

6lbs. of pollard, and 2lbs. of waste. It used to be 10lbs. of bran, 8lbs. of pollard, and 2lbs. of waste, making 60lbs. If persons wished to kill themselves by eating very fine bread, we could not help that. The clause was so little likely to be carried out that it would have no effect; therefore he consented to the amendment.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No harm would be done in passing the amendment, because the clause as it stood was an impossible one.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause was more impossible as it stood than with the amendment. As the Bill stood, standard bread could only be made of flour of a certain fineness, and no other fineness whatever would be allowed. The amendment was inserted by the Assembly so that the fineness of the flour could be increased.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: The clause was most ridiculous. In Western Australia 40lbs. of flour to the bushel was the largest yield; and if the standard were made heavier more bran must be put in. It was not obvious how one could ascertain what quantity of flour wheat would produce, nor how the clause could be enforced.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That must be left to the experts.

Question—put and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Again we had arrived at the happy position of having no work on the Notice Paper except a second-reading debate on the Electoral Bill. To meet the wish of members that we should as far as possible consider as a whole the three Bills dealing with the constitution of Parliament, he moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday next.

Question passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at 5:48 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 29th September, 1903.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	1290
Questions: Road Crossing, Closure	1290
Railway Refreshment Rooms, Tenders	1290
Goldfields Water Supply, Reticulation Pipes ..	1290
Gingin Municipal Council	1291
Strangers in the Galleries; Explanation of Error	1291
Bills: Municipal Institutions Act Amendment	1292
(Mr. Purkiss), first reading	1292
Redistribution of Seats, in Committee resumed; Assembly Electorates farther considered, reported	1292

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read, assenting to Supply Bill, £500,000.

QUESTION—ROAD CROSSING, CLOSURE.

MR. FERGUSON asked the Minister for Railways; 1, Whether it is proposed to close the level crossing on the Perth-Fremantle road, known as Leighton's Crossing. 2, If so, whether it is proposed to give the people in the vicinity any other means of crossing the railway line.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, It is not proposed to close this crossing at present. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS, TENDERS.

MR. BATH asked the Minister for Railways: What are the names of the tenderers and the amounts of the tenders received for the conduct of the railway refreshment rooms at Kalgoorlie.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, W. Turner, £559 per annum. 2, W. W. Berry, £550 per annum. 3, W. M. Hunter, £510 18s. 4d. per annum.

QUESTION—GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY, RETICULATION PIPES.

MR. DAGLISH asked the Minister for Works: 1, Whether the contract of Messrs. Hoskins & Co., Ltd., for the supply of pipes for reticulation of the Goldfields Water Supply provides for the manufacture of the majority of items in this State, and whether an enhanced price

is paid for the pipes on that account. 2, Whether it is a fact that this condition is being ignored by the contractors, and that very large importations of pipes are taking place each week. 3, Whether the Minister will take steps to enforce the conditions of contract, so that local labour shall be employed and the money be circulated in the State.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1 (a), Yes; (b), Pipes could have been obtained under indent from England at a somewhat lower rate. The increased price was given chiefly in consideration of the contractors' guarantee to give quicker delivery, but the advantage to the State of local manufacture also influenced the case. 2, Up to date the contractors have supplied about 22,000 pipes, and of these 20,000 have been made locally, the balance having been obtained from the Eastern States. Those obtained from the Eastern States were of the larger diameters, and the contractors were notified that the price would be reduced to accord with the cost of indenting the pipes. 3, Conditions of contract have been and are being enforced.

QUESTION—GINGIN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL.

DR. M. O'CONNOR asked the Premier:

1, For what reason, and under what section of the Municipal Institutions or other Act, the Municipal Council of Gingin was abolished. 2, Whether the Colonial Secretary's Department has written to the late town clerk demanding all books, money, etc., held by him; if so, by what authority. 3, Whether the Government will appoint a returning officer for the election of a new council at once; if not, why not. 4, Whether the name of Gingin is not in the list of Municipalities supplied to this House by the Government. 5, Whether it is proposed that the rates in the Municipality shall be collected by the Roads Board.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, The council has not been abolished, but has ceased to exist, because the mayor resigned and reported that it was impossible to get candidates for the council; the town clerk reported that the mayor's resignation reduced the council to nothing. 2, Yes; in the interests of the creditors of the late municipality. 3, In view of

the circumstances detailed in No. 1, the Government consider that the affairs of the district can be better administered through the roads board. 4, The hon. member is referred to the list in question. 5, It is proposed to deal with this question by legislation.

STRANGERS IN THE GALLERIES.

EXPLANATION OF ERROR.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue): I desire to make a personal explanation by leave of the House. At 3 o'clock on Friday morning I was acting as Deputy Chairman of Committees, when an hon. member called attention to the presence of strangers in the galleries. It was rather a sudden question. I think it is the first time it has occurred in this Parliament, or at any rate in my experience of it. I had present in my mind the standing practice of the British House of Commons, and I understood for the moment that I had no option but to order strangers to withdraw, based upon what we find recorded in May, page 201, which says:—

According to ancient usage, the exclusion of strangers could, at any time, be enforced without an order of the House; for, on a member taking notice of their presence, the Speaker was obliged to order them to withdraw, without putting a question.

Lower down, however, it says:—

It was not until the 23rd May, 1870, that strangers were again ordered to withdraw, in order to avoid publicity being given to a debate upon the Contagious Diseases Acts. This led to farther discussion; but the House still adhered to the old rule of exclusion, which was again enforced on the 19th March, 1872. The inconvenience of the rule prompted the House to agree to a resolution, 31st May, 1875, now Standing Order No. 93, which provided that, if notice was taken that strangers were present, the Speaker or the Chairman should forthwith put the question that strangers be ordered to withdraw; reserving to the Speaker or the Chairman the power, whenever he thought fit, to order the withdrawal of strangers from any part of the House.

In turning up the Standing Orders, it is somewhat remarkable to find that Clause 68 on Strangers is not indexed, while in the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council the clause referring to the same question is indexed and stands as Clause 36, which reads:—

At the request of any member, or at his own discretion, at any time the President shall order strangers to withdraw from any part of

the Chamber, and they shall immediately withdraw accordingly.

I was under the impression that I had no choice but to order strangers to withdraw. I find, on turning to our own Standing Orders, paragraph 68 says:—

If any member shall take notice that strangers are present, the Speaker or the Chairman (as the case may be) shall forthwith put the question, "That strangers be ordered to withdraw," without permitting any debate or amendment: Provided that the Speaker or the Chairman may, whenever he thinks fit, order the withdrawal of strangers from any part of the House.

I find, therefore, notwithstanding the general impression in my mind, based upon ancient practice, that I ought to have put the question to the House "That strangers be ordered to withdraw." I failed to do so, and I express my regret at having overlooked the change that had taken place in the practice of the House of Commons.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by Mr. PURKISS, and read a first time.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous sitting.

MR. HARPER in the Chair; the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Second Schedule (farther consideration)—Assembly Electorates.

Forrest Electoral District:

MR. JOHNSON moved as an amendment,

That the "Forrest Electoral District" be struck out.

By the insertion of this new district in the schedule, the Government were proposing to give one extra seat to the South-Western portion of the State. Under existing conditions we had practically one member for every 1,700 electors; but if the Committee agreed to this new electorate it would be giving the South-West one representative for about 1,500 electors. There was nothing in the South-West to justify the Government in proposing to give to it an additional member, as it had more than its fair share of representation at present. To give one member for every 1,700 electors in the South-West, practically no dis-

tance from the seat of government, was wrong. This was a new system, a pet scheme of the Premier's, and the boundaries were so drawn that the Labour element, the workers at sawmills in the South-West, would be cut out of the agricultural area and grouped as a separate electorate. The Premier practically said, by bringing in this new electoral district, that the workers at these sawmills did not know sufficient about politics to be capable of dealing with matters pertaining to agricultural areas. The whole thing was a reflection on the workers in the sawmills, and it certainly was an insult to the occupants of the Labour bench. Take his (Mr. Johnson's) own case. He was born and bred on a farming station, and the greater part of his life was spent in agricultural districts in New Zealand. The Premier practically said that he could represent the goldfields, connected with which he knew absolutely nothing beyond what he picked up during his seven or eight years on those goldfields; but if he were living in an agricultural district, for instance in the Murray electorate, although he was born and bred and brought up in agricultural districts in New Zealand he would be regarded as not having the brains and intelligence to adequately represent the farmers. It was not fair of the Premier to offer this insult to the workers at the sawmills in the South-West, and it certainly was not fair of him to offer such an insult to the occupants of the Labour bench. To remove from the agricultural seats the labour element—practically in this State, anyhow, the advanced thought in political movements—and leave the agricultural areas to be represented by members selected solely by the farmers, was a new departure unprecedented in the history of Australia. Did the Premier wish to say that the farmers should have different representation from any other portion of the State? The Premier did not cut up the mining seats so as to cut out the labour element or the working portions of the electorates, and give certain portions of the goldfields over to the landed interest. The hon. gentleman did not do that in the mining centres, and why did he do it on the coast? Why did he pick out the farmers for special representation, when the farmers got

special representation in the Upper House from the way in which the Legislative Council was at present constituted? In the Upper House they had special representation, and not satisfied with that, the Premier came down with a proposal such as this in connection with the Forrest electorate, and asked us to give them special representation in this House.

MR. MORAN: All the representatives of the farming districts were not farmers. Let one look at the members for Wellington and the Murray. They were good enough. The principal thing was that they must be Government supporters.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.

MR. JOHNSON: The Premier was of opinion that whilst the representative of the timber combine could represent farming, the employees underneath him, who were associated with the same industry, the same work, as the member for Wellington (Mr. Teesdale Smith), were not capable of representing agricultural areas; and when we came to the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton) there was exactly the same proposition. The member for Sussex was associated with the timber industries, and was capable of representing the agricultural interests, yet the workers underneath him had not the brains and intelligence to represent the agricultural areas. Looked at from whatever side one liked, the proposal was a reflection on the intelligence of the workers at the sawmills, and an insult to the occupants of the Labour bench. He trusted the Committee would look at it from that point of view, and would not be a party to that insult, and to casting reflection on the workers in the sawmills, but would agree with him in striking out this clause. He would like to contradict certain statements made during the debate last Thursday in connection with the proposals of those who were trying to get more representation in this House for the people. It had been said that goldfields representatives were opposed to the agricultural interest; but he contradicted that flatly. During his campaign in Kalgoorlie, he was never backward in saying the agricultural interest should always have a warm supporter in him; and he defied any member to point out anything he had done during his career in the House, or one vote he had given against the advance of agri-

cultural interests in this State. He had always supported, and in speaking on the Address-in-Reply he stated that he would support, the building of any railway that would open up agricultural areas; consequently he contradicted flatly that they had any desire to do any injustice to the farming interest. Their sole intention was to get more representation for the people, and to show they were sincere in desiring to see the farmer justly and fairly represented they did not go absolutely on a population basis even in this proposal. If the Committee agreed to strike out the Forrest electorate, which he hoped they would do, we should give to the farmers of the South-West one representative for every 1,700 electors; and when we came to Kalgoorlie and gave them one representative for every 3,500 electors, that, he thought, ought to convince the Committee that we did not wish to deal unjustly with the farmers. The Premier was giving too much consideration to acres, and too little consideration to people. This pet scheme of the Premier's should be struck out, and it would be an after-consideration as to how that seat should be placed.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: Having represented for two years past a portion of the district out of which the Forrest electorate was to be formed, he was forced to the conclusion that either the farmers or the workers in that constituency lacked representation. Their interests were different; and to continue the present system would mean the disfranchisement of one or the other set of electors in that constituency. The last speaker had complained that the forming of this electorate was a reflection on the intelligence and ability of the workers to represent a mixed constituency in this House. There was no reflection evident to him in the Government proposal, and he took it that the Forrest electorate, when formed, would be represented purely and simply by Labour.

MR. JOHNSON: Members who represented Labour had to think of other interests in this country besides Labour.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: The Labour man thought only of himself; the farmer also had to consider himself; so it was with every member of this House; also, he supposed, with the timber combine. It was self all the time.

To continue the representation as at present would be unsatisfactory, and the member who proposed to strike out the new electorate evidently thought that by doing so the Labour party would secure two seats in that district. It was much easier for labour men in a district to act in combination than for farmers to do so. At each timber station a ballot-box was placed, and at that station there would be a voting power of 100, 300, up to 400 workers; whereas if farmers wanted to record their votes, they had to travel in some cases 15 miles to reach a ballot-box. To leave the electorate as it was would be an injustice, and he hoped the Committee would agree to include the Forrest electorate in the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposal to strike out the Forrest electorate could not be put as an amendment, being contrary to the rule which required that such an amendment as this should be moved as a new clause. The regular course would be to negative the question that the clause stand part of the Bill, and the suggested amendment could be proposed later as a new clause.

MR. PURKISS: The schedule was not a clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: The schedule (the items) was being dealt with the same as clauses in a Bill.

MR. MORAN: Having strongly objected to the carving out of this new electorate in the Bill of last year, he must repeat his objection. The principle on which this electorate was formed was very obnoxious, as the object was to circumvent a certain body of electors by carving out a bunch of workers here and a bunch of workers there so as to combine three distinct parts in one electorate, and prevent those workers from voting in the larger electorate of which they properly formed a part. This principle was entirely wrong; and he had been sorry to hear the Premier the other night brutally and frankly admit that the intention in forming this electorate was to preserve three seats, the representatives of which were at present supporters of the Government. The Premier had said he intended to preserve these as agricultural seats; and unless the hon. gentleman had edited *Hansard*, those words would be found in the report of his speech. Those three

representatives were now supporting the Government.

THE PREMIER: Which three?

MR. MORAN: The member for the Murray (Mr. Atkins) and the member for Wellington (Mr. Teesdale Smith) were supporters of the present Premier; and had it not been for those members voting in a certain way the other night, the Government would have been defeated on the vital question of representation of the people; therefore the Premier was preserving the seats of two members who were with him in this matter. But the Premier had no more right to carve out an electorate for this purpose than he had to go to West Perth and cut out the railway vote, or go to Subiaco and cut up that constituency with a particular object, or cut out the civil servants from the several constituencies in which they resided, and group them as one special electorate. Indeed the principle of giving the civil servants a separate vote in that way had been suggested, as if civil servants could not be trusted to act as ordinary citizens by voting as part of the constituencies in which they severally resided. To cut out sections of the community for special representation in that way was an extraordinary course, as he said last session, and as he repeated now.

THE PREMIER: The exact effect was pointed out by himself in moving the second reading of the Bill.

MR. MORAN: The Premier said last session that the intention in forming the Forrest electorate was to give the timber interest a certain seat in this House. It would be a Labour seat; but a Labour member would be no more a special representative of timber than of any other industry in the State. Labour politics took no notice of particular interests, but their object was to get representation for Labour employed in industries generally. There were two special representatives of the timber interest in this House at present, and both were well able to represent the farming interest. If a Labour constituency were carved out of that district, what particular industry would the Labour member represent? One might ask in the same way what particular industry did the Premier represent. He was not a practical farmer; he did not appear to be a practical miner —

MR. NANSON: He would be a good representative of the timber industry, being an expert log-roller.

MR. MORAN: That might be so; but on the broad basis, the South-West was not entitled to another member; and even in the distribution of seats proposed by the member for Cue, those people were to get a member for 2,100 electors and the bigger centres would get a member for 2,700 electors. The much larger centres were to get one representative for 2,700 voters, but the proposal of the Government was that sparsely peopled portions of the State should have one member for 1,360 voters, and Perth with its surroundings one member for 3,000 voters. Notwithstanding the rather able manipulation of the figures of New South Wales by the member for South-West Mining (Mr. Ewing) the other night, that hon. member was followed promptly by the member for Hannans (Mr. Bath), who clearly proved that there was no parallel in any of the States to the position of Western Australia, and that there were agricultural seats in New South Wales with double the representation of city electorates. He also clearly showed that, though there was an automatic system of redistribution in that State, the waves of population could not be controlled, and that excrescences would grow upon any Redistribution of Seats Act. However, the intention of New South Wales was to have voting values as nearly equal as possible. The intention of the present Bill was to give to agricultural seats double the value that was given to Perth and the goldfields seats. One could not help noticing the weapon of sarcasm which had lately been used against those hon. gentlemen who had combined to get more justices done to populous centres of the State. They had been howled at on two accounts in the same columns; firstly because they proposed to give undue representation to the North, and secondly because they did not give to the North and to the agricultural seats fair representation. However, the people of the State would be the best judges. It would have been unwise to have brought in a scheme altogether on a population basis, but by the scheme of the member for Cue it was not impossible to give due representation to the North and fair representa-

tion to the agricultural districts, and at the same time to secure popular rule in the House. All the ridicule in the world would not prevent a man from being branded as a reactionary who contended that he would not support the proposal unless it went the whole hog.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was wandering from the point.

MR. MORAN: The proposal of the Government was to give representation to the agricultural districts on a quota of 1,368 voters, but members should accept the recommendation of the member for Cue and give representation to the farming interests in the South-West on a quota of 2,000 voters. For that reason there was no justification in including the Forrest electorate, even if it was done with forethought and with the deliberate intention of cutting out certain voters from an electorate. He objected firstly to too much representation being given to the South-West, and secondly to the pernicious principle of setting one portion of the community against another, because if there was one way by which class was not turned against class it was by mixing people up. The timber and farming industries, according to his experience, were as friendly as possible. One who stood to represent any of the South-West seats on a fairly liberal basis would be supported by timber men, farming labourers, and even the farmer himself. The proposal of the cross-benches, leaving the seats as they were at present, was that the quota should be 2,100 for the farming districts. The proposal was not unfair. In fact it was a very fair handicap indeed. He could not understand why the people of the metropolis and goldfields should be mistrusted, unless the Government intended to aim a deadly blow at the people of the metropolis, so that their voice could not be heard against unjust taxation proposals.

THE PREMIER: The House should retain the Forrest electorate for reasons that were absolutely convincing to any fair-minded man. There were in the existing Murray electorate 2,000 voters, and in the Wellington district upwards of 2,000 voters. Under the redistribution scheme it was proposed to abolish the existing Cockburn Sound electorate, and, following on that abolition, about

450 votes, which now formed part of Cockburn Sound, would form part of Murray. Thus Murray and Wellington would have an aggregate of 4,700 voters. The proposal was that these votes should be divided into two electorates, giving to each electorate 2,350 votes. That was the standard proposed to apply.

MR. MORAN: Who had proposed that?

THE PREMIER: The mover of the amendment proposed it. The difficulty of understanding what was meant by the amendments caused the whole trouble. It was clear that the Forrest electorate, attacked by the members for Kalgoorlie and West Perth, was a timber electorate, but, being an electorate, it was contended it gave too much representation to the South-West. Therefore, the clear intention of the mover of the amendment must be to abolish the Forrest electorate, and to throw it into the Murray and Wellington electorates.

MR. JOHNSON: There would be a readjustment all round.

THE PREMIER: It was not proposed to strike out the Forrest electorate and give it to some other spot in the South-West. Thus Murray and Wellington would aggregate 4,700 votes, and each electorate would have 2,350 votes.

MR. JOHNSON: What about Sussex and others?

THE PREMIER: One was anxious to deal with the amendment before the House. It was difficult to understand what the members on the cross-benches meant. When one tried to pin them to an amendment they said something else might happen. He desired to deal with the proposition before the House, and he hoped fair-minded members would support him. Objections were raised to the continuation of the Forrest electorate on the ground that it was an insult to the Labour party. Secondly it was argued that, by the continuation of the Forrest electorate, too large a value was given to the votes in the South-West. Assuming that the Forrest electorate was abolished, the Murray and the Wellington electorates would have a quota of 2,350, a greater average than the cave-dwellers proposed to give.

MR. JOHNSON: Could there not be readjustments?

THE PREMIER: One could not readjust the propositions of the cave-

dwellers. That would be entirely unsatisfactory.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Could the Premier argue that way, when it had been proposed to alter Beverley and York?

THE PREMIER: The hon. member must not go back to that question, because it had been dealt with on the word "Beaconsfield." This was merely a question of the boundaries of electorates, and members should not reiterate the old discussions on the proposition to include Beaconsfield. He did not propose, like the member for West Perth, to make a second-reading speech every five minutes. Life was too short for that. He desired to deal with the question as to whether the Forrest electorate was to be maintained. Taking the Forrest electorate as proposed, roughly speaking it came within the geographical area now included in the Murray and Wellington electorates, and inside this geographical area there was a voting strength of 4,700. Murray contained 2,118 votes and Wellington 2,101, while the portion of Cockburn Sound proposed to be included in the Murray electorate contained 430 votes. The total would be 4,649 votes. There were inside that geographical area 4,700, and the effect of striking out the Forrest electorate would give to each of those two constituencies about 2,300 electors.

MR. HASTIE: Was that too large?

THE PREMIER: It was too large, whether we applied it to the standard suggested by the Government or the standard suggested by the cave-dwellers. We were only dealing with these two theories, because the cave-dwellers told us they were not prepared to accept the same quota for the agricultural area as for the metropolitan area, and as they proposed that the quota for Fremantle should be 2,300, they would not ask for a quota of 2,300 in agricultural districts.

MR. MORAN: If we took Claremont in Fremantle, and included a thousand in Cockburn Sound, we then got a quota of 2,600.

THE PREMIER: There were about 800 in the existing Cockburn Sound electorate. So far as his recollection of the various schemes brought forward in rotation by different dissentients served him, the particular scheme he had in his mind

— he might be wrong—suggested a quota of 2,300 as applied to Fremantle.

MR. DAGLISH : Oh, no.

MR. MORAN : The hon. gentleman was wrong.

THE PREMIER said he was glad he was wrong. He submitted that if the Forrest electorate were struck out, the quota for the two other electorates would be too large, and that being so we ought to have a third electorate. On this particular point we had nothing whatever to do with the question as to whether the representation was to be in the South-West, in the North, or the East. He thought that the only time when we introduced the geographical element was when dealing with the pastoral electorate, in relation to which both sides were prepared to give a larger representation than they were prepared to give in the portion of the State lying to the south of the Murchison. It was beside the question therefore, in dealing with this particular proposition, to say the South-West had too much representation. The other argument raised—that to deal with the electorates in the way proposed was an insult to the Labour bench—was also entirely beside the question. He had already pointed out that we had in those electorates, the Murray and Wellington, about 2,000 electors in each, and in each there were about a thousand in the timber industry, and about a thousand agriculturists. We had that see-saw between one side and the other. It was idle for the member for Hannans (Mr. Bath) to ask whether a Labour member could represent agriculturists. He (the Premier) did not say a Labour member could not do so. No doubt any member could do it, but that was not the point. There was a wide divergence between the agricultural interest on one side and the Labour bench on the other. It might be looked at perhaps from the point of view of the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) that there was no reason why it should exist, and it might be that it would soon be removed ; but dealing with the position as we found it to-day, surely the hon. member would agree with him that, speaking generally, there was a strong divergence between the political views and aspirations of the agriculturists and the political views and aspirations of the Labour party. If the hon. member

would not agree with him on that point, perhaps he would agree with him that there was a strong divergence between the methods by which one side and the other endeavoured to obtain domination. When we found this strong divergence of political views why should we insist upon throwing the electors together, when we all admitted there was need for a redistribution of seats, and when therefore an opportunity arose of removing some of those difficulties which he submitted the present position created. Admitting for the sake of argument that the South-West districts had too much representation, was it right to strike out the Forrest electorate? Could not a better equality be obtained by striking out some other electorate?

MR. NANSON : Which one would the hon. member agree to strike out?

THE PREMIER : What he wanted to deal with was the argument put before the Committee.

MR. NANSON : If the hon. gentleman would give an assurance, he might support him.

THE PREMIER : Life was too short. He was glad members saw the point. Were we unreasonable in saying that in dealing with the question of redistribution we should have regard to the fact that inside the Murray electorate and the Wellington electorate there existed those two, he would not say hostile forces, but at all events divergent political forces?

MR. BATH : The hon. gentleman was unreasonable.

THE PREMIER : Not so. We found in the midst of this agricultural district what we found nowhere else—a very large population which, in the ordinary sense of the word, was a factory population.

MR. BATH : We had to depend upon a great number of those for settlement on the land.

THE PREMIER : What had that to do with the point? A great number of miners settled on the land, as did also a great number from the metropolis. Every line in connection with electorates was more or less imaginary. How could one say we were unreasonable in drawing this line in connection with the Forrest electorate, when on one side there was a separate industry, a body of people controlled by different political ideals

from those held by the people on the other side of the line? They were widely distinct, measured by political feeling, interests, or mode of living. There was just as great a distinction between those engaged in the milling interests and agriculturists as there was between the metropolitan area and the agricultural area.

MR. DIAMOND : Would the hon. gentleman do the same with regard to factory hands in Perth?

THE PREMIER : One was satisfied that the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) and the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) believed that argument applied, for if they did not think in that way they would not have joined the cave-dwellers.

MR. BATH : After all, this discussion on the redistribution of seats propounded by the Premier, and taken up by the leader of the Opposition, we could discover a slight glimmering of reason in what had apparently been very obscure, almost approaching to madness, in the proposals put forward. The Premier's idea in propounding the scheme was that good government could best be obtained by setting the different interests in the State at each other's throats. In the State we should have something of the same kind of duel as was mentioned in "Midshipman Easy"—a three-cornered duel. The farmer would be blazing away at the miner, and the miner at the resident in the metropolitan area. We should have the acme of good government when this condition was brought about. As far as the proposal to cut out the Forrest electorate was concerned, because being essentially a timber electorate therefore we should have the one interest in the constituency, we should always have this difficulty facing us, that if the representative of the Forrest electorate and the representative of the agricultural constituency were to oppose one another as the Premier stated they would, we should have the opposition in this House instead of the battle being fought out on the hustings as it should be, and the majority being allowed to win. The efforts of this Committee should be directed as far as possible towards consolidating the interests of these various sections of the people. It had been done in other States of the

Commonwealth, and why should we not have the same happy condition of affairs in Western Australia? In the northern river districts of New South Wales it was the timber cutters who opened up that magnificent agricultural area, and as a result an enormous population was settled there to-day. That population largely or partially consisted of men who went there cutting timber, and who found out the advantage of the district from an agricultural point of view and then settled upon it. The same sort of thing had taken place in the southern areas of Western Australia. Men who had been employed in timber districts had saved money and taken up land there. He knew of men who had been employed in the timber mills and were now engaged in farming.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH said he did not know one.

MR. BATH : The hon. member told us just now he did not know anything about timber, and the hon. member had quite confirmed that view. As far as representation was concerned, some of the very best representatives of labour in the New South Wales Assembly were representatives of farming constituencies. In fact, more than half-a-dozen of the Labour members of New South Wales were engaged in farming and pastoral pursuits before they were returned to that House. If the Forrest electorate were struck out and distributed among the others in that area as proposed by the amending scheme brought forward, we should have a much better condition of affairs. Although various sections of the community might for a time strive against one another as far as securing representation was concerned, in a few years the co-operation which would naturally ensue from these people being brought together and hearing one another's views, and from their becoming educated, would remove the spirit of opposition, the spirit of faction, and make their interests one, as they should be. But by having the Forrest electorate as a separate constituency we should be perpetuating these differences and tending to accentuate them. If it were persisted in, and the same proposal carried out in future redistributions in regard to other areas, we should have what apparently the Premier desired, that

being various factions in the community representing special interests, and we should have these contending elements not only outside but inside the House. Such a position should be avoided.

MR. HASTIE: This was the first occasion on which the House had an opportunity of saying whether there should be a Forrest electorate or not, because although the Bill of last year included a Forrest electorate, that Bill did not reach the stage for discussing details in this House. The select committee which sat this session to revise the schedule did not consider the Forrest electorate in detail, but regarded it as a matter of general policy which should be left to the House as a whole. It was for members to say now whether this constituency should be included in the schedule. As to the principle of carving out an electorate of this kind, he saw no objection to it if the boundaries could be arranged conveniently; but in this case that hardly applied. Those who were connected with the timber interest in this electorate were estimated to be 1,700 to 1,800 in number, and his opinion was that such a number was not sufficient to return a member to this House. The timber people could not be said to be inhabitants of a sparsely-populated district, for they were together in large groups. The Premier had suggested this evening that rather than strike out the proposed electorate the Committee might strike out some other electorate in the schedule. If that could be done it might solve the difficulty, because the Forrest electorate could then get an extension of boundaries. He had strongly protested against interests being put forward for representation in this House. It was seriously proposed by the Government to give to the South-West a member for every 1,500 electors, though if the Swan were included that would raise the quota. Surely the Premier should have given strong reasons for making that proposal; but instead of looking at the whole area as one electorate, the proposal was to give two members to this district for 2,650 electors. The Premier had said this number was too much for one electorate, and that there should be two members: but surely that was not much of a compliment to the South-West members. People living in the South-West were

within a hundred miles of Perth, and it was said that 2,650 in that district were too many to return one member. But comparing this number with constituencies on the Eastern Goldfields outside the main centre, it would be seen that the people there were represented in the proportion of about 3,000 electors to one member, and they were 400 to 600 miles away from Perth. If a timber constituency had been proposed to be created in this way on the Eastern Goldfields instead of creating it near to Perth, the Premier would not have proposed to give to those people such large representation. The proposal amounted to this, that the Committee were asked to give to people in the South-West from two to three times as much political power as was to be given to districts outside of the metropolitan centre on the goldfields or the metropolitan centre on the coast. It was agreed the metropolitan centres should have a little less representation than the sparsely-populated districts. There were on the goldfields more sparsely-populated places than in the South-West, for while the people in the South-West were within a few miles of a railway or a town, most people on the goldfields were in a completely different position, simply because they came from different and distant localities. It had been argued that people on the goldfields not being permanent residents should not have so much representation as people on the coast, who were said to be more permanent; but surely it could not be contended that people about saw-mills were permanent residents. They were in fact less permanent as settlers than were the people on the goldfields. The main question was, should the South-West, which had now one representative to every 1,700 electors, be allowed an additional member. He hoped the Committee would express an emphatic opinion against that proposal.

MR. NANSON: Last session he gave a qualified support to a proposal for creating a Forrest electorate, as he was then under the impression that the proposal would be acceptable to people connected with the timber industry; but he believed now they did not desire to have the proposed Forrest electorate carved out of the existing electorates. No provision was made in the schedule to repre-

sent timber-cutters alongside the Eastern Railway; also the Denmark mills and the Karridale timber mills were not included in the proposed electorate, as they were intended to be last year. He could not approve of this proposal in the schedule, seeing that those members in this House who specially represented the workers assured us that the workers at the timber stations did not desire to have this separate electorate.

MR. HASTIE: They never asked for it.

MR. NANSON: Then if it was superfluous from the workers' point of view to create this electorate, on whose behalf was it to be formed? Clearly in the interest of the member for Wellington and the member for the Murray, out of whose electorates the new district was to be carved. This process was known in America as "jerrymandering," and it implied that certain sitting members in Parliament were to have their seats secured to them by a process of arranging the boundaries. The Government were now indulging in that pleasant political pastime of "jerrymandering," by making the electorates sure for that type of member who could always be regarded as supporting a conservative Government. This was only part of the great conservative conspiracy which had been formed to defeat democratic ideas in regard to reform of the representation in Parliament. One instance of the disingenuous method in which the Premier was dealing with the Bill was his suggestion that, if members objected to the South-West having too many members, they might strike out some other electorate than the Forrest electorate. The Premier, however, was very careful to refrain from giving any assurance that he would meet members to that extent, and did not mention any electorate which he thought could be struck out. In the absence of any such assurance, whatever his views might be with regard to timber electorates, he (Mr. Nanson) would support the striking out of the Forrest electorate. He had not the slightest possible belief in any assurance the Premier might give with regard to reducing the number of the members for the South-West. Another reason which actuated him was that the southern portions were being given a number of members quite out

of proportion to the number given to the northern agricultural portions of the State. As it had already been affirmed that the representation in the Assembly was to lean towards interests rather than towards population, he was justified in saying that the southern representation should be diminished by one seat, which should be given to the North. Whether he could obtain the seat for the North it was impossible to say; but he would support any amendment to reduce the representation in the South, for with the representation of the South so reduced there would be some chance of getting an additional member for the North. It was clearly impossible to increase the number of members beyond 50, so that to get one extra seat for the North it was essential to strike one out of the southern seats.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: The member for Hannans, in dealing with the saw-miller, had made one or two remarks which should not go uncontradicted. The hon. member had stated that saw-millers became farmers, but he (Mr. Smith) did not know a single man who had left the sawmilling industry and taken up the farming industry. Apparently the hon. member for Hannans did not know much about the subject. The representation as proposed by the Government would be the only satisfactory representation down in the timber district. One could not get away from the fact that the interests of the worker and the interests of the farmer were not the same.

MR. HASTIE: Was it satisfactory to other portions of the State?

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: As far as it was possible to cut the State into separate electorates, the better it would be for the State. In the case of the Wellington and Murray electorates either the timber or the farming industry would be sacrificed. Why should either be sacrificed, when it was so easy in the drafting of the Bill to have both interests conserved? The object of the Bill was to provide representation for electors. Yet the Labour party, by the amendment moved by the member for Kalgoorlie, desired to disfranchise perhaps a thousand men. Nobody could get away from the fact that, if the farmers' and labourers' interests were at variance, he (Mr. Smith), as a representative of

the district, would without hesitation support the farmer. In the Forrest electorate there were 1,000 labour voters. It would be unjust and a scandal for the House, when it had an opportunity of giving these men representation, to try and cut them out. The only object of the member for Kalgoorlie was to deprive the farmer of his representation.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Was not the hon. member's presence in direct opposition to his arguments?

MR. TEESDALE SMITH said he did not think so. He did not desire to be supported by the Labour party. Judging by his experience in the House the tactics of the Labour party had only one object, and that was to serve their own ends. He would support the Bill as it stood, and all the eloquence of members on the cross-benches would not draw him away from his support of a measure in which fair representation was to be given to the two interests of farming and timber.

MR. F. CONNOR: The reason which would induce him to support the striking out of the Forrest electorate was somewhat different from that which might be given by any other hon. member, except perhaps the member for the Murchison. In justice to the North more consideration should be given to the pastoral industry. It was suggested that the North was getting four representatives, or otherwise that the pastoral industry was getting four representatives; but such was not the case. At the most the pastoral industry was only getting two representatives. By the fullest stretch of imagination Pilbarra could not be called a pastoral seat. It was absolutely a mining vote, and necessarily so. Pilbarra was a place that ought to have a mining member; because it would be a great and important mining centre. That took one pastoral representative from the North. Could members by any stretch of imagination affirm that Kimberley, with Broome in, would be a pastoral seat? The member for Kimberley would be elected by the people at and around Broome, people engaged purely in the pearling industry. So two pastoral representatives could be taken off the North, leaving only Gascoyne and Roebourne, the only representation given to the North from a pastoralist point of

view. Was Roebourne, however, a pastoral vote? It was a port, and the people living at the port who would return the member were dependent as much upon mining as upon the pastoral industry. The mines outside Roebourne would produce more votes than the pastoralists could. Consequently, if that seat were also deleted, there was only one representative for the pastoralists of the North, a fact which would face hon. members later on, because there would be big developments in the North. One direct representative for the pastoral industry was not sufficient. Would that one representative represent the most important part of the pastoral districts of the State? East Kimberley was the most important pastoral district to-day. Twenty thousand head of fat cattle would leave Wyndham this year for the South, representing £240,000 worth of cattle; and the trade was in its infancy. The district would be absolutely unrepresented in Parliament, because the past practice of the members representing semi-pastoral districts would be a guide to their future actions. One could only base his ideas on his prophecies, if he wished to put it that way, on the past, and in the past the agriculturist had not been a friend but an enemy to pastoralists in this House. The agriculturists in this House tried all they knew to stop the development of the best and fairest pastoral country in Western Australia. They had tried to stop it by introducing absurd, unjust, and iniquitous regulations, and succeeded in doing it. The pastoral industry ought to have an additional member. As to the member for the Gascoyne (Mr. Butcher), that gentleman would, he had no hesitation in saying, represent the great North of this State very badly. If the Government were in earnest and wanted to bring in a Bill suitable to the whole of the State which would give a certain amount of justice, they should give one seat to the pearling industry, represented by the member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott). He wanted to know why the hon. member had not suggested this himself. The reason was that the hon. member said "I will have the pearling seat as well as the East Kimberley and West Kimberley seats." How could we have the pastoral industry represented by one who was also a representative of the people directly

interested in pearling? [MR. PIGOTT: Why not?] Because the hon. member did not know anything about it, and it would not be in the hon. member's interest. He (Mr. Connor) was putting the position the hon. member was afraid to put before the House simply because he durst not clash with the people he was in league with. If the member for West Kimberley had done his duty, the first thing he would have suggested in connection with the Redistribution of Seats Bill would have been that there should be one member given to the pearling industry. If the Government would abolish this Forrest electorate and give direct representation to the pearling industry, and allow four other members to the North, that would, he thought, have the general agreement of members, and in his opinion it would be not only a generous thing but a wise thing to do.

MR. ATKINS: The speech of the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor) really contradicted one of the strong points of the member who moved this amendment, that the fact of persons representing different classes of industry did not make them enemies. It seemed to him that the last speaker spoke of the pastoralists as being deadly enemies of the agriculturists. Why then should not the Labour members be in opposition just as well? It was nonsense to say that all were a happy family. If that were so there would be no opposition. As to the Forrest electorate, when he went into politics—if he might say he went into politics—he put up for the Murray electorate. He was elected by a majority of four votes, and it appeared to him plainly then that half of the people who voted were not in sympathy with him as their member. Therefore he held that those people were disfranchised, and the first time he saw the Premier he told the hon. gentleman he did not think that was fair electoral distribution. A lot of men who held one opinion should have representation, and men who held another opinion ought also to have representation. Why should we in the case of the Murray and Wellington try to disfranchise either the timber worker or the farmer? He did not see any way of getting fair representation for both these classes of men

unless they were separate. If we had two members for the Murray district, one to represent the farming constituency and the other to represent the milling constituency, we might do something, but how were we to make a man feel as the farmer wanted his representative to feel and also feel as the timber worker wanted his representative to feel? He wanted to see most of the country people and the town people represented. Every man should have a vote, but there should be a difference in the value of votes. There should be a difference between the numbers in some electorates and those in others. We had a number of people in this country who came from Victoria because Victoria was in a bad state, and there was no reason to suppose that this country would not have a reverse as well as Victoria. In that case the number of electors in those districts which had, say, 3,000 would probably be reduced to only 2,000, and perhaps less, whereas the people in the farming districts, who were fixed in the country, would be just as many as at present, and perhaps more. The votes of people on the land should have more value than the votes of nomadic people. He believed in the cobbler sticking to his last. Those engaged in labour should have representation just as well as other people, and therefore labourers on the sawmills had just as good a right to be represented by a person whose tenets suited them as had those engaged in farming, and for that reason the Forrest electorate should have its own representative. They did not want a farmers' man to represent them, but one who was in unison with their own ideas. The farming men should have their representation, and the working men on the mills should have theirs also.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. WALLACE: After hearing the arguments on this question, he intended to vote for striking out the Forrest electorate. The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) had expressed a desire to see this electorate struck out, so as to provide one additional seat for the northern districts. He (Mr. Wallace) had held all along a conviction that the northern portion of this State could not

fairly be dealt with on the same basis as the more populous centres; and had a population basis been adopted for most of the electorates south of the Moore River, and due consideration given to the claims of the North on the basis not only of population but of interests, that would have been a more equitable redistribution scheme. He had not heard any clamour in the country, and certainly not in the district he represented, for a redistribution of seats on a population basis under present conditions. The whole question had originated with some members of this Chamber, to gain political notoriety; and because of that fact we found that the whole disagreement as to the fixing of electorates hinged on the question of classifying them as agricultural, or pastoral, or mining, or metropolitan, or port constituencies. To continue arguing on that line would be an endless process, and he did not mind what the classification might be so long as fair representation was given to the northern districts. After an experience of six sessions as a member of this House, he could come to no other conclusion than that the metropolitan and suburban members had not once during that period given any consideration to the fair claims of the northern portion of the State. He could say this without fear of contradiction; and this being so, those members representing the northern portion of the State, desiring to see the districts north of the Moore River progress along with other parts of the State, now wished to have justice done to the North. It was with this desire that he had joined the "cave-dwellers," and intended to support the striking out of the Forrest electorate from the schedule. There had been too much guessing about figures, which seemed to be treated to suit particular ideas or interests. At the last general election the redistribution resulted in three seats being taken from the North; and it was proposed in this new distribution to take two more northern seats, East Kimberley and Northampton, thus reducing the representation of the northern districts by five seats altogether. If representation were to be purely on a population basis, there might be a big justification for this reduction in the number of northern representatives; but he did not admit that the principle should apply to the

northern portion of the State in the same way as it might apply to the more thickly populated portions. The North had industries which required very little attention from the Government to place them prominently before people outside with a view to inducing capitalists to develop those industries; but if the present Government continued to follow on the lines of Sir John Forrest in regard to the northern districts, the North would continue practically unknown outside this State. Members representing the northern districts had never lost an opportunity in this House of making known not only the pastoral and mineral resources, but bringing into notice the fact that in the North there were many minerals other than gold which could be developed profitably to the State. On the question of constructing a railway to the North, the southern members were not eager to give it support; but when any question arose in this House as to undertaking public works in southern districts, we found the southern members voting solidly for those proposals. So far as he had assisted them in doing so, he had always tried to help in the development of any resources that would benefit the State as a whole. As to the creation of this Forrest electorate by combining three separate areas, no injustice would be done to the interest which predominated in those portions by striking out the proposed electorate. But there would be this benefit, that an additional seat would be provided out of the 50 for meeting the just claims of northern districts to additional representation. The northern members had hitherto to contend for some consideration from metropolitan and southern members; and he now asked those members to assist in striking out this electorate from the schedule, so as to give another member to a portion of the State which was entitled to it by the recent large increase of settlement, particularly in the Chapman Area and the Northampton district. Surely this increase fairly entitled those people to representation, and if it were not granted on this occasion it would be because the Government, having induced people to settle there, forget all about them.

MR. DIAMOND: The electorate should be struck out. It appeared to him that

the coinage of the term "cave-dwellers" had been the cause of some merriment, but it had not been laid down whether members of the cross-benches were Troglodytes or Adullamites. History showed that the Adullamites were eventually successful. Troglodytes were people who retired into a cave, hole, or well, and this term might be more properly applied to members of the Opposition and to the Government for striking out the proper amending proposals which were made last week. The proposal to take a piece out of one electorate and a piece out of another for forming a new electorate, was like taking plums out of a pudding. To be consistent to the principle of representing industries, Pilbarra should have a mining seat, the member for West Kimberley should have a pearling seat, the artisans of Perth should have a seat, the railway men at Guildford a seat, and the railway men, lumpers, and boat builders at Fremantle should have a seat. If the selection from one district of members to represent two or three interests was to be carried out to its logical conclusion, London ought to be divided into constituencies representing the Stock Exchange, merchants, manufacturers, retired capitalists, and professional men. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was the case some years ago.] Any such attempt must result in failure sooner or later, and must eventually result in failure in Western Australia. One could fully approve of the suggestion of the member for East Kimberley, who had made out a very good case. The northern pastoralists were only represented by one or perhaps two members, and the hon. member had made a very fair and reasonable appeal to other members of the House, to which the Premier and his supporters should give some attention, although the hon. member was among the minority. One excuse for the formation of the Forrest electorate was the representation of interests. At the present moment some trouble existed between the workers on the timber mills and the proprietors. As a rule it was the proprietary that constituted the timber interest. If the workers in these mills were given a seat, we would certainly not be giving representation to the owners, and consequently not giving representation to the timber interest. It was not a fair representation of interests

unless the proprietor was represented. He (Mr. Diamond) objected to any proposal asserting that the worker in a timber mill was not capable of voting for the general interests of his district, or that he would deliberately go to work and vote against the interests of the farmers and agriculturists in his district. His (Mr. Diamond's) experience of Australia had been entirely different. During 42 years' residence in Australia he had never seen an attempt to cut up a district into rival interests, and he trusted that the House would not countenance such a thing in Western Australia. The member for the Murray had said that the vote of the farmer was of more value, because he was fixed to the soil and could not get away. The hon. member did not quite think of what he was saying, because the farmers of Victoria and South Australia, who were supposed to be fixed to the soil in those States, were now leaving there and coming to Western Australia. There might possibly be a time when farmers would want to leave Western Australia. The hon. member's argument went only to a small extent in the direction he intended, but when carried to its logical sequence it was ridiculous. No people were fixed to the soil. A man was only fixed to the soil as long as it personally suited him. A very strong reason why the electorate should be struck out was that the power of the Labour party in the House was getting altogether too strong. The attempt of the Premier to force on the House another Labour electorate appeared to be worthy of being regarded with very great suspicion. The Premier must have had an eye on the forthcoming general elections. As he (Mr. Diamond) did not wish to see the Labour party unduly increased, he would support the amendment.

MR. PURKISS: The Forrest electorate should be deleted. Its inclusion was one of the greatest blots in the scheme propounded by the Government. The ostensible reason for introducing the electorate was to give representation to the timber industry; and the Premier had laboured the point very considerably last week, going so far as to say, in support of his contention that the timber industry should have distinct and separate representation, that the timber and agri-

cultural interests were incompatible. His (Mr. Purkiss's) retort had been "Why have a Minister for Lands who is a representative of the goldfields industry, the Minister for the timber industry and the Minister for agriculture?" Supposing that was the real reason for the Premier's insertion of the electorate and that we were to have representation of interests pure and simple, we were going back fully a hundred years. We were going in the teeth of all we had done, in the teeth of "one man one vote" and "adult suffrage," if we carried out this electoral principle to its logical conclusion. What did the Premier mean by representation of the timber industry? Did he mean the capitalists in this Forrester district or did he mean the employees? One supposed the employees did not care very much whether their masters had 1,000 acres of concession or 2,000. They were wages men, and so long as they had a good master and received fair wages they were satisfied. If the Premier meant representation to the employees—and they were 100 to 1 as against the employers—then the hon. gentleman was asking for representation not in respect of the industry, but for wage-earners who received wages from that particular industry. But assuming the Premier was absolutely sincere and wished to see this particular industry represented in this particular radius by one representative, assuming that was his reason for carving this electorate out of two others, then we got back 100 years, to give representation to interests. If the majority were going to refuse the deletion of this portion of the electorates, we must give representatives to the tin, coal, and pearling industries, and to railway employees. Where were we going to end? Every dominion under the British flag, including Great Britain herself, had been trying to get away during the last 100 years from representation of interests. We had all read the history of reform, and knew what the state of things was in England from 75 to 80 years ago, when in order to foster and develop the representation of industries pure and simple there were pocket boroughs and all kinds of boroughs. There were little country electorates of one square mile with a handful of people in them. That was what the fight was over by the minority,

who were invariably beaten in the beginning of any reform. All reform emanated from a minority fighting an apparently hopeless battle from time to time. Every reform started almost with one man, as in the case of Plimsoll, who stood almost alone in the House of Commons in fighting the battle of the loading mark on ships. Plimsoll walked out of the House, was called to order, and threatened almost with imprisonment. That man stood alone, yet to-day that Plimsoll mark was the law of the United Kingdom. The seed of all reform had sprung up into fruition. We had tried step by step to get reform, and we had manhood suffrage. We had one adult man one vote and one adult woman one vote, but we were seeking now to abrogate that by such a proposal as this. If we did this, and were going to be logical, we must take up the various interests he had mentioned, the primary interests of the State, and give them special representation. If we did that we should, as he said, be going back about 100 years. Was the Premier honest when he said that he was carving out of the districts of Wellington and the Murray, this peculiar configuration, this peculiar tract of land, in order to give the timber industry a vote? Was that the real reason? Did anyone in his heart of hearts believe that the real reason for the insertion of this electorate was to give the timber industry representation? It did absolutely nothing of the kind. [MR. MORAN: Hear, hear.] Was not the real reason to make sure of those two electorates by means of creating a third? From the Government point of view it was infinitely better to make sure of two seats now in jeopardy, and put in this electorate called "Forrest." They did not wish to jeopardize these two seats, but said "No; better let us make sure of these two seats; we will make sure of them, but at the expense of giving away another." They could well afford to gain two seats at the expense of another. If those were the reasons and motives which were actuating members, as surely as night followed day chickens of that kind would come home to roost sooner or later, and we should have representatives of the pearling interest, the tin interest, the coal interest; and the civil servants, the railway em-

ployees, or any other large body of men would have representatives of their own. He supposed that in the Forrest electorate there were at the outside a dozen men representing the timber industry—the men who had taken up concessions, large tracts of land, and had put their machinery there, and who were exporting timber. The great bulk of the voters were employees who did not represent the timber industry at all, and had only very little interest in it saving and except the earning of fair wages from those who represented the timber industry. He therefore asked members to pause before they allowed such a blot to stand in this schedule as appeared when the Government asked us to carve out of two flanking electorates this particular electorate to be designated "Forrest." Looking at the configuration of the country one saw that the Government had taken much trouble and had to make acute angles in order to carve from the adjoining electorates this particular electorate. If in the past any harm had been done and had been perpetuated to any particular territorial district or any particular interest in that territory, it was in regard to a territory which represented from a fifth to a sixth of the whole of Australia, that being the northern territory. Those there had suffered, though their grievance had not been anything like the grievance which the people in the North of Queensland had to submit to for years. Let members look at the agitation which arose for separation. Let them look at the North-West territory, where there was a most perilous coastline which had not been surveyed yet. The answer to that might be that it was the duty of the Admiralty to survey it. Yes; but there was such a thing as putting pressure on the Admiralty. There was not a survey on that vast coast-line, there was no lighthouse to speak of along it, there were no railways to develop that territory, and no roads even had been made to develop it. He was only alluding to this by way of saying that if there were any interests that had been absolutely neglected, they were those of the northern district; and if the Committee could see their way to give far more representation than they had, he for one would heartily support it. However, that was only by the way. It was a parenthesis and had nothing to do with

the Forrest electorate. He was simply reminded of it because the Government had made such a feature of forming this Forrest electorate on the ground that it was to represent an important interest. It would not, however, represent and could not represent anything of the kind.

MR. CONNOR said he was pleased to say a few words, so that what he said might appear in *Hansard* later on. He wanted to bring before the attention of members the fact that all the members representing the North of this country, excepting himself, were voting with the Government to keep the inclusion of this seat. The only hope they had to get any farther representation for the North was by the excision of this Forrest electorate. He wanted it put in *Hansard*, he wanted the Press to take notice of it, he wanted it shown clearly that the members who represented or misrepresented the northern electorates—whichever they liked, because it was not what one said in the House, but how one voted—were selling the North.

MR. MORAN: If the Forrest electorate were excised, he would then be willing to listen to a case being stated for the North. Seeing that the question of interests predominated in the Chamber, we (reformers) should make the best fight we could. The members for the South-West could look after their interests very well. The representatives of that portion of the country were as old as this Parliament, and they had been constantly the champions of retrogression. Some members for the South-West opposed the establishment of responsible government, opposed loans and the building of railways; and if those members dared they would have stood on the beach and prevented anyone landing from the other States. There was something to be said for giving to the North another member. He remembered the battle between East and West Kimberley being fought in this House, and if East Kimberley had not had a member to fight for the live stock being brought to the southern markets, meat would be 2s. a pound in this State to-day. That was an absolute fact. In view of what transpired yesterday at a Ministerial guzzling match at Greenhills, bearing directly on the question of the Forrest electorate, and in view

of the fact that the Premier had said he had one trump card up his sleeve, and had farther said that until the debate was finished he would not bring down his Estimates—the Premier had used that as a threat under the exhilarating surroundings of the classic district of Greenhills, a railway to which district his party so strenuously opposed in this House—the Committee should now consider whether it was not wise to let the details go, to finish the discussion, for behind it was the threat of the Premier, and there might be some secret purchases to hide up, some secret money spent. The Premier wanted the Estimates rushed through at the end of the session, when the heat of the summer would be on us. Members did not want the Premier to hustle the Estimates through the Chamber. That was the object—the Premier wanted to cover up the mistakes of the Government, more secret purchases, and perhaps more contracts let without the authority of Parliament. The people's expenditure should be well and carefully examined by members. It was plain that the reforming party could not win on any of these details, for the patient phalanxes of the Government were ready waiting, the whereabouts of every member was known, they were all on the wire, and if in bed there was an electric wire attached to the bed so as to fetch them if necessity required. Strike the Forrest electorate out of this schedule, and fight the northern areas; but was it worth fighting any of the details? He did not wish the Premier to be able to say that we were to blame for the Estimates being brought down so late. He wished to see the Estimates carefully scrutinised, every line, every vote. He would not get tired as the summer came on, but as a rule as the summer came on four-fifths of the members did not take any interest in the proceedings. He hoped the Forrest electorate would be struck out. It was a vicious principle to adopt; it was going back 100 years. The Premier had owned up that the Forrest electorate had been created to save two agricultural seats, but the Premier would be sorry for introducing the principle. It would be hard for the party in power in future to accuse anyone else of jerrymandering when they were the princes of jerrymanderers themselves.

MR. TAYLOR: It was necessary to enter his protest at this stage. The remarks of members when they referred to jerrymandering were very apparent. The Premier had pointed out in support of the Forrest electorate that in that electorate there were 1,800 voters and in the adjoining electorates of Wellington and the Murray there were something like 1,300 electors apiece. In all there were something like 4,400 or 4,600 electors, and the Premier argued that it was necessary that this body of electors should have three members. He could not let this opportunity pass without showing to the Committee the gross injustice that appeared in the Bill. The Premier had said that 4,500 or 4,600 electors should have three votes, and the Bill provided that one electorate on the goldfields, which was a new electorate, was to have one member for 4,541 voters. That was the electorate of Kurradjong. The Premier might know the figures and the boundaries of Forrest, the Murray and Wellington electorates, but he had not much knowledge of the number of voters in the Mt. Margaret, the Menzies, or the Kurradjong electorates. A great deal had been said about the interest the Forrest electorate would represent. It had been pointed out that this electorate would not represent the timber interest but the workers in that district, and the object of carving up the electorate was to minimise the labour vote for Wellington, the Murray, and Forrest. The member for the Murray in a very eloquent and logical speech pointed out that votes should have equal values, but he argued that the votes of those settled on the land and those carrying on industries should have greater value than the votes of the nomadic population, that those who had votes by residential qualification of 6 or 12 months should not have the same value as the man who was living on the land or carrying on an industry. That to his (Mr. Taylor's) mind was about as democratic as one could expect from the member for the Murray. Members backed up by the Premier had stated that the farming industry and the Labour party were hostile. That was not borne out by facts in this State nor in any State on the continent. Where capital was organised better than in any other part of Australia, in Queensland, and likewise

where labour was better organised and the fight between the two parties was keener and fiercer than in any other part of the Commonwealth, we found there the farming constituencies returned members who joined the Labour party. The same thing would happen in this State if members would only allow it to do so; but the Premier's argument had been to cause friction between the farmer and the worker. It was well known to those who had studied political economy that labour, no matter to what branch it belonged, was the same in politics all the States over, and we found that capital was exactly the same in politics, it mattered not whether the capitalist was a merchant, a squatter, a goldmine owner, a coalmine owner, or a timber merchant. When there was a conflict between labour and capital, the capitalists united to fight the common enemy, the worker, and *vice versa*. He would like to know whether all the voters in the farming districts were owners of land or how many were employees. The farming employees and the timber employees had the same interest in labour politics. He was perfectly satisfied from the Premier's own showing during the debate on this Bill that the Forrest electorate had been cunningly carved out by the Premier to save two seats for his supporters, Murray and Wellington. A stranger entering the House and noting where these members sat, would hardly think that both supported the Government; but that they did could soon be proved by an examination of the division lists. The creation of the Forrest electorate would give Labour one member for Forrest while preventing the return of two democratic representatives, if not direct Labour men, for Murray and Wellington, in which no hidebound tory would in the past have had a chance of election. The Forrest electorate was an injustice, as must be obvious to the Premier. The Bill provided three members for some 4,500 voters in Wellington, Murray and Forrest, and one member for 4,541 voters in Kurrajong.

MR. YELVERTON supported the proposed Forrest electorate. He knew the inhabitants well, having worked there for the greater part of his life; and they desired direct representation, which could not in justice be denied them. The

member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor) advocated additional representation for the pastoralists of the North, and even representation for the pearlers, yet denied direct representation to the workers on timber stations in the South. The Labour party would work injustice to the agriculturists also, who, unless the Forrest electorate were created, could not be properly represented.

MR. CONNOR: Would the hon. member support a proposal to give another member to the North?

MR. YELVERTON: Yes; but not at the expense of a pastoral district. Under the Bill the North would have three electorates—Kimberley, Roebourne, and Gascoyne. Though mining and other industries might be carried on in these electorates, the primary industry was pastoral.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Some speakers had complained of how the State had been treated in the matter of representation by some of the older members of the House. In the first Parliament under responsible government were 14 agricultural members, five pastoral, four representing the city, and six the different ports. At that time there were no mining members. Thus, agricultural and pastoral industries were represented by 19 members, and the remaining members were 11 in number; but the 19 members, who could have dominated the House had they thought fit, were the very men responsible for all the liberal legislation which had followed the introduction of fresh population. Immediately on the necessity arising for the extension of liberal institutions, appropriate legislation was forthcoming from the agriculturists and pastoralists, who to-day were accused of withholding due representation from the people. Throughout the debate the agriculturists were accused of asking for more than their due; yet to-day their number was less than in the first Parliament. To-day agriculture asked for 13 representatives, while in the first Parliament there were 14, in the second 14, in the third Parliament of 44 members, 15; in the fourth Parliament of 50 members, 15. Therefore the agricultural and pastoral representation had been reduced. The first Parliament gave mining three seats.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: But Pilbarra returned a pastoralist.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The hon. member admitted that Pilbarra was a mining seat. To-day mining had 15 representatives, agriculturists asked for 13, and the metropolitan districts for 12. Although the country had increased in population, agriculture had increased proportionately. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) knew better than other members with what liberality newcomers to the State were treated by the members of the first Parliament—men who gave the best of their time and energy to liberalising the country's institutions. He (Mr. Piesse) would vote for the Forrest electorate.

MR. MORAN: None was more willing than he to accord to those who controlled this Parliament in old times a meed of praise. He had said before vast audiences hostile to the early settlers, and he now repeated, that in the matter of public works the old party, under the distinguished and enlightened leadership of Sir John Forrest, made a record which had not been equalled in the world. True, as a member interjected, such a policy increased the value of their own estates; but too much credit could not be given to Sir John Forrest and his party for their pluck and enterprise. But notwithstanding that generous public works policy, the taxpayer of to-day demanded an equal share of representation, and disputed the right of a minority in the State, however generous, to be the givers while he was merely the receiver. The new taxpayers wished to have equal power with the old, claiming equal justice and being willing to give equal justice. Why argue that because the old settlers had been generous they were entitled for all time to control the purse? The universally admitted maxim was that the taxpayer should be a tax-spender; that there should be no taxation without full representation. At the time of the first Parliament some 13 years ago, when, as the preceding speaker admitted, agriculture had two-thirds of the representation, the State's population was 40,000. The hon. member overlooked the fact that now it was 220,000, and that almost the whole of that increase had occurred in the two great centres, the metropolis and

the Eastern Goldfields. Supporters of the amendment did not ask that the farmer should lose the preference always accorded him, but that the populous centres should have one member for a quota of 2,700 voters, and the agricultural districts one for each 2,000. The farmer was in this House still given an advantage in voting power of 27 per cent. It was undeniable that the most advanced proposal so far was to allow an advantage to the farmer of 27 per cent. and to the pastoralist of 77. He did not desire his remarks to be misunderstood or misinterpreted. When the day came that he should refuse to accord a tribute of praise to the splendid statesmanship of Sir John Forrest and to the party who followed him in assisting in the material progress of the State, he should be unfit to hold a seat in the House. That day would never come. This question should be removed from the old problem of public works. It was now a question of population and representation, refusing a meed of justice to none. Those who followed Sir John Forrest had followed him in the teeth of the party at present in power, who would have denied anything in the shape of public expenditure to any part of the State. If, in discussing the matter, he had said anything, where the South-West was concerned, which could be taken as meaning that he said something detrimental to that part of the State, his judgment had been got the better of, for he had always been one to give to the old farmer full praise for the generosity with which he had looked upon the new-comer, though he might have looked upon the new-found prosperity, which might have been effervescent, with suspicion. He (Mr. Moran) was still one of the champions of the farmer, and was willing to lose his seat rather than, by winning it, raise his hand against the farming industry. At the same time, he would point out that in other States the country party kept the popular party in power. All the farming electorates in New Zealand sent representatives to support Mr. Seddon. Mr. Andrew Rutherford, of Canterbury, the biggest farmer in New Zealand, was returned as a direct supporter of the Seddon Government, his reason being that he had used his land all his life and the Seddon Government had never touched him, their policy of

breaking up big, idle estates having brought prosperity to all. The farmers of Queensland were turning round and supporting a Government which would break up the oligarchy that had ruled the State for so long. They had joined with the Labour party, recognising that their interests and the interests of the worker were identical. The small farmer had nothing to fear from popular Government, and he (Mr. Moran) again wished to say that he had never levelled any charge, taunts, or sneers against the farmer. If he had appeared to do so, he withdrew them *in toto*. He wished to live in peace and harmony with the farmers. One argument had not been touched upon, that if we continued to refuse popular representation we would destroy State rights, for the people would turn to the Federal Parliament as their champion. There they would have popular government, and the first time there was a movement in the Federal Parliament to encroach on State rights, the people would say "We have no State rights; we will go to the Federal Parliament." By harking back to the methods of a 100 years ago, and by carving out hostile portions of an electorate or by jerry-mandering electorates, harm would be done.

MR. ATKINS: What was jerry-mandering?

MR. MORAN: The hon. member had better not inquire, because if he learned the meaning, he would get up and leave the crowd with whom he was working at present. One did not desire the hon. member to be wandering about the Chamber like a motherless child.

MR. PURKISS: One remark which was relevant to the question, in the light of the speech of the member for the Williams, was the phrase "That which is cradled in shame is very often heard in sorrow."

Question (that the Forrest electoral district stand as printed) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	21
Noes	14
				—
Majority for	7

AYES.
Mr. Atkins
Mr. Burges
Mr. Butcher
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gordon
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Jacoby
Mr. James
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Piessie
Mr. Pigott
Mr. Bason
Mr. Smith
Sir J. G. Lee Steere
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Bath
Mr. Connor
Mr. Daglish
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Holman
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Moran
Mr. Nanson
Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Reid
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Diamond (Teller).

Forrest thus agreed to.

Fremantle, East Fremantle, and North Fremantle Electoral Districts—agreed to.

South Fremantle Electoral District:

MR. MORAN: If a thousand votes were taken from Cockburn Sound and joined to South Fremantle, the voting strength of the four Fremantle electorates and Claremont would be 15,400. The proposal of the cross-benches was to give this number six seats, the quota then being 2,600. In other words, even with a new seat for Fremantle, the quota would be 600 higher than the agricultural quota. This proposal had been defeated by the patient whipping of the member for Fremantle, and by the solid voting of the other members for the Fremantle district, except the member for South Fremantle.

South Fremantle put and passed.

Gascoyne and Geraldton Electoral Districts—agreed to.

Greenough Electoral District:

MR. NANSON: With a view of securing three members for the agricultural districts extending from the Murchison River to Gingin, he had placed several amendments on the Notice Paper. By the first he proposed that the name of "Greenough" should be changed to "Chapinuan." The boundaries would be practically the same, except that the electorate would not go so far south as provided in the Bill. The northern boundary would be the Murchison River, and the east and west boundaries the same as in the Bill, but the south boundary, according to his suggestion, would start from Mullewa Junction and extend in a more or less straight line eastward to Gullewa stream. The other electorate he would like to see inserted was one to

which he would give the name "Victoria." Its northern boundary would be the southern boundary of the suggested Chapman electorate, its western boundary the sea-coast, its eastern boundary the same as in the Bill, and its southern boundary would run to Carnamah. A third electorate would be the Moore, extending to Gingin. This would give three seats instead of two to the northern agricultural areas. It was hardly necessary to go at length into the details of the injustice being perpetrated against the northern agricultural districts in making them bear the whole brunt of redistribution by depriving them of two seats, and by not depriving the agricultural areas to the south and east of Perth of a single seat. He contended that there was still greater reason since the debate the other night, when the principles of representation in this Chamber were definitely settled. Since that question was settled there was the greater reason to deal liberally with the North. It was decided last Thursday that population was no longer to be the governing factor in this Chamber. We all knew, or at least everyone at all conversant with the agricultural districts of this State knew, that the country extending from Gingin to the Murchison River had larger and much more important interests than the comparatively small area which comprised the Eastern Districts, which were at present allowed to return four members. We knew also regarding the district we had just been discussing, the Forrest electorate, that even in a comparatively small area we proposed to give three members, and yet that huge extent of country extending from Gingin to the Murchison, which if it had not progressed had only failed to do so because of the existence of the Midland Railway in the hands of a private company, and which had been penalised in the past with regard to representation in this Chamber, was to be still farther penalised in future because its representation was to be diminished by 50 per cent. He recognised that with this schedule, providing as it did for 50 members, there was no chance of carrying the amendment unless the Committee were prepared to knock out one of the seats of the South-West or West districts so as to provide room for an additional northern seat;

but although it might be a work almost of despair, he still considered it his duty to make this last plea on behalf of the Northern agricultural districts. He very much regretted that on an occasion like this, when one would have thought agricultural members would be present in full force, he found that three vitally interested in the Champion Bay district were absent from the Chamber, and that in this fight for the northern agricultural districts he and those who fought on the same side had in the past been supported by only one member besides himself. He knew exactly what the feeling was in regard to this question in the northern portion of the agricultural division. In Geraldton and the country round about there not merely was there a strong feeling against the knocking out of these two constituencies, but he himself had been blamed, and very strongly blamed, because he had not opposed the abolition of his own constituency; but he had always recognised that we must allow some claim to population, and that it was impossible for a constituency like his own, having a little more than 500 electors, to be still allowed to return one member, while far more populous districts on the goldfields had no greater privilege. Therefore, he submitted to the loss of one member for the northern agricultural area; but he never suspected that when he submitted to that deprivation the southern portion of the State would be allowed to go scot free. Members would remember that in the Bill introduced last session, to which he gave general support, provision was made to deduct some amount of representation from the southern agricultural districts. He could only make this final appeal to the Committee. He recognised that in the past the North had suffered from lack of representation, and mainly through the votes of the agricultural members in the South, because they had done everything they could in regard to the agricultural legislation in relation to the Land Purchase Act, the working of the Agricultural Bank, and all those other measures which had been of so much use to the southern and eastern agricultural districts. Those measures had been made to apply practically only to the country to the south and east of Perth. Once one left a point north of Perth, say

Gingin, only 30 miles from Perth, he began to find that legislation until recently had no existence so far as the northern district was concerned. He was glad to be able to pay a tribute to the Government, and more so because of the many points on which he opposed them so strongly—he was glad to say that at last they had one large estate purchased in the Chapman district, to which he wished the name of the electoral district to be given. In that portion which was described as the Greenough Electoral District, but which he would like to see called the Chapman Electoral District, the Government had recently purchased an estate which would make available for closer settlement something like 50,000 acres of land, if they included what was formerly held under pastoral lease as well as freehold and conditional purchase. There could be no question that this 50,000 acres would have a fairly large population. There would be a population of farmers and fruit growers, and it would become the principal citrus fruit-growing portion of Western Australia, not even excepting Gingin, which at the present time was in the South regarded as the principal orange-growing district. Those whose experience extended beyond the southern portion of the State were perfectly aware that the Chapman district was going to be the citrus fruit-growing district of Western Australia. In evidence of that assertion we had the fact that during the past year or two it had not been an easy matter to obtain land in the district, yet we found selectors from the South-West and round about Busselton going to the Chapman district. This district and the other he had referred to in the northern agricultural areas were, on the ground of interest, entitled to more representation than was given. There was not only a large farming district, but the average of wheat production was larger than in portions of the South-West, and larger than in the East districts. The rainfall was better than the rainfall about Northam and York, and not only that, but we had a considerable and growing mining industry. He had little doubt that we should get coal there. In fact coal had been found there, and there was very little doubt that had it not been for the fact that the political power at the

time when the Collie coalfield was developed was settled in the South-West, and had Sir John Forrest and those who supported him happened to come from the northern portion, instead of the Collie coalfield being developed there would have been development round about Geraldton, the Irwin coalfield, and other parts of the district. When coal was first used in this State for steaming for marine purposes, it was not coal from Collie which brought the steamer down from Geraldton to Perth, but coal from the Irwin; but the political power at that time was centred almost entirely in the South-West, and the northern portion never had the political influence, the consequence being that the coal mining never got the attention it deserved. In the same way there were other minerals. Copper mines were being developed at the present time, and sooner or later the mineral resources in Northampton would again, he had no doubt, come to the fore. With all these reasons, the reasons of interest, to which members who voted last Thursday attached so much weight, he appealed to them to listen to the plea from the Northern agricultural area, and see whether even at this late stage a rearrangement could not be made which would give that very small concession they asked for, one additional member for the agricultural area.

THE PREMIER: If members turned to the Bill they would find that very liberal concessions—he did not say unfairly liberal concessions—were made to the northern portion of this State.

MR. NANSON: Perhaps the hon. gentleman meant the far North.

THE PREMIER: It was difficult to take the question as a geographical one, because at once one was brought face to face with the point as to where the North portion or the North-West or the Middle-North began.

MR. NANSON: The agricultural area.

THE PREMIER: Dealing now with the whole of the North, we had three pastoral electorates with an average of 600 voters. That of course, as members knew, was much the lowest quota under the Bill, and it was granted having regard to the special claims of the pastoral industry to representation. Then, taking

the most northern mining constituency, Pilbarra with 800 electors, we had an electorate which contained less than half the number of voters in the smallest mining constituency southward. Again special consideration was given to the North, for taking the mining constituencies of North Murchison, Cue, and Mount Magnet, we found that the population quota was less than the quota in other mining electorates. In the pastoral districts we had a very low quota; in regard to the mining interests in the North there was a considerably less quota than in any other of the mining electorates; then we dealt with the northern port of Geraldton, which had less population than either Albany or Bunbury. Therefore all the northern electorates he had so far mentioned were more generously treated than other electorates south of that part of the State. If we took the agricultural electorates, Greenough and Irwin together would contain under the Bill about 2,050 voters, Greenough having 1,000, and Irwin 1,050. He believed these two would be the smallest agricultural electorates under the Bill. So whether we took the mining, the pastoral, the port, or the agricultural electorates, the Bill would give to these northern electorates smaller quotas than were exacted for the more southern constituencies. But assuming that we were contemplating giving another member for the agricultural districts, if we took Greenough as it stood now with 1,000 electors, and Irwin with 1,050, say a total of 2,100, and if we made three instead of two electorates, the quota would be 700; and although the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) had argued so strongly in favour of future developments in the northern agricultural areas, the hon. member must have heard equally strenuous arguments for other agricultural areas in regard to development. The member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) had been very strong on that point, and doubtless the member for York (Mr. Burges), and the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell) could place before us convincing arguments from their point of view that their districts would in future justify additional representation. He did not think the mover of the amendment, however earnest his advocacy of northern agricultural areas, would ask us

to take 2,000 voters or 2,500 voters and make three constituencies.

MR. NANSON: The hon. gentleman had thrown over population.

THE PREMIER: Admitting that he had thrown over the population basis, we had already a lower quota for the northern constituencies. To say that we should reduce the quota, and that Greenough and Irwin with 2,100 voters should have three members, with an average of 700 electors for each, would be going too far. If we did that we should be increasing the quota for other agricultural areas, because we should be taking one member from them and farther decreasing the comparative quota for northern districts. It was to be hoped the hon. member's anticipations of the future would be abundantly justified. He agreed with the mover that the northern agricultural areas had had great difficulties to contend against in the past, and he hoped the future developments of those areas would attract population which would enable Parliament three or four years hence, when the matter cropped up again, to give them increased representation. No one thought that the present Bill was to be a final settlement. He hoped the increase of population would be so great in the near future that we should soon be called on to again consider the question before us. Under the present system, having departed from representation on a population basis, there could be no complaint of want of generosity towards the northern agricultural, the mining, or the pastoral areas by the Government in the scheme propounded in the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Greenough, Guildford, and Hannans electoral districts—agreed to.

Amendment—New metropolitan electorate:

MR. DAGLISH moved that "High-gate Electoral District" be inserted, the boundaries to be defined by the Committee. No amount of argument would influence the Committee in this matter, but he wished to give his reasons for moving the amendment, which were to simply place on record the view he held that there was not sufficient representation given to the people of the metropolitan area. According to the schedule we had five

constituencies in the South-West with an average of 1,300 electors, Forrest, Wellington, Sussex, Nelson, and the Murray. As near as he was able to make out there might be 100 or 200 different in the total. He had taken the Premier's figures as far as Wellington, the Murray, and Forrest were concerned, and he had taken the figures in the printed return as to the other two electorates. Assuming the average was 1,500 electors, we had six metropolitan areas representing 24,400 electors, or an average of over 4,000 electors to each member. He was taking Perth and the suburban electorates which were simply metropolitan districts, but he did not care what they were. It was an unjust and an unrighteous proposal that in one particular quarter of the State there should be one member for every 1,500 electors and in another quarter one for every 4,000. He took that as a high compliment to his capability of representing so large a number of electors, but it was unfair to his electors that they should be asked to intrust all their interests, which were far more varied than those of Forrest, Wellington, and the Murray combined, to the hands of one man. He moved to insert "Highgate," in order to somewhat lighten the anomaly; although the anomaly would still exist, it would be rendered slightly less grievous than under the present proposal.

MR. MORAN: The Perth figures taken since the last roll were—Perth, 3,320; East Perth, 3,720; North Perth, 7,170; South Perth, 1,608; West Perth, 6,990; and Subiaco, 3,197. The proposal of those who had been designated the cave-dwellers was to give 26,064 electors eight seats. That would pan out, including South Perth, to 3,250 electors per member. So modest was this proposal that we were content to allow the north of the State to have a quota of 700 electors, the northern agricultural areas a quota of 1,250, the agricultural areas in the South and the centre a quota of 2,000 electors, the goldfields and the metropolitan areas a quota of 2,700 electors, and Perth itself being directly metropolitan, including South Perth, had a quota of 3,258. The proposal of the Government was to give Perth a quota of nearly 4,000. Strange to say, the metropolitan members and the

Press were largely supporting that contention.

MR. HASTIE: Taking the roll as made up by the Federal Parliament, the number of electors in the metropolitan area, leaving out South Perth, was 20,250, which gave a quota for Perth of 3,820, that was if the amendment were carried; but if that proposal were adopted, one other seat would have to be provided for the Golden Mile, which had a quota at present of 3,500 electors, and one other seat would be required for the country districts north of the Golden Mile, which would have a quota of somewhere about 3,300 electors.

MR. MORAN: The specious argument of the member for Kanowna should not be allowed to go uncontradicted. In order to get the member to lend his valuable assistance in Committee with the otherwise solid party, he (Mr. Moran) was quite willing to take one member from Perth and add it to the goldfields, making the members 15 for Perth and 17 for the goldfields, but the hon. member did not remain loyal to those who wished to place the electors on a population basis.

MR. HASTIE: Although he did not owe any explanation to the member for West Perth, he might say that he had told some members that if they proposed to reduce the number of seats for the smaller electorates he would assist them. Members had declared that the motion of the member for Cue, in the first instance, was to disagree with the entire schedule; but he (Mr. Hastie) did not look on it in that way. He had said that if a straight-out motion of that kind was placed before the Committee he would vote for it. He had taken every opportunity of voting against all small districts, and he would continue to do so until the end.

New electorate put and negatived.

Irwin Electoral District:

MR. NANSON: Having already explained the object of his amendment, he formally moved that "Irwin Electoral District" be struck out and "Victoria Electoral District" be inserted in lieu, the boundaries to be defined by the Committee.

Amendment negatived, and Irwin agreed to.

Ivanhoe and Kalgoorlie Electoral Districts—agreed to.

Kanowna Electoral District:

MR. HASTIE: An amendment of the boundaries of this district would have been moved by him had he known how it could be effected. Population was more scattered there than in any other district, being on an average over 400 miles from Perth; yet there was but one member for 3,332 voters, and it surely deserved another. Perhaps some genius could propose an amendment.

Kanowna put and passed.

Katanning Electoral District:

MR. DAGLISH: This proposed district resulted, he understood, from an arrangement made by certain members to insert Katanning on condition that another goldfields province was added to the Legislative Council's schedule.

MR. HASTIE: There was no such arrangement.

MR. DAGLISH: Surely the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) had said so here.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: No; he had denied the statement on the night it was made.

MR. DAGLISH: But before this electorate was inserted the hon. member agreed to support the transfer of a province from the agricultural districts to the goldfields districts.

THE PREMIER: Absolutely incorrect. This schedule was before the Committee when the provincial schedule was before it.

MR. DAGLISH: And when the provincial schedule was before the Committee, a province was transferred from the agricultural districts to the goldfields, or an arrangement was come to whereby it should be transferred. If members agreed to the insertion of Katanning, the Council might accept our redistribution as to the Assembly, but insist on amending our redistribution for the Council, so that the Assembly would have sacrificed a certain representation for the sake of getting in another Chamber more representation for population; and members would find that after giving to the southern district a seat to which it was not entitled, they had not gained any extra goldfields representation in the Council. We were thus putting ourselves unreservedly in the power of the Upper House, by giving away representation in this Chamber and losing it in the other.

THE PREMIER: To hear the member for Subiaco speak of a sacrifice was amusing, after the hon. member had fought half-a-dozen items in the Bill, had tried to knock out several electorates, or had assisted other members in so doing. How could the hon. member be making a sacrifice in allowing Katanning to pass? If the hon. member, with a majority of the Committee, could eliminate Katanning, he would not hesitate to move for its elimination, and for giving the representation to some other place. So far as he (the Premier) was aware, there had been no compromise or other arrangement with regard to this Katanning seat, nor any suggestion of such compromise or arrangement.

MR. TAYLOR: Evidently the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) knew something of an arrangement.

THE PREMIER: Members should vote independently on the item, disregarding any such rumours.

MR. DAGLISH: Had not the member for the Williams announced that an arrangement had been come to?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: A few evenings ago the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) asked what he (Mr. Piesse) expected to get for his district; and the reply was that he asked for nothing; that there was no compromise or arrangement. He asked for justice only; and if members were not prepared to vote for Katanning, let it be struck out. On its own merits the district was justly entitled to a member.

MR. MORAN: The member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) was to be pitied; for he had told several members that he stuck to his party on this Bill because of an understanding that another goldfields province was to be granted in the Upper Chamber in consideration of the Katanning electorate being created. Consider the composition of the select committee who drafted the schedule which included Katanning. It might be said with all respect to the member for the Williams that he had an axe to grind; his paramount object was to get another member for his own little part of the country. The select committee were composed of four Government supporters, including the leader of the Labour party (Mr. Hastie), who was conspicuous by his absence when the fight took place in the

Chamber, though members caught a fleeting glimpse of him as he vanished through the door at the first division. On the select committee were the Premier and the Government whip (Mr. Higham). One would have thought that the Premier would have said a word for Perth and the whip for Fremantle; but all the talking had been done by the member for the Williams, whose rugged personality dominated the select committee. The tired member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott) had consistently supported the Government on this question; therefore the whole select committee, with the exception of the leader of the Labour party, were solid in the matter when it came to be discussed in the Chamber.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was hardly in order in discussing the select committee.

MR. MORAN: Members were not likely to hear of whatever arrangements had been made for this Katanning electorate. There might have been no express arrangement; but there must have been a tacit understanding such as arose when men came together whose interests were mutual. Probably the member for Kanowna did do his best on the select committee, but for some reason got the huff and would not fight in the Chamber, where his aid would have been appreciated by the democratic party. The hon. member, owing to his popularity in agricultural districts, could have converted two or three agricultural representatives, and persuaded them to vote against the Katanning electorate.

MR. HASTIE: Two Redistribution of Seats Bills had been sent to select committees, and on each occasion the proposed Bill took one member from the Great Southern District. On the first occasion he strongly objected to the seat being reinserted in that district; but the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran), who was a member of the select committee, did nothing whatever to deprive that district of one representative. On that occasion he (Mr. Hastie) fought vigorously for the original proposal of the Government to take one member from the district; and had the member for West Perth been on the second select committee he would probably have taken up the same position as he took on the first. The Great Southern District at present

had six members, and was increasing in population. The Bill originally proposed to take away one member from that district on the understanding that there would only be 48 members in the Assembly; but the House by a big majority increased the number to 50 members, and now no members desired to take one seat from that district. When he approached the matter in the select committee, he did not think he had any chance of depriving the Great Southern District of a member. The present proposal was not to increase the membership of that district, but left the number the same as before. He had done his best to keep the number of members at 48, but with 50 members no one wished to deprive the Great Southern District of the additional member. In spite of this, he had tried to deprive that district of a member, his principal reason being that the district had been worked for so energetically by the member for the Williams and the members for the Great Southern District that it could get on with a greater quota than before. However, he had been defeated in the select committee, and he had submitted to his defeat. He was not aware that the House would agree to depriving Katanning of a member. If it was so, then he would vote for it. The member for West Perth complained that he (Mr. Hastie) did not support the proposal to give an additional member to Fremantle; but one was fully justified in voting against an additional member for Fremantle. In spite of the talk of the member for West Perth, no sensible man would be likely to believe that the hon. member would give more representation to population than he (Mr. Hastie) would. The House should consider whether it was wise that the Great Southern District could do with a member less.

Katanning put and passed.

Kimberley Electoral District—agreed to.

Kurrajong Electoral District:

MR. TAYLOR moved that "Kurrajong" be struck out and the words "Mount Leonora" inserted in lieu. His object was to call the electorate after something that would remain. Mount Leonora was one of the largest landmarks in the electorate, being even a larger landmark than Mount Margaret was in the Mount Margaret electorate.

The name suggested in the Bill was that of a tree growing close to a place called Diorite King. This tree could be removed at any time by a bush fire, or by an axe; but the difficulty of removing a mount was rather too great. There should be no opposition to his amendment.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: There was no special objection to alter the name, and he did not know whether the Committee strongly desired to retain the name "Kurrajong." Personally he did not desire it. Had members of the select committee any special reason for calling the new electorate "Kurrajong?"

MR. HASTIE: The select committee had found it difficult to suggest a name. He asked several people, amongst others the member for Mount Margaret, who doubted the wisdom of calling the new electorate after a town. The Surveyor General showed on the map that the most prominent name was "Mount Kurrajong," and it was suggested that the electorate might be called "Mount Kurrajong" in the meantime.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Could not "Mount" be omitted?

MR. TAYLOR: The full name "Mount Leonora" should be given to the electorate. The district would not then be called after the town of Leonora, but after the "Mount," which was two miles from the township. The name "Mount Kurrajong" was prominent on the map, but there was no mount at all. There was a tree near Diorite King mining site, and the person who got a license for a hotel there called it after the kurrajong tree. It was 21 miles from Leonora, north-westerly on the road to Lawlers. The kurrajong tree was by no means indigenous to Western Australia. It grew all over Australia. Mount Leonora was a landmark which would remain for all time, named by Sir John Forrest, and was a prominent mount. There would be no confusion between the electorate and the township.

Amendment to strike out "Kurrajong" passed, and "Mount Leonora" inserted in lieu.

MR. TAYLOR moved that in the description of the same electoral district the words "Ranford Peak" be struck out, and "survey mark B 82 at Brickey's Soak" be inserted in lieu; also that all the words after "situate" in the

fifth line be struck out, and the following inserted: "south from the summit of Mount Redcastle, thence north to the said summit, thence north-westerly through the summits of Mount Abednego, Redcliffe, and Blackburn to the starting point." The object was to make the two electorates, Mount Margaret and Mount Leonora, nearly equal in population. If the amendment were not carried, Mount Margaret would have 2,248 electors and Mount Leonora 4,541 electors. This was one of the great injustices the select committee had forced upon the House. According to the statistics of the Electoral Registrar, the votes in Mount Margaret were—Murrin Murrin 129, Anaconda 182, Morgans 860, Laverton 662, Eristoun 135, and Burtville 280, totalling 2,248. In the proposed "Mount Leonora" electorate the votes were—Malcolm 435, Leonora 595, Lawlers 708, Darlôt 184, Sir Samuel 340, Gwalia 478, Kookynie 1,511, Yundamindera 132, and Mertondale 208; total 4,541. If the amendment were carried, Kookynie with 1,511 votes and Yundamindera with 132 votes would be removed from Mount Leonora electorate, giving to that electorate 2,898 voters and to Mount Margaret 3,891 voters.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: How many would the hon. member leave in Menzies?

MR. TAYLOR: The same as at present.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The addition south?

MR. TAYLOR: There was no addition in numbers but only in country. The registrar to-day could find no figures showing where there was any population. During the federal referendum there were in Cashmans 59 voters, and in Balgarie 81; but the census roll taken in March gave no number for either of those places. The Minister for Mines, who represented that district, might be able to enlighten the Committee as to whether there was any population in the country which had been added. He did not think there was much population at Cashmans. The Minister might know. If the Committee did not carry his amendment, we should add 1,643 electors to the present Mount Margaret electorate, which had 6,002 electors.

MR. HASTIE: That had been altered.

MR. TAYLOR: The alteration the Bill proposed was to cut off Black Range and place it on to Mount Magnet; and the voters there, according to the registrar to-day, numbered 349; and Wiluna, better known as Lake Way, was to be cut off Mount Margaret and added to North Murchison. The registrar's figures showed 295 voters there. This meant that we should cut off from the present Mount Margaret electorate in these two cuts 644 votes, and then we were going to add 1,643 votes. That meant that we were going to put 1,000 on to Mount Margaret, which would give a total of 7,001 electors to be divided into two, giving 3,500 for each seat. He wished to have the boundaries shifted by this amendment, and that would bring something like 5,400 voters in the two electorates; roughly, 2,700 odd in each electorate. He believed the Committee would have no desire to make the representation any larger there. The quota was large in comparison with the quotas in any of the South or South-West districts. We found, according to the Premier, that there were four thousand four or five hundred electors, and they had three representatives. The two electorates as proposed by his amendment would have 5,000 and odd. He had no desire to labour the question at this stage unless there was opposition. If there was opposition to the amendment, he would stand in his place and defend the people. This should be the people's Chamber, and we should give the people the vote, and not deal with so many different interests as we had heard about to-night. The people on the goldfields desired as much representation in this House as any other section of the people, and he did not think they wanted any more. He was only here to ask for a fair thing for the people of any portion of the State, whether goldfields or agricultural. He hoped the Committee would carry his amendment, and by so doing they would have the Mount Margaret electorate and the new electorate known now as the Mount Leonora electorate with 2,700 and odd voters for each member.

MR. JOHNSON: What did the hon. member leave the number at for Menzies?

MR. TAYLOR: According to the census of which he was speaking something over —

MR. JOHNSON: Nearly 4,000.

MR. TAYLOR: The Federal rolls said 3,960 and the State roll 3,500. As had been pointed out by the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) to-night, the select committee which submitted the redistribution scheme to this House was dominated by the personality of the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piessé), and there was no gainsaying that the committee was composed of people who were friendly to the Bill and friendly to the redistribution of seats principle, because everyone gave his vote for the Bill. Reformers fought the Bill as long as they could. Those who had been designated cave-dwellers were the men who fought for popular representation. This Bill had been supported by the select committee, which practically was the Government. We had on that committee the Premier, the Government whip, the leader of the Labour party (who was as solid a supporter of the Government as any man in the Chamber, Minister or any other man), the leader of the Opposition, and the member for the Williams. Every one of those gentlemen had supported this Redistribution of Seats Bill and had given the South people of this State, with 28,000 voters, 19 representatives, while they gave to the goldfields a quota of 4,500 electors per member. Was that the sort of representation the Committee desired to put before the country? We were giving to the South portion of the State three representatives for the same number of voters as one goldfields member would represent. That was overwhelming testimony that the Katanning electorate should never have been placed in this Bill, and there should have been another seat for the goldfields in the scattered portion between Kanowna, Menzies, and Mt. Margaret. The Minister for Mines could see the difficulty in redistributing the three seats without cutting them into five. Instead of there being four seats—Kanowna, Menzies, Mt. Margaret and Kurrajong—there should be five, covering the population to which he referred. We found the Mount Margaret electorate with 6,002 electors, Menzies with 3,963, and Kanowna with 3,332, and we were going to give that number of electors four representatives, whereas to have anything near a fair representation

they ought to have five. He did not see any possible chance of doing that, but when we came to the Menzies electorate the Minister might show some way of reducing the number of voters there, and perhaps on recommitment the Government, with the support of the Minister for Mines, could see their way clear to give another seat.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: We could hardly deal with the question of Leonora and the Margaret districts without also including the Menzies district. The member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) had been informed it was the intention of the Government upon recommitment to alter the boundaries somewhat so as to put the population of each of those upon a more equal basis.

MR. TAYLOR: Would the Minister alter it so that they would not have any big population up there?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: As far as he could, he was going to try and have the population as equal as possible in the three electorates. The Government intended to recommit upon those electorates, so that the map could be properly marked, and the hon. member would know exactly how the electorates would be defined. The hon. member was not fair in regard to figures he gave.

MR. TAYLOR: The source of those figures had been given by him.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member might possibly have intended to be fair, but when he gave the figures of the Kookynie district he forgot to credit the Menzies district with the large population in Mount Niagara.

MR. TAYLOR: Kookynie embraced everything within about 10 miles around Kookynie, as far as Tampa and Niagara.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member knew that a proposal was intended to be submitted to exclude the Niagara district from the Kookynie district. That would be a loss of from 450 to 500 votes. He did not want to deal especially with figures to-night, because on recommitment members would have those figures properly marked out so that every member would distinctly understand the proportion of population with regard to each electorate. But if we took the latest returns we had here we should find that in the Mt. Margaret electorate there were some 6,002 voters, and in the

Menzies electorate 3,963. By the proposals of the Government there would be more uniform districts in the Murchison electorates. It was decided to take away the Wiluna district, in which there were, according to the Premier, about 300 voters. That would be 300 voters taken away from 6,000 at present in the Mt. Margaret electorate. Then we had to take the Black Range district, in which, according to the Premier, there were some 400 voters. There would be about 250 at Wiluna, and he (the Minister for Mines) said there would be about 500 at Black Range. That would be 750 odd taken off. Then we had to add Siberia and the district south towards Kunanalling and the 42-Mile, and he reckoned there were some 200 electors in that district. We must try to have as nearly as possible accurate figures. The hon. member's figures were—Malcolm, Leonora, Gwalia, Lawlers, Sir Samuel, Darlôt, Mertondale, Anaconda, with 3,206 electors; then Morgans, Laverton, Burtville, Erilstoun, Yundamindera, and Kookynie, with 2,979 electors. He would give the hon. member a distinct promise that those electorates should be recommitted; but he wished now to put the figures before members. There was Menzies with 3,963 electors, to which he proposed to add 200 for the district to the south, giving a total of 4,163 voters. Then he took off Kookynie district, for which he had allowed 1,000, leaving 3,163 voters, thus making about 9,400 voters in the three electorates. The object should be to cut up the district as fairly as possible. He wished to see fair representation given to the goldfields. It was no object of his to have any portion of the electorate cut out, but there should be no desire to have a new part of the south added or the portion to the westward taken away. After taking away 750 electors from the Mt. Margaret district, that would leave 5,250. It would be necessary to add some portion on to Menzies from the other part of the district. He would try to get the fullest details possible in regard to these electorates, and a map might be drawn showing the proposal of the Government, and if the member for Mt. Margaret was not satisfied with that, another map could be drawn showing the proposal of the hon. member; then the

Committee would be in possession of full information in regard to the district. The way in which the electorates were first cut out would give too great a population to Leonora, with too small a population in the Menzies district. There would be only 1,800 voters in Mt. Margaret as at present shown on the map. We should try to have the electorates with about 3,000 voters in each. He hoped the hon. member would allow those districts to stand as at present, with the promise that the three electorates should be recommitted.

MR. TAYLOR: Was he to understand that the Bill would be recommitted?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The three districts would be recommitted; that was a distinct promise.

MR. TAYLOR withdrew his amendment.

Mount Leonora (amended from "Kurrajong") put and passed.

Kimberley Electoral District—agreed to.

Menzies Electoral District—agreed to.

Mt. Magnet Electoral District—agreed to.

Mt. Margaret Electoral District—agreed to.

Murchison Electoral District—agreed to.

Murray Electoral District—agreed to.

MR. MORAN: Had there been any chance of success, this would have been the place to insert the new metropolitan district; but the opposing forces at present were too great. The members for North Perth, South Perth, and East Perth were against giving the metropolis more representation, therefore to hasten business he did not propose to move an amendment.

Nelson Electoral District—agreed to.

Northam Electoral District—agreed to.

Perth Electoral District—agreed to.

East Perth Electoral District—agreed to.

North Perth Electoral District—agreed to.

West Perth Electoral District:

MR. MORAN: It was out of West Perth, North Perth, and Balcatta that it was proposed to cut a new district. At present there were 7,000 electors in West Perth, and over 7,000 in North Perth; 14,000 electors for two seats. If three seats had been given to these two elector-

ates there would have been over 4,000 electors to each member.

Put and passed.

Pilbarra Electoral District—agreed to.

Roebourne Electoral District—agreed to.

Subiaco Electoral District—agreed to.

Sussex Electoral District:

MR. YELVERTON: It had been his intention to propose the amendment appearing on the Notice Paper, but he found under the new proposal there would be about 1,400 electors in the Nelson district and 1,100 in Sussex, certain electors being cut out of Sussex and placed in Nelson, chiefly agricultural people; and as in future these electors would be represented as faithfully as they had been in the past by the member who now represented them, therefore he had no objection to the electorate standing as proposed.

MR. HASTIE: The schedule would alter the boundaries of Nelson and Sussex electorates. It had been explained to the member that the alteration would take only three ladies and one man from the Sussex district; and the hon. member having discovered this, other members would doubtless appreciate his generosity.

MR. TAYLOR: While Sussex and Nelson had 2,500 voters for two members, the ingenuity of the Minister of Mines had been taxed in trying to get three members for 9,000 electors on the goldfields. The Bill proposed 4,500 electors for one member on the goldfields, while the Sussex electorate contained only 1,100 voters; and if this was the sort of redistribution of seats desired by Parliament, he was sorry for the people of the country. Members for the metropolis were sitting placidly behind the Government, while the direct Opposition members, who should see that the Government passed a fair Redistribution Bill, were supporting the Government in this measure—for what reason? One member of the Opposition represented a district with only 1,100 voters. The best thing that could be done was to pass the schedule as quickly as possible, so that too much notice could not be taken of what was done. Goldfields electorates, with three or four thousand voters, were to return one representative each, a proportion that was absurd. The

Government would stand condemned by the Bill. Nelson and Sussex should have only one representative, the two electorates being combined. He knew there was a feeling of friendship for one of the members. According to the figures supplied, Sussex had 1,114 voters and Nelson 787; therefore he would prefer to strike out Nelson. According to the arrangement in the Bill, if the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton) were correct, Nelson had 1,400 voters, and Sussex 1,100. To test the feeling of the Committee as to this anomaly, he would move that "Sussex" be struck out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not move to strike it out, but could vote against it.

MR. TAYLOR: Then he would divide the House on the question. Strike out the smaller electorate, and let the larger absorb it. It was disgraceful to give two representatives to 2,500 voters in one place, and in another only one representative to 4,000. According to the Minister for Mines it would be impossible to remodel Menzies, Mt. Leonora, and Mt. Margaret electorates without giving over 3,000 electors to each member; yet we found two members on the coast representing 2,500 electors—less than the smallest quota of those three goldfields electorates. Was it for this that the goldfields members supported the Government? At the next general election every member for the goldfields and every member for the metropolitan area of Perth and Fremantle would be tested on the platform as to his opinion of such representation. The electors would not sit silent while their liberties were invaded for the benefit of the farming districts.

MR. PURKISS agreed with the preceding speaker. It was nothing less than a public scandal that the Sussex district, with 1,100 electors, should be on a par with a metropolitan electorate containing 4,000, and with four of the most distant goldfields districts having over 3,000 each. Sussex, which was close to the metropolitan districts, had 1,100 electors. For years the democratic party had fought for one vote to each adult; but what right had we to make that of no effect by giving 1,100 electors almost "within cooee" of the capital the same representation as a metropolitan district containing 4,000 electors, and four goldfields districts each with more than

3,300? When taxed with this injustice members who supported it answered with a laugh. That was not argument.

MR. MORAN: The comparison between the southern and the metropolitan areas showed more startling results than even the last speaker supposed. One could understand why the Premier had refused to consider Sussex in discussing the Forrest electorate earlier in the debate. The Premier did not mention that one of the adjoining electorates out of which Forrest was carved was left with 1,100 voters.

THE PREMIER: No part of Sussex was in Forrest.

MR. MORAN: The Forrest electorate had been carved out of Bunbury, Sussex, Collie, Murray, and Wellington.

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. MORAN: It was true. In other words, the present voting population of the South-West had, without the introduction of Forrest, a quota under 2,000; therefore Forrest was carved out of the whole of the South-West electorates. That was on the latest census rolls; but by the creation of Forrest the seats of two Government supporters were left, one with 1,400 voters and the other with 1,100, namely Sussex and Nelson. Members for the four Perth seats represented 21,259 voters, and the Government proposed to give those voters five seats, with a quota of 4,200. Ministers were afraid of the popular voice in democratic constituencies; but they were not afraid of the inequality of members which ruled in Sussex and in Nelson. They would trust 1,100 men in Sussex with four times the voting power of the people of Perth. The argument of the Premier that his small quotas were found in the northern agricultural areas only was incorrect; and were the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) here now he would be astonished at the admission unguardedly made by the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton) that under the new proposal there was a seat in that district with 1,100 electors. The member for the Murchison asked for a quota of about 1,000 for the northern farming electorates.

THE PREMIER: No. The existing quota was 1,000, and the hon. member wished it reduced.

MR. MORAN: The existing quota was 750.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: And the member for the Murchison asked for a quota of 700.

MR. MORAN: The quota in the North, according to the Government figures, was 1,250.

THE PREMIER: A misstatement.

MR. MORAN: Considered from any aspect the Bill was indefensible. Nelson and Sussex, when combined as proposed, would, according to the latest rolls, have less than 2,200 voters. [MR. EWING: No.] Let the hon. member refer to the census roll.

MR. EWING: We were dealing with the Bill.

MR. MORAN: Evidently the hon. member was a wobbler. The figures in the census roll could be taken for Sussex, and the member for Collie did not desire to misrepresent matters. Sussex had 711 on the present census roll.

THE PREMIER: It had 1,114.

MR. MORAN: Federal rolls were taken on some occasions, State rolls on other occasions, census rolls on other occasions, just to suit the Government. Right through, one statement had been accepted as fair for one as for the other. If the hon. member desired to have amended rolls, the quota for Perth would go up by a thousand. Sussex was 711 and Nelson 1,279, so that the proposed new combined electorate would have under 2,000 voters.

THE PREMIER: There were no figures giving 700 for Sussex.

MR. MORAN: What was the voting strength of Sussex on the census roll?

THE PREMIER: 1,279.

MR. MORAN: What was Nelson?

THE PREMIER: The figures were 787 on the federal roll, and 711 on the census roll.

MR. MORAN: There would be a total of 1,990, as he had contended.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member said Sussex was 711.

MR. MORAN: That did not matter. It was proposed to combine the two, making a voting strength of 1,990. Leaving out the Forrest electorate, Bunbury, Wellington, and Murray would have a quota of 2,000 each, and by combining Nelson and Sussex the quota would be a little under 2,000. So for the South-West the quota would be

exactly half the proposed quota for Perth. Surely that was not a fair proposition? Even by putting in the Forrest electorate, the situation would be made more ridiculous. The 4,000 electors in an intelligent centre like Perth were to have only equal voting power with Sussex, the oldest part of Western Australia. There had been settlers in the Vasse for 60 years, and now they had only 1,000 electors. Of course there were new-comers in the city, and it seemed they did not deserve proper representation. It was the story of the "Old Man of the Sea," keeping the power in the hands of the old settlers and not giving the new-comers a chance at all.

MR. TAYLOR: The member for North Murchison had worked out the figures on the federal rolls, and ascertained that it was no wonder the Opposition were supporting the Government, because the nine members of the direct Opposition represented only 11,715 voters. That accounted for the partnership of the Government with the direct Opposition; and so that this matter should be brought clearly before the country the Bill should not go through without the fullest discussion. To-night we were only finding out the real bottom of the Bill, and accidentally had discovered the conspiracy between the Opposition and the Government. One could take the census roll.

HON. F. H. PRIESE: The hon. member should take the other roll.

MR. TAYLOR: The position of the Opposition was infinitely worse under the other roll, because the nine members of the direct Opposition would then only represent 6,000 voters. On the Federal roll Nelson was shown as having 700 voters, and on the State roll 500 odd. Sussex on the Federal roll had 1,114 voters and 862 on the State roll. The Williams had 2,119 on the Federal roll, and 1,074 on the State roll. The hon. member had better stick to the Federal rolls. The member for Dundas, who sat in the direct Opposition, represented 2,184 voters. Taking these 2,184 voters out of the 11,715 votes of the direct Opposition left eight members representing 9,600 voters. No wonder the dark conspiracy between the Opposition and the Government had been in existence to rob the people of the country of fair representation. This point had been

clearly brought out through the innocence of the hon. member for Sussex having let it slip that he was going to betray the Premier, who had cunningly left Sussex out of the debate when dealing with the Forrest electorate. Members saw that nine Opposition seats represented 11,715 votes, while on the goldfields four members represented over 12,000 electors on distant fields.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The Opposition members represented 13,273 voters.

MR. PURKISS: Even then it was bad enough.

MR. TAYLOR: On recommitment the anomaly of Sussex and Nelson should be dealt with. The Government should see their way clear to deal out even-handed justice to the metropolitan and goldfields centres. The representation of the agricultural districts should be reduced, and two or three seats at least should go to the metropolitan and goldfields centres, particularly to the large scattered goldfields districts, where one member perhaps represented 3,000 electors, and had to travel hundreds of miles over his electorate. Places which could be covered by half-a-crown on the map had representatives, while there was only one member for a large scattered mining centre, with camps and townships many miles apart.

MR. QUINLAN: Opinions which had been expressed on this Bill were distinctly contrary to his own. There had been no agitation in respect of the Bill, except from goldfields centres and from Perth and Fremantle. No person could demand a Redistribution of Seats Bill at the present time, as far as these centres were concerned. One could not see why there should be 50 members in the House. It would be more in accord with the feelings of the majority of the State if the Government should withdraw the Bill entirely and leave the seats as at present. The result would make no difference whatever. If the Bill passed the Assembly it was more than likely it would be thrown out in the Upper House, and the time of the country was being wasted in a useless measure. One realised that interests should be represented. It would be hard in a growing community to have redistribution on a population basis. There were other interests than the goldfields interest to

be represented. At present there were 16 members in the House directly representing the mining industry, and surely there were more than three interests in the State to be represented. Sussex, although it was not too greatly populated, was nevertheless an old district which had been represented in the House since he could recollect, and something might happen in that electorate, even within a few weeks, which might cause an influx of population. Members recollected that the electorate of the late Mr. Vosper contained very few people at one time, but that, a rush occurring, the population increased tenfold. The same might occur in any part of the State. While one agreed that population was to have representation, the interests of the State were entitled to some representation. Therefore the Sussex district was of vast importance. It had more industries than the agricultural industry, because there was the timber industry as well. So it was equally entitled to representation as were places of greater population. What had been the case with regard to the metropolitan area? A few years ago there were three members, the constituencies being Perth, East Perth, and West Perth, and he believed the constituencies were equally as well represented then as at the present time. So far as agricultural and metropolitan districts were concerned, agriculturists as a rule supported all parts of the State, and they only asked for some consideration to be given to their interests when they sought it. At the present time he represented an agricultural district, but in the past he had represented a district in Perth, and then he supported the agricultural districts the same as he did to-day. In a country like this, where we were increasing rapidly, interests must be represented, and the district of Sussex was entitled to fair representation.

MR. MORAN: The member for Toodyay had said the members representing agricultural interests always supported Perth, and that those in Perth always supported the country. That was what was said by members who urged that if a fair share of votes were given to the city no injury would be caused. The hon. member was a consistent conservative. He said he had not heard of much disturbance for a popular distribution except

from Perth and on the goldfields and Fremantle. Where would it come from if not from Perth? It would not come from a man who obtained a vote for every four or five cows he possessed.

MR. HASTIE: The question was whether we should give an additional member to the South-West, and allow the South-West to have one member for every 1,500 voters. He strongly advised hon. members to strike out Sussex, because we wished a member particularly for the northern part of the Eastern Goldfields, where four scattered districts had an electoral roll of 12,800. It was sought by the Bill to have them represented by four members, each with 3,200 electors; therefore it would be only fair to give another member to that district.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	11
<hr/>			
Majority for	11

AYES.

Mr. Atkins
Mr. Burges
Mr. Butcher
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gordon
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Harper
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Jacoby
Mr. James
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Pigott
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Rason
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Bath
Mr. Daglish
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Holman
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Moran
Mr. Reid
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Connor (Teller).

Sussex thus passed.

Swan, Toodyay, Wellington, and Williams Electoral Districts—agreed to.

Yilgarn Electoral District:

MR. MORAN: If we were to give 1,100 voters a member, it would have been a most graceful thing on the part of the Premier and the Government to give that member to the Yilgarn Goldfield, the original goldfield of the State, instead of to the oldest part of Western Australia, which was 60 years old and had made very little progress.

THE PREMIER: The number of voters in the Yilgarn electorate was 900.

MR. MORAN: Yilgarn was being obliterated.

THE PREMIER: The original Yilgarn included Coolgardie.

MR. MORAN: No. He was talking of the old Yilgarn Goldfield to which a railway was built in the first instance; the original goldfield in Western Australia, and there were now 1,100 people in that part. If the Government wished to have anomalies in the Bill, they might have left Yilgarn as it originally stood.

MR. REID: It was not often that he agreed with the member for West Perth, but he did so on this occasion. Yilgarn was the oldest goldfield electorate in Western Australia, and it was an electorate with boundless possibilities. At the present time great developments were taking place there which had caused a number of leases to be taken up, and no doubt more would be taken up which would lead to profitable gold mines being discovered, thus attracting a large population. The Bill would merge Mount Burges into Yilgarn, and in the Mount Burges district at present development was taking place. It was intended, according to the Bill, to increase the boundaries of Coolgardie to include a majority of the electors of Mount Burges, the remainder being given to Yilgarn. The boundaries of the Coolgardie electorate ought to be changed, as they took in too much of Mount Burges. Was it intended to recommit the Bill?

THE PREMIER: If members desired to propose amendments on recommitment, they must give notice.

MR. REID: Was it to be understood the Government intended to reconsider the Coolgardie electorate?

THE PREMIER: Undoubtedly.

MR. TAYLOR: It was to be regretted that the Committee had not the advocacy of the member for Mount Burges in the early stages of the fight, in which case the Yilgarn Goldfield electorate might have been preserved.

THE PREMIER: It was preserved.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes; but the Mount Burges electorate swamped it. If the member for Mount Burges had given a little more attention to the Bill, instead of going about with the member for Kanowna and being "nobbled" by the Government, it would have been better.

MR. PURKISS: It was simply heart-breaking to see what was being done. Members supporting the Bill through

thick and thin were advocating representation in the first place on territory, then on interest, then on population. They advocated territory when it suited them, and when it did not they threw that aside and advocated the representation of interest. We had the Premier saying that territory should be looked after. Yilgarn was a big place, and there were other electorates where there were 3,000 voters or 4,000 voters, yet we had just passed an electorate with only 1,100 voters. Yilgarn was an old district connected with the metropolis by railway and by telegraph, and it should have representation. We were retrograding, and protests were unavailing. A great deal more would be heard of this matter in the country.

Yilgarn put and passed.

York Electoral District:

MR. DAGLISH: Did the Government propose to adhere to this electorate?

MR. PURKISS supported the retention of York because one of the leading agricultural members said that stupidity should have a greater representation than intelligence, and because another said that acres should be represented rather than intelligence and population. Moreover, yesterday the Premier designated the member for York as one of the most brilliant of his supporters.

MR. MORAN supported the item for the last reason mentioned by the preceding speaker, and because the member for York had said that town was likely to become the federal capital.

MR. BURGESS denied the statement.

York put and passed.

Preamble of the Bill:

MR. MORAN: Could we not insert a preamble to the effect that this was a Bill to disfranchise the populous districts of Western Australia?

Put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

THE PREMIER moved that the consideration of the report be made an order for Thursday next. Members would thus have time to give notice of amendments.

MR. MORAN: Did the Premier intend to adhere to his statement at York, that the House should not have the Budget till the Redistribution Bill was finally disposed of?

THE PREMIER: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Then the Government were on their own initiative postponing the Budget Speech for another week.

Question put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11:24 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 30th September, 1903.

	PAGE
Questions: Fremantle Harbour, Pilotage ...	1325
Fremantle Harbour, Alterations ...	1326
Returns ordered: Water Shaft Contract, Jourdie Hills ...	1326
Audit Department, Salaries ...	1326
Midland Railway, Sales of Land ...	1326
Liquor Licenses, Inspection ...	1326
Motions: Petition of Dr. Hungerford ...	1327
Single-Chamber Constitution, a Referendum ...	1329
Norseman Goldfield, Railway to connect, debate resumed; Amendment passed ...	1341
Timber Wasted, how to be utilised, debate resumed ...	1360

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: By-laws of Nelson Roads Board. Railway Classification and Rate Book, Alterations.

By the TREASURER: Report of Museum and Art Gallery, 1902.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR PILOTAGE.

MR. JACOBY, for Mr. Hassell, asked the Premier: The amount of pilotage paid to the Fremantle Harbour Trust since its formation, and when collected.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES, for the Premier, replied: The amount of pilotage paid to the Fremantle Harbour Trust direct has been £543 10s. 6d. for