that if members carried this amendment they could not trust the people.

Mr. Wisdom: You are afraid to trust the people; you will not provide for a majority of the people.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member was asking that unless so many people went to the poll the vote should be of no avail. That was not trusting the people but was coercion of the people. The people could not be trusted, and if they liked to stay away from the poll that was their option.

Mr. Wisdom: Will you refer the question as to whether the poll shall be held on election day to the people also?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was no objection. Whatever the people desired in connection with this traffic could not be objected to, but we had no right to limit their answer—allow them to say they wanted a certain thing and then prevent them from getting it until five years hence. Every license was an annual affair and there could be no vested interest in it, whatever custom might have grown up.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Custom becomes common law.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was no lawful vested interest in the business.

Mr. Underwood: If there is no law we will make one.

[*Mr. Price took the Chair.*]

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Those interested in the traffic had had notice year after year of the progress of this reform, and must have known that sooner or later this law must come into vogue. If the people had no right to vote no license they had no right to vote reduction or increase. If they had the right to vote increase logically they should have the right to vote decrease. If we were not to trust the people on the questions stated in the Bill the whole measure was a farce and hypocrisy from beginning to end.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): There was strong objection to the Attorney General's language and the manner in which he dealt with this question. Those who were opposed to the Minister on this question were equally as honest as he in their endeavours to bring about a reform in the liquor traffic. In fact, he believed they were more genuine. When the Minister called others hypocrites he should remember there was a manner of returning that remark in a different direction.

The Attorney General: On a point of explanation he had called no one a hypocrite. He had said that if this Bill were to have these questions deleted the Bill would be an act of hypocrisy. He asked the Honorary Minister to withdraw the statement he had made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Having received the assurance of the Attorney General, he would withdraw the remark. This question had

to be looked at from a reasonable point of view. There could not have been local option for the next 50 years if there had not been an arrangement for some form of compensation. The Attorney General knew that if this Bill were sent to another place it was impossible for it to become law unless some system of compensation was provided. As a matter of fact, it had been his main object and the object of the temperance organisations in the State as put before him in written communictaions, that this matter should be settled by introducing the system of time compensation.

Mr. Lewis: What does Tregear say now?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Tregear now made accusations of treachery against him. He had told the electors from the platform that he was in favour of time compensation, and prior to the last election he had written to Mr. Tregear telling him the same. The one object they had in view was to get for the people local option, and sometimes, in order to get a thing, one had to compromise. This question had been argued on the public platform almost since the commencement of responsible Government, and the public had not yet returned members to this Chamber who would agree to local option without compensation.

The Minister for Lands: They did absolutely.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Hon. members knew that when this matter was dealt with in 1910-11 the only question raised was as to what should be the term of years. Strong efforts had been made to fix the term at 15 years, and many members favoured that period, but they entered into a compromise. They had said, "If you come to 10 years there is a possibliity of the Bill going through." That was carried into effect. Now had we any right, after entering into that compromise, to break it? He wanted to say a word of warning to those who were pressing for such an action, that there was the possibility of reaction, and if we were so anxious to break a compact that was entered into and confirmed at the last election, there was a possibility of a Parliament being returned who would say that, after once a compact had been entered into and an effort made to break that compact, it was equally right to bring about an increase in the number of years, instead of a reduction. The greatest enemies of those who were trying to make a settlement once and for all of this question were those who were endeavouring to make an alteration of the term put down in the present Licensing Act. As things were going here in another six or seven years this term would expire and then we could say to these people "You have neither legal nor moral right for the continuation of your license." Perhaps, technically speaking, it was an annual license, and was only granted for one year, but it was an understanding, and a custom that had grown up, that if the Licensing Act was complied with there should be no objection to the renewal of the license. In fact, one could not lodge a petition against the regranting of a license unless one could show some just cause in the matter of the Licensing Act not having been complied with, which fact indicated clearly that there was some understanding that the license would be renewed if the Licensing Act had been complied with. So far as he was personally concerned he thought he would be doing wrong to break the compact entered into by the Act of 1911. He was as loyal to his colleagues as any other member of the party, and this was the one question of disagreement, because he believed we would be doing an injustice if we departed from what was laid down in the 1911 Licensing Act, as a compact under which people had gone to expense. So far as time compensation was concerned the law should remain as at present.

Mr. ALLEN: In the licensing of houses for the sale of liquor certain conditions were laid down. If liquor was allowed to be sold in ordinary buildings, similar to those in which various other businesses were carried on, without compelling the owner to bring plans for the approval of the licensing bench, one could understand that if at the end of 12 months it

was decided that the place should be closed down, there would be no grounds for compensation. He was not quite in accord with the amendment submitted by the member for Northam. He had always contended that compensation would have to be paid in some form, and preferably time compensation, but had never been in sympathy with the 10 years' limit. He thought it was always understood that seven years' time compensation would have been a fair thing. Most hotels within the metropolitan-suburban area had been in existence many years and the owners had been paid over and over again for their buildings. He moved an amendment on the amendment—

That "1920" be struck out and "1917" inserted in lieu.

Mr. THOMAS: The amendment of the member for Northam would not have his support. He preferred 1917 to 1920 but would rather the Bill stood without either. The whole thing resolved itself into a question of whether we were prepared to trust the people or not. Some members seemed prepared to let the people decide this great question for themselves. Other members arrogated to themselves the right to decide without giving the people the opportunity. If there was any truth in the contention that the publican had an implied right to retain his license until 1920, we might rest assured that that view of the case would be put clearly before the people before they cast their votes. We should have no fear in letting the people say whether this time compensation operating up to 1920 should be allowed. The question of local option had obtained such prominence that when the people themselves were asked to decide there would be a very substantial vote recorded one way or the other.

Mr. Lewis: It will not lessen the consumption.

Mr. THOMAS: We were not discussing the question of whether it would lessen the consumption of liquor or not, but the justice or otherwise of allowing the people to settle this question. Another phase had been raised by the Honorary Minister that hotels had been built and money invested under the impression that there would be no local option poll until after 1920. He (Mr. Thomas) did not consider because an Act of Parliament had been passed that any body of people would have the right to expect that that would obtain for any special few. It must be obvious that opinions had been growing on this question, and if he had been thinking of applying for a license he would have taken into consideration the possibility of a local option poll taking place at any time. Members had a duty to perform, and to vote for what they considered to be right whatever might happen to a Bill after it left their hands. If it met with a certain fate in another place that was the responsibility of the other place, and not ours. We should fight for what we considered was essential and allow others to do what they believed to be right. There was nothing that we had to fear. We were only asked to trust our masters, the people, and we should have sufficient faith in their intelligence to allow them to deal with this question in the way which seemed to them best.

12 o'clock, midnight.

Mr. PRICE: But for the extraordinary dictum of the hon. member that once an Act of Parliament was passed nobody had a right to expect that it should remain in the form in which it passed, he would not have risen to speak. He had never heard such a dictum propounded by an hon. member. It was said that no compact was entered into; certainly no compact was entered into, but in 1911 a Bill passed the Parliament of this State which set forth that in 1920 a full measure of local option should be given to the people, and the reason it was postponed until 1920 was because in this Chamber the question of compensation had arisen, and as a compromise between those who believed in monetary compensation and those who believed in time compensation, and others again, like himself, who were indifferent on the matter, but who believed we had allowed to grow up in our midst a certain trade which should receive fair compensation before we

brought about its sudden termination, agreed to a full measure of local option coming into operation in 1920.

The Minister for Lands: It was not a compact.

Mr. PRICE: It was however carried in this Chamber and the people engaged in the liquor traffic throughout Western Australia naturally believed that Parliament, having decided that in 1920 the people would be given the opportunity of saying whether or not licenses should continue, they were at liberty to carry on their trade until that period. Not only was that carried in 1911, but since then it had been reaffirmed. As a matter of fact, the licensing benches—and on this point he knew the member for Katanning would bear him out—believing that the Government would be true to this implied compact, if it was not a legal compact, insisted upon owners of licensed premises expending huge sums of money in bringing their premises up to date, believing that the licenses would remain in existence until 1920. If this were a party measure, and if it were that the party now in Opposition had made a party question of this particular phase of local option, there might be some reason in suggesting that we should break this implied compact, but at no stage had it been suggested that the question of compensation should be made a party one. He was one who voted for 1920, and he had yet to see any justification for altering his vote. He had voted on this question and his constituents had endorsed the stand he had taken, and he had no intention whatever of going back on what he had previously done. It had been asked why should we not allow the people to settle this question. He had no objection to that.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Oh, yes you have!

Mr. PRICE: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I say you have.

Mr. PRICE: Unfortunately he had to differ from the hon. member. After recording his vote on this question at a time when it was being thoroughly threshed out a certain implied compact was made between himself and the owners of licensed premises in Western Australia, and he had no intention of breaking that compact. He hoped that in Western Australia such a condition of affairs as obtained in the so-called prohibition districts in New Zealand, which he had seen himself, would never come about. He protested against the Government amending a law which would have such far-reaching effects as this particular clause regarding the compact which we had undoubtedly made by implication with the owners of licensed premises throughout Western Australia. If the owners thought or suspected that this Government or succeeding Governments would not honour that compact which was made in 1911, then undoubtedly they would not have spent the money they had done in providing additional accommodation. This was particularly noticeable along the Great Southern line and in the town which he represented. At Albany many thousands of pounds had been spent by order of the licensing bench in providing up-to-date premises and did we believe that the licensing bench would have called upon the owners of those premises to spend thousands of pounds if they thought that the Act would be amended, and that licenses might possibly terminate immediately following the expenditure of that money? They should receive something like a fair return for the money they had expended. In view of these facts, he hoped the amendment moved by the member for Northam (Mr. Mitchell) would be carried, and that moved by the member for West Perth (Mr. Allen) defeated.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: To suggest that because something had been carried in 1911, those who then opposed it should now remain silent, was the strangest argument he had heard. The member for Albany (Mr. Price) would get himself into a very queer position if he applied that reasoning to other measures of legislation. Did the member for Albany suggest that because under one system of taxation lands were taken up and developed we had no right to amend that taxation; or because we had passed a Factories Act in a certain form we had no right now to amend it? No

more specious argument had been heard. It was customary to hear of vested interests and moral rights when reforms were mentioned, but this was the first time he had listened to an hon. member talking about morally acquired rights because Parliament sought to amend existing legislation. No measure of legislation limited us in our right of amendment.

Mr. Elliott: What about the Honorary Minister?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Honorary Minister's (Mr. Angwin's) argument was just as unsound as that of the member for Albany. We were not deciding whether hotels should be closed. What we were seeking to do was to give the people the right to decide the question of increase or reduction. Thirty-four members of the Ministerial side of the House had been elected pledged to local option.

Mr. Underwood: You are not the only immaculate in the House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member had no right to browbeat other hon. members; he for one was not going to submit to it. Members on this side were pledged to local option; the hon. member himself was pledged to ocal option.

Mr. Underwood: With restrictions.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: To ocal option as a provision by which the people were to be given an opportunity of voting on certain questions.

Mr. Underwood: In 1920.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Mr. Underwood: I say yes.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The on. member was wrong.

Mr. Underwood: The hon. Minister is wrong.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Hon. members were pledged to local option, nd not to 1920. If we believed in local ption, it was for the public to decide hen the vote should be taken. If the ectors were in favour of applying it 1915, this amendment would deny em an opportunity of carrying their ishes into effect until five years afterards.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There was a tendency among those supporting the Bill to accuse of being hypocrites everybody who differed from them.

Mr. Hudson: Hyprocites and worse.

The Minister for Lands: No such accusation has been made.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Honorary Minister (Mr. Angwin) had had to protest against the remarks of the Attorney General, and the Minister for Lands had said that he (Mr. Underwood) was returned in favour of local option. As a matter of fact he was returned in favour of local option with restrictions, and he did not intend to sit here and allow the Minister to call him a hypocrite.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister had denied having used the epithet.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There was not the slightest doubt this question of liquor reform made people mad. When the Bill was brought forward by the late Attorney General (Mr. Nanson) the question had been discussed at great length, and after mature consideration one of the finest temperance advocates in the State, Mr. Angwin, had voted for time compensation, indeed had moved that the people interested be allowed this time compensation. That had been accepted, and he, with others, was going to stand by it. There was no more sincere advocate of temperance in Western Australia than Mr. Angwin; no man tried more sincerely to give effect to local option than did Mr. Angwin, and Mr. Angwin had been the mover of the time compensation provision. Those who had supported him were going to stand by him now, notwithstanding what the Minister for Lands or the Attorney General might say.

Mr. Hudson: We went to the country on it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, hon. members had gone to the country on the principle, and the country had sent them back. He would still advocate 1920 when next he went to the country. After all, there was a moral obligation of compensation to those who had paid ingoing for licensed houses; there was a moral obligation to those who had been instructed by the various licensing courts

to erect expensive premises. These people had been told that if they did not erect buildings costing thousands of pounds they would not get their licenses. This was accepted as an indication that on the erection of the buildings the licenses would be renewed, and would be permitted to last for more than a year at all events. There was that guarantee up till 1920 given by the members who had voted for the present Licensing Act, and any man who would go back on what he had voted for then would be playing the confidence trick on those who had built those premises.

Mr. BROWN: As an advocate of temperance he still believed in a certain amount of justice. The Government were bound legally and morally to allow those interested in the liquor traffic a certain number of years in which to recoup themselves for the expenditure they had put into hotel buildings. The Licensing Act of 1911 laid it down that no reduction of licenses could take place until 1920. There was no doubt that a number of people had invested their capital in huge hotel buildings which the licensing bench had practically compelled them to build, and they had erected those buildings because they believed they would have a certain number of years at their disposal before a local option poll could reduce the licenses. Under the Licensing Act anyone wishing to make an investment was bound by the licensing bench to put up a certain class of buildings and provide certain accommodation, and he was given only a twelve months' license. If that license was taken away from the people whose money was invested, those buildings became practically of no use for any other purpose. We should take steps to reduce the sale of liquor throughout the State as much as possible, but we must make a start from a certain definite date. The present Act gave justice, and from 1920 the people would have the right to say whether they would have a reduction of licenses or not, and publicans knew that beyond that time they were investing their money at their own risk.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Much had bee said about some kind of compact havin been entered into, but an enormous a teration had taken place not only in th personnel of this Chamber, but also in th state of parties from what had existe prior to the last election. It was a mos audacious argument to say that one Par liament could decide a burning questio and bind future Parliaments upon it. I there was any force in the argument o the member for Albany on that point w had no right to be again dealing wit a redistribution of seats. It was dow right hypocrisy for any member to clai that he was willing to trust the peopl on this matter and yet refuse to allo them to vote for a reduction until 192 Any hon. member who denied the rig of the people to speak on any questio at any time had no right to belong to democratic party, because he did no know the first principles of democracy The statements made in regard to th amount of money spent in bringing prem ises up to date were mere assertions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Min ister): What I said were facts.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The hon. membe had no right to say that because he ha pledged himself at the last election h could bind all other members. It wa incorrect of members to say that the had been before the people on this 192 issue. The Premier had distinctly state that he was in favour of the five years compensation, and 1920 had never bee mentioned by that hon. gentleman rig through the campaign.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Min ister): He said he was personally in fav our of five years.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: At any rate th party did not go to the country wit 1920 as part of their platform. In cor tradiction of the statements made abou the large amount of money spent in bring ing the hotels up to date was the repo made by Inspector Sellinger to the Fre mantle licensing bench, in which h pointed out that many of the hotels ha little or no accommodation for boarder or lodgers and that they catered almos entirely for the bar trade. Hon. mem

bers would lead the Committee to believe that palatial premises were being erected.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It is true.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: It was not true.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not say it is untrue. The hon. member must withdraw the remark.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: What remark was to be withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had practically called the Honorary Minister a liar.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The Chairman must have a very elastic imagination.

The CHAIRMAN: That remark also must be withdrawn.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Both remarks were withdrawn. Inspector Sellinger's report showed also that portions of other premises were sub-let for other purposes. In one instance it was for a plumber's shop and in another a bootmaker's shop, and that was done after they had submitted the whole plan to the licensing court as being for a hotel building. There was no foundation whatever in the contention that these people had been compelled to spend large amounts of money in connection with their buildings. Parliament could not be bound by what a previous Parliament had done. We had a right to decide this question for ourselves. We could not be said to live in a democracy if the people were not to have a vote on all questions that affected them. In view of the introduction of the Initiative and Referendum Bill there was no consistency in a member on this side of the House refusing the people the right to decide on this question at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. PRICE: The member for Subiaco claimed that because he (Mr. Price) or any other member on the same side of the House dared to adhere to the compact which had been made, he had no right to belong to a democratic party, but were we to accept the member for Subiaco as a judge of what party we were to belong to if our views did not coincide with the narrow party views of the hon. member? He challenged the hon. member to prove that any statement which he (Mr. Price) had made regarding the amount of money which the owners of property had been compelled to spend upon licensed premises along the Great Southern line was not true. Within the last two years five hotels in Albany had been rebuilt. The hon. member said if one did not agree with him one had no right to be on this side of the House.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member said one had no right to belong to a democratic party if one was not prepared to do as he was and break one's word. He (Mr. Price) had stated that he was in favour of 1920. He was going to stick to it. The member for Subiaco said that the Premier in enunciating his policy pledged every member of this party to immediate local option. To make such a statement was endeavouring to mislead the Committee, whether deliberately or unintentionally.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I never made the statement; the hon. member's wild imagination is running away with him.

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member stated that the Premier announced in his policy speech that immediate local option was to be granted.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PRICE: Then one must accept the hon. member's assertion that he did not say it and simply imagine that he said it. What the Premier did say was that he personally was in favour of a certain course, but he could not pledge the party to it, that it was a personal matter to be dealt with by individual candidates. That was the Premier's policy and it was upon that policy that we went to the country, namely, that individual members were at liberty to pledge themselves in whatever way they chose to the people who were electing them. He (Mr. Price) and others had pledged themselves to honour the agreement or compact they had made before the election. If by voting as he intended to vote and honouring that which he considered to be a pledge made to the people, namely, that a full measure of local option should be given in 1920; if

by voting in favour of that question meant the extinction of his political life, and that he could no longer remain a member of the democratic party, then his membership would have to cease. No amount of threat, vituperation, or scurrilous attack would cause him to swerve one iota from the pledge he had made to his electors, which he felt himself bound to carry out in this Chamber.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It was his intention to oppose both the amendment of the member for Northam and that of the member for West Perth. If either of these amendments was carried it would mean that so far as this particular Parliament was concerned there could be no alteration and no reform in regard to the liquor traffic. The Premier and members of the Ministry, with the exception of the member for North-East Fremantle, as well as some other members, came into the House pledged to give the people an opportunity to take a vote on a bare majority as to when local option should come into force. As one who gave that pledge he was here to-night trying to give effect to it. He challenged the member for Northam to show that any pledges which he had given had not been kept so far as it was in his power to do so. The point he wished to emphasise was that if either of the amendments was carried, the Bill brought in by the Government would be lost so far as any reform was concerned. The Government promised local option at once and the pledge of the Labour party was local option and State control of the liquor traffic, and the Bill was supporting that plank.

1 o'clock, a.m.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The member for Albany seemed to run away with the idea that if he pulled sufficient facial contortions he could frighten some members and get others to believe what he said. He (Mr. Stubbs) had said that some members on the Ministerial side of the House, by interjection, tried to imply that the Labour party went to the country with the 1920 compact in their platform. Mr. Scaddan did not mention it in his policy speech that 1920 was to be the policy of this party. Would the member for Albany deny that again? Then again, a man who claimed to be a democrat and refused to allow the people to vote on a question of this kind could not be considered such. If he claimed to be a democrat he did not know the meaning of the word democracy. The member for Albany claimed that he had entered into a compact. He had no right to do that.

Mr. Price: I am not going to ask you what I should do.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: There was no intention on his part to put himself up as a censor but he declared that the member for Albany had no right to enter into that compact.

Mr. Price: I have the right to do what I like.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The hon. member signed the platform and in regard to this particular pledge there was no time stated. It was implied that the poll was to take place immediately.

Mr. Price: Now that you have gone so far, tell us what happened at the last congress.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The hon. member signed the platform which provided for continuance, increase, or reduction of licenses.

Mr. Price: Give us the lot now that you have started it.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be as well if the member for Subiaco confined himself to the amendment. He was going very wide of the mark.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The member for Albany had made such glaring misstatements and had made an attack upon him that he felt justified in replying.

Mr. Price: I did not attack you first.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: There was nothing further that he desired to say.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was for hon. members to decide what was right and fair. When the previous Bill passed it was provided that there should be no money compensation and that was against his wish; but that there should be time compensation. It was for hon. members to determine what was right

and fair. It was his intention to stand by 1920 because Parliament at that time thought there should be time compensation. Was it likely that licensing benches would order hotel-keepers, as they had done, to spend money on buildings, if those hotel-keepers were only to have licenses for the next two months or so? It was his intention to stand by the law and any man who did not do that would be supporting something which was absolutely wrong. The local option vote on the question of increases was a determining vote, and the vote was against increases. Yet the Minister had brought down a Bill for the establishment of a State hotel at Dwellingup. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Licensing Act, Ministers had established that hotel. Yet to-day we were told that the members of the Government were champions of the principle of local option, and must have it without further delay. Ministers had themselves established an hotel despite the result of a local option poll; yet to-day they were applying the term hypocrite to those who were not prepared to break the compact arrived at by Parliament in 1911 and agree to the exercise of local option straight away.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would be required to confine himself to the amendment.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Surely he was in order in discussing the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member persisted, it would be necessary to be firm with him. The question was as between 1920 and 1917. Any reasonable illustration would be permitted, but if the hon. member persisted in referring to a Bill for the establishment of a State hotel it was not to be expected that he (the Chairman) would sit under it all the time.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The question before the Chair was as to whether we were going to give the people the right to close the hotels in 1917 without compensation, to close the Dwellingup State hotel in 1917 without compensation.

The CHAIRMAN: The Dwellingup State hotel entered no more into the question than did any other hotel. The hon. member knew that, but persisted in trying to get in this particular illustration.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The illustration had been got in, and, in his opinion, justifiably so. He could name another hotel on which a considerable sum of money was being spent in the belief that the license was safe until 1920, at all events. It would be a good thing for the State if the liquor trade was under the strictest control; but the point was that people had put their money into hotels on the understanding that they would not be closed before 1920.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: In 1911 the extreme temperance people had been very grateful to know that this question of local option was settled in a manner which, although not perhaps quite acceptable to them, yet, undoubtedly constituted a very reasonable compromise. I was a pity that more hon. members did not take the reasonable view of the Honorary Minister (Mr. Angwin) and the members for Albany (Mr. Price) and Pilbara (Mr. Underwood), and others who supported the principle of time compensation. In one respect we had had immediate local option already in that people had had the opportunity of declaring on the question of increases. In seven years' time we would be enjoying complete local option. Why all the bickering to-night? Much had been said to-night about hypocrisy and want of sincerity in this matter. While he did not wish to impute hypocrisy to the Government, he thought there was at least a good deal of kite-flying in this matter. He was sorry the Attorney General had not been able to judge better of the support he was likley to have in regard to this measure. We should give a reasonable period of time to those engaged in the trade, notwithstanding that, in his opinion, the country would have been better off if we had not allowed the trade to assume the proportions it had. They had allowed the trade to be built up, and it was only fair that some compensation should be meted out to those people when the licenses were reduced. There was only seven years to go before we got complete local option, and with that even the temperance party

ought to be satisfied. Along the Great Southern railway many hotels had been practically rebuilt during the last three years. In Albany the majority of the hotels had been rebuilt at an expenditure of between £50,000 and £60,000. Those people would not have spent that amount of money if they had not thought there was some guarantee in the time limit provided for under the Act. He had no desire to see more hotels erected. In new districts there would be some necessity for houses of accommodation, but he was quite willing to give the people concerned a full measure of local option so far as new licenses were concerned. There were some good points in the Bill, but we would be doing an injustice if we departed from the provisions of the 1911 Act by which Parliament was morally bound. He hoped the people who took up the extreme temperance side would take a reasonable view, because those people who steered a middle course and took a reasonable view were the best friends of local option.

Mr. CHESSON: The people should have the right to say whether there should be an increase or a decrease in licenses, but there also should be a time limit compensation. During the last election the people had been given to understand that Parliament had carried a measure providing for time compensation in order to give the people in the trade an opportunity of recouping themselves. He had been a member of a district licensing bench and just recently after the police had reported the results of their examinations the bench had adjourned all applications for a fortnight to allow of certain improvements being made in the premises. The people in the trade had to get a renewal of the licenses each year, but an inspection was made, and if the premises were not up to the requirements of the Act the bench compelled the necessary alterations to be made. He thought the amendment proposed by the member for West Perth fixing 1917 instead of 1920 as the time limit would give ample opportunity for the people interested in the trade to be compensated.

Mr. TURVEY: Only the intemperate temperance people could object to withholding the issues of reduction and no license until 1920. Those who did not see eye to eye with the advocates of immediate complete local option were said to be influenced by vested interests. He was taking the same stand as he took last year and he believed that the Government in 1911, having made provision that a local option poll regarding this issue should not take effect till 1920, and this having been re-affirmed by the present Government when the local option poll was being discussed last year, that was an indication to the people who had invested their money in building hotels that Parliament practically believed the trade should receive some form of compensation. It was nonsense to say that anyone who was about to invest money in building hotels would not study the Licensing Act and the likely effect of a local option poll. If a tenant was going into an hotel building, and fixing up an agreement, he would naturally consider what were the provisions of the Licensing Act of this State at the present time. It was only fair to assume that arrangements for the lease were based upon the provisions of the existing Act. If any Government were desirous of controlling the abuse of alcoholic liquor there was ample provision in the present Licensing Act to take action. If the provision was enforced that if any person under the influence of liquor was supplied by a licensee, or one of his employees, it was a punishable offence, it would do away with much of the evil that existed to-day. The best way possible to deal fairly with all sections of the community was to stand by the provisions of the present Act, to take effect in 1920. In standing by the provision we had made in this respect we had the opportunity of settling once and for all every claim of the trade for compensation. He did not believe in monetary compensation for the trade. Seven years from now was a very short period to wait and the people should wait, when it was realised that by waiting until 1920 they would forever have stopped any claim in the future by those

who were investing their money in the trade. He believed temperance advocates generally approved of the operation of the 1920 provision, and that those who had invested their money in the liquor trade would be quite satisfied if they were given the time compensation which had already been provided for.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was regrettable that so much feeling should have been exhibited in the course of this debate, as there had been no necessity for it. The point was whether we should agree to let matters stand until 1920, or take any possible limitation that was put in our way. It was his intention to vote for 1917 with the view of even reducing that. He preferred 1917 to 1920, but preferred 1915 to 1917. If he could not obtain what he desired he would not be foolish enough to reject what he was able to get in the direction in which he was aiming.

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

Ayes	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	20
Majority against		..	10

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lander
Mr. Bath	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Collier	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Bolton
	(*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Elliott	Mr. Price
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Swan
Mr. George	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDonald	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Monger	Mr. Layman
	(*Teller*).

Amendment on amendment thus negatived.

2 o'clock a.m.

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

Ayes	..	..	21
Noes	..	..	8
Majority for		..	13

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Price
Mr. Elliott	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Taylor
Mr. George	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Layman
Mr. Mitchell	(*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Collier	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lander	Mr. Bolton
	(*Teller*).

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Gill
Mr. A. N. Piesse	Mr. Carpenter

Amendment thus passed.

Clause as amended put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Effect of carrying resolutions:

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (c) the following words be added, "by granting a license or licenses for premises owned or to be erected by the Government."

This would not make it possible for private individuals to obtain licenses in the future. Every hotel should be owned by the Government, whether run by the Government or not. Then when it came to closing hotels the matter would be more simple. He objected to private individuals getting a large amount of ingoing which was not earned.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Amendment of Sections 45 and 87 of Licensing Act, 1911:

Mr. GEORGE: Would any alterations which had been made to the Bill necessitate alterations being made in these sections?

The Attorney General: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—agreed to.

Schedules. Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 2.12 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 5th December, 1913.

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

DISSENT FROM SPEAKER'S RULING.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): As announced on the preceding evening, it had been his intention to give notice of dissenting from the ruling of the Speaker; but as the occasion for his motion had been removed by the effect of the subsequent vote of the Committee, and as it was late in the session, he had resolved to wait until a similar occasion should arise at some future time.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR, DEEPENING.

Mr. CARPENTER asked the Minister for Works: What steps have been taken to procure the necessary plant for deepening the entrance to and portion of Fremantle Harbour to 36 feet, in accordance with plans submitted, and when will the work of deepening be commenced?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The Agent General has been asked to obtain quotations for a modern bucket dredge on information supplied by the Engineer-in-Chief whilst in England. Plans of drilling and blasting, preparatory to dredging, are now under consideration.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

Third Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker) moved—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Geraldton) moved an amendment—

That the Bill be recommitted.

His object was to move the following amendment to the Bill—

Clause 4, Subclause 2: Strike out the words "one-fifth" occurring in lines 12 and 13 and insert "one-fourth" in lieu thereof.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): The motion could not be accepted at this late stage of the session, seeing that so much time had already been spent in debating the Bill. He would be perhaps more willing to concede the point to the hon. member if there had been more time. He had not known of the hon. member's intention to move the motion until arriving at the House this afternoon. Moreover, the hon. member would have an opportunity of making the amendment in another place.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): The Attorney General was wrong in saying the hon. member would have an opportunity of amending the Bill in another place. The hon. member was a member