

Mr. SAMPSON: It may be argued that it is cheaper to send it through the post, and give the railways the percentage they would receive under their contract for the carriage of parcels, than to give it direct to the railways. I should like to see a railway depot established near the ticket-receiving office, and another in some more central position. If we are able to increase the revenue of the railways, the Treasurer would not regard this matter as one of minor importance. I am sure the Government would welcome any step that would ensure the greater utilisation of a system that has been established for the common good.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 18th October, 1933.

	PAGE
Bills: Police Act Amendment, recom.	1347
Yuna-Dartmoor Railway, 2a.	1348
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 2a.	1350
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 2a.	1350
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, 2a.	1351
Fruit Cases Act Amendment, 2a.	1352
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2a., defeated	1353
Return: Ministerial travelling allowances	1356
Adjournment: Special	1356

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

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, Bill re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

In Committee.

Hon. Sir J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 66 of principal Act:

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yesterday there were inserted in paragraph 2C the words "charged or." The effect is that a person who is merely charged will be liable to the penalty provided. That I do not think is the intention of the Chamber. Therefore I move an amendment—

That the words "charged or" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause:—"Paragraphs 2A, 2B, and 2C of this section shall remain in force until the 31st day of October, 1934, and no longer."

I shall not repeat the arguments I used last night. The Bill represents emergency legislation; and if it is fair and equitable that such legislation should come up for review annually, that consideration justly applies to this clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the amendment will not be carried. All hon. members must recognise that the depression will not be over by the 31st October next year, but that then it will still be necessary to continue relief work. Such being the case—unless a miracle should happen—the measure must then be in operation. It may be contended that there is no harm in introducing the words, but the discussion of the amendment here and in another place will not be a good advertisement for Western Australia. Any Government in power will be only too glad to recognise the advisableness of repealing such legislation as this so soon as it can be done with safety.

Hon. A. Thomson: Then there is no harm in the amendment.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	10

Majority against 1

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Harris	(Teller.)

Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. W. Miles

Noms.

Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. T. Moore

(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported with an amendment.

BILL—YUNA-DARTMOOR RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 6th September.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.47]: Much of what I said on another railway Bill will apply to this one also. The Bill has evoked a lot of criticism, some of which perhaps was unwarranted. We must all admit that the outlook for the wheat-growers is very black; probably it was never worse in the history of Western Australia. I suggest that if this state of affairs is to continue for any length of time, only those wheat-growers favourably situated will be able successfully to carry on. It is as well that we should examine what is necessary in that event for the wheat-growers to carry on successfully until better times come again. First of all it will be necessary for the farmer to be cropping his good land. Much of the country that has been put under wheat in recent years cannot in any circumstances pay at the present time, but where the wheat farmer is cropping good forest land, and farming properly, he can be increasing his yield at least, and so helping to negative the existing conditions. Secondly, it is necessary for that man to be within easy distance of a railway siding, and it is also advisable that he shall be within reasonable distance of a port.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You did not say that on the Southern Cross Southwards Railway Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have remarked that much of what I said on that Bill applies to this, but there are additional factors in favour of this Bill. Having already mentioned two or three things, I say there is one other which is very important, namely, the question of rainfall and water supply. In all the factors alluded to, this district seems to be very well favoured. First of all, it is within 100 miles of Geraldton, a well-equipped port. Secondly, we are

advised that there is there a huge area of first-class country to be developed; and, thirdly, experience shows that the rain, which falls at the right period of the year, is more than sufficient to ensure reasonably good crops every season. I think I am right in saying the records from that district show a considerably higher average yield of wheat per acre than in most other wheat-growing districts in the State. That being so, surely we are entitled to say to those people already settled in the district that they shall not be further handicapped than they are at present by the abnormal conditions prevailing, by compelling them to cart their wheat 30 or 40 miles. Transport costs are going to be a most important item within the next few years, and by the construction of this line we shall make it possible, not only for those people who are now just beginning to develop their area, but also for a large number of people who have been in the adjoining districts for years, to get their wheat to the port at a much reduced cost. And there is another point: This railway is not going to serve the Yuna district alone, but will also serve other districts which are more fully developed. There is Balla, a district of which we have heard a lot in this House in years gone by, a district very progressive in farming operations and which has shown by experience that the settlers there are able to produce far above the average yield of the State. Then there is the district of Wandalong, one of the show places in that part of the State. Settlers in that district have had a wonderful experience in wheat production, not only in point of quantity, but in point of quality also. Then we are told there are very few districts in the State where water is so easily obtainable as it is in the district to be served by the railway. During the last six years the average rainfall has been 11.12 inches, most of which falls in the period when it is needed. Then there is the experimental block, to which the Chief Secretary referred. That has been established only some two years, but the annual rainfall over the elapsed period has averaged 10.61 inches, and with that rainfall there have been produced very fine crops of wheat, proving conclusively that in any ordinary season that district will be equal to any other in the production of wheat. If all these statements I am making be true—and I have every reason to believe they are—the district to be served

by the railway must be a most desirable one from a wheat-grower's point of view. It seems strange that so fine a district should have been neglected for so long; but because it has been for so long neglected is no reason why we should not endeavour to give the settlers up there the facilities for which they are asking. What does it mean? The settlers, if they get the required line, will find their transport costs very considerably reduced. That is something we should aim at. In addition, there will be a saving of time in the carting of their produce to the railhead. The surrounding district, which has been settled for some years, and which has been agitating for a railway, will also benefit as the result of the building of the proposed line, and a much larger number of settlers than those mentioned by the Chief Secretary will reap a very valuable benefit from the line. I may use the same argument in regard to this line as I used when speaking to the other railway Bill, namely, that in addition to being of assistance to the wheat-growers in the district, it will also be in accordance with the policy of the Government in the provision of work. If there be one class of work which allows of the absorption of a large number of men, it is railway construction. When we consider that there will be no necessity for expenditure on rails in order to build this line, because it is proposed to utilise rails from another line to be pulled up; when we consider that there are many thousands of men for whom we are endeavouring to find employment, and that everybody says that any employment we find for those men should be reproductive; then I say here is a way in which we can absorb those men in reproductive work which will also prove of advantage to men who have been struggling for the last few years growing wheat and having to cart it long distances to the railhead. All these points are in favour of the building of this line. And when we consider the first factor I mentioned, namely, that the district to be served is within 100 miles of the port of Geraldton, it seems to me we would have to travel a long way before we found another district so favourably situated as this one from the wheat-growers' point of view.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have not the lines already authorised a big claim for construction?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Undoubtedly they have a claim, but I do not think

such a claim is greater than the claim for the railway proposed in the Bill, which is a genuine one and which we ought to recognise if we are going to carry on with our wheat-growing industry. And since this State has to rely to a great extent on the prosperity of our wheat-growing industry, we must endeavour to see that it is made possible for those growing wheat to do so at a profit if possible, and if not, that we shall give them every facility for their purpose.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: For 10 years or more we have been told that in regard to the authorised railways.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know that, but I do know that the position of the wheat-grower was never worse than it is to-day. It is going to be a bad time for everybody in this State unless there be a material improvement in the wheat position in the near future. In the district under consideration we have everything which will lead to the successful growing of wheat, and will allow men who are farming on up-to-date methods to reap wheat in such quantities that even if they are not able to make a profit, at all events they will be able to carry on, which is more than a large number of our wheat-growers will be able to do unless there be some marked improvement in the near future. I can understand the feeling of some members with regard to railways that have already been authorised and not built, but if we make a fair comparison between the districts it was intended to serve by those railways, and the district that will be served by the railway under discussion, it will be agreed I think that the construction of the proposed Yuna-Dartmoor line is more justified than any of the others authorised but not yet built. The grades along the route of the proposed railway are all easy, we have rails which will be suitable, and which may not be suitable for other railway proposals, the fact that we must find employment for a large number of men, in addition to the fact that the Government have committed themselves to a scheme of employment—all these facts justify us in asking Parliament to pass the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would not the same arguments apply to the Brookton-Armadale railway?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Possibly, but there might be difficulties associated with the construction of that line which are not

here. Taking all the facts into consideration, I cannot see that there is any room for reasonable objection to the building of this line. Bearing in mind all the facts that have been submitted by the Chief Secretary and those that I have presented this afternoon I can confidently say that there is no other proposition at the present time before the House, or likely to be submitted to members, which merits approval to a greater extent than does this one. Therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.4] in moving the second reading said: The main reason for this Bill is to define the word "sell" as far as it relates to the Feeding Stuffs Act, 1928. Section 4 of the Act provides that any person who sells any bran or pollard which is not in accordance with the standard prescribed therefore, in the Second Schedule to the Act, shall be guilty of an offence against the Act. Experience has proved that before any one could be prosecuted, even though samples taken by departmental officers did not comply with the prescribed standard, it was necessary to prove that the bran or pollard from which the sample had been taken, was actually sold, and this presented great difficulties. It is only reasonable to conclude that when a mill has manufactured, and has stored on its premises, large quantities of bran and pollard, that those commodities are available for sale, and it should not be necessary for the department to prove that they have actually been sold, before taking action. This amendment makes provision that will enable the firms or individuals to be prosecuted, if, on analysis, the samples of the bulk are found to be below the standard prescribed. Similar provisions are included in other Acts such as the "Fertilisers Act" and the "Agricultural Products Act" and it is considered advisable in the interests of settlers, that such a provision should be included in this Act. A further amendment is intended to give the Minister power to

publish, in the "Government Gazette" or the "Journal of the Department of Agriculture," a list of dealers who have registered foods for stock, and also a list of all foods for stock that have been registered, together with a synopsis of the information supplied in regard to the particulars and percentages of the contents of such foods. It is considered that the publication of this information will be of great benefit to settlers as it will enable them to make comparisons of the value of the various foods on the market. These amendments will also enable the department to see that stock foods offered for sale contain a reasonable standard of food value, and will prevent unscrupulous dealers disposing of under-standard goods. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.8] in moving the second reading said: This is a small amendment of the Plant Diseases Act, 1914, to enable the Minister for Agriculture to exercise greater supervision and to give him additional power in dealing with neglected or abandoned orchards. Section 18 Subsections (1) and (2) of the present Act provide that when an inspector reports to the Minister that an orchard has been abandoned, the Minister may publish in the "Government Gazette," and the Press, a notice of the receipt of such report, and unless within three months from the date of publication, the orchardist has not provided good reasons why the plants should not be destroyed, action is taken to have been destroyed. These clauses are nullified by Section 3, which provides that—

"For the purposes of this section an orchard shall be deemed to be abandoned which is habitually or has been for a long period left uncultivated or neglected."

Under this section if an orchardist digs around a few trees in the orchard, it cannot be claimed to be abandoned and therefore the clause defeats the purpose of the Act. The proposed amendment will allow the Superintendent of Horticulture to apply the

provisions of the Act to any part of an orchard and will give him all the power required should he consider any part of an orchard to be abandoned. Provision is made to protect the owner or occupier against injustice, by granting him the right of appeal to the Minister against the decision of the Superintendent of Horticulture. The fruit-growers in conference have requested such an amendment on several occasions, and it is only right that persons having orchards should be forced to give them adequate attention in order to prevent the spread of plant diseases and pests. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland, debate adjourned.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [5.12]: It will be remembered that the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act which was passed last year provoked a good deal of discussion because of the severity of many of its provisions. After about 12 months' operation, it has been proved that we were wise in placing the measure on the statute-book. Naturally difficulties have arisen. They were to be expected, because so much new ground had to be broken. Now it is found that certain amendments are necessary to facilitate the work of the board. When the Act first came into operation last year, it had practically three objects, the first to assist the milk producers to secure a reasonable price for their product, the second to see that the milk was pure and supplied under hygienic conditions, and the third to reduce the cost of distribution. Along the first two lines the Act has proved satisfactory, but I consider there is still room for improvement with respect to the cost of distribution. I trust the board will look very closely into that matter. There is still an important question to be dealt with, and that is in respect of surplus milk. The board were to have control of whole milk. A certain quantity of surplus milk is brought into the metropolitan area for disposal for the manufacture of butter. The price of that milk runs out at, roughly, 11d

a gallon, whereas whole milk used for domestic consumption works out at 1s. 1d. per gallon, the present fixed price. To obviate the possibility of the surplus milk being disposed of as whole milk at the higher price, it is necessary that the board shall have control in order to see that the consumers and the producers alike are protected against the vendors. One clause deals with that matter and I trust it will receive favourable consideration at the hands of members. It would be unfair to both the consumers and the producers if the Act could be overridden so that the vendor, or any one of the intermediaries, could dispose of that surplus milk by buying it at 4½d. and distributing it as though they had paid 1s. 1d. per gallon for it. The board should have the information specified in the Bill so as to know definitely what quantities have been delivered and how the milk has been disposed of. By that means, adequate protection will be accorded the producer and the consumer. The Bill is one for consideration in Committee and I shall support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: The amendment embodied in the clause relates to the definition. Under the Act, the definition clause does not cover pasteurised, scalded or concentrated milk because the definition relates only to the natural product of the cow. It is necessary to extend the scope of the definition to cover other forms of milk.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 9:

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: Without the addition of the words provided in the clause, it would be possible for members elected to the board in March next to demand that they should take their seats, although the present members will carry on until July. The clause will clarify the posi-

tion and will set out when the new members will take over their duties. The clause will deal with emergency vacancies relating to appointed, as well as elected, members.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That the proposed new Section 23A be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

Persons producing or bringing into the metropolitan area for sale milk, other than milk to be used as whole milk, to give notice thereof to the Board and to furnish returns.

23A. (1.) Every person who, in any year, intends to produce for sale in the metropolitan area, or to bring into the metropolitan area for sale, any milk other than milk for use as whole milk shall give notice thereof in writing to the Board on the prescribed form, and during such year or thereafter, shall submit to the Board, at such times and places, as may be specified, such returns, giving information as to the quantities of milk handled and to the manner of its disposal as the Board may require.

(2.) Any person who fails in any respect to comply with the provisions of subsection (1) hereof shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Penalty: Fifty pounds (£50).

The provision contained in the Bill is not quite correct and the amendment will set out the position more clearly. It deals with a point that was referred to by Mr. Yelland. It will enable the board to demand particulars and returns so as to control the distribution of milk with a knowledge of prices paid, where the milk came from, and so on. It is a necessary power that the board should possess.

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

Clauses 9 to 11—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—FRUIT CASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.29]: I understand the Bill is intended to place the Railway Department on exactly the same footing as motor transport. As the Bill has

been dealt with in another place, I do not propose to raise much objection to it, but it seems to me that it might place some fruit-growers in an unfair position. Growers producing fruit in certain areas will be compelled to sell their fruit in new cases, but growers in the hills and metropolitan area will be able to use second-hand cases.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Not if this Bill be passed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I read it otherwise.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Were not second-hand fruit cases prohibited some years ago?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes. One provision of the Bill reads—

When bananas or pineapples have been imported into the State in a prescribed case, such case may, after undergoing the prescribed inspection and treatment, be used again for containing either bananas or pineapples or vegetables (not being fruit).

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The case has to be treated.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, and I am wondering whether the process of treatment will be sufficient safeguard for the clean areas. The measure goes hardly far enough. I have received by to-day's mail a letter from Mr. Barker directing attention to the unfair treatment to which growers there will be subjected, and I desire to discuss the matter with the Minister. By so doing, I hope we shall be able to safeguard the interests of growers in country districts. It may be that my correspondent—

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is barking up the wrong tree?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, but I do not think he is. I shall not object to the second reading of the Bill, but I hope the Committee stage will be deferred.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [5.32]: The object of the Bill is to prevent the spread of disease into clean districts by supervising the cases used. It is necessary to impose restrictions on fruit carried by motor transport such as the railways are precluded under the original Act from carrying. While it is true this measure will have the effect of placing road transport on the same footing as the railways, that is only a secondary consideration. I am advised that the proposals contained in the Bill were submitted to the Fruitgrowers' Council, and were agreed to; consequently I do not think the Bill contains

anything to which exception can be taken. I have no intention of taking the Bill through Committee this afternoon.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [5.35]: Notwithstanding the many arguments directed against the Bill, only one principle is involved and that is the principle of one-ratepayer, one-vote. The debate, however, has given members an opportunity to declare where they stand on a measure of reform which, to my way of thinking, is long overdue, and which I believe I am correct in stating has been adopted in most English-speaking countries. Some members have given expression to the most conservative and reactionary views that it would be possible to hear in any representative assembly. Apparently any old argument is good enough to defeat a measure of this kind which, after all, is only attacking the privileges of a select few. Some members have certainly shown that they are possessed of most vivid imaginations, and I found it very hard to reconcile their arguments either with the Bill or with their professed democratic outlook. Mr. Miles described the Bill as the thin end of the wedge.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Quite true.

The HONORARY MINISTER: But the hon. member might have gone further and let us know to what the wedge was being applied.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You know as well as we do.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Perhaps I do. Mr. Mann went a little further than did Mr. Miles and said he would not be surprised if this Bill were a long shot at the franchise of this House.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That also is true, is it not?

The HONORARY MINISTER: How Mr. Mann could arrive at such an astonishing conclusion I cannot fathom. Mr. Harris, following Mr. Mann's suggestion, went much further, and stated definitely that the Bill

was a long shot at the Council franchise, and then he took considerable pains to show how he had arrived at that conclusion. I assert that there are no grounds whatever for the statements made.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I drew a comparison between the Bill and the Labour Party's constitution.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The quotations given by the hon. member simply disproved the contention he put forward. The hon. member might have gone much further in quoting from the constitution of the Labour Party, and he might have made his argument much stronger, but I ask what comparison can there be between representation based on property or money values and representation of human beings? There can be no comparison whatever.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That argument is too thin.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member knows that no comparison can be drawn between the two. If it satisfies him to draw such a comparison, well and good; it does not satisfy me and I hope it will not satisfy other members.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What about the newspaper shares? There are no human beings there.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member knows that the constitution he quoted applies to an organisation comprised of a number of units who find it impossible to attend a particular meeting at a given time. Consequently, for convenience sake, a basis of representation satisfactory to all concerned has been arrived at.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You elect representatives similar to a municipal authority.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In the ordinary business transacted by the Labour organisations, no complaint is made as a rule that any one organisation is not getting the representation to which it is entitled, or that some other organisation is getting more representation than it is entitled to have. If the hon. member had only quoted a little further from the constitution, he would have been able to tell the House that when it comes to deciding an important matter, the decision is given, not according to the delegates present at the meeting, but, by means of a card vote, whereby each organisation gets the full value of its total effective membership. That is the only way by which such an organisation can pos-

sibly carry on its business. As I have stated, however, there is no comparison whatever between that and the Bill or the Act we are now seeking to amend. Mr. Harris used another argument in which he referred to a nigger in the woodpile, with his gin and all his piccaninnies. I fail to see the remotest connection between that argument and the actual facts.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You did not have on your spectacles or you would have seen them.

The HONORARY MINISTER: By no stretch of the imagination can the amendment be described as one that will give any person the qualification to vote at a municipal election unless he possesses that qualification at the present time.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It applies to two enrolments.

The HONORARY MINISTER: And so does the present Act. The hon. member must have known that that was so. If that statement is correct, the whole of Mr. Harris's argument in that connection falls to the ground. Under the Bill, it will still be necessary for voters to have the qualification of ratepayers provided in the original Act. That qualification has not been altered. All that has been done is to provide for each ratepayer exercising only one vote instead of some ratepayers having two, three or four votes.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But two enrolments.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no question of two enrolments at all. No matter what I say, I suppose the hon. member will still continue to urge his view. The Bill will make no alteration in the case of persons who are eligible to vote except that, whereas under the present Act they would be entitled to more than one vote, under this Bill they would be entitled only to one vote.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: That makes a lot of difference.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It makes a difference to those particular people.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: A difference of three votes.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is not right there should be this difference?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Certainly not.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Of course not.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It would not matter what argument was used, Sir Edward Wittenoom would still hold to his own opinion. I have heard him so often on

this question that I feel it is futile to endeavour to persuade him to adopt a different point of view.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are not confusing this with University matters, are you?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It is no use your wasting any further time on me.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. I did not expect the Bill would receive the unanimous approval of the House, but I did think that a number of members would be sufficiently democratic in their outlook to agree that what matters is not the money value of the property a person occupies, but the fact that the person concerned is a citizen. In these days we hear so much about the necessity for sections of the community coming together to deal with the problems confronting us that I am surprised so many members are prepared to argue that there is no necessity to alter legislation of this kind.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: This is only ammunition for the next elections.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They are a long way off.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: No.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the Bill were intended for that purpose, I should not be dealing with it at this moment.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Someone did refer to long shots.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This is simply an effort to bring the municipal franchise more into line with that of our national Parliament. In the Old Country, where municipalities function almost in the same way as this Parliament does, and where the matters dealt with are as important as the matters with which we deal, plural voting was abolished many years ago.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: They have gone back now.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have not heard any desire on the part of anyone to reinstate the old system. In this State there are only 21 municipalities. The Bill would affect the metropolitan area more than it would the country. There are cases where men have the right to use as many as 20 votes at municipal elections.

Hon. E. H. Harris: For one candidate?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. We have knowledge of one man, who, at municipal elections has the right to exercise up to 20 votes.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: He has done something to deserve it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No; it is only that the Act gives him that right.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you mean that all those votes would be for one candidate.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. In another case, one man could elect nearly the whole of the local authority.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you want to get us in the same position as Brisbane?

Hon. E. H. Harris: A man can have only four votes for one candidate, no matter what property he may own.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Act provides that one man may represent other men and other companies. In that way one man controls 20 votes.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What do you mean by that?

The HONORARY MINISTER: He can record them.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But the Act says four votes.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Four votes for one individual. The Bill provides for one vote only.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You say he has more than four votes, but four is the maximum.

The HONORARY MINISTER: He can record more than four votes.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is an extreme case.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do not all these people pay rates?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, but no man should have the right to record votes in such a wholesale manner.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is quite right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Quite right that one man should have power to elect pretty well all the local authority?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Quite right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I cannot agree with that view. I am justified in claiming that the time has long since passed when this reform should be put into operation.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you say a man should not have a proxy at a board meeting? This is the same thing.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I know I cannot alter the hon. member's opinion. We should be more broad-minded than some of us are, and pay a little more attention to

the type of person referred to by Mr. T. Moore. That hon. member said the only man who counted was the real citizen, who brought up his family in a particular district and should be entitled to his vote. No one should have greater representation than he has. Money or property values should not count against the value of citizenship. It is the only thing that should count. Some members will never be converted to that way of thinking.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are quite right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The arguments used against the Bill will not stand examination. I refer particularly to those advanced by Mr. Harris. This is one of the few countries where plural voting is still tolerated. It has, as I have shown, been abolished in the Old Country.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The conditions there are entirely different.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They are the same as they are here.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Anyone who pays all my rates can have my votes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Plural voting has not been abolished in all the States in Australia.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I hope the time will come when the other States will fall into line with the more advanced thought of the Old Country.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They must have good reason for keeping to it in the other States.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Because a man possesses property worth a little more than that possessed by another, there is no justification for giving him additional votes. I can see no sense in it. I had hoped that more members would support the Bill. I now leave it to the tender mercies of members opposite, who have distinctly stated they are not prepared to pass it.

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

Ayes	6
Nocs	13

Majority against 7

AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray

Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. T. Moore

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. T. Franklina
Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. E. H. Harrie
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. Sir C. Nathan

Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. L. B. Bolton
(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; Bill defeated.

RETURN—MINISTERIAL TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

Debate resumed from the 13th September on the following motion by Hon. E. H. H. Hall—

That a return be laid on the Table of the House showing—

(i) The total amount of travelling allowances drawn by the Ministers of the Crown during the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1928, 1929, 1931, and 1932, respectively.

(ii) How many visits to the Loan Council were made by the Premier during the above-mentioned periods;

To which an amendment had been moved by Hon. A. Thomson, that all the words after "the" in line 3 of paragraph (i) be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"last three years the Collier Government, and the three years the Mitchell Government, were in office."

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—on amendment) [5.58]: I remind the House that the answers given to my questions—

Hon. E. H. Harris: The lack of answers.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: —were so unsatisfactory that I found it necessary to endeavour to obtain the information by way of this motion. I was careful to state that I had no desire to cause offence, that the information was required by a public body in my province, and that it was information I considered the taxpayers in general had a right to get. The motion deals with the travelling allowances drawn by Ministers of this and of previous Governments. Consequently, it was not directed against any particular Minister or Ministry. I might have mentioned several instances.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I omitted to state that an amendment had been moved to this motion. I must therefore ask the hon. member and other hon. members to speak to the amendment. Until it is disposed of, the discussion cannot be resumed on the motion. The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: In view of what you have said, Mr. President, I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.1]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 18th October, 1933.

	PAGE
Questions: Zoological Gardens—1, Water supply from bore; 2, Slaughtering horses ...	1356-7
Fruit Diseases Act, prosecutions ...	1357
Leave of absence ...	1357
Bills: Entertainments Tax Act Amendment, 1A. ...	1357
Land, report ...	1357
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, Council's amendments ...	1366
Motions: Government business, precedence ...	1357
Fruit fly pest ...	1357
Legal costs, to inquire by select committee ...	1361
Collier coal, use by Government Railways and Utilities ...	1374
Dairying industry ...	1379

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

QUESTIONS (2)—ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS.

Water Supply from Bore.

Mr. CROSS asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that the water service to the South Perth recreation ground from the bore in the Zoological Gardens has been cut off? 2, If so, when will this service be restored?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, This is difficult to state. The bore is in disrepair. There are several bursts throughout the system, now over 30 years old and subject to