

NOMI

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

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

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Wednesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 3rd April, 1929.

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

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

PETITION—LOYALTY.

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

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

Petition received and ordered to be laid on the Table.

BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Standing Orders Suspension.

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

RETURN—LIGHT LAND,
APPLICATIONS.

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

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

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

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—HOSPITAL FUND.

Recommittal.

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

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 "1928" be deleted and "1929" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That in the definition of "dependant" all the words after "includes" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"wife or the parent, or a child, or ex-nuptial child or adopted child or an orphan brother or an orphan sister not in receipt of income, salary, or wages equal to one pound or more per week, and dependent on the contributor for maintenance."

The clause defines "dependant" as including the wife and any relative of the contributor by blood, marriage, or adoption, etc. That definition is extravagantly wide.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Yours is extravagantly narrow.

Hon. H. STEWART: The definition I am proposing was adopted in the Soldier Settlement Act, and if it was wide enough for returned soldiers, it should be wide enough in this instance. The words "any relative by blood, marriage or adoption" are extravagantly wide, and unwarrantably bring in people who really have no claim to come under the aegis of the contributor. The definition as it stands could include a wife's cousin.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no special point in the amendment. After all, the chief thing to be remembered is that all persons in receipt of less than £1 per week will not be contributors to the scheme though at the same time they will be entitled to benefits under it. The definition as it stands would class a mother-in-law or a sister-in-law as a dependant; in fact, I know of such cases. If the amendment is carried, such relatives would be excluded. The definition should remain as it stands.

Hon. H. STEWART: The provision in the Bill is ample without including the mother-in-law or sister-in-law, since they will have the same right to medical benefits as any other persons. In all legisla-

tion it is desirable to get as near the mark as possible, and if a definition has been found suitable in one measure we may well use it in another.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 4—Contributions to fund:

Hon. H. STEWART: There was a close division when this clause was last considered. I move an amendment—

That in line 4 the word "half-penny" be struck out.

This means that the maximum tax to be imposed at this stage will be one penny in the pound. That maximum should be ample, seeing that private hospitals have been cut out and that the Government will continue to contribute towards the funds of public hospitals. We do not want to tax people unduly after a somewhat adverse season merely in order that the Government may have surplus funds lying in the Treasury.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment raises a most interesting position. During the second reading debate and Committee stage, almost every argument used against contributions to patients in private hospitals purported to show that if no money was devoted to that purpose there would be a sufficient surplus to enable the Government to establish intermediate wards.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You said that would take 2½ years.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I still say it. The best part of 12 months will elapse before the major portion of the revenue under this scheme comes to hand. As regards the building of a hospital, other members should be in a better position than I to determine the lapse of time before any considerable accommodation could be made available in the metropolitan area. The shortage of bricks is such that supplies are absorbed from five to seven months ahead.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Are you referring to the State brickworks?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I refer to the private brickworks as well. The Bill provides that the money is to be used for a specific purpose. Hon. members cannot have the argument both ways. If this Chamber reduces the maximum tax to a penny, there will be no margin for the erection of new hospitals.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I hope Mr. Stewart will not press the amendment. The time may

come, perhaps a couple of years hence, when the maximum should be reduced as proposed.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: We would never get it done then. Once the tax is put on, it will remain.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Accompanying this measure is the Bill which levies the tax. This measure does not levy the tax. In the taxing measure we can insert a new clause to limit its operation to a year or two years, and it will have to come before Parliament every session just as the income tax Bill does. If the tax produced too much money, it would be quite competent for Parliament to reduce the rate two years hence. However, seeing the parlous condition of the hospitals at the present time, I think that for two years we should give the 1½d. tax, so as to enable the institutions to pay their debts and to begin promoting the intermediate wards which are so badly needed. If the half-penny is cut out, the Government will not have funds to put up intermediate wards, and we shall be practically no better off than we are to-day, but shall have a penny tax upon us for no good purpose at all. There would be no better accommodation. We can reserve to ourselves the right, as we do in connection with income tax Bills and many other measures, of restricting the operation of this measure. The present Bill cannot operate until about the beginning of July, and therefore there will be only one year's operation of the tax. With this measure we are going into an unknown country; we do not know what the tax will yield; and the year or two allowed to the Government will give information in the light of which we may come to a reasonable determination hereafter.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I agree with Mr. Lovekin's argument. If the amendment is carried, the Bill will be practically valueless. The present clause does not fix the tax at 1½d., but merely provides a maximum; another Bill will state the precise rate to be levied in any one year. It would be much better to insert in that other Bill a time limit, at the expiration of which we shall be able to see what the Government do with the money. If they are using the money well, we can continue the tax at the rate which we agree to be necessary. If we do not approve of their administration of the tax, we can cut down the amount of contribution from each person.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think there is likely to be a chance of that?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: We shall have the matter in our own hands.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This is merely a machinery clause.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Yes. In the clause there is provision made for the maximum amount that can be levied; in the second Bill that will be before us, the precise amount of the tax to be levied will be fixed. When we deal with the latter Bill, we can limit the operation of the tax to a period of two years, as Mr. Lovekin suggested. If we cut out the tax of 1½d. in the pound and substitute one of a penny, there will be no chance of any surplus money being forthcoming to enable intermediate wards to be provided in our public hospitals. I must say frankly that if the amendment is carried, I will have no further interest in the Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I hope Mr. Stewart will insist upon his amendment. As we have decided to cut out the contributions to private hospitals, that will relieve the Government of considerable expenditure.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But the Government will not be able to build an intermediate hospital.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Government will be able to find the necessary money from Loan funds, as in the past. This is not the time to place an extra tax upon the people.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Your suggestion will not provide sufficient for maintenance.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: At any rate, I thought Loan Funds were supposed to be spent only on reproductive works.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Owing to effect having been given to the Financial Agreement through the necessary legislation having been passed, the Government have been saved the contribution of certain moneys to the sinking fund. Why cannot the money saved under that heading be utilised in constructing the intermediate hospitals? I think the Committee should agree that a tax of 1d. in the pound is sufficient for these purposes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you any information as to how much a tax of 1d. in the pound will yield?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I hope Mr. Stewart will not insist upon his amendment. I am convinced that the provision of intermediate wards is most urgent, and the additional money represented by the ½d. in the pound will go towards providing the Government with sufficient funds to proceed at once with the erection of intermediate wards. I

understand that the department is now considering the erection of intermediate wards in connection with the hospitals in the country districts. If that is so, we should be fair to the Government and provide them with the necessary funds to carry out the work. We have placed upon the Government the obligation to provide new hospital accommodation, and we should allow the tax to continue. Even assuming that a new hospital were built out of loan funds, the interest and sinking fund charges would be a legitimate impost against the hospital fund. Rather than cut down the tax, we should make available to the Government sufficient money to enable them to erect the hospital accommodation on an adequate basis, with proper equipment and proper intermediate wards. One member interjected with reference to the Forests Bill, which has to be introduced each session. The very fact that a time limit was inserted in that legislation enables us to keep control of forest administration. If Mr. Lovekin moves to insert a time limit clause in the Bill that will be placed before us later on, that will give us the necessary power to take action against any charge that we consider not justified.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I would be prepared to agree to the provision for a tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound, if I thought Mr. Lovekin's amendment would bring us to that haven of bliss he anticipates. On the other hand, I know what will happen. If he inserts his amendment in the taxing Bill, and provides for a time limit of two years—the Council having, in the meantime, allowed the Bill now before us to pass without amendment regarding the tax—then, when the amending Bill comes before us in a couple of years and we agree to reduce the tax to 1d. in the pound, that Bill will pass to and fro between the two Houses and the usual deadlock will ensue.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And then there will be a reference to the Privy Council!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This House will give way and the tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound will continue. On the other hand, if Mr. Lovekin were to provide for a tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound for two years, and thereafter a tax of 1d. in the pound, that would provide the Government with money during those two years to enable them to establish hospitals and intermediate wards. With an amendment such as I suggest, we would

have something definite and there would be no necessity for further alteration. In the absence of any estimate of what the tax will return, we are in the dark. If the Minister has any figures that he can make available, they should be placed before hon. members.

The Honorary Minister: The figures were made available.

Hon. H. Stewart: A tax of 1d. in the pound will mean a return of £150,000.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then a tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound would mean a return of £225,000, or of £450,000 in two years. That is a substantial sum to go on with. In view of the Minister's statement that no bricks are available, and that it would take $2\frac{1}{2}$ years to establish a hospital, I suggest to Mr. Lovekin that he would achieve his end if he were to adopt my proposal.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I quite appreciate what Mr. Holmes seeks to achieve, but I am not sure that he will gain his end by the means he suggests. In any event, this is not the Bill in which the amendment should be made, seeing that the Bill merely makes provision for a maximum tax. We need not trouble about this Bill at all; the point can be dealt with when we have the taxing Bill before us.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I think the point should be dealt with in this Bill as well.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: While I am to some extent with Mr. Holmes in the views he has expressed regarding the limitation of the operation of the Bill, we should consider the question from various standpoints.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You know the argument used by Mr. Holmes was correct.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I quite understand what that hon. member meant. The object of the higher tax mentioned in the Bill is to enable the Government not only to provide intermediate wards, which are highly desirable, but to construct a new and up-to-date hospital, which is so badly needed. The Premier has said that the money that will be derived will be supplemented by the usual hospital grants, and the money that will be provided under the Bill is necessary to carry out the work that I have indicated. If we cut down the tax to 1d. in the pound, we shall defeat the whole objective. If we were to wait for two years, having allowed the tax to stand at $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound, we would be able to see how much had been collected, how it had been spent, and what

was proposed to be done with the money. If we reduce the tax now, the Government will have no chance of doing anything towards their objective. Surely the reasonable way is to allow the maximum rate to be fixed in the Bill and then to limit its operation in the taxing Bill to two years. Mr. Holmes wants to go further and provide that the tax shall be 1d. in the pound after that period. I am not so sure that it should be 1d. in the pound thereafter; it is possible that it should be $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound thereafter. If the population increases sufficiently, a tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound might be ample, so why should we fix it at 1d. in the pound?

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not feel disposed to withdraw the amendment. If we were now arriving at a final decision, I might view the position differently. We have not reached finality regarding the Bill, which will have to go to another place, and the change we have made in a vital principle of the Bill may not meet with the approval of members there, and the measure may have to go to a conference of managers. For that reason we have to consider at each stage just what is the best procedure. In my judgment it is best at this stage to limit the tax to 1d. in the pound. This is not the first time that those interested in a particular phase of public activities have asked for a tax, nor is it the first time that the people themselves have expressed a willingness to be taxed. From experience, we know the tendency is to make the maximum tax continuous. That has been so in connection with the vermin tax. If 1d. in the pound should not be sufficient, in the light of results at the end of $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, it will be quite easy to ask Parliament to increase the amount. During that period the Government can make preparations and put before Parliament particulars that will indicate what the financial obligations are likely to be.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They have done so.

Hon. H. STEWART: Here is the position as it appears to me: The Government are spending a very large sum of money on hospitals. Sir Edward Wittenoom has asked how much they are spending on the Perth Hospital, and he cannot get a reply. But in addition to whatever they are spending to-day, they are going to get £150,000 from this penny tax. In 1925, after the Main Roads Act was passed, the annual estimate

for road construction in this State was a total of £200,000. What happened? Within two years that amount had risen to £600,000 per annum. And the result was the same as it will be here if we give large sums of money to people who have not been used to spending such amounts—the Minister will say to them, "Put it out. Get rid of it."

Hon. J. R. Brown: You are classing the Minister with yourself.

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not know what the present administration of hospitals costs, but I am satisfied that an extra £150,000 will be a very large accession of money to what is already being disbursed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that this does not impose a tax.

Hon. H. STEWART: No. But it authorises the imposition of a tax, and we are considering what amount that tax will bring in. If this large amount of money is provided over and above what is necessary—for the Honorary Minister has admitted that it cannot be expended within the next $2\frac{1}{2}$ years—

The Honorary Minister: I have not said that.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Minister said this work of building intermediate hospitals could not be proceeded with for another $2\frac{1}{2}$ years.

The Honorary Minister: I did not say that. I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am sorry. I now understand that what the Honorary Minister said was that it would take $2\frac{1}{2}$ years to build the hospital. In my view another £150,000 to be handed over to the Government and the Medical Department to disburse efficiently without waste is quite enough at the present time.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: I congratulate Mr. Lovekin on the business-like way in which he has placed the position before us. From time to time it has been pointed out that the hospitals are starving and that it requires a large additional amount of money to finance them, about £150,000. Over and above the financing of the existing hospitals, it has been proved by the evidence before the select committee that it is necessary to have intermediate wards and to build a new and up-to-date hospital. How is it possible to bring that about unless the Government have the nucleus of a fund from which they can

start operations? I think Mr. Stewart misunderstood the Honorary Minister when he spoke of its being two years or more before a start could be made. I understood from the Honorary Minister that it would take from 18 months to two years to complete the new intermediate wards. In the meantime there is much to be done in the way of preparing the land and making a start with the buildings. If we reduce the authorised tax from 1½d. to 1d., where are the Government to get the extra money for the new buildings? It is an altogether unreasonable proposal. It is absolutely necessary that we should have intermediate wards and new hospitals, and therefore we must give the Government some funds to enable them to carry out the programme.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I was very sorry when on Thursday last the Committee after listening to the eloquence of Dr. Sarg, made a very vital amendment to the Bill. I gathered from various members that it was intended to erect an intermediate hospital in the city. I would not support the amendment were it not because this Committee, with a thin attendance, saw fit by 13 votes to eight to vote against the Government on a vital matter. Where every man and woman is called upon to contribute to such a scheme as that before us, sick patients should be allowed to enter any hospital they choose and should not be compelled to enter a Government hospital?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that that phase of the question has no relation to the amendment.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: If the proposed 1½d. tax was intended to include the payment of 6s. per patient per day to private hospitals, the Government could well afford to drop the halfpenny now that the private hospital grant has been struck out.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: The hon. member seems to have overlooked the fact that the Committee deleted the provision relating to private hospitals with a view to the establishment of intermediate hospitals. As I interpret it, the intention of the Committee was to utilise in the establishment of intermediate hospitals the amount that otherwise would be paid to private hospitals. If, now, the halfpenny is to be cut off, it will mean that the Government will not be in a position to establish the intermediate hospitals. By leaving in the halfpenny, we shall be putting on the Government the responsibility to build

the intermediate hospitals, and if they fail to do that, they will not be standing up to their responsibility. However, I have every confidence that they will go on with that work. If we impose a 1½d. tax, it will be paid more freely than any other tax that has ever been levied upon the people. And the amount of money realised will produce an asset that will be of benefit to the State for all time. I believe in playing the game. We have told the Government we are not prepared to allow them to subsidise private hospitals, and that as an alternative we require intermediate hospitals to be established. That is why we refused the Government the right to make grants to private hospitals. If, now, we take from the Government the wherewithal to build the intermediate hospitals, we certainly shall not be playing the game by them.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I will support the clause as it stands. Until recently, I was entirely opposed to the Bill, holding as I did that the upkeep of all hospitals should come out of Consolidated Revenue. However, on further consideration I see that under this scheme the expenditure will be more widely and evenly distributed than it would be if it came out of Consolidated Revenue, with its innumerable exemptions. So I have been compelled reluctantly to change my attitude towards the Bill.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It has taken you a long time to find that out.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Yes, a man of limited intelligence thinks more slowly than do brighter men. There is a great deal in what Mr. Stewart says. Though I support the clause as it stands, I reserve to myself the right to vote as I may think fit on another Bill to come before us.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: One thing seems to have escaped Mr. Stewart, namely, the necessity for the establishment of intermediate hospitals, not only in the metropolitan area, but also in country districts.

Hon. H. Stewart: If you in the city had to pay fifty-fifty for your hospitals as the people in the country do, you would realise what a costly business it is.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I desire to pay tribute to the great liberality of people in country districts, who have maintained their hospitals in a highly praiseworthy manner. In the city from time to time we have been invaded by collectors making appeals on behalf of the hospitals. In order to obviate that, the Government by this measure are

seeking to find the means of supporting the hospitals in a proper manner. Mr. Stewart seems to have overlooked the fact that it is essential that the Government should be provided with substantial funds to enable them to erect intermediate wards, not only in the city, but also in the country districts.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What guarantee have we that they will?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We have amended Clause 12 by stipulating that provision for intermediate wards or hospitals shall be a first charge on any surplus.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Do you anticipate any surplus?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes; hospital accommodation is estimated on the basis of six to ten beds per thousand of population.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Bill now says that such provision shall be a first charge.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is bound to be a surplus. I understand the Minister has assured us that contributions made from revenue in the past will be continued. If such contributions ceased at any time, I would oppose any increase of the tax.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What power would we have to reduce it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We have power to reduce but not to increase a tax, and we would be justified, in such circumstances, in moving for a reduction. If the amendment submitted by Mr. Stewart is desired, it should be made in the tax Bill.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	15
				—
Majority against	5	

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. E. Rose

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Seddou
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. A. Lovekin	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The concluding proviso reads—

Provided also that a person in receipt of payments from a superannuation fund to which he has contributed shall be exempt from liability to contribute to the fund in respect of a proportionate part of each payment in ratio to his contribution to such superannuation fund.

I have looked at the Superannuation Act and it seems to me that all persons in receipt of superannuation under that Act will pay no tax because they have contributed in ratio. To take an instance; Judge Rooth drew £800 superannuation a year. He gained that by an unpaid increment to his salary and he would pay nothing under this measure. I merely direct the Minister's attention to the matter because the proviso opens a way of escape for quite a number of persons. It is evidently intended to apply to people coming under the Commonwealth superannuation fund where the Government provide half the money and the individuals find the other half. Under our Superannuation Act, the participants have to subscribe either the whole or nothing. They usually subscribe the whole and therefore would not be liable to hospital tax.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Contribution in respect of income:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) of Subclause 1 " (16) " be struck out.

Section 31 of the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act deals with deductions for insurance premiums, children, etc. The retention of the reference to paragraph (16) would mean that a person making a munificent gift in the interests of the community would not be allowed to deduct it from the amount taxable under this measure.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That would stop free giving.

Hon. G. Fraser: If that would stop it, it would not take much.

Hon. H. STEWART: If a man was donating a couple of thousand pounds, he could well afford to pay this tax, but it is a petty thing to include in the Bill. Such pettiness is liable to react on generous spirits.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I cannot agree to the amendment. Although it

has some merit, it would have a wider application than the hon. member intends. If a generously disposed individual contributed a large sum to a hospital, he might consider it hard if he were taxed on that amount, but there are not many such people in the community. Other people would not take into account that there was a benefit fund of this kind in existence. The amendment would have too wide an application, and I cannot agree to it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is a good deal to be said in support of the amendment. We ought to do nothing to stem the flow of generosity. As it stands, the clause would undoubtedly do that. The amendment therefore, should be passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is not quite equitable that a person who gives £200 or £300 to a hospital should also be taxed under the Bill. In many cases it will be cheaper for such persons to pay the tax than to continue their giving. Most of them, however, would, I think, continue these donations despite the new legislation, and the only way to get contributions from others who will not give is by means of a measure of this kind. I hope the amendment will not be pressed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 16—Penalties:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I had moved to insert in this clause the words "knowingly and wilfully." Possibly, because I did not sufficiently stress the point, the amendment was negatived. I now propose to put forward an amendment to the same effect, but couched in different terms. The clause is a drastic one. No discretion is given to the authorities to remit any penalty. If a farmer in the backblocks pays an employee £1 in advance of his wages, and neglects to secure a properly stamped receipt he will be guilty of an offence. Under the Stamp Act the Commissioner has power to remit penalties in certain cases. It provides that if a taxpayer makes a slip in the conduct of his business, the mistake may be rectified. This Bill, however provides no safeguard for anyone. It merely makes criminals out of innocent persons. The Land and Income Tax Assessment Act contains provisions almost identical with those I propose to embody in an amendment. It says that it shall be a defence to certain portions of the Act if the defendant proves that a false

statement, etc., was made through ignorance or inadvertence. I want some such safeguard embodied in this Bill. There should be some means by which a position may be properly represented to the authorities, and justice done to the taxpayer, without his being obliged to go before the court. I therefore move an amendment—

That at the end of the first paragraph, after the word "Act," the following be added:—"It shall be a defence to a prosecution for an offence against this section if the defendant proves that any such failure, neglect, omission, or false statement was attributable to ignorance or inadvertence, or was unintentional."

In this amendment I have adapted Section 69 the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act to fit in with the wording of the clause.

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

Bill again reported, with further amendments.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages at this sitting.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I take it that the Honorary Minister is availing himself of the privileges of Standing Order 422.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Is it competent for us to pass that motion at this stage? I think it should have been put to the House before the Bill was dealt with, and not at this stage, when a number of members are absent and do not know that the motion is to be put.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Standing Order 422 reads—

In case of urgent necessity any Standing Order of the Council may be suspended on motion duly made and seconded, without notice, provided such motion be agreed to by an absolute majority of the whole number of members.

Motion put and passed.

Remaining Stages.

Reports of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.*First Reading.*

Received from the Assembly, and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.5] in moving the second reading said: As regards this Bill, I feel that I have a somewhat easy task. In connection with other measures it has been incumbent on me to explain and justify their provisions. It should not be necessary to follow a similar course on this occasion. Hon. members have had ample opportunity to study the Bill. They know at least as much about it as I do. They do not want to be told in regard to the old electoral districts for the Assembly how this one has been altered, nor how that one has been altered, or which seats have been amended or absorbed under the scheme of redistribution. All that is made clear from the Bill, read with the Commission's report, and particularly from the maps which I understand nearly every hon. member has scrutinised. Nor can I be expected to give reasons for the different alterations in the boundaries. It would be impossible for me to do so, for the source of information is not available. I am no more entitled to approach the members of the Commission on the subject than is any other member. But I can say that in my opinion the Commissioners have performed their work conscientiously and well. It would be difficult to point to even one instance in which they have laid themselves open to criticism. There may be some hon. members who do not like the Bill, but I think I am safe in saying that their objection is not to any aspect of the work of the Commission, but to the basis on which Parliament asked the Commission to operate. This phase received due consideration—in fact, it was the main question for consideration—when the Electoral Districts Bill was before us last year, and we had lengthy debates on the subject, and amendments were moved but were not carried. The position now resolves itself into this: Parliament agreed to a basis on which the redistribution should be made, and agreed to the appointment of a Royal Commission to fix the boundaries of the seats for the Legislative Assembly. Parliament was not in doubt as to who would

be appointed to perform the task of defining the new electorates. The personnel of the Commission was specified in the Bill. The Commission have now sent in their report, and the Bill gives effect to the report. Unless there were manifest defects of a serious nature in the scheme submitted, Parliament could scarcely object to accepting the decision of men whom it considered qualified in every way for the duty imposed on them. So far it has not been even suggested that the work of the Commission is faulty. Any criticism that has been offered has centred round the instructions given to the Commission in the Electoral Districts Act. But as a majority of both Houses assented to the instructions, it seems to me that discussions on the wisdom or otherwise of those instructions would not be relevant to the present measure. Speaking of the Electoral Districts Act, I regret to say that there was no provision in the Bill to enable the Commission to deal with the electoral provinces. Apart from a change in the method of determining the quota, the Bill adopted the provisions of the measure which the Mitchell Government placed on the Statute Book in 1922. In that measure there was no power given to define the boundaries of provinces, but nevertheless the Commission of 1922 did it. The latest Commission, however, refused to make a re-arrangement on the ground that they had no Parliamentary authority to do so. All must realise that the boundaries of the provinces require attention as well as the boundaries of the Assembly electorates; and while the Bill before us leaves the provinces as they are at present, it is the intention of the Government to introduce next session a Bill giving the Commission power to re-arrange the boundaries. I may say that, after the Commission presented their report, the Government asked their advice as to what the boundaries should be. Having no instructions from Parliament to guide them, the Commissioners allowed the same voting power to remain in the districts whose voting strength had been very much diminished under the Assembly redistribution, and no increased voting power was given to localities whose voting strength had been increased under the redistribution. Such an anomaly would not be likely to meet with the approval of Parliament, and would be attacked on the very same grounds as justified a demand for the removal of the anomalies in connection with the Assembly seats. There is dissatisfaction in some quarters with this redistribution of seats, but, as I have already

stated, not with the work of the Commissioners, who are generally credited with carrying out the wishes of Parliament in an exceptionally able manner. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [7.30]: It was not my intention to speak so early in the discussion on the Bill, but it appeared as though the second reading was about to be agreed to prior to the tea adjournment, and because of that, I rose to my feet. I was pleased to hear the Chief Secretary compliment the Commission on their work. We will all agree that they had a difficult task to perform, and that they did their job as well as it could possibly be done. Having said that in regard to the Commission, I wish to make it clear that while I agree to the references made to the good work carried out by the Commission, I cannot agree with the basis upon which they did their job. Some figures were quoted during the debate in another place. I did not take the trouble to verify the figures, and I shall base my argument on the supposition that the figures are correct. The figures apply to the position as late as December, 1928, when a census of the population was taken and it disclosed that 14,000 odd adult people in the country districts were not enrolled although they were eligible to exercise the franchise. On the other hand, the census showed that the whole of the adult people in the metropolitan area, who were eligible to vote at an election, were enrolled with the exception of less than a thousand people. That indicates to me that while the Commission did their work well, it was carried out upon an entirely wrong basis. I contend that before any such Bill was submitted to another place or to this place, the rolls should have been brought up to date. Money was spent in bringing the rolls up to date in the metropolitan area, but the country districts were neglected. Taking the figure-basis I have referred to, we can come to the one conclusion only that if the whole of those who were eligible to vote were enrolled, the country districts would be entitled to at least two more seats under the quota system. I object to the basis upon which the Commission did their work because of that position. I do not profess to be a lawyer, or to understand the law. As a matter of fact, on many technical points of the law, the

lawyers themselves disagree, and in view of those circumstances, we cannot expect laymen to know much about them. A constitutional point was raised in another place when the Bill was discussed there. While I am not a lawyer I think I can claim that I have analysed the Electoral Districts Act to my own satisfaction. In Section 3 it says—

It shall be the duty of the Commissioners to divide the State of Western Australia into fifty districts for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly.

That is as clear as anything could possibly be, and indicates that when the Commission have carried out that work they cease to exist, but if we turn to Section 9 we find the following:—

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

It appears to me that while the Commission did their job, the Government have not done theirs. It is clearly set out that that Government's duty, after the Commission had carried out their work, was to bring in a Bill, not only to fix the boundaries of the Assembly electorates, but of the Council provinces. The Government have not attempted to do that. While a ruling was given in another place to the effect that the Bill was in order from a constitutional point of view, I cannot agree with that, in view of the reading of Section 9. Something has been said about the community of interest in the redistribution of electoral boundaries. In my opinion, the Commission made a very good attempt to bring that about, and they are to be commended for having done so. Looking at some of the boundaries, however, as they have been proposed by the Commission, one is led to believe that a good deal more might have been done. Someone said that we cannot draw lines as on a draught board in order to regulate the boundaries of 50 electoral districts. I agree with that statement. On the other hand, I think it would have been quite easy to get somewhere nearer to what I might describe as

draught-board boundaries than is indicated in the result of the Commission's work. It was said that the boundaries of the Sussex electorate were unsatisfactory in the past, but those boundaries are still very poor. Whereas one boundary goes north, in some places it is found to go almost immediately in the opposite direction. In fact, I would defy any person having a vote in that electorate, and also I would defy the man who represents that constituency in another place, to say off-hand just where the boundaries of the electorate really are. While they may have been fixed in order to provide for community of interest as far as possible, I am convinced that the draught-board arrangement could have been approached more closely. In another place, the Premier mentioned that the whole of the members here were agreed upon the Bill that was before us last session. That statement is entirely wrong. If my memory serves me aright—we can look at the records of the vote taken here—we were not all in accord with the measure that was placed before us last session, and which led to the introduction of the Bill we are now considering. I think there was strong opposition to it in this Chamber, and that opposition was expressed by several members on the floor of the House before the vote was taken. I do not intend to labour the matter. Before I sit down I want to make it clear that I stand where I stood originally. I agree that the Commission did their work well; I disagree with the basis upon which they did their work; I disagree absolutely with the principle under the original quota, and I am reluctantly compelled to vote against the Bill.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [7.40]: It does not seem as though anyone else is inclined to speak on the second reading of the Bill. I took my time in getting up to speak, but no one appeared anxious to rise. I do not intend to elaborate the points that have been touched upon by Mr. Glasheen. His first objection was that the rolls were not in order in the country districts, although they had been brought up-to-date in the metropolitan area. That indicates a manifest injustice. When that fact was mentioned in another place, I understand that the Premier subsequently sought information from the Registrar General's Department in an endeavour to

furnish some reason why there were 14,000 odd electors in the country districts who were not enrolled; subsequently he made no reply either during the second reading debate or the Committee stage. When we dealt with the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill in this House, we pointed out that since 1911 the increase in population in the so-called agricultural areas was more than 50 per cent., whereas the increase in the metropolitan area was less than 50 per cent. Despite that fact, the metropolitan area is to receive five new seats, and the so-called agricultural areas do not get an additional seat at all! Even with the amended provisions agreed to last session regarding the Electoral Districts Act, had the rolls been up-to-date the country districts would have received two or three extra seats. A perusal of the records will show that only Country Party representatives voted against the amending legislation last session. If we take the position over the last four years, it will be found that the increase in the country population has been about 12,000 electors, whereas the increase in the metropolitan area represented about 11,000 electors; yet the country districts are not to have a single additional seat! Mr. Glasheen referred to the constitutional point to the effect that the Commission had done their work fully, but that the Government had not done theirs. While the requirements of Section 9 were complied with in that the report of the Commission was laid before both Houses of Parliament, and a Bill for the redistribution of seats has been introduced as well, the part of the section that refers to the introduction of a Bill for the readjustment of the boundaries of the electoral provinces has not been given effect to. That is, unless Clause 3 of the Bill now before us covers the position. That clause reads—

The ten electoral provinces shall be designated, as heretofore, by the names stated in Section 6 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, and the existing boundaries of such provinces at the date of the passing of this Act, as determined by the Redistribution of Seats Act, 1911, shall, until otherwise determined by Parliament, continue and be unaffected by this Act, or the proclamation whereby it is brought into operation.

I contend that it does not. The Act says that the Bill—I have in mind the Interpretation Act which sets out that the singular includes the plural and the plural in-

cludes the singular—shall be introduced at this session of Parliament, not the next session. That has not been done. Clause 3 of the Bill provides that the 10 electoral provinces shall be designated, as heretofore, by the names stated in Section 6 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, and the existing boundaries of such provinces at the date of the passing of this Act, as determined by the Redistribution of Seats Act 1911, shall, until otherwise determined by Parliament, continue and be unaffected by this Act or the proclamation whereby it is brought into operation. That clause perpetuates the existing boundaries, and yet the boundaries of the Assembly electorates have been altered. The Electoral Districts Act Amendment Act, which was designed partly to guide the Government in bringing this measure before Parliament, stipulates "and for a readjustment of the boundaries of the electoral provinces." It shall be done by a Bill or Bills; it shall be done in this Parliament, and it shall be done by a readjustment of the boundaries of the electoral provinces. That is what the Act provides. I contend that under Clause 3 there is no readjustment and I would ask your ruling, Sir, whether the Bill is out of order and not properly before the House because of its not being in accordance with Section 9 of the Electoral Districts Act.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Does the hon. member ask for a ruling whether I consider the Bill to be properly before the House?

Hon. H. STEWART: Yes.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: My answer is that this Bill was introduced by Message into the Legislative Assembly, and passed by a statutory majority. For this reason and for other reasons upon which I shall not dwell, I rule that the Bill is properly before the House. If, however, hon. members think otherwise, a remedy lies with them. They can vote to reject the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART: The past basis of representation has not prevented centralisation in this State and the basis of representation proposed under this measure will only make the position worse. As one who opposed the passing of the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill, the only logical course for me to adopt is to vote against the second reading.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [7.48]: Having recorded my vote against the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill last ses-

sion and given my reasons for so doing, it is only right that I should not register a silent vote on this measure. I felt very keenly the action of the Government in apportioning the quotas contained in the Electoral District Act. As I remarked last session, for years the public men of Australia have been deploring the centralising of the population of the various States in the cities. I do not wish to be associated with any remarks that have been made in another place in trying to compare the man in the country with the man in the city. I deprecate such comparisons. Each and every man has his own sphere of usefulness. The merchant in the city, the man who drives the merchant's lorry or serves behind the counter, the man who drives the plough or the tally clerk in the country, each and every one has his respective sphere, and it is unbecoming of members of Parliament to set the man in the city against the man in the country, and equally unnecessary for the Premier to draw attention to the fact. I do not wish to belittle the man who earns a living in the city, but I do think the honest endeavours of every man who has the welfare of the country at heart should be to stop the drift to the city. He should not be content with complaining for ever of the drift to the city. If he is honest in his professions he will endeavour to stop that drift. I do not say that the additional Parliamentary representation of five seats given to the metropolitan area is going to make the lives of the people of the metropolis any better or easier, but if members of Parliament are worth anything to the community—and I suppose they are—why not, in the name of all that is fair, just and equitable, give that representation to the people who are opening up the undeveloped parts of the State? I read an anonymous letter in the newspaper the other day, the writer of which I dare say considered he was saying something rather clever. Speaking of the agriculturists, he said that the man who goes out to develop this country would have the other people of the State believe he was going out as a patriot and a philanthropist and not to better his own conditions. That is stuff and nonsense. No sane and sensible person expects a man to go out in the back country, put up with the hardships there and take the chances he has to take to gain a decent livelihood, merely out of a spirit of patriotism. But the fact cannot be gainsaid that the man who is willing to take the chances

and put up with all the hardships that life outback involves is helping to develop this State of ours. The more people we can induce to take up land and develop it, the more prosperous the State will be. That is why it is the aim and object of every member of Parliament to assist people to get out into the country and open up the undeveloped spaces whose development is essential to the progress of this State.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have six more members than has the metropolitan area pushing them out.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: If the Government wish us to believe that they have the welfare of the country at heart, why did not they think of that and try to arrange, as was done by a previous Administration, for a few additional seats to be given to the people of the country. I think the Government made a fatal blunder in that respect. As a new member, I ask the consideration of those who have had many years' experience in this Chamber if, owing to nervousness, I have not expressed myself as clearly as I should have done. Having voted against the previous measure, however, I consider that I shall not be inconsistent in voting for this Bill. The previous measure passed both Houses of Parliament; instructions were given to three gentlemen to divide the State into electoral districts, and those gentlemen having accomplished their task, I cannot see there is anything left for us to do but to pass this Bill. When we were discussing the Electoral Districts Bill, I think I said I would be quite favourable to allowing the Commission to have the final say. I thought it unnecessary for members of Parliament to adjudicate on the results of the Commission's work. That, however, was not to be. The Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill was passed with very little discussion and without a division on the second reading. This Bill was passed by another place last week by one vote, showing there must be something in the contention that when members' individual interests are concerned they do not view the question with that wide and open mind expected of public men.

Hon. E. Rose: Fourteen out of fifteen voted against it.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It is only right to mention the fact that there may be members representing the metropolitan area who have the welfare of the country districts just as much at heart as have the direct country representatives, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The Electoral Dis-

tricts Act Amendment Bill passed this Chamber with only five opponents, and I was one of the five. I voted against it because I did not think it fair, and I do not think it fair to-day. The Bill having been passed by both Houses, however, and the Commission having done their duty, there is only one thing for us to do, and that is to pass the Bill now before us.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [7.56]: Last session a Bill came before us that has resulted in the presentation of this measure to-night. The Act of last session appointed a Commission to make a redistribution of seats on quotas definitely laid down. Whether we agreed with those quotas at the time has no bearing on the question to-night. I had some amendments which I considered very reasonable, but the House in its wisdom rejected them. It was very unfortunate that they were rejected. Some members may say they were unreasonable, but on the present enrolment no fair-minded person can say that the agricultural districts have received a fair deal. The metropolitan area is to benefit to the extent of five additional members, while the agricultural districts have to remain in the same position they have occupied for the last 16 years, and I suppose will continue so for a long time to come. There has been wonderful development in the country districts.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The country districts have had more than they were entitled to all the time.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I would expect such an interjection from a representative of the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. Stewart: We have never heard it before. It was never voiced in 1923.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In the more advanced parts of America the capital cities have no representation at all in Parliament. The people there say, "We do not want representation because we are in touch with all the members of the House." If our metropolitan area had half the number of seats it has at present, it would be well represented. My view of our position to-night is that against my own wishes and against my work to defeat the Bill of last session, that measure became an Act. The will of Parliament was that it should pass into law, and it has passed into law. Here we have before us the result of the Commission's work based on that measure. The members of the Commission have carried out their work well. No fault has been found

with it. A majority of Parliament being favourable to it, I have to bow to the will of the majority. This Bill is the outcome of what has been agreed upon, and it would not be right for me to do other than support it.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [8.0]: This Bill seeks to secure the approval of Parliament to the report of the Commissioners who have discharged their duties in accordance with the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act. It is designed to rectify the shrieking anomalies which have existed for many years in the representation of the electoral districts. Whilst it may have achieved that object in one direction it may also have created anomalies in other directions. It was in 1923 that the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, when speaking of the want of a redistribution of seats, referred to the position as a travesty on representative government. The endorsement or rejection of this Bill may mean much to the parties or individuals in another place. A merciful Providence has hidden the future from our gaze. The future of some members of another place is indeed very dark and uncertain. That may account for the voting there. We must sympathise with those members who are particularly affected, in that they may have been the representatives of electorates in various parts of the State for many years, and they will perhaps be deprived of their seats, or indeed of any seat in the Parliament of this State. We should have sympathy with those members, particularly when we have regard for the statement made by the Leader of the House to-night, that at an early date it is the intention of the Government to bring down a Bill for the redistribution of the boundaries of the Legislative Council provinces. Anyone who is acquainted with the boundaries of the provinces, and the political possibilities in them, will realise that the seats which have been lost by the redistribution of the electoral districts have been lost to the goldfields, owing to the decline in the mining industry and the diminishing population connected with it. I submit that if there is to be a redistribution of the boundaries of the provinces, those who will suffer in representation in this Chamber will be the people of the goldfields. The seats which may be lost in the whirlpool of politics, after these boundaries have

been readjusted, will probably prove to be those now occupied by goldfields representatives, and they would include myself.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Not at all.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: One thing is worthy of note. In 1922, when the Mitchell Government introduced a Bill for the redistribution of seats, it was defeated on a non-party vote, and practically all the members of the then Opposition, those who are now sitting on the Government side, voted against the Bill, and it was lost. The present Government were pledged to bring down a redistribution on a more equitable basis, and they have fulfilled their obligation.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: On a more equitable basis?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am going to quote the remarks of the Premier as reported in the Press last week, namely, "the Government have been given exactly what they expected." The Premier was referring to the report of the Commissioners. It is remarkable that whilst the Government were pledged to introduce a Bill for the redistribution of seats, and the measure was brought down and they received exactly what they expected, we find that a minority only of the representatives of the Government party voted for the measure in another place. Had it not been for the votes of those sitting in opposition, the Bill would never have reached us. The Council had the foresight, which I regret was not shown in another place, to endeavour to amend the quotas as submitted in the Bill of last session. Mr. Baxter moved along those lines, and I voted with him. I held the view that the quotas submitted to us for the electoral districts were not equitable. I emphasised that at the time, and do so again. This Chamber gets credit for doing many things which perhaps are not thoroughly understood by those who are outside the Chamber. We did, however, make an effort in that direction, and it is regrettable that another place, some of the members of which are vitally affected and had so much to say about the seats that have been lost, and finally recorded their votes against the second reading, made no similar effort. We have no alternative in this Chamber but to pass the Bill. I will say of it, what was said on the Financial Agreement Bill, that I do not think it is doing justice to Western Australia. The Premier, when dealing with the Financial

Agreement, said it was the best that could be obtained from the Commonwealth Government and that, "although we did not approve of it, we had no alternative but to vote for the Bill." We are in the same position here in respect to this Bill, and I will therefore vote for the second reading.

Question put.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Bill requires the vote of an absolute majority of the House. In order to ascertain it I will divide the House.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	4

Majority for .. 15

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
	(Teller.)

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I declare the second reading carried by the necessary constitutional majority.

Question thus passed.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Schedule:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I wish to draw attention to the name given to one of the new districts. I refer to Irwin-Moore. I notice that the Moore district will no longer exist.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It will be no more.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In its place the Irwin-Moore district has been created. I would point out that this is a hyphenated name, and I intend to move that the name "Moore" be reverted to. The centre of the

Irwin River is in the Greenough district. It is fully 100 miles from the boundary of the Irwin-Moore district. I move an amendment—

That in the first column of the schedule the word "Irwin" be deleted.

Amendment put and negatived.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Question put, and passed on the voices.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There being no dissentient voice, and there being an absolute majority of the House present and voting, I declare the Bill carried by the necessary constitutional majority.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 27th March; Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 44b:

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment had been moved to add to the clause the following words:—"and the words 'which advances the board, as a State authority, is hereby authorised to accept, under and subject to the provisions of that Act' are inserted in the third line of the said Section 44b, between the figures '1928' and the word 'may.'"

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I asked the Honorary Minister to report progress on the amendment because it was not on the Notice Paper, and I generally like to see what I am doing. I have looked at the amendment since, and I see that it is purely formal.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendment.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages at this sitting.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I take it that the Honorary Minister is again moving under Standing Order 422?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes.

Question put and passed.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There being no dissentient voice, I declare the motion carried by the necessary constitutional majority.

Remaining Stages.

Report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Assembly.

Sitting suspended from 8.28 to 9.4 p.m.

House adjourned at 9.5 p.m.

was pleased to deliver the following message to the Assembly:—

Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament. (Signed) R. F. McMillan, Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator.

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENTS, REVALUATIONS.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Premier: 1, Has the Assessment Board, appointed to fix the capital cost of Group Settlement, started on its task? 2, If so, when, and how many settlers have been apprised of the value placed upon their individual holdings? 3, Is it intended that each settler's block shall be examined and valued by the Board? 4, If so, how many months does the Board estimate it will take them to deliver their final valuation on the present number of settlers established on the groups?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, February 18th. No valuations have yet been finalised. 3, Yes, so far as the Board considers necessary. 4, It is too early to frame an estimate.

Sitting suspended from 4.37 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—HOSPITAL FUND.*Council's Amendments.*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill, subject to a schedule of amendments.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the message be considered at a later stage of the sitting.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the Premier will give us ample time to look into these amendments. Such a course will save the time of the House.

The Premier: That is my object.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In order to have ample time, we should ask for consideration of the message to be taken to-morrow. We have already discussed most of these amendments, but now we must have time to consider them again. There is a tremendous lot of them.

The Minister for Health: But nearly all of them deal with the one subject.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 3rd April, 1929.

	Page
Address-in-Reply, presentation	122
Question: Group settlements, revaluations	122
Bills: Hospital Fund, Council's amendments	122-3
Redistribution of Seats, returned	123
Workers' Homes Act, 18.	123
Standing Orders, suspension	123

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

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY
PRESENTATION.**

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House that I waited upon His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and presented the Address-in-reply, to which His Excellency