

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 24th October, 1933.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1421
Auditor General's Report	1421
Bills: Police Act Amendment, further recom.	1421
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, Council's message	1423
Land, IR.	1423
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, report	1423
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 2d., Com. report	1423
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 2d., Com. report	1423
Fruit Cases Act Amendment, Com. report	1424
Return: Ministerial travelling allowances	1424

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read, notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Government Tramways Act Amendment.
- 2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance.
- 3, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
- 4, Reduction of Rents Act Continuance.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT: I have received from the Auditor General a copy of the Treasurer's statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended 30th June, 1933, together with his report, which will be laid on the Table of the House.

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Further Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, Bill further recommitted for the purpose of reconsidering Clause 2.

In Committee.

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

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 66 of principal Act:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Unfortunately I was absent when the Bill was last dealt with in Committee, and the words "charged or" I had succeeded in having inserted in paragraph 2C were struck out. Had I been pre-

sent in time, I would have moved for the insertion of the words "if convicted" after "otherwise" in line 3 of paragraph 2C. I have had an opportunity to confer with the Crown Law authorities, with the Minister in charge of the Bill in the Legislative Assembly and with the Chief Secretary. The Minister in another place has asked me to say that he has no objection to the insertion of the words I desire included in the paragraph. The amendment will make the paragraph clearer than it is. No one wishes to see any man who may be charged with one of the offences dealt with in the Bill, running the risk of being stigmatised as having been charged under what is known as the "rogue and vagabond" section of the Police Act. The amendments I have in mind will remove such a possibility. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph 2C after "person" the words "charged or" be inserted.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I moved for the deletion of these words because of the effect they would have on the paragraph as it would then appear. The further amendment indicated by Mr. Nicholson will overcome that difficulty, and I shall support the amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There seems to me to be no necessity for the inclusion of the words suggested. The paragraph is merely apologetic. It means that if a person has been convicted of an offence under the Bill, he shall not be considered a rogue and vagabond, although he may be such. If such a man is not to be considered a rogue and vagabond, how is it possible for a man, who is charged but not convicted, to be considered a rogue and vagabond? The amendment is superfluous.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: When this matter was previously before the Committee, it was recognised that it would be proper to clarify the position. The reason for the amendment is that according to the paragraph as it stands, a man has to wait until he is convicted for it to be declared that he is not a rogue and vagabond, because Section 66, which the amendment will affect, is commonly known as the "rogue and vagabond" section. It is clearly unfair to leave a man to wait until he is convicted to declare that he is not a rogue and vagabond when he may be charged and made liable to certain other penalties under Section 68.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Get back to British law.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am dealing with British law.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: A man is deemed innocent until proved guilty.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the proviso had not been inserted, a man convicted of one of these offences would have been deemed a rogue and vagabond, but he is to wait until he has been convicted before he is to be cleared of that stigma. If a man were charged under Section 66, the stigma would attach to him even though he were not convicted. I wish to make it clear that if a man convicted is not to be deemed a rogue and vagabond, a man charged but not convicted shall be cleared of the stigma.

Hon. G. FRASER: I cannot follow the hon. member's reasoning. According to Mr. Nicholson a man will be a rogue and vagabond when charged and can be declared not to be a rogue and vagabond only when convicted. I admit that if the first amendment is agreed to, the second amendment will be necessary, but I consider both are unnecessary.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The amendment shows the danger of bringing the new offences under Section 66 of the Act. Members know that people are often uncharitable. Many men have made false representations in order to secure work.

Hon. E. H. Gray: If they could make good, no harm would be done.

Hon. A. THOMSON: While I agree that a man charged should not be declared a rogue and vagabond, the proviso shows the danger a man runs in endeavouring to maintain his wife and family.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is apparently opposed to the amendment and the clause.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes and I intend to oppose the third reading.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not wish members to be influenced by Mr. Nicholson's statement that he had conferred with the Chief Secretary and the Minister in another place. The proviso was not in the Bill when it was introduced in another place but was inserted in defiance of the wishes of the Minister. Consequently I am of opinion that the Minister does not approve of it at all. It is not for Parliament to decide when

a man becomes a rogue and vagabond. That is the duty of the magistrate.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Nicholson has satisfied me that the Minister in another place has no objection to the amendment. At the same time I cannot follow his reasoning. It would be stupid of the Crown Law Department to recommend a prosecution if there were no possibility of obtaining a conviction. Mr. Nicholson has in mind Section 68 of the Act which applies to an idle and disorderly person, a rogue and vagabond or an incorrigible rogue. That section has no application to Section 66, and it is Section 66 that the Bill seeks to amend. The Police Act has been in operation for 41 years and has not been amended to any great extent, and though I may disapprove of some of the sections, they seem to have met with general approval.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I cannot see that any harm will be done by passing the amendment, but I should like to be clear that, if the words are not inserted, it would not be competent for the police to arrest a person as a rogue and vagabond. Otherwise, the amendment is necessary.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Such a person could not be convicted.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That does not matter. For a man to be arrested as a rogue and vagabond would place him in an invidious position.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The clause does not charge or convict a person; it simply provides that a person, whether charged or convicted, shall not be deemed a rogue and vagabond.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The insertion of the words will remove what I consider is an objectionable feature of the Bill. There is grave doubt whether Section 68 would not apply. Under that section, any constable apprehending a person charged with being an idle and disorderly person, rogue and vagabond or incorrigible rogue may seize any horse, cattle, money, goods or vehicle in the possession of that person and convey him before a justice, and provision is made for dealing with the goods in the event of the accused being found guilty. Section 66, which we are seeking to amend contains this—

If a person shall commit any of the next following offences he shall be deemed to be a rogue and vagabond, and shall on conviction

be liable to imprisonment for any term not exceeding twelve months with or without hard labour.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: "Shall on conviction."

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A man may carry a stigma by being told "You were charged under Section 66 as a rogue and vagabond." Suppose a man is charged and not convicted, the stigma remains. He is not a rogue and vagabond until he is convicted. The only way to make the position clear is to insert the words I suggest.

Hon. G. Fraser: If a man is charged and the charge is dismissed, he is a rogue and vagabond, but if he is convicted he is not.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am saying that the law as it stands at present is unfair because there is left behind the stigma on the man who may be charged but not convicted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill specifies clearly the offence with which a man can be charged if he wilfully makes any false representation as to any sums of money being his own personal property and in his possession. Everything is clearly specified in the Bill. He would not be charged with being a rogue and vagabond; he would be charged under one of the two paragraphs set out in the Bill. When the Bill was introduced in another place, there was a clause dealing generally with the position, but it was amended and the offence was confined to the two paragraphs now in the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported without further amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—TENANTS, PURCHASERS, AND MORTGAGORS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

BILL—LAND.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.10]: I recognise it is necessary that there should be safeguards to ensure that those who are supplying foodstuffs for animals should supply articles that are up to standard. It seems, however, that drastic steps are being taken to effect those safeguards. It is quite possible that a seller may have some foodstuffs in his warehouse which perhaps he had no intention of selling, but if the inspector should come along and take a sample, the warehouse owner would come within the penalty provisions of the Act. I have no doubt that the Bill has been rendered necessary by the failure of the department to protect the honest trader, and therefore I offer no objection to it. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [5.15]: I secured the adjournment of the debate to look through some of the clauses of the Bill. I find that there is really nothing of very great importance on which to offer comments. Wherever there are abandoned orchard or farming properties, they always become a menace to settlers living in close proximity, by reason of pests that breed on those neglected areas. Especially is that the case in connection with orchards, and naturally one realises the anxiety of an orchardist who finds that an adjoining property which has been abandoned becomes the breeding ground for pests. A little while ago I was invited into an orchard to have some fruit. While there I inspected the figs, and found there was not one in the whole orchard that was not riddled with

fruit fly. In those circumstances, the spread of fruit fly becomes a menace to all surrounding orchards. The Bill gives power to deal with such orchards and, if they are neglected, to have them destroyed. The department is to be commended on that attitude. I suggest to the Minister for Agriculture that he take steps along similar lines to deal with the rabbit pest. However, that is for another Bill, but at all events it is of vast importance to the wheat-growing and grazing industries, and I think something should be done in that direction. I will support the second reading.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.17]: I congratulate the Government on having brought down this Bill. I have attended a number of fruit-grower's conferences, and at every one of them this vexed question has arisen. In the past, the difficulty has been to define an abandoned or neglected orchard. I am sure the fruit-growers who have to make their living from the cultivation of their orchards will welcome the Bill. I will support it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

**BILL—FRUIT CASES ACT
AMENDMENT.**

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2:

Hon. A. THOMSON: The reason why I requested the Honorary Minister to hold up the Bill last week was that a fruit-growers' conference was then being held at Donnybrook. I communicated with that conference and I have their assurance that, while they do not approve of the use of second-hand cases, they realise that the Act should be amended as proposed in the Bill. They hope the department will see to it that the legislation is properly policed with a view to preventing the spread of fruit-fly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I had the pleasure of attending the fruit-growers' conference at Donnybrook, where I heard a very interesting discussion on second-hand fruit-cases. I think practically every delegate there would vote for the elimination of second-hand fruit cases if it were possible.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Would that not add to the expense?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It might, but every protection against fruit-fly should be provided.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Cannot they be fumigated?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Some of them are; but the second-hand case is not desirable from other points of view. For instance, one delegate said he had repeatedly seen second-hand cases of which six would be required to equal five new cases. He explained that the second-hand case shrinks, and so will not hold as much fruit as a new case. I had not realised that the second-hand fruit case would shrink to that extent. The delegates were aware that we could not prevent the use of second-hand cases in many districts, more particularly in the metropolitan area, and in view of the ineffectiveness of the existing Act they were prepared to agree to the amending Bill in the hope that there would be some improvement in the supervision of the use of second-hand cases.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 5—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

**RETURN—MINISTERIAL TRAVELLING
ALLOWANCES.**

Debate resumed from the 18th October 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) [5.27]: I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—in reply) [5.28]: I would remind the House that the answers to my question as to ministerial travelling allowances were unsatisfactory. I felt it was necessary to endeavour to obtain the information by way of motion, and I did so without any desire whatever to cause offence. The required information has been requested by several bodies in my electorate and, in addition, I contend that the taxpayers have a right to it. My motion was not directed against any particular Minister or Ministers. I might have advanced many instances of what have appeared to be abuses of ministerial privileges, but I preferred to confine myself to one instance of which I knew personally and which had been going on for years, back to the time when previously the Minister was in office. It is not contended that Ministers generally are guilty in this respect, and that is why I referred to a specific case. I indulged in no innuendoes, but stated what I saw. I considered I was justified in doing this, remembering the condition of the State finances and the hardships that are being suffered by so many people. Those in high places should set the example, and action should be taken to protect the taxpayers from any unnecessary expenditure, whether incurred by Ministers of the Crown or other people. I remind members that I criticised a member of the previous Government for having engaged in private work whilst drawing Ministerial pay. The Minister in question I admire for many things, but that did not prevent me from criticising his action. I also criticised the present Minister for Employment for absenting himself from his duties for three weeks shortly after his appointment, and proceeding to Sydney to take part in the deliberations of what was purely a party conference. I did not ask if he drew travelling expenses, because I did not at that time think such a thing

would be likely to happen. It is only since I read in the "West Australian" about an ex-Minister drawing Cabinet expenses while on a visit to Adelaide, that it occurred to me Ministers might be entitled to draw such allowances for the time when they were travelling, irrespective of the occasion. As I was desirous of knowing whether such was the case or not, I asked the questions I did, and I maintain I have every right to ask them from my place in this House. The reply of the Chief Secretary may be thought by some to have been clever. It was certainly amusing, but as a reply to the questions, it was not of the slightest use. To show what others are thinking about the subject covered by my motion, I would quote from a letter to the "West Australian" dated July 21, 1931, as follows:—

I read with much interest the figures published in your issue of July 17th; these, together with your well-reasoned editorial of the 18th, give much food for thought. My point is that their Ministerial work does not fully occupy their time. Day after day we read of Ministers journeying to various parts of the State for the purpose of opening halls, schools, laying foundation stones, or performing other social functions.

I am not complaining, as the writer of that letter does, of Ministers travelling about on such occasions. I do say, however, that when they travel on public business the taxpayers should know the cost, and that only on such occasions should expenses be allowed. If the Premier is to be believed, such is not the case. I quote from the "Bulletin" of October 8, 1930, in which appeared a leader headed "Why Politics are in the gutter." This concludes by stating, "The usual reply is that the people get the Parliament they deserve. That is the excuse of dishonesty." My ideas about Ministers devoting their whole time to the affairs of State were the same in 1911 as they are to-day. I would quote a letter I received from the Chief Secretary in that year, when he obtained his first Ministerial appointment. I wrote to him and congratulated him, and asked what arrangements he intended to make for the conduct of his newspaper. He replied as follows:—

I desire to thank you sincerely for your kind congratulations, which are heartily appreciated. I hope my administration will justify the confidence reposed in me by numerous friends. In regard to the "Express," I have made full arrangements for carrying on the paper in my

absence, and therefore do not desire to dispose of it; otherwise I would have been prepared to consider your suggestion. Before you decide to leave the department, I hope you will give the subject serious consideration, after such a long service, but if you do decide to retire and enter into private business, I have no doubt that with your energy, industry, and ability you will be successful.

I quote that to show that as long ago as 1911 I thought that one who agreed to accept an appointment as a Minister of the Crown should make suitable arrangements for the conduct of his private affairs. I should like to quote another letter I received from the same gentleman, in which appear personal references to me of a flattering nature. In 1932 the Chief Secretary wrote to me as follows:—

I am pleased to see that despite the worries incidental to political life in these sad times, you are still remaining true to your old ideal, concerning yourself for the sick and suffering.

Is it any wonder, therefore, knowing the Chief Secretary as I do, that I bear him no grudge for his sarcastic remarks concerning my political ideals especially in connection with my advocacy of the reform of Parliament! Numbers of people have expressed surprise that he should have spoken as he did, but I have explained that that kind of thing is all in the game of politics. At the same time, if as the Chief Secretary states, the information required is difficult to obtain, one wonders why it was not decided at once to take action to ensure for the future that an account would be kept of all such expenditure, and, if required, made available. Such a reply would have made it difficult for me to persist further in the matter. The Leader of the House said that I travel on the Midland line. Of course I do, and so does he, as well as the Minister for Railways, Mr. Patrick, Mr. Ferguson, and Mr. T. Moore. We are entitled to do so, representing as we do districts through which that line runs. Are Ministers of the Crown to be regarded as sacrosanct? I do not think so. We, as members of Parliament, are expected in a measure to share with the Government of the day the responsibility for all State expenditure. If we in this House are powerless, as we frequently are, to insist on Governments facing their financial responsibilities, surely we should take such action as we are able to take to ensure that at least a record is kept of all

such expenditure as is referred to in this motion. The Chief Secretary said I would limit the use of gold passes to members when travelling between their homes and Parliament House. If such an inference can be drawn from my previous remarks, I desire to state that I consider the use of the pass is justified only when members are travelling on business connected with those they represent. Mr. T. Moore rallied to the defence of Ministers, and he included in that defence Ministers of all parties. He declared that the Auditor-General had a complete check on Ministerial travelling allowances, and that in this State there had never been talk of anything corrupt, underhand, immoral, or even indecent having been done by anybody. The Chief Secretary, on the other hand, put quite a different complexion upon the position. He said it would be practically impossible to furnish the information with any degree of accuracy because when Ministers went away their expenses vouchers were debited to the department concerned.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Surely he would not say it was impossible to answer the second question?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I do not know which statement members will accept. It is, however, ridiculous for Mr. Moore to state that the officers of the Audit Department should be able to audit accounts when the information they would require for such an audit is not available. I cannot believe that members will allow themselves to be sidetracked in this manner. Mr. Moore in a sense vouched for Ministers generally. Has he so soon forgotten the words of his Leader, uttered only as lately as the 2nd August? In view of the definite statement of the Premier, am I not entitled to ask that but little notice should be taken of Mr. Moore's opinion on this matter? Surely it is not too much to ask of that House that some action should be taken to prevent a recurrence of regrettable happenings of this nature, if we are to believe what has been said by the Premier. The passing of this motion should certainly lead to a full statement of all Ministerial expenses being made in the future. If such a statement were made public, it would probably lead to these expenses being kept as low as possible. I should like, now, to deal a little more fully with the charge laid

against me by Mr. T. Moore. Strictly speaking, it may be said to be outside the scope of the motion. I am sure, Mr. President, that with your sense of justice you will permit me to indulge in a more complete explanation than was possible at the time the charge was made. When people have a bad case, they invariably abuse the other side. Mr. Moore described his friend as "one of our older farmers." The gentleman in question happens to be a single man about 35 years of age. Some time before, his father had presented him with an improved farm of 3,000 acres, worth some thousands of pounds; but like the prodigal son, this man wasted his substance, and got into difficulties. The father, who is a retired farmer, lives near Geraldton, and was so disappointed in his son that he refused to assist him further, and he was turned down by every bank in Geraldton. That was in 1927, when I was induced to go to his assistance.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You went to the rescue.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I pointed out at the time that the money would cost me 8 per cent. The loan was to have been for 12 months, but at the end of that period no settlement was forthcoming. I was then asked not to take extreme measures, and refrained from doing so. The proposal was made that I should finance the cropping of the property. This proposal was made by the debtor and his brother-in-law. I did this until the latter pulled out. I then continued to finance the debtor himself, and bought and paid for £600 worth of stock and plant. This was placed on the property without being covered by any bill of sale. In February, 1932, the debtor, unknown to me, sold 76 sheep, and did not leave the hotel he was staying at until he had spent the entire proceeds. Only then did I discover that the mortgage I had on the property did not cover stock and plant. I therefore had a bill of sale prepared and posted to the farmer, but he refused to sign it. My failure to have a bill of sale executed on the stock and plant at the time of purchase is accounted for by the trust I had in this man, and also by the fact that it was the first experience I had had of such a transaction. When I heard what he had done, I wrote to the purchaser of the sheep, who confirmed the information. I was so disappointed with the conduct of Mr. Moore's friend that

I told him I had finished with him, and had a buyer for my equity. He then went to Perth and consulted solicitors, who wrote to me requesting a statement of accounts which I supplied through my solicitors. A few days after the receipt of this statement, his solicitors wrote to my solicitors, who wrote to me as follows—

They suggest that the meeting should be entirely private between you and Maloney, and that neither party's solicitors should attend.

I agreed to the suggestion and made an appointment. When the debtor turned up, his sister and her husband came with him. The husband explained that, as he was a resident of the metropolitan area, he would conduct the negotiations on behalf of his brother-in-law. To this I also agreed. Several meetings were held. On the first occasion every account and receipt from 1927 to 1932 was examined. Finally, in view of the fact that I had failed to protect myself with a bill of sale over the plant and stock, and because of the unsatisfactory conduct of the debtor over a long period, I agreed to accept a cash payment of £1,425, which was a reduction of £300 on the amount owing. All the transactions in this matter were audited by Messrs. Cavanagh and Campbell, certificated accountants, Geraldton. They covered the period from 6th April, 1927, to the 20th August, 1932, the total amount involved being £3,188 10s. 11d. I do not ask members to accept my version of this matter, for I have some documents and letters here to prove every statement I have made. I am glad to have had the opportunity to make this statement, because for some time past some of my political opponents have been whispering misrepresentations about this matter around the country in the hope of damaging me politically. Mr. T. Moore excitedly makes an assertion, knowing one side of the story only, and assumes the role of accuser and judge. He declares, "I have proved it up to the hilt." Had he not allowed himself to be blinded by political party bias, he could easily have ascertained the facts from the bank or from his friend's solicitor, Mr. Altorfer of Geraldton, who authorised me to make this statement.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not say of any member of this House that he is actuated by political bias.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I withdraw the statement. Mr. Moore prefers to introduce

a one-sided account of a purely private transaction into a political discussion in order to draw a red herring across the trail. From the manner in which the remarks were made, I could only account for the hon. member's outburst by supposing that he was blinded by party bias. He could easily have ascertained the facts from the bank or from the solicitor concerned. I have always refrained from personalities, and from references that were not strictly political and such as my position in this Chamber required me to make. When I do express an opinion, I endeavour to do so courteously and without imputing motives. Each of us here has important public duties to discharge, and very often the duty is a painful one. In the case under review I can only again express my surprise that the Government have decided to inform members that it is practically impossible to furnish the information, and have not promised that in future a strict account of all such expenditure will be kept. During a period of 25 years I handled thousands of pounds of public money, and was quite rightly required to account for every penny of it. I have therefore become accustomed to expect that this should apply in all cases to those entrusted with the spending of public funds, irrespective of the position held. May I quote one of many letters received by me from electors of my province—

My chief reason for writing is that I like to see any man get a fair deal, and neither Drew nor Moore gave you that. I personally wrote to Moore and asked him to obtain the information. He did not do as he was requested. Of course it was presumption on my part to ask him. But I did not think that he would have the hide to use my letter to slate you for complying with a perfectly legitimate request. Although he did not answer my letter, I would not believe him if he said he did not receive it, as he used some of the facts I gave him when he was trying to prevent us from obtaining information that we are justly entitled to receive. I was under the evidently mistaken impression that the only justification for the existence of the Council was that it was the impeccable guardian of our purse, but according to Drew, Nathan, and Moore—vide "Hansard"; that is all I go on; if they are a fair sample of the Council's guardianship, I say cut the cost and do with one Chamber. You may show this to both Drew and Moore, if you so desire, as I have only stated facts as I know them.

In conclusion, I desire to express my thanks to those members who have supported me in this motion. Such support was quite

spontaneous and unsought, and therefore all the more appreciated.

Question, as amended, put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 24th October, 1933.

	PAGE
Auditor General's Report	1428
Assent to Bills	1428
Questions: Midland Railway, Inspections	1428
Police appointments	1429
Lucerne flea parasite	1429
Bills: Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 18.	1429
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Com. report	1430
Entertainments Tax Act Amendment, 28.	1431
Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed... ..	1431
Public Works and Buildings	1431
Justice	1444
Education	1432

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

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER: I have here a copy of the Auditor General's report, which I will lay on the Table.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Government Tramways Act Amendment.
- 2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance.
- 3, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
- 4, Reduction of Rents Act Continuance.

QUESTION—MIDLAND RAILWAY, INSPECTIONS.

Mr. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that the contract between the Midland Railway Company and the Western Australian Government pro-