

provide any semblance of equality of representation either in the city or in the country; therefore one must look for the reason why the Government and its supporters have introduced it and are supporting it. By the interjections and the pleantries that have occurred to-night, one must judge that the Labour party is pleased about the Bill and hopes that it will further the aims of Socialism. One must believe that it will, otherwise it would not have been adopted with such glee. Those people who desire to further the aims of Socialism will welcome this proposal, and for that reason, if for no other, I shall register my vote against the Bill because I will not at any time do anything which will support or further the aims of Socialism.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL (North-Western Province).—I oppose the Bill, and, in view of the fact that this is the first time I have participated in a debate, I crave your indulgence, Mr. President. Since I have become a member of this Chamber there has been a fight, or a competition, or an election. One party won the election well and truly. I offer my personal congratulations to members of the Labour party on their win. It is part of my code to shake the hand of a winner at any time and to wish him well. I wish the Labour party a successful term of office, and its success can be gauged only by the contentment and prosperity of the people.

So far as the Bill is concerned, this is not a debate. There is no chance of an amendment being accepted or of members opposing the Bill being able to convince the Government that it has acted wrongly in bringing down the measure. All we can do is to voice our opinions. The views I hold have already been expressed by other members. The Government can be truly representative of the people only when its members are prepared to be tolerant and to listen to the point of view of the minority. In this House, the minority can express their points of view, and, although we may not agree with Government supporters, we can still be friends and respect the different opinions that we hold.

I feel that the two-for-one principle is aimed at the annihilation of the Country party, but that will not be achieved by

the Labour party. I can recall the time when one Country party member in the Federal sphere held the balance of power. Under the two-for-one principle, there will be two parties in the metropolitan area that will be fairly evenly balanced in this House. The pendulum has swung one way, and it must come back. When it does so, under the two-for-one scheme the danger is that country people will be anti-metropolitan, a state of affairs that I hate to contemplate. A minority will sit in the corner benches and will decide whether the Labour or the Liberal party is to govern. That will bring back the old method we despise of bargaining and rule by the minority. As a member of the Country party, I foresee that my party will become stronger as the outcome of this legislation, because country people will become more united than ever.

The time is more than ripe for a re-distribution of Assembly seats, but I think we are approaching the question in quite the wrong way. Country representation should be at least the same as it is now. If it is desired, there could be a greater number of seats in the metropolitan area, but the country must be adequately represented. As a representative of a country province, I know that country members have tremendous areas to cover and a large diversity of jobs to perform. As one speaker said, we do not come to this Parliament to do those jobs, but we must carry them out. A metropolitan member knows of the work that is carried out by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and he is not called upon to make representations to Ministers on those aspects. In country areas, there is not a strong body carrying out such functions but there are numbers of small trusts. They call upon their local member to make representations and to submit their points of view to Ministers.

I believe in the principle of one vote one value, but much depends upon the interpretation of the word "value." Is it fair that a vote should have the same value in the metropolitan area and in the country? People living in the metropolitan area have all the amenities they

desire to promote family life and to educate their children. In the country, that is not the case. In my own province, some children attending high school must travel more than 40 miles to and from school each day of the week in order to receive secondary education. The representative of such an area represents people earning their livelihood in many different ways. In the Mildura district, an exportable product of an annual value of more than £10,000,000 is obtained. It is produced on holdings that average $16\frac{1}{2}$ acres, and each holding produces annually to the value of from £2,000 to £2,500. Under the two-for-one principle, an Assembly member may have to travel to an area 250 miles away where production and irrigation methods are different. It would be practically impossible for him to attend to the needs of one type of production, and to represent all his constituents as they deserve. It would mean reverting to the days when the honorable member for Swan Hill represented Mildura and was seen there only on rare occasions. As I have said, I believe in the principle of one vote one value, but emphasis must be laid upon the value of the representation of the people. Country electorates should be left as they are, so that country people can be adequately represented in this House.

I feel that it is useless to debate this subject. Members have made up their minds, and time is being wasted, as other Bills could be debated. The Government will make a rod for its own back by the passage of the Bill, which will drive country people into a solid bloc. They will fight for their rights, and that will bring about in the country what I would hate to see—an anti-metropolitan feeling.

The Hon. A. G. WARNER (Higinbotham Province).—I listened with interest to the speech of the Minister of Labour when he explained the Bill. The honorable gentleman opened his remarks by stating that there was a substantial mandate for the measure. I should have thought, in view of the alleged mandate, that we would have heard a great number of contributions from Labour party

members on this subject. Despite the fact that this is supposed to be for the good of the State, members of that party and their supporters are not prepared to do more than make mild interjections from time to time; therefore, we should analyse the reasons for their silence. Was there a mandate, or are those members ashamed of the Bill?

I shall first consider the mandate. Before the recent Assembly elections, there were other elections. There was a Federal by-election and also an election for this Council. At those elections, the Labour party obtained a greater majority than they did at the election which was fought around this two-for-one plan, which the Minister in Charge of Electrical Undertakings rightly said meant two for Labour and one for the Opposition.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—That was the result of the election.

The Hon. A. G. WARNER.—The logic of this Bill is two for the Labour party, one for the Liberal party and perhaps none for the Country party.

The PRESIDENT (Sir Clifden Eager).—Order! Mr. Warner is successfully inviting interjections.

The Hon. A. G. WARNER.—It is obvious that the percentage of victory for the Labour party at the recent Assembly elections was smaller than its majority on any other issue fought about that time. For instance, the Federal Flinders by-election of a few weeks previously resulted in a swing to Labour of 13 per cent. or 14 per cent., whereas in the Assembly elections the swing was down to 9 per cent. It is clear to me that if the people registered anything in respect of the two-for-one principle, it was a vote against it. Normally, one would have expected that the figures for the Assembly elections would have been similar to those of the Federal by-election. However, we find that at the Assembly elections the Labour party did not achieve its usual percentage victory, and so it has nothing to crow about in regard to a mandate. When we look at the system by which the elections were won, we find curious anomalies. I do not wish to enter into the intrigues of the story,