

Mr. BARNARD: Probably there is a different type of unemployed in my district from that found elsewhere. I do, however, earnestly hope that consideration will be given to the matter to which I have referred, and that the position will soon be relieved. Although every member who has spoken on the Address-in-reply has referred to unemployment the Government do not seem to be in any way forward with the problem, nor do they seem to be making available the necessary relief works for the employment of these men. I hope that when the debate on the Address-in-reply is concluded, at perhaps no distant date, an improvement will be effected to a very unpleasant state of things.

On motion by Mr. Withers, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 8th August, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: State Insurance Office	214
State Labour Bureau	214
Railway haulage, ton-mile cost	214
White Cliffs, Perth and Goldfields	215
Loan expenditure, 1928-29	216
Leave of absence	215
Address-in-reply, seventh day	215

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

QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE OFFICE.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the total amount of premiums received from all sources by the State Insurance Office during the year ended 30th June, 1929? 2, What was the amount of claims paid and outstanding during the same period? 3, What was the amount of premiums received in respect of workers' compensation and employers' liability? 4, What was the amount of claims paid and

outstanding in respect of same? 5, What was the cost of conducting the office, including salaries, commissions, medical expenses, and all other charges? 6, What percentage did the medical fees and charges under the Workers' Compensation Act bear to (a) the premiums received, and (b) the compensation paid or payable? 7, Are policies issued by the State office subject to stamp duty?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £172,721; 2, £149,619; 3, £160,861; 4, £143,676; 5, £4,395; 6, (a) 19.3 per cent., (b) 21.6 per cent.; 7, Yes.

QUESTION—STATE LABOUR BUREAU.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the number of applicants for employment at the State Labour Bureau for each month during the year ended 30th June, 1929? 2, What numbers were engaged each month (a) by Government departments, (b) by municipal authorities, (c) by other employers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: I produce a return giving the information desired by the hon. member.

The Chief Secretary laid the return on the Table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY HAULAGE, TON-MILE COST.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the cost per ton-mile on the Government railways for goods and livestock during each year from 1924 to 1929? 2, What was the cost per ton-mile for wheat traffic during each of the same years?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, It is not practicable to take out actual cost of haulage per ton-mile, but the receipts per ton-mile for all goods traffic hauled during the years mentioned were: 1929, 1.71 pence; 1928, 1.76 pence; 1927, 1.82 pence; 1926, 1.91 pence; 1925, 1.90 pence; 1924, 1.95 pence; and as over the six years the railways just more than paid their way, it is reasonable to assume that an average of the above would approximate the actual cost per tone-mile for the haulage of all descriptions of goods. 2, Answered by No. 1. The average receipts

per ton-mile for the carriage of wheat— which being bulk traffic is not as expensive to haul as traffic in smaller quantities—during the six years were as follows: 1920, 1.01 pence; 1928, 1.02 pence; 1927, 1.05 pence; 1926, 1.11 pence; 1925, 1.06 pence; 1924, 1.04 pence.

QUESTION—WHITE CITIES, PERTH AND GOLDFIELDS.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, On what date were instructions issued for the closing of White City in the metropolitan area? 2, Were similar instructions also issued for the closing of White City on the goldfields? 3, If so, when? 4, When were the instructions in the latter case rescinded? 5, If they have not been rescinded, why is this institution allowed to continue, and why the discrimination?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, 20th May, 1929. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, Answered by No. 2. 5, The request for the closure of White City was confined to the Perth institution.

QUESTION—LOAN EXPENDITURE, 1928-9.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: What was the Loan Expenditure for the year ended 30th June, 1929?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: £4,372,269 3s. 9d.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, leave of absence for three consecutive sittings granted to Hon. J. J. Holmes (North) on the ground of urgent private business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.38]: At the outset I desire to associate myself with remarks which have been voiced by numerous members regarding the pleasure we feel in having you, Mr. President, once more back with us, and at the same time to express appreciation of the ser-

vices you rendered to the State while you were abroad. Favourably known as you are in the Empire's home, I feel that any observations which you felt called upon to make would be received with a great deal of respect, and I am certain that in that way you have rendered a service that it is not given to every member to render. I also wish to acknowledge the kindly remarks made concerning me by Mr. Hall and other members during the debate yesterday. I shall not follow the lead of other speakers in stating that the Governor's Speech is a thing altogether devoid of substance, that it is all husk and no kernel. In fact, I do not know that there is any standard by which a Governor's Speech is to be measured. If the ideal is a brief recapitulation of a number of things that we already know, such as the fact that we have had good rains, or that the price of wheat fell and rose again, or that the finances of the State are a source of satisfaction, I should say this is an excellent Speech. But if it should be regarded as an exposition of the Government's intentions for the session, and as an indication of what we may expect them to do and of what we will be expected to do, then I should say the Speech is disappointing. Inspiration can frequently be gained from retrospect, and the same thing applies to incentive. I am inclined to say that inspiration will be much more engendered by a few references to worthy objects, and to aims and aspirations which the Government have for the betterment of the country. While it is always pleasing to look back over the achievements of the past, I for one take the viewpoint that in a Speech of this description we should have more initiative and less retrospect; that we should have less self-adulation, and a little less inclination to bask in the reflected glory of work done by other people in the past.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is a good thing to have some glory to bask in.

Hon. W. J. MANN: It is the glory not so much of the Government as of the people. Some of us were taught that condensation is the art of being concise. Applying that old maxim to the Speech, we can congratulate ourselves on having somewhere amongst us an artist in condensation. I refer particularly to that part of the Governor's Speech which deals with the centenary—a line and a half, covering 20 words, being devoted to a highly important subject. In my humble opinion the compilers of the Speech lost a very fine opportunity indeed

of putting on record some recognition of the labours of the people in Western Australia during the past hundred years. A centenary is one of those things that do not recur for a long time, and I suppose it is not much use saying that we hope this Speech will not be taken as a precedent. Nevertheless, one may express a pious hope, which may go down to posterity, that when the next centenary rolls round, those responsible for the Governor's Speech will rise to the occasion and contribute something worthy of the State and worthy of the work done in the past.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You are looking a long way ahead.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have acknowledged that a centenary comes only once every hundred years. The Government have missed the opportunity on this occasion. Let us pray the opportunity may not be missed when we shall have long returned to the dust. There seems to be much doubt as to what influence our spirits may be permitted to exercise on mundane affairs; and if we cannot do it in the spirit in time to come, let us now express our hope that in a hundred years' time somebody will produce something, as I have said, worthy of the State. I want first of all to congratulate those who are engaged in the wheat-producing industry on the recovery that has taken place recently. Unfortunately, there seems to be at the moment another little wave of depression, but I am optimistic enough to believe that it is only temporary, and will shortly disappear. I think this fall in the price of wheat should be a very good lesson to all those controlling the affairs of State, both State and Federal, to take stock of the actual position and see that any factors likely to retard production in this respect are wiped away. The wheat-producing industry is subject to a great deal of disadvantage. Other members have dealt at length with some of those disadvantages and I do not intend this afternoon to go into them. But there are a number of convincing factors to which those who have the government in their hands should turn their attention. In the Speech, reference is made to the diminished wool clip. Here again I feel that stock should be taken of the position and that whatever assistance can be given to those engaged in this very important industry should be promptly rendered. I notice in the Speech no reference to the production of wool and sheep in the South-West. For a great many years, in-

deed until the last year or so, it was thought the South-West was unsuitable for sheep. But that idea has been dissipated, and to-day it is recognised that the South-West is destined to play a very big part in the production of wool, mutton and fat lambs. For many years past I have advocated the production of fat lambs in the South-West. I intend to keep on with that, because I feel that we can rival New Zealand in that industry. We have a better climate than has New Zealand and we have all the necessary facilities, and now that the industry has been inaugurated, our production of fat lambs will be very large in the future. On this question of the production of wool, sheep and fat lambs, I regret the Government have not seen their way clear to go on with the construction of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway. That Boyup Brook-Cranbrook district is a part of the State but little known at the present time, or rather but little known amongst the great bulk of the community. But those who have interests in that part of the country recognise that there is to be found there some of the finest sheep country in the State. It has a splendid rainfall; it is wonderfully prolific, and will, I am sure, in future play a very big part in the production of the South-West. For the last three years the Government have kept that part of the country in a state of virginity by reason of the fact that they have not fulfilled their promise to the people to build the proposed railway. The line was authorised three years ago and, in looking up some records recently, I found that the Development and Migration Commission had included it in a number of works which they agreed to. Their recommendation was that it should be gone on with as early as possible. At that time there was, I think, something like five millions of money being made available by the Development and Migration Commission, of which about four millions were to come to Western Australia. Out of that sum the Salmon Gums railway was built. Then there was £400,000 odd for the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook line, and there were also to be provided for the Denmark line, the Busselton drainage scheme, and a number of water supply schemes. All but one of those have been completed, and the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway is the only item on the programme that has not been carried out. I want to emphasise this fact because there is in the city to-day a very large deputation from the South-West and

they will wait on the Premier to-night with a request that the construction of this railway be accelerated. The Minister for Works, when moving the second reading of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook Railway Bill spoke to the extent of a full page of "Hansard" in eulogy of it. He said, referring to the Advisory Board:—

Whilst they admit that a considerable portion of the large area between the Bridgetown and Great Southern railways, and the Kojonup and Denmark railways must be looked upon as second class, they are satisfied, not only from an inspection of departmental plans, but also from personal observation, that there is available a very large area of first class land, which in conjunction with the second class country is admirably adapted for dairying and allied industries, whilst the well-watered nature of the country and the fine climate render it well suited to closer settlement.

And so he goes on. The Minister concluded by saying this—

They have been waiting for a railway for a long, long time. This is the first of the three required to give the whole of that territory proper railway facilities.

I am not going to weary the House by reading the whole of the Minister's speech made on that occasion. But if what he said was true at that time, its truth to-day is tenfold. Because since that speech was made it has been recognised that super and clover have revolutionised the whole position in the South-West, and that where perhaps a sheep could be carried to five acres under the old conditions, to-day three sheep are being carried to one acre. That, surely, is an additional argument why this railway should be put in hand right away. Except for Fremantle and Geraldton, the people generally are not very enthusiastic about the Government's reference to harbours. At Bunbury nothing but a little dredging has been done, nor has the promised Engineer-in-Chief's report come to hand. I have previously pointed out in the House the unsatisfactory state of the shipping berths at Bunbury. The position to-day is worse than ever before, and there is a crying demand for some attention in that direction. Notwithstanding the marked depression in the timber trade during the past 12 months, 131 vessels have entered the port of Bunbury as against 136 in the previous year. And that they were not merely small vessels, is borne out by the fact that the average tonnage of those ships was 3,833 tons. Also the small increase in the number of wheat vessels that previously called at Bunbury has grown to

quite a considerable figure. I have not the figure to hand at the moment, but it is rapidly approaching the 100,000-bushel margin. The other night I entered the House almost too late to hear Mr. Stewart making some reference to ports, but if I remember rightly he said it was a pity that money should be spent on Bunbury, Busselton and such harbours, and that he considered it should all be spent at Albany, so that that port might make more rapid progress. I hardly think Mr. Stewart meant exactly what he said, or that he is so devoted an apostle of centralisation. But we all agree that every port should have the trade to which its hinterland entitles it, and when I tell you that the cargo dealt with at Bunbury last year was valued at £1,570,000, members will agree that it is a very strong argument for improving the port. The people there are not asking anything unreasonable. All they say is that they want certain facilities provided, and the depth of water maintained.

Hon. H. Stewart: When speaking on harbours, I read the opinions of other people. I expressed none myself.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I accept the hon. member's explanation. As I said, I was not sure whether I had heard him correctly. However, I am very pleased to have heard his explanation. I want to point out that Bunbury suffers considerably by the fact that there is no provision there for fruit export. Members may be aware that last year a record for the State was created in fruit shipment. We sent overseas 737,636 bushel cases, and in addition we sent 150,000 bushel-cases to the Eastern States. The balance consumed locally brings the production of last year up to about 1,000,000 cases. That is a very fine record, one of which we are justly proud. When I say the great bulk of that fruit had to pass over the South-Western railways, and had to pay an additional railage of about 100 miles, it will be seen that the producers in those parts are being mulct in extra freight to that extent. Bunbury may well ask for increased facilities for fruit shipment at that port. The previous best in fruit export was 564,000 bushel-cases, as against last year's record of just under 1,000,000 bushel-cases. So I think we have every reason to congratulate ourselves upon the progress the fruit industry is making in this State. While on the question of harbours, I wish briefly to refer to a promise the Premier made to the people of Busselton when on the hustings at the

last election. He had been asked on many occasions to spend some money in making the jetty a little more useful by widening it slightly so that another set of rails could be put in. Previously the question had been evaded but the Premier, during the last election, definitely promised the people in the public hall at Busselton that if the Government were returned to power, that work would be undertaken. The promise is still unfulfilled, and shippers are suffering greater disadvantages than they did 2½ years ago, whilst the lumpers are working under difficult conditions. Thus we can reasonably ask the Premier to keep the promise he made on that occasion. While on the subject of jetties, I should like to refer to that at Flinders Bay. That bay does not loom very largely as a port of shipment, but it is used by group settlers as a port. There is a strongly erected jetty there, but by reason of the fact that no repairs have ever been carried out on it, the shore end is beginning to break away. I believe that the expenditure of a few pounds at the present time would save the expenditure of thousands in the future. I mention this because I understand it is the intention of Millars to instal another big mill close to Karridale shortly. If that is done, then Flinders Bay with its wonderfully good harbour and deep water will be largely utilised. I am not enthusiastic with regard to the policy of the Government in continually adding to the East Perth power house, chiefly for the reason that I consider it is an uneconomic proposition to do so, and also that it tends to centralisation and does not take stock of the requirements of the people of the country. Few people will dispute the fact that where the source of electric power is within 200 or 300 miles of the consuming area, there the power should be generated, and accepting that view there is only one place for its generation, and that is Collie. Ultimately the source of electric power for the southern and South-Western part of the State—and I include the metropolis—must be at Collie. The Government are not altogether thoughtful of the requirements of the people of the country who suffer many disadvantages, and suffer them in silence.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Not much silence about it.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, in silence. The people of the country have just as much right to cheap electric power as the people

of the city. Their work is so much more arduous, and every consideration should be given them. Those who are in small country towns pay 1s. a unit for light and 6d. a unit for power, whereas in the metropolis it is as low as 1½d. There is no chance to establish secondary industries in the country under such conditions, and it is the duty of the Government to assist to establish secondary industries in the country as well as in the city. So long as the Government subscribe to the pernicious system of centralisation which has been the curse of every country that has adopted it, then the country will have good reason to complain. Mention has been made of the Government's forestry activity. I do not intend to say much on that, because this morning I attended a deputation to the Premier that lasted two hours and we engaged in a ding-dong argument. Unfortunately, we did not get very far. I do not hold with the policy that is being adopted by the Forests Department. I have no wish to be misunderstood because I do subscribe to the idea of a forests policy. The Forests Department are asking the people to cultivate a forest conscience. My reply to that is that we should try to cultivate an agricultural conscience at the same time. The Forests Department have now dedicated to themselves an area comprising almost a million acres, and it is alleged by those who have lived in the country all their lives and who know the areas in question, that at least 500,000 acres of the territory reserved is land on which there is no timber, never has been and never will be, and that it is rich agricultural land that should be thrown open for settlement. I simply express my disapproval of the action of the Forests Department in closing that area against settlement, because there is a great outcry for land in that part of the State. Many young men who are growing up are leaving their native heath in that part of the State and are being forced to go away from the South-West because they are unable to get land on which they could become producers. For the first time since I have been in Parliament, there is no mention in the Governor's Speech of group settlement. I take that as an indication that the Government have at last agreed with the scheme initiated by Sir James Mitchell, although the scheme has proved a little more expensive than was anticipated. Most hon. members have read the report of the revaluation board, which report deals with

329 locations. Members will also have noticed the amount of money that will have to be written down. As one who knows the locations concerned, I am not prepared for the moment to make any definite statement, because sufficient time has not elapsed for one carefully to go into revaluations. A cursory examination leads me to believe that the board have not inflicted any great hardships on the settlers. There may be an odd case here and there where hardship has been done, but in the main, settlers will be satisfied with the work. I say candidly that there are many people outside the settlements who would be glad to take those locations at the prices put on them, and do very well. I do not want the House to get the idea that the valuations are not high enough. There is one phase that may be lost sight of, and it is that on many occasions, and in quite a number of instances, men went on the settlements with some capital and they have spent that capital on those locations. A lot of them have done a great deal of very fine spare-time work. I understand that allowance has been made for the money that has been spent in that way and where value can be shown. It may be said that the revaluations do not reflect very highly on the character of the country—and when that statement is made I would like members to bear in mind the fact that in many cases money that has been spent on those locations is not shown by the revaluations. What concerns me, as it must concern every other public man, is the amount of money that will have to be written off. There is just one aspect that we must not lose sight of, and that is that the revaluations up to the present have been made on the older locations, and we expect when the newer locations come to be revalued the loss will be not so great. The amount of money that will have to be written off is what was expected because of the waste, extravagance and ignorance. I consider that the blame is not altogether that of the settlers; it is largely that of the Government. When the Mitchell administration handed over the group settlements, the average expenditure was about £450 per location. When the revaluations were made recently, they ran into about £3,000 per block. I, for one, have never been able to see how there could be such an increase.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Interest and everything is included.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I understand that. One thing that I am proud of is the production that is going on at the group settlements, and just as in the last decade there was a remarkable advance in agricultural production, so in the next decade we shall see a similar expansion in dairying. Very few people recognise that 10 years ago the value of dairying in this State was limited to about £500,000. Last year the value was over £2,000,000. That is very gratifying indeed, because whereas in the past money has been sent to the Eastern States, a good deal of it is now circulated in Western Australia, where the people will reap the benefit. For that change I believe the group settlements are largely responsible. Let me give as an illustration the output of two factories in the South-West. At Bunbury last year there was manufactured 1,596,848 lbs. of butter representing an increase of 292,112 lbs. over the previous year—a very decent increase indeed. The increase at the Busselton factory was perhaps more phenomenal. There was manufactured at that factory 655,549 lbs, as compared with 346,265 lbs in the year before, the increase being 304,284 lbs. The total production of butter at those two factories last year was 2,247,397 lbs., or put in another way 103 tons 6 cwt. The total increase was 596,396 lbs. or 261 tons 16 cwt. over the output of the previous year. The tonnage increase for the year was 36. The figures at Manjimup factory are equally gratifying. Then again, as indicative of the interest taken in dairying in the South-West at the present time, a modern butter factory has been erected at Harvey at a cost of £17,000. I have been informed by those in a position to give an opinion that there is no better butter factory anywhere in Australia. It contains all the latest appliances for use in the production of butter and is altogether arranged on most modern lines. A great deal of enterprise has been shown by the dairy farmers at Harvey and all that is required there to improve the position is the inauguration of the drainage scheme, which will bring into productivity many thousand acres of rich flats. We have advocated the Harvey drainage scheme for years past both inside and outside Parliament, and I am convinced that if the Government could see their way clear to carry out that scheme the State would be repaid handsomely. At Boyanup it is proposed to erect a butter factory. I was surprised re-

cently when I was told that a census had been taken of the dairy stock in the Boyanup district and it had disclosed that whereas a few years ago there were 400 or 500 cows there, to-day there were 6,000 in that comparatively small area. That is a very gratifying expansion indeed. Another butter factory is to be erected at Margaret River. To my mind all this development reflects back on the group settlement operations because had it not been for the promulgation of that scheme, we would still be lagging along far behind in development. I want to say a word in advocacy of the establishment of an agricultural college in the South-West. There is no such institution available at present, and there is a public demand for it. At the South-West Conference, which was attended recently by between 70 and 80 delegates, all practical men from various parts of the State, this question was debated at length and the speeches showed there was a decided demand for the provision of such an institution. I am convinced that the Government should accelerate agricultural research work. Any country of note that has shown a decided advancement in agriculture has certainly speeded up its research work in that direction. The Government are doing something along those lines, but certainly not sufficient to cope with the requirements of this State. I believe money spent in that direction will be wisely spent and the results will redound to the credit and benefit of the State, particularly to the primary producers. A number of pests that are known elsewhere have made their presence felt in the South-West and these include the red mite and the lucerne flea. I believe science could come to the aid of the settlers and lead the way in dealing with those pests. If that were done, it would mean the saving of much money in the future. Another matter I wish to refer to briefly, relates to our main roads. The Governor's Speech includes a paragraph dealing with that subject, and the Government have indicated their intention of amending the Main Roads Act. Perhaps we could hardly expect to have references to the report of the select committee that investigated main roads matters included in the Governor's Speech, but I hope the Government will take notice of the information contained in that report. Many things were disclosed which I do not intend to go into now, but it is certain that they do not redound to the

credit of the State. I hope that many of those features will be obviated in the future, for we do not want a repetition of many things that happened in the past. I hope the Government will give the report of the select committee due consideration, and thus see that the interests of the State benefit accordingly. Since we passed the Main Roads Act, a great deal of information has been obtained in regard to the inability of the local authorities to pay the quota demanded of them. Those of us who heard the evidence taken by the select committee can testify that in every instance the local governing authorities stressed the impossibility of paying the amounts that would be demanded of them, and that if payment were insisted upon, those bodies would have to go out of action. I make no apology at this stage for concluding my remarks by referring to what I consider the failure of the Government to do their duty in fostering the tourist traffic. Each year since I have been a member of this Chamber, I have referred to this matter, which is of considerable interest to me and, I believe, of interest to the State as well. So long as I am a member of the Council I intend to advocate greater regard being had for this traffic and the trade that comes with it. I have repeatedly called attention to the inadequacy of the accommodation at Cave House and to the fact that each year hundreds of people cannot possibly stay there during the season because the accommodation is not available. I am positive that if Cave House were run privately instead of by the Government, the Licensing Board would come down like a thousand bricks on the licensee and insist upon more accommodation being provided. The Licensing Board, quite rightly, insist upon additional accommodation being provided if they regard it as essential. I fail to see why the Licensing Board, if they are careful regarding private individuals, should not be just as careful in dealing with the State. If there is one place throughout Western Australia where more accommodation is required, it is at Cave House.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: For how many weeks in the year is the accommodation over-taxed?

Hon. W. J. MANN: It is not a matter of weeks, but of seven or eight months in the year. I do not ask the Government to embark upon something of a questionable nature. Cave House is a proved money-earning institution and money spent there

will be more than recouped to the State. There is no question about the value of the tourist traffic and I recently discovered some figures that staggered me, as I am sure they will stagger hon. members. Quite recently the Canadian Bureau of Statistics published a return showing that during last year the tourist traffic brought into Canada no less than 250,501,000 dollars, or £50,100,200, which is five times the revenue of Western Australia. Those figures seemed almost inconceivable, so much so that I made investigations to ascertain whether the report was accurate. I found that the figures were in accordance with State reports and, further, that it was estimated that 103,245,000 dollars, or £20,649,000 was estimated to have been spent by Canadian tourists abroad during that year. Of course Canada has a greater population than Australia, but if tourists could bring into Canada a revenue of £50,000,000 in a year, then we in Australia ought to be able to secure as great a revenue in proportion to our population. It has to be remembered that such a revenue is practically all profit. We have a variety of attractions in Australia, and in Western Australia we have attractions from the Abrolhos to the Leeuwin.

Hon. G. W. Miles: From Wyndham to the Leeuwin.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is so. I think the Government, from the business side of the question, quite apart from the sentimental aspect, could foster that traffic with decided advantage to the State. The Government should wake up to the possibilities of the tourist traffic and trade, and see that something is done to promote the interests of this State in relation to that traffic. I regret that opportunity was not taken by the Government to be represented at a conference held in Melbourne this week. That conference was the outcome of the efforts of the Development and Migration Commission's movement to attract tourists. In the Eastern States the Australasian National Travellers' Association has been inaugurated to give effect to that scheme, and £75,000 has been contributed by shipping companies and others for expenditure on propaganda calculated to attract tourists. Every State in the Commonwealth, apart from Western Australia, was represented at the conference. We sometimes complain that the people in Eastern Australia do not evidence a kindly disposition towards us in the West. On the other hand, if we sit down and allow these conferences to take

place without taking steps to have a delegate present to draw attention to the interests of this State, we deserve all we get. The other day I investigated the available figures to ascertain what the Tourist Department of Western Australia costs the taxpayers. I was astonished to find that apart from salaries and so on, the money voted for the department amounted to £350. That is positively ridiculous! Here we have a tourist traffic and trade worth hundreds of thousands, if not millions of pounds to Australia and yet the Government of this State are prepared to allocate only £350 to the department for the purposes of advertising and so on. Originally I believe the vote was £500, but for some extraordinary reason the amount was cut down to £350. How can we expect to make any progress with our tourist resorts if that is all we are prepared to spend along those lines? The Tourist Department has done wonders with the money available; I am surprised the departmental work has proved so effective. There is one other matter I wish to mention and it also has a bearing on the tourist traffic. I trust the Government will pay some attention, through the Fisheries Department, to the depletion of some of our angling waters because of netting. The waters I refer to are principally the estuaries and rivers in the recognised tourist areas. A few years ago it was possible to visit any of the estuaries and indulge in wonderfully good fishing. Netting was permitted in the waters, and they have been cleaned out. As soon as the fish begin to multiply again, they are raked out by one or two fishermen. It may be said that to do as I suggest would inflict a hardship on people, but we have a very long coast line and there is any quantity of fish to be obtained without combing places that are an undoubted advantage to tourist traffic. Last Easter it was my privilege to be in Victoria and I was motored to several places on the coast that I had not previously visited, and I was astounded at the number of people camped on little creeks for no other reason than to get a bit of fishing. There were scores of camps alongside the creeks and some of the people had journeyed 100 and 150 miles to enjoy the fishing. It redounds to the credit of the Victorian Government that they have stocked those waters and kept them for the enjoyment of the people. I am sure more could be done with our waters; they could be stocked and so the attractions of the

State in that respect could be increased. I support the motion.

HON. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [5.32]: It is not my intention to speak at any length on the Address-in-reply. We listened with interest to the Governor's Speech, which while rather lengthy was delivered in His Excellency's best style. There is no need for us to discuss what the Government have done. That is a thing of the past. We are looking forward to what the Government intend to do during the last session before the general election. I am sure that the Government do not intend to bring down any contentious legislation but that they are prepared to go quietly through this session. Amongst the items mentioned is legislation for the establishment of a rural bank. I do not understand what form a rural bank can take without conflicting with the Agricultural Bank. It is something new to me, but evidently the Government have their ideas on the question. Other members who have spoken seem to be in the dark as to what the Government's intentions really are. The Speech makes reference to an amendment of the Health Act. The Government have in mind certain amendments that they consider desirable. I believe there is room for improving the Main Roads Act. It seems from the speeches of country members that quite a lot of dissatisfaction exists, especially regarding the manner in which money has been expended on the roads. I hope the amending Bill will have the effect of providing something concrete and definite for the benefit of the road boards. A redistribution of seats Bill is to be introduced. That measure will concern this House very much. I think it is a measure that should emanate from this Chamber. A redistribution of seats for the Legislative Assembly was fought out in another place, and I do not see how it comes within the province of another place to dictate the boundaries for Council provinces. The Bill should be introduced here through the Chief Secretary or a private member. I admit it will be difficult to introduce a measure that will give satisfaction to all parties.

Hon. A. Lovekin: How could you fix the boundaries?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I do not care what form the measure takes. So far no member has referred to this Bill and I merely state my opinion that it should originate in this

House. Then it could go to another place and we would know exactly where we stood. We might even be able to square each other on the question of the boundaries desired. We have read and heard much recently about arbitration. An amending Bill is to be brought down this session. I remember a previous occasion when it was sought to amend the Arbitration Act. One member, who I think is in the Chamber at present, spoke in high praise of the sponsor of the measure and we thought it would be passed, but that same member tabled no fewer than 38 amendments to the Bill. I do not know how the amending Bill will fare on this occasion. Everyone here seems to condemn the Arbitration Court, but we are not permitted to bring in a measure that will be of benefit to the workers. After all, the Arbitration Act is for the benefit of the workers, not for the benefit of the capitalist or the members of this House. However, members here put their foot down and refused to give us our own way.

Hon. H. Seddon: You have the best Arbitration Act in the world.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: We want an Arbitration Court that can enforce its own awards. What is the good of the court if no notice is taken of it?

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is right.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: It is of no use having an Arbitration Court that cannot declare a strike on or off.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is not that an argument against it?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: No. If we had a perfect Arbitration Act, we would have something to work on. No reference is made in the Speech to a hospitals Bill. I do not know whether the Government intend to bring down another measure to finance the hospitals. Last session we had a special Bill which proposed a tax of 1½d. in the pound, but it was fired out by this Chamber.

Hon. E. H. Harris: No, we did not fire it out.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: The hon. member may put it as he likes. Did the Bill go through?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The other House refused to accept it.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Accept it! After it had been killed here! Since the Lotteries Bill was introduced a few years ago, a number of new members have been elected to this Chamber who favour such legislation.

If the Government again introduced a lotteries Bill, it would have a very good effect. I have a news cutting dated London, the 9th April, referring to the sweep on the Derby. The demand was so great that the staff had to be doubled and the organisers decided to limit the issue of tickets to 1,000,000. The sweep is thus the largest in the world. The organisers were undecided whether to split the sweep into two sections or double the prizes. That shows what is being done elsewhere. If we had something on the same lines, look at the money we could make! The Minister for Health does not seem to realise how much a sweep would produce. If he objects to calling it a sweep, let him call it a golden casket, or if he does not like that, let him call it premium bonds. Whatever he calls it, all those things are a gamble, and it is idle to attempt to argue otherwise. If we had a sweep, lottery, premium bonds or golden casket, people would be surprised at the amount of money it would attract from overseas. But for Tattersalls, Tasmania would be off the map. The Government of Tasmania make quite a lot of money out of those sweeps. Look what Queensland has been able to do with its Golden Casket funds! That State has been able to provide millions of money for charities since the Golden Casket was begun. What can be done in Queensland can be done here. I should very much like the Government to adopt some such method of raising funds. If they wish to camouflage it, they can call it what they like, but we do want something of the kind in Western Australia. A measure which is not mentioned in the Speech but which I understand is to be submitted this session is a profiteering Bill. On a previous occasion we had a similar measure before the House, and it was mutilated—chucked out.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you mean it was merely amended?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: There are several classes of people I wish to mention who should come under a profiteering Act. There is the rents man, the man who owns property. In Perth to-day there are people paying as much as £20 a week rent and they have not taken that sum in three weeks. It might be that the present is just a dull time, but the fact shows that rents are too high. A man in receipt of the basic wage of £4 7s. has to pay as much as 35s.

a week for a decent house. He cannot get a 5-roomed house anywhere near town for less than 35s. a week. If he went away out into the sand dunes and walked two or three miles from anywhere, he might get a place a little cheaper, but it would be very inconvenient. Such rents should be reduced. There should be a fixed rate and a man should be prohibited from charging more. A doctor should also be prohibited from charging more than a certain fee for an operation. Fancy a doctor taking a patient out of a warm bed, putting him on the operating table and opening him up at a charge of ten guineas for the anaesthetist, £60 for the opening up process and another £40 for a third doctor to hold a towel and wipe his instruments! By the time the man is sewn up again, their verdict may be that they cannot do anything for him, and yet though he is beyond recall, there is a bill of 110 guineas or more.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Where did that happen?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: It happens all around Perth. There should be a maximum charge for an operation. A doctor should be permitted to charge only so much per hour. Of course he might go slow on the job, but then the patient would be likely to die and the doctor would lose his reputation. Consequently, he would have to be reasonably fair to keep his reputation. Then, after a man has been murdered by the doctors, an undertaker is called in to bury him and he is just such another profiteer. He grabs up the corpse, puts it in a box and takes it away, and then there is a bill for 30 guineas. The charge is outrageous. Undertaking should be the work of the Government; the corpse should be taken away and cremated. There is a matter to which I would like the Government to give consideration and that has reference to old age pensions. I do not know whether my suggestion could be met by regulation or otherwise. It is no use asking the Commonwealth Government to do anything. They are as hard as nails and will do nothing. The State Government, however, could easily do what I am going to suggest with regard to old age pensioners, invalids, and incapacitated pensioners, men who reach the age of 60 and cannot work, but are not actually invalids. These aged persons should all be allowed a free pass once a year either to go from the

coast to the country, or come from the country to the coast. Whenever I go to Kalgoorlie I meet some of those old men. They are living on £1 a week. It takes every penny of that to enable them to keep body and soul together. Some of them may have friends in Perth, and those friends may be willing to put them up for nothing for a week, a fortnight or a month. If the men could come to Perth for a month from the goldfields and be put up by their friends, the change would do them a world of good. The £4 they would be enabled to save would go a long way towards the purchase of necessities. When their boots have worn out, in the ordinary course of events they have to get a pair from someone or go without. It is the same thing with their clothes. They cannot hope to renew them on £1 a week. The trains are running just the same, and the extra cargo involved in finding room for these old men would not make much difference to the amount of steam consumed by the engine in hauling the train to Perth. I hope the Government will bring in some measure whereby a pass can be given to these deserving old pensioners. I saw that someone was writing to the papers the other day suggesting that this should be done during the centenary year. Such an act should not be confined to the centenary year. It should be done every year. There are not many men involved, but several of them would be glad to have the opportunity of coming to the coast, or going from the coast to the country. The least we can do to cheer up these old people in their declining days is to give them a change of this kind. If members could only hear the disheartening accounts these men give of their mode of life, and listen to the tale of the hardships they endure, they would be astonished. I have had a good deal to do with them and know their position well. We have heard a lot about the cost of production being too high. Every member who has spoken this session has talked about it. They always refer to the high rate of wages. They claim the wages are responsible for the position. It does not occur to them that motor cars have something to do with it. Let any member glance down St. George's-terrace as far as Bennett-street and see if it is possible to park a car anywhere on either side of that thoroughfare. The cars do not belong to the workers. These are the things that are making the cost of living so high. They all have to be maintained and paid for. It costs

between £5 and £6 a week to keep one of them.

Hon. J. Ewing: Do not the workers own motor cars?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: How could a worker on the basic wage keep a motor car, and be honest? Hundreds of primary producers who keep motor cars are dishonest. That is where the trouble is. People should start at the top of the tree, and not attempt to cut down the poor worker. Some 30 years ago men who could not afford to buy an old crock of a sulky for £15, to-day are running motor cars worth £350.

Hon. J. Cornell: My bread carter has a motor car.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Perhaps he has a share in the dough. Members should think of these things, and should not attempt to cut down the basic wage for the worker who has so little to spend. It takes the worker all his time to keep his stomach inflated, without thinking about motor cars. The only chance he has of getting one is to steal it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Will you give us your views on the tariff?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: That is for members like Mr. Nicholson to deal with. They put the Bruce Government—which gave us the high tariff—into office.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Does not Mr. Scullin want a hundred per cent. tariff?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: He did not get it through, and did not intend to do so. I will not say any more as I do not believe in long maudlin speeches. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.