

their share of the dole. Because a man has a worn-out contraption that is referred to as a motor car, a vehicle that he cannot hope to get rid of, he should not be prevented from participating in the bonus. Is it right and reasonable that a farmer living eight or ten or perhaps 15 miles from the railway should be deprived of the use of a motor car, which is really part of the machinery of his farm? A farmer is justly entitled to leave his work, say, twice a week, for the purpose of obtaining his letters, which consist mostly of bills, his newspapers, and stores and other requirements. Imagine such a farmer leaving his team standing idle in the paddock while he uses one horse for the purpose of the trip! In that way he would lose more than the cost of using a motor car, which the Federal Government profess to regard as a luxury. Imagine a farmer with children from 12 to 15 years of age having to send them in by spring cart when they want to go to an entertainment! The boys and girls would arrive back home when the old man was dressing, and just in time to start the day's work. I hope the Minister for Lands will see that if our farmers have to rely upon a Federal dole in future, it shall be distributed more equitably. As an optimist I cannot claim to rank on an equal footing with Sir James Mitchell, but I have hopes that next season wheat will bring a reasonable price. That is not to say, however, that the farmers do not want a good many things from the present Government. They hope that the Minister for Lands will carry out the promise he made at the close of last session, to go into the whole position and bring down suitable proposals during this session. I believe that the Minister when making that promise spoke sincerely, and the farmers are looking for some results. I firmly believe that the worst of the wheat crisis is over. Nature will take care of that matter in the long run. Quite a deal of what we have heard about enormous quantities of wheat stored in Yankee-land is a mere figment of the imagination. As soon as the United States are threatened with a partial drought, we find a mob of wheat gamblers rushing in to secure grain and thereby putting up the price by 6d. or 9d. per bushel. I am convinced that the present season will be a good one. In my constituency, which will produce quite a large proportion of the wheat for export, personal inspection leads me to regard success as practically assured. There will be a good

harvest if there is a good tail-off of the season. We shall have a good heavy wool clip, and if prices only hold many of the troubles experienced by the farming community last year will disappear. At the same time the farmers sincerely hope that the Government will watch the situation, and not let them down in regard to any reasonable requests they may make. The man who has devoted the whole of his life's savings and many years of hard work to turning forest country into a national asset must not be allowed to sink. For that much I do not think the farmers will ask in vain.

On motion by Hon. N. Keenan, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,200,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 14th August, 1934.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway crossings, accidents ...	71
Mining—1, Insurance, compensation and relief, 2, Beneficiaries' form ...	72
Hospital for the Insane, additions ...	72
Agricultural Bank Commission, Report ...	72
Motion: State Transport Co-ordination Act, to disallow regulation ...	72
Address-in-Reply, fourth day ...	78

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, ACCIDENTS.

Rivervale and Maddington Crossings.

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many accidents have occurred during the past five years at the railway crossings at Rivervale and Maddington? 2, How many, during that period, proved fatal? 3, In the interests of the safety of the community, should not the Commissioner of Railways be compelled to

make proper provision to safeguard the users of the two main roads that the above crossings intersect?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Maddington—five accidents, involving seven fatalities; Rivervale—three accidents, with one fatality. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Whilst there is, and must always be, an element of risk at any level crossing, the Commissioner of Railways is of opinion that, provided reasonable precautions are taken by those using them, the two crossings specially referred to are safe.

QUESTIONS (2)—MINING.

Insurance, Compensation and Relief.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the amount of premiums collected by the State Insurance Office from the mining industry for insurance against the liability to pay compensation for mining diseases under the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act from 1st January, 1930, to 30th June, 1934? 2, What were the total payments made under the Workers' Compensation Act from 1st January, 1930, to 30th June, 1934, as compensation to sufferers from mining diseases? 3, What was the amount of premiums collected by the Mine Workers' Relief Board from the mining industry from 1st January, 1932, to 30th June, 1934? 4, What were the total payments made under the Mine Workers' Relief Board as compensation to sufferers from mining diseases from 1st January, 1932, to 30th June, 1934?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Information is not available in regard to the amount of premium collected as from the 1st January, and the figures given relate to the financial year—1930-31, £38,825 18s. 8d.; 1931-32, £45,549 16s. 4d.; 1932-33, £52,293 17s. 9d.; 1933-34, £57,877 8s. 2d. (to 31st May only). 2, The information available again relates to the financial year—1930-31, (a) £2,485 15s. 10d.; (b) £10,000. 1931-32 (a) £1,948 2s. 10d.; (b) £10,000. 1932-33 (a) £2,750 14s. 2d.; (b) £25,000. 1933-34 (a) £9,913 4s. 11d.; (b) £25,000. (a) Shows the amount paid direct to claimants, and (b) the amount paid to the Treasury on account of payments made under the Miners' Phthisis Act, and paid by the Mines Department, and which could have been claimed under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act.

These figures do not show the amount outstanding in regard to claims, each of which represents a liability of £850. There is also an accruing liability in the case of every miner, in respect of which some reserve must be created. 3, £54,610 8s. (This sum represents contributions by mine workers, employers, and the Government.) 4, £29,216 12s. 1d.

Beneficiaries' Form.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table of the House, Form 6, which beneficiaries under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund are required to complete and sign?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Yes.

QUESTION—HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE, ADDITIONS.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Were tenders called for the additions to the Claremont Hospital for the Insane? 2, What was the cost of such additions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, Approximately £21,000. The work is not yet completed.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK COMMISSION, REPORT.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: Seeing that the report of the Royal Commission on the Agricultural Bank was made available to the public per medium of the newspapers, thus departing from the usual custom, when will it be made available to Parliament?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: No departure from usual custom has been made. The report will be laid on the Table of both Houses as soon as it is printed.

MOTION—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

Debate resumed from the 9th August on the following motion by Hon. A. Thomson:—

That Regulation No. 48, made under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933, as published in the *Government Gazette* on 16th

March, 1934, and laid on the Table of the House on 7th August, 1934, be and is hereby disallowed.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.41]: Regulation 48 was promulgated with a view to having uniformity of decision in regard to transport appeals. The necessity for this should be clearly recognised. One can well conjecture the chaos that would ensue if various appellants went all round the countryside lodging appeals with different magistrates. The appeals at present are being dealt with in zones. This gives the magistrate dealing with the cases an opportunity of seeing the whole working of the transport system over a particular route, and it also enables him, if he decides to grant a license, to choose between various appellants. One can imagine an individual being refused a license by one magistrate and a less deserving person being granted a license by another. In such an event, much dissatisfaction would be created. Obviously the magistrate who gains experience through having to review the whole working of the system over a period is, from a co-ordinating point of view, the best person to adjudicate. It is therefore contended that there is good sense behind Regulation 48, and that it should not be disturbed.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.45]: I am afraid that if Mr. Thomson's motion be carried, the object he seeks will not be achieved. If the regulation were disallowed, the position would be that appeals would cease forthwith. The hon. member argued that it was the intention of the House when the amendment was made—and it was made in this House—that any stipendiary magistrate should act as a court of appeal. Originally the Bill provided that a court of petty sessions should be the court of appeal and that its decision should be final. The reference in the original Bill was in the singular—to a court of petty sessions—and although the Committee may have had in mind the desirableness of several courts of appeal being set up under stipendiary magistrates, there is no question that the intention was not expressed in proper language. The Act states that the appeal shall be to a stipendiary magistrate, not magistrates. I consider that the board have acted rightly in framing the regulation as they have done because they may determine any license at a

given point. If people who hold licenses are required to make their applications to the board, irrespective of the part of the State in which they are operating, I venture to say there would be no hardship in having the appeal heard at the place where the license was refused. If stipendiary magistrates in, say, Kalgoorlie, Katanning, Albany, Northam and Geraldton dealt with appeals, the whole paraphernalia of the board would have to be made available at the centre where the magistrate was sitting.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Why not?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member should consider the cost, which would be great. What is the position regarding courts of law? The lower courts have practically ceased to sit in any part of the State other than Perth. When they did, any appeal was made to the court at the seat of government and was not heard in the centre in which the original action was started. That affords a precedent for the regulation.

Hon. W. J. Mann: At the cost of the man in the country always.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In ordinary circumstances the Crown does not pay the costs of litigants who desire to appeal.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The position is just the same.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know of any instance of higher appeals where the country is bound to pay the costs of the appellant.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is only a natural disadvantage that people in the country suffer all the time.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then they would be under no new disadvantage.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They are, as compared with the city man.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We are aware of that, but it happens frequently. It is the experience of members of this House. It costs a member whose electorate is distant from the seat of government far more than it costs a man on the spot, and he gets no more for doing it.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Query!

Hon. J. CORNELL: As the Chief Secretary has pointed out, we shall be treading on very dangerous ground if we empower a multiplicity of tribunals to hear transport appeals. One magistrate might give a decision quite the reverse of that given by another magistrate.

Hon. A. Thomson: Would not he give a decision on the evidence submitted?

Hon. J. CORNELL: We must bear in mind that there is no appeal from the decision of the magistrate. I submit that, in view of the words of the original Bill and the words inserted by this House in lieu of what another place proposed, the board have acted within their rights. If we had intended that various magistrates should hear the appeals, we should have said so. If we disallow the regulation, the board can continue to refuse licenses until such time as the Act is amended, clearly and definitely setting out how appeals shall be dealt with. I think that would be a more logical way out of the difficulty than the proposal to disallow the regulation. The board have given effect to the legislation of Parliament. If the Legislature desire some other interpretation, the present system of appeal should be retained until the alteration is made. I feel inclined to vote against the motion. In this House it is practically an unwritten law to carry motions for the disallowance of regulations. I do not recollect one such motion having been rejected, but I warn members that if they pass this motion, they will probably find that the new position that will be created will be worse than the present one.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [4.53]: I am pleased that Mr. Thomson has directed attention to the regulation and has moved for its disallowance. The fact has always been recognised that where a person is suffering an injustice and has the right of appeal, it should be heard in his own centre where the injury is being done him. If the appellant were at Carnarvon or Geraldton or Kalgoorlie, what would the magistrate in Perth know of the local circumstances? The board were instructed by the Act to consider the question of licenses and to make inquiries from all persons concerned. It seems to me that from the outset the board overlooked the intention of Parliament that they should inquire in the various centres how the Act would affect the people most concerned, namely the general public, in the service being rendered to them. After years of experience it was found that the railways were not giving the service required by the people, who were glad to avail themselves of the new service rendered by motor transport. Parliament intended that there should be co-ordination. Each individual centre must be considered on its merits, apart from

what may be happening in neighbouring localities. In each instance there would be some benefit or the reverse operating, and there can be no co-ordination if all the appeals are to be heard in Perth. I cannot imagine how a magistrate in Perth could consider the individual requirements of the various centres throughout the country. I come into contact with people who have invested money in various ventures because of the advent of motor transport. Without it they would not have been able to carry on and they would not have entered into those avenues of investment to build up industries with the system previously in vogue, but the new form of transport has made that branch of business possible. We extended the right of appeal in case they were being injured by the board, and I never for one moment thought—and I do not believe any other member thought—that there would be only one magistrate in the whole of the State to deal with appeals. How could the magistrate in Perth decide the merits or demerits of a case arising at Kalgoorlie? From time to time judges journey to Kalgoorlie to try cases in order to obviate the expense that would be incurred in presenting all the evidence in Perth. I maintain that the same consideration should apply in this instance. A magistrate should be appointed to hear appeals in centres like Kalgoorlie, Wiluna, Geraldton, and other distant places. My impression was that, though we were not allowing compensation to persons to whom licenses were refused, we were giving them an opportunity to present their cases in their own centres where it would be easy for them to marshall their evidence and show how they were being affected, or possibly harassed by the attitude of the board. It would be difficult for an injured party to incur the expense of presenting all the evidence he required in Perth. I am satisfied that people in the country who have been refused licenses are being increasingly harassed by the regulation. The board should make it much more convenient for the people who are appealing. Many of the appellants in the country could furnish oceans of evidence, to support their claims, but it would be impossible to bring that evidence to Perth. It is unfair and unjust to ask them to do so. This is just another of those actions which are bringing about centralisation. I intend to support the motion.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [5.3]: While I agree with a good deal of what the Chief Secretary said about the desirability of having these cases heard by one magistrate, there is also a good deal that can be said in favour of the appeals being heard before magistrates in the districts in which the appellants reside. One of the reasons advanced by Mr. Hamersley in support of the motion is on the score of expense that has to be incurred by the person lodging the appeal. I too, consider that the person concerned should not be put to unnecessary expense in defending what he considers are his rights. At the same time I am not inclined to support anything that is likely to hamper the Transport Board in its operations because I consider it was a wise move to create that board to deal with the transport problem. I cannot understand the argument advanced by Mr. Cornell, that if appeals were to be heard, they should be heard by a magistrate in Perth. I contend that a magistrate in Kalgoorlie, or in any other large town, would be equally competent to hear these appeals. When we were considering the measure, it was understood that the appeals were to be heard by a stipendiary magistrate, but it was not set out that that magistrate had to be in Perth. If all the appeals could be heard before one magistrate, it would be better, but I think a hardship would be inflicted upon many of those concerned in outlying centres. Therefore, if something in the way of expenses could be allowed those people who have to cover a considerable distance to come to the city, that might probably meet the position. But certainly it is a hardship for those living any distance from the metropolitan area to have to undergo the expense of having to submit their appeals in Perth. In many cases the expense of coming to the city would be considerable, and therefore the appellants should be entitled to some consideration. I do not know whether anything in this direction can be done, but it is worthy of consideration. I am not prepared to say whether I shall or shall not vote for the motion, but I repeat that a hardship is inflicted on those who have to journey long distances to submit their appeals before a magistrate in Perth. I am sure it was not the intention of the House that that should be so; the belief was that the cases should

be heard before a stipendiary magistrate in the district wherein the person making the appeal resided.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.8]: In asking for the disallowance of Regulation 48, Mr. Thomson advanced arguments which appealed to me very much. It is certainly correct to say that a hardship is imposed upon people when we compel them to come long distances from the country to present their appeals before a magistrate in Perth. Surely there are magistrates in many of the country towns capable of hearing appeals of this description, and, moreover, those magistrates would be possessed of a knowledge of local conditions. I admit that many of the transport people come into Perth weekly, and perhaps more frequently, and for those it would not be any difficulty to attend the court in Perth. There are, however, many who carry on transport of a local nature and who might never come to the city, and to ask them to submit their appeals in Perth is unreasonable. The Act should be administered more generously towards those people. It was never intended that a penalty of this kind should be imposed upon those engaged in transport work in the country, and therefore I consider Mr. Thomson is doing them a good turn by asking the House to disallow the regulation. At the same time I admit the advantage of all the evidence being taken by one person. Still, if evidence were taken by magistrates in places such as Northam, Kalgoorlie, Geraldton or Wiluna, where motor transport is really vital, recommendations could be made and sent to Perth. I ask members to support the motion so that some relief may be granted to the transport carriers who are already suffering sufficiently under the Transport Act, which it was found necessary to pass into law largely because of carelessness in allowing those engaged in motor transport to dig in as they have done. I hope relief will be given in some way or other.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [5.11]: From the remarks of hon. members, it would appear that the meaning of the section under which this particular regulation has been framed was not thoroughly understood by some members in this Chamber. That being so, it seems to me that the pro-

per thing to do now is to bring down an amending Bill. Of course that will take some time. I appreciate the seriousness, as set out by the Chief Secretary, of allowing the motion to go through. At the same time, representing a far distant province, I realise it might deal very harshly with some of the people outback. It might be possible for the board to add to that regulation permitting the hearing of appeals before the nearest magistrate. In such cases, the evidence could be sent to the central magistrate in Perth. That would do away with the need for bringing down a great number of witnesses to give evidence before the central magistrate. I believe that in many appeals against decisions given by country magistrates, it is only the sworn evidence and the notes taken by the magistrate that come to the city. If a somewhat similar method could be adopted in the case of these appeals, the difficulty might be overcome, until the Act was amended.

Hon. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.13]: On the principle that this House should safeguard the interests of the people in distant parts of the State whenever possible, I feel disposed to support the motion. I have not heard anything yet in the course of the debate to make me believe that there is any great hardship or difficulty in the way of the Transport Board delegating duties to a magistrate in a country town. I want to know what particular qualifications a city magistrate possesses to hear these appeals that are not held by a country magistrate. The idea of insisting upon people travelling long distances to the metropolis to submit their cases does not appeal to me. We should, in every possible way, meet the people who live a long way from the capital. Mr. Cornell told us that there were precedents in other directions for bringing people to the city. That, however, does not alter the principle, and we should not stand for it. We should see that all these matters are decentralised and the people put to the minimum of expense.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.14]: This matter has raised a question of great interest, and the reply given by the Chief Secretary shows that the Board has been guided by wisdom in seeking to nominate one particular magistrate for the hearing of appeals in order that uniformity

of decisions might be maintained. One can realise that if a stipendiary magistrate in one district hears an appeal, his decision might be diametrically opposed to that given by a stipendiary magistrate in another place. Uniformity of decision is essential, but I think that uniformity of decision could still be maintained if the stipendiary magistrate to be appointed is authorised to go around the various districts, just like an ordinary circuit court, and hear the appeals in those districts. The regulation is framed under Section 24 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, which provides that certain persons in the carrying trade shall be entitled to appeal to a stipendiary magistrate, but nothing is said as to where the appeal shall be heard. I quite agree that when the Bill was before us, we were all generally under the impression that what was intended by the Bill was that the appeal should be heard by a stipendiary magistrate at the court nearest to the place where the appellant resided or carried on his business, just as in local court matters. That was clearly understood. Nevertheless, the reference in the section is to "a stipendiary magistrate" without any indication as to where the appeal shall be held. Before referring to the Stipendiary Magistrates Act, I was of opinion that the stipendiary magistrates were generally limited in their powers and jurisdiction. However, in Section 5 of the Stipendiary Magistrates Act, although it does limit the magistrates, it is provided nevertheless that the jurisdiction of such magistrate shall not be deemed to be limited to the court or courts, or district or districts, which has or have been assigned to him. Although the effect is to limit each stipendiary magistrate to a particular district, yet there has been a saving power carried in, whereby those magistrates are not necessarily limited to any particular district. Therefore, in view of the inconvenience which is bound to arise in bringing people from far-distant centres, it is only fair that those people should be considered. A step could be taken in the way of appointing one stipendiary magistrate with full powers to visit the various districts and hear the appeals locally, so giving the minimum of inconvenience to the appellants. That seems only fair and reasonable, and if there be nothing against it in Section 5 of the Stip-

endiary Magistrates Act, the difficulty could be got over. If assurance were given to the mover of the motion that it was the intention of the Government to see that steps were taken in the direction I have suggested, I am sure the hon. member would accept that and withdraw his motion for the disallowance of the regulation. What Mr. Cornell said is quite true, namely, that if we actually disallow this regulation, the machinery for the appeals will be gone, and those appeals will all be held up, to the serious inconvenience of the appellants; but if we disallow the regulation, it will be an intimation to the Government that the regulation should be amended and something done to avoid the hardships which obviously will accrue to people resident in far-distant centres if they are brought to the city for the hearing of their appeals.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And the convenience of the general public will be affected also.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is so. I ask the Chief Secretary to see whether it will be possible to appoint a special stipendiary magistrate to go round all the districts and so avoid this great inconvenience. Section 5 of the Stipendiary Magistrates Act provides a power which enables something of the sort to be done. Thus the difficulty would be overcome, and there need not be any disallowance of the regulation. However, there should be some amendment made in the regulation, because, whilst the Act states that the appeal shall be heard by a stipendiary magistrate, it does not say it shall be heard in Perth or Kalgoorlie or any other nominated place, but the regulation states the hearing of the appeals is to be limited strictly to Perth.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Is not that a limitation of the intention of the Act?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, it certainly is. When the Bill was before us, it was in the minds of members that each appeal would be heard by the magistrate nearest to the district in which the appellant carried on business. The regulation limits all the appeals to one magistrate in Perth. If the stipendiary magistrate of Perth were appointed to go around the districts and hear appeals, that would overcome the difficulty. The appeals would be to him in Perth, but he would visit the various districts and there hear the appeals.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would not that mean the appointment of another magistrate?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suppose it could be arranged to fit in hearings of necessary cases in Perth. Moreover, an exchange could be made from time to time of magistrates from one court to another, and so the difficulty could be surmounted without much trouble. I hope it will be possible to achieve something in this direction. It seems necessary to ascertain what effect the position will have upon distant centres.

Hon. A. Thomson: The motion refers only to one regulation.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But the hon. member would destroy the whole machinery.

Hon. A. Thomson: Not necessarily.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If this regulation were disallowed, another portion of the regulations dealing with appeals would be rendered more or less inoperative.

Hon. J. Cornell: If an appeal was heard and no decision given, would it not go by the board?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Those that have been heard and disposed of would be finalised, but when decisions are pending there might be some inconvenience.

Hon. J. Cornell: They would go by the board.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I think no decision has yet been given. Are these appeals not all pending?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think so. I hope the matter will be looked into with a view to the difficulty being overcome. For the purpose of recording my protest against persons in far distant places being inconvenienced, I am prepared to vote in favour of the motion. We should show the Government the necessity for remedying the position. I hope the Chief Secretary will be able within the next day or two to tell us that something can be done in the direction indicated.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.34]: I should like to make an explanation.

THE PRESIDENT: A personal explanation?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. On the morning following the moving of the motion, I got into touch with the Chairman of the Transport Board. He knew nothing about the matter. He was not responsible for the regulation and neither was the board. The Crown Law Department prepared the regulations with the object of getting uniformity, and so that the magistrate might

gain experience and in the end be an expert in the business.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is a most important thing.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Crown Law Department could not give me any indication as to whether finance would be provided, or whether a magistrate would go on circuit. There was no time available for me to continue the investigations, and discover whether the Government would be prepared to find any necessary money. I have to get into touch with Cabinet.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The debate could be adjourned.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That would not affect the validity of the motion. It is advisable that the matter be discussed further.

Hon. A. Thomson: I have no objection to a postponement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think a postponement is advisable. The Government are in no way responsible, except that the regulations were allowed to go through Executive Council. It seems to me I should be given an opportunity to discuss the question with Cabinet.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, debate adjourned.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Debate resumed from the 9th August.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.35]: Before dealing with the motion, I should like to join with other members in expressing my pleasure at seeing you, Sir, back again in such good health. I also extend my congratulations to the Honorary Minister on his recovery from a serious accident that might easily have been fraught with disastrous consequences. I am sure we were all very glad to see him back in his place. A perusal of the Speech left me with the impression that it was an unusually ordinary document. We have been passing through a very serious crisis. There seems to be a general impression that things are improving throughout the State, but there was a very poor vein of optimism running through the Speech. Even that slight optimism was offset by the remarks directed to the members of another place to the effect that the financial situation was still extremely

grave, and required constant attention. The Speech went on to say that rigid economy was necessary, and that no funds were available for other than absolutely essential services.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is that not right?

Hon. W. J. MANN: That may be correct. I shall examine the position as I go along. It does not make very bright reading nor is it very cheering. If there was a bright spot in the Speech it was in reference to unemployment. We are told that as a result of the policy of the Government the number of people on sustenance has been reduced from 6,265 to 1,196, and that the amount spent on this form of relief has been reduced from £7,120 per week to £1,787. That in a measure is perhaps due to the action of the Government, but there are other factors to be taken into consideration and for which private enterprise is largely responsible. It is gratifying to know that employment avenues are being steadily reopened. Many industries which have been languishing are beginning to brighten up and to absorb men. Many persons will doubtless before long return to work in their old-time avocations. The saving to the Government has been considerable, and in that respect they are to be congratulated. A saving of this description must represent a formidable sum, but one regrets that the Government still promise to show a fair-sized deficit. In the absence of the Budget, we can conclude from the remarks I have quoted from the Speech that this is so. The State is still going to leeward despite additional revenue contributed by the people as a result of increased taxation. After a partial respite from borrowing over the last two or three years, there now seems to be a strong tendency in some quarters to revert to the old policy. Last year showed an increase in borrowing over the previous year, and this year we know there is to be another substantial increase in borrowing. I was hopeful that the lessons of the great crisis through which we are passing, but from which we are slowly emerging, would show the fallacy of trying to live on borrowed money, as we have done so extensively in the past. There is a tendency through the Loan Council, or by other means, to go back to the money market, and pile up more public debt. If this House is to function wisely, now is the time for it to take a firm stand with regard to the

extension of the principle of borrowing. A year or two ago we got down to bedrock, and made some very praiseworthy efforts to bring about something like a balance in our financial position. Such a method should as far as necessary be continued, in order that we may escape what future generations are likely to curse us for.

Hon. J. Cornell: How could this House stop the borrowing?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Very simply.

Hon. G. W. Miles: By not voting for a railway south of Southern Cross.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Or the Yuna-Dartmoor railway.

Hon. J. Cornell: Or we should close the Wyndham Meatworks.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I did not anticipate that those side issues would be raised. The comment of some members when the financial emergency tax was debated last year was to the effect that the scale advanced by the Government was too high. Already some of these members have said, "I told you so." Only this afternoon one member said, "What did I tell you? Double the amount of money is going to be received from the emergency tax compared with what we were told last year would be received." That hon. member is nearly right. If my memory serves me correctly we were told that the taxation would bring in between £360,000 and £370,000 last year, but according to the figures supplied by the Chief Secretary for the seven months ended 30th June, the Government are likely to receive more like £600,000 over the full year. Whoever was responsible for advising the Government on that occasion has something to think about now. However, the Government are fortunate in having received that amount of money.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about the poor fellow who is taxed?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, there is another phase—the man who is paying the tax. When bringing down the emergency taxation measure the Government endeavoured to pacify, and did pacify, many of their supporters, married men receiving under £3 10s. a week, mostly £3 9s. 3d., by telling them that they would be exempt. It was generally predicted in this Chamber that before long there would be a rise in the basic wage, and that then these gentlemen who were so anxious that their Government should shield them as far as possible from every form of

taxation would be slipping through the meshes and getting into the net. Well, they are in the net now. The last declaration of the basic wage has roped them all in.

Hon. J. Cornell: They are in only till the end of next month.

Hon. W. J. MANN: They are paying. Mr. Cornell says they will pay only till the end of next month. Does the hon. member know what will take place after the end of next month?

Hon. J. Cornell: The measure expires then.

Hon. W. J. MANN: But that is not to say that the capacity of those men to pay taxation is going to expire. I think those men will have something to say about Government measures and Government taxation. If their Government had listened to some other members of this Chamber, they would even now, with the increase of the basic wage, be better off. Those members advocated a minimum of 2d. against the Government's 4d. Under the former the men would have been paying 2d. in the pound instead of 4d. I do not wish any hon. member to think that I object to people paying taxation if it is necessary and if they are able to pay it. I contend that we should pay taxation in accordance with our station in life. I do not hold very much with exemptions. In my opinion every wage earner should pay some taxation, be the amount ever so small. If hon. members had a heart to heart talk with some of those men, as I have had, it would be found that there is no real objection to paying taxation in some small degree. I do not hold that we should all pay alike. I believe in graduated taxation in many cases, and a full graduation would have been perfectly just in connection with this emergency taxation. I have said that the Government were fortunate in having a considerable amount of revenue over and above that available during the last year of the preceding Government. Thus we may fairly suggest to Ministers that when they bring down new emergency legislation at the end of next month, as mentioned by Mr. Cornell, they should make provision for a considerable remission of that taxation. On their own figures, on their own showing, they will receive nearly double what we were told was anticipated last year; and during the past year the Government have not been badly treated. They have had one or two unexpected lifts, and therefore I con-

sider it fair for this House to suggest that there should be some remission of taxation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are an optimist!

Hon. G. W. Miles: How about reducing the deficit?

Hon. W. J. MANN: There are other ways of doing that, besides emergency taxation. It is impossible to tax people into prosperity, as Mr. Holmes has often told us. The Government cannot harass people by heavy taxation and still expect ordinary avenues of trade to expand and flourish. In this brief reference to finance I wish to express my dissatisfaction and disappointment with the findings of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. I shall not dwell on the subject at length, but without pretending to be one of the I-told-you-so persons I say candidly that I was not optimistic of results from the Commission. My experience of Federal Governments and their Commissions, and I think Western Australia's experience, has not been too happy. There was not much hope for us when the chairman of the Commission was obviously biased against Western Australia. In my opinion the Commission's findings were based on wrong premises. The Commissioners failed to appreciate the magnitude of the burden of developing this huge territory, hampered as we are by Federal policy in many directions. It is not encouraging to the people of Western Australia to encounter an almost total lack of sympathy with their efforts. After all, it can fairly be claimed that the efforts of the people of this State during the last 25 or 30 years, in the way of development and determination to build up this part of the Commonwealth, have been magnificent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Also in the way of creating deficits.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Deficits have been built up in the process, I admit; but there has been a great deal done in other respects. Deficits were a phase, unfortunately, of the development. Much borrowed money has been unwisely spent. Of all legislation recently passed, that relating to the question which was before the House earlier this afternoon is probably paramount at present. I shall not criticise the Transport Board for their work up to date, although I may say that some of their decisions have been rather difficult to comprehend, at any rate for me. However, I hold that the board should be given a fair opportunity; and I think it would be just as well to let them have twelve

months and then judge them by results. In the meantime we may withhold our criticism. There is, however, just one phase of the transport problem which in my opinion should be mentioned here, one which has been causing considerable concern in the province that I represent, and I suppose in most other provinces. It does not affect the board at all, but relates to roads. Undoubtedly those huge transport vehicles have done considerable damage to roads throughout the country. It is my definite opinion that the State cannot continue to build expensive roads to be ruined in a few brief months by this extremely heavy transport traffic. It is clear to me that although this form of freight carrying has been of material advantage to the individual, the system is disastrous to the finances of the State. I can take hon. members to pieces of road which 12 months ago were almost perfect and to-day are scarcely passable. That has been brought about wholly and solely by the traffic in question. One feels that in order to give credit where credit is due he should utter a word of appreciation to the railway authorities for their recent endeavours to bridge the difference between the cost of road transport and that of railway carriage. Reduction of railway freights is long overdue, but is none the less appreciated. Only recently I discovered in my own business a highly satisfactory case in which the Railway Department have been able to transport heavy goods at a more favourable rate than the road transport people charge. The latter quoted my office, unsolicited I am informed, a rate of 3s. per cwt. from Fremantle to the town in which I live. That is equivalent to £3 per ton. The railway freight worked out at about 43s. per ton, representing a 3s. material advantage. The next move of the Railway Department, and a very imperative move, should be a speeding-up of their services. It does not avail, nor does it improve the position, to say that the railways are doing their best. Sometimes when one talks to the railway authorities on this subject, they reply, "Well, we are doing our best." That does not get us anywhere. Existing railway methods have their limits, but as regards improvement of services we have been stagnating for years. It now takes an hour longer to travel from my home to Perth in the train than it did 30 years ago. Thirty years ago the time of transit was eight hours, and now it is nine. I cannot fathom the

reason for that, and nobody has been able to explain it to me.

Hon. A. Thomson: How long does it take you by road?

Hon. W. J. MANN: If in a hurry, I can do it in four hours, and without a great deal of effort.

Hon. A. Thomson: But you do not stop to pick up passengers at stations?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Ordinarily I do it in 4½ hours. A couple of weeks ago I left my home three hours after the departure of the train and was in St. George's Terrace two hours before the train reached Perth. That is not bad over 150 miles. To ask the people to patronise the railways when they have to put up with that sort of thing is more than we can honestly do. Undoubtedly there are ways and means by which the railway service can be accelerated. I hope I will be pardoned for speaking so much about the Bunbury line, but that is the one of which I know most. That the service can be accelerated is proved by the fact that on Saturdays what is known as a fast train is run. It stops at all stations for about one-third of the distance, and yet the Railway Department can save two hours on the trip. In other words, they do the trip in seven hours instead of nine hours. Then some departmental officers turn round and tell us that they are doing the best they can! In the circumstances, I fail to believe them. The very fact that the traffic is falling off is sufficient to indicate that the service is unsatisfactory. Trains remain standing in stations for five or 10 minutes longer than is necessary. At one time there was sufficient traffic to keep porters and others busy handling goods in and out of trains, but that time has long since departed. The railway service is far too slow, and trains are running comparatively empty. I do not desire to deal further with that phase of the Governor's Speech and will turn to the references to the dairying industry. The Speech contained a paragraph setting out that the prospects of dairying for the 1934 season were bright, and that the fixation of an Australian price of 140s. per cwt. for butter would enable at least 1s. per lb. to be paid locally for butter fat. I hope that anticipation will be realised and that the payment of 1s. per lb. will eventuate. At the same time, I desire to point out that we are far from having any guarantee that the man producing the butter fat will receive 1s. per lb. for his product. The

industry is without legislation adequately to safeguard the producers, such as exists in the interests of the dried fruit industry and of other sections of production. Something has been done along those lines in the Eastern States but there is some doubt regarding the action that has been taken and we are still, as it were, in the air. Apart from that phase, it looks as though Western Australia is in grave danger of being sacrificed by the Eastern States in this respect. We had certain promises a little while ago to the effect that if we subscribed to certain conditions, the people in the Eastern States would do their utmost to see that the Western Australian producers retained their own market. Now we find that producers in the Eastern States, aided and abetted by some unpatriotic and utterly selfish importers in this State, are insisting upon exporting Eastern States butter to Western Australia. The excuse advanced is that the public here insist upon having the imported article.

Hon. R. G. Moore: What is the reason for that?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I would like to know actually what percentage of the people demand the Eastern States product.

Hon. L. Craig: About 1 per cent.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I do not believe they would represent 1 per cent of the population. I do not believe that percentage of the people could tell the difference between choice Western Australian butter and butter imported from the Eastern States. I have seen that tried out on a number of occasions and even when an individual has managed correctly to differentiate between the two products, he has been prepared to say that there was a good deal of luck about his choice. Many supporters of the imported article will contend that people insist upon having that product. Candidly, I do not believe it. There is a good deal of method in their attitude. I am more inclined to the view indicated recently by a retailer who said that there was a better margin of profit with the imported butter. That is probably the crux of the position.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is a reason they do not disclose.

Hon. W. J. MANN: To show what has been happening, I shall quote some remarks by the Director of Agriculture, Mr. Sutton, in his capacity as chairman of the Western

Australian Dairy Products Equalisation Board. His statement appeared in the "West Australian" of Monday last, the report reading as follows:—

When questioned on Saturday concerning the butter position, the chairman of the Western Australian Dairy Products Equalisation Board (Mr. G. L. Sutton) said that despite the arrangement entered into with the Eastern States earlier in the year, that Western Australian producers of butter should be assured of their own market to the extent to which they were able to supply it, butter was still being imported into this State.

On July 16 he had telegraphed and written to the Commonwealth Dairy Products Equalisation Committee, Ltd., intimating that Western Australian production was now equal to the demand and asking that in view of the understanding with the Commonwealth and Eastern States Governments, no further licenses be granted for the export of butter into this State. To those communications he had now received the following reply:—

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram and letter of July 16. This was placed before the last meeting of the board of directors, and I was instructed to reply stating that members considered it unfair for your State to store this quantity of butter against the Eastern States. A delegation from this committee will be visiting Western Australia shortly and on the return of members the matter will receive further consideration.

Whether or not the Commonwealth committee considered it fair was beside the point, Mr. Sutton continued. The arrangement entered into between the States and the Commonwealth was that Western Australia was entitled to retain its own butter market. The whole matter had been fully discussed before that arrangement was reached, and it was pointed out that Western Australia had been a very good market for Eastern States butter for many years, and that she still purchased some of their surplus when local supplies were inadequate. It had been agreed that only when the demands could not be met by local supplies should butter be allowed to be imported, and Western Australia expected that agreement to be carried out. He had replied to the Commonwealth Committee accordingly.

The report furnishes fairly clear evidence that whatever the Commonwealth authorities promise to-day, they are likely to repudiate to-morrow.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I think Mr. Sutton was misled.

Hon. L. Craig: The Prime Minister himself sent a wire over about the matter.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I endeavoured to see Mr. Sutton this morning to verify portions of the statement, but I found he was out of town. I hope the Minister for Agriculture

who has taken a keen interest in the dairying industry in the past, will not relax his efforts to secure something like a fair and reasonable deal for the producers in this State. During the course of his remarks, Mr. Thomson entered a plea for increased attention to what is termed in the Eastern States and other countries, the tourist industry. Some members are inclined to smile when I hammer at this matter each year. I have referred to it a number of times and I do not make any apology for returning to it on this occasion. From observation in other parts of the world, and from what I have read, I know that the tourist business is wonderfully lucrative to any country that can succeed in interesting those people who are looking for something fresh and new. In this State, we have a Tourist Bureau that is little more than a name.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Tourist Bureau can get no money.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Exactly, that is the trouble. I do not want anyone to misunderstand my remarks. I have no intention of casting a reflection on the staff of the State Tourist Bureau. The fact remains that that bureau is practically unknown outside Perth. My experience, and that of most people with whom I have discussed the matter, is that the officers of the Tourist Bureau are keen, alert, always courteous and always anxious to do business, but they are practically starved for want of means to enable them to make their presence felt. If we peruse any magazine or publication of any moment in the world of travel, rarely will reference be seen to Western Australia. That is a calamity. If we do not make our presence known and our scenic attractions familiar to the outside public, we cannot expect people of other countries to take notice of the State. I have looked through the Estimates for some years back and found that the amount of money set aside for advertising the Tourist Bureau has been ridiculously small. It has been gradually diminishing for some time past and last year a maximum of £150 was available for advertising purposes. I believe that out of that amount the Tourist Bureau had to find the money for postages and other minor expenses. It is utterly impossible to do anything with £150 spread over 12 months, so that no blame is attachable to the officers of the Tourist Bureau for the lack of re-

suits. Nor do I blame the present Government, but rather all Governments. I do not single out the present Government because I believe their predecessors in office were as negligent as anyone could be in their recognition of the advantages of the Tourist Bureau. The fact remains that the tourist industry is not appreciated in this State. Millions of people who are potential tourists, investors and investor-settlers are passing by our doors because our advantages are not made known. We are not considered in the ordinary order of things because no one has told the truth about this wonderfully productive, wealth-creating country of ours. We are victims of an inferiority complex concerning our own possessions.

Hon. J. Cornell: We lack imagination.

Hon. W. J. MANN: We are more and more prone to belittle ourselves and the State we live in. Of that there can be no doubt. The moment we talk of a tourist traffic, someone will say, "What have we got?" They will then proceed to tell what other countries possess. So far as I can see, the Almighty balances things up very well. We may not have the same grand scenery that one sees in New Zealand, Switzerland, or in the Rocky Mountains in America, but we have in Western Australia attractions that those countries would give untold wealth to possess.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I was dealing with the manner in which many people from other parts of the world seek fresh tourist fields, and was endeavouring to show that in Australia, and particularly Western Australia, we have scenic and natural beauties that are the envy of other countries. I pointed out the danger of developing an inferiority complex in that we are inclined to belittle our own country. On looking up figures I was surprised to find that even with the small volume of tourist traffic Australia enjoys, the amount of money it brings to our shores is considerable. The figures quoted in a publication issued by the Australian National Travel Association are based on official estimates taken from the Commonwealth Year Book. In the five years ended December last, no less than £5,242,000 was expended in Australia by visitors, and that despite the fact that the depression had more than halved the average number of visitors

coming to Australia. Those figures show an average of over a million pounds a year, and that amount, of course, is infinitesimal as compared with the figures of Canada, the United States and Continental countries. It goes to show that with a little energy and forethought, judicious advertising and persistence, this phase of wealth production can be considerably increased. I contend that it is the duty of the Government to see that we do not fall behind other States in the matter of making our advantages known. Other figures are quoted in the publication that are illuminating, and although they do not actually refer to tourist traffic, they appertain to transport, and may be worth recapitulating. A sum of £2,710,000 was brought to Australia during the last five years by new citizens; £9,058,000 was expended by overseas shipping companies on stores and fuel; £28,452,000 was expended by overseas shipping companies on port charges, stevedoring, duties, etc. Then it goes on to say that no record is available of new capital attracted to Australia for investment in the establishment of new industries, but must amount to millions, and advertising plays an important part in this aspect of national progress. I think there is very good ground for urging the State to expend a reasonable amount of money in making its claims known. Let me bring before members some views of other people who are entitled to be heard with respect. I have a pamphlet issued by the Chief Railway Commissioner of New South Wales, entitled "A Great New Industry." The writer, Mr. Cleary, says—

Travel promotion offers the prospect of a great new industry for Australia which will benefit all sections of the community—an industry that in time to come should rank as one of outstanding financial importance to the Commonwealth.

Referring to the Australian National Travel Association, under whose auspices the pamphlet was written, Mr. Cleary says—

The association has been formed by keen business men who have studied the possibilities of the tourist business. They have applied to it the same astute reasoning that has made them successful in their own lines of business. Many of them are world travellers who have seen the prodigious expenditure of tourists in Europe, Canada and the United States. They have seen these and other countries reaping rich harvests, while Australia has been content to wait, Micawber-like, in the hope that some day the tourist trade might turn this way of its own volition.

Sitting down and hoping is not the kind of way to attract business of any kind, and the tourist business needs pushing and advertising, perhaps more than any other. . . . Practically all the foreign nations spend money freely in tourist propaganda, and our sister dominions, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa, have set us an example that might well be followed.

The balance of general trade with America is so grave that we must welcome a movement which should bring back in tourist dollars some of the gold we are sending there with monotonous regularity. American expenditure on world travel has been estimated at various amounts, but £200,000,000 a year might be regarded as a conservative figure. Such figures stagger the imagination of the ordinary man.

That is clear evidence that this trade or industry is worth seeking. When I mention that the State Tourist Bureau receive £150 with which to prosecute an advertising campaign every 12 months, members will realise how ludicrous the whole position is. The pamphlet continues—

That Australia can get a share of this vast turnover is conceded by all who have studied the question. It is a known fact that literally millions of Americans have trodden the beaten tracks of the Old World and now pine for new lands to conquer in the tourist sense. We have something new to offer them—scenery equal to the world's best, strange flora and fauna, golden sunshine and other attractions which if not superior to those in other countries are at least different.

Speaking broadly, the tourist is a moneyed man. Canada has proved by analysis that a definite percentage of its tourists invest money in Canadian industries, or settle in the Dominion. There is no reason to doubt that Australia will have the same experience and that greater development of its resources will follow.

Those remarks come from a man who has evidently made a wide study of the question and are entitled to serious consideration. Now let us take the policy or lack of policy observed by our Railway Department. In the spring we have hushland displays unequalled elsewhere in the Commonwealth. We have wild flowers beyond description, flowering shrubs, widespread areas with multi-coloured flora that have to be seen to be believed. These wonderful features are permitted to come and go each year without the least effort being made to encourage people to go and see them. I wonder whether it has ever occurred to the railway authorities that cheap excursions to get people to travel to the outer parts of the State where flowers are the feature would be a payable proposition. I think it would be a good policy. At present, when on almost every railway line

trains are running practically empty, any increase of traffic by way of excursions would be to the good of the railways. It would be good policy if the State widely advertised in other countries our wild-flower season and induced people to come here, particularly in the springtime. This sort of thing is done in other countries. Seasonal attractions are advertised, and our great seasonal attraction for many thousands of people would be the springtime. I wonder how many people know that Australia has 300 varieties of eucalypts, or that there are 500 varieties of acacias, of which the wattle is the most notable, and 70 species of wonderful everlasting flowers. It is unnecessary to remind members that in the spring the best part of Western Australia is carpeted with flowers of vivid red, blue, purple and green. How many people know the wonderful variety of orchids, or have more than a hazy association with many of our wild flowers. They do perhaps know of the boronia, the wax plant, the bottle brush and the kangaroo paws, but there are thousands of others that are the envy of the botanical world, and we are allowing this business to go by the board. I view this question seriously because the time will come when Western Australia will have a big tourist traffic, from which we shall derive a great benefit, and it is only by hammering into the powers that be from year to year that we are likely to develop some sort of a tourist conscience, and force the authorities to move. I cannot let the opportunity pass without expressing my regret that the present Government, like their predecessors, have not risen to the occasion regarding some of our tourist resorts. I have not mentioned the caves, and I do not intend to weary members with any recapitulation of their beauties, but I would point out that it is a crying shame that Cave House still remains in a neglected state. I am not casting any reflection on the management—I am speaking merely of the building itself. I know that if it were in private hands the license would have been cancelled long ago. It is sinful that it should have been allowed to drift into its present condition. I know that the Government placed on the Estimates last year a sum of money that might have been used towards carrying out improvements, but at the last minute the amount disappeared. I hope the Chief Secretary will use

his influence to have it again placed on the Estimates. I know that the Honorary Minister is anxious that some long overdue improvements should be carried out so that we may invite people to reside there with some degree of comfort. The present condition of the building is certainly not in keeping with the surrounding natural beauty. One has only to go to New Zealand to see how the Government in that dominion cater for the tourist. They have risen to the occasion and provided accommodation in such a manner that a person who goes there for a day or two almost invariably stays a week or longer. I wish to say a few words only about the report of the Agricultural Bank Commission. Until we get that document, it is hardly fair that we should criticise it. I can, however, say I am sorry that the Commission, as far as we have been able to gather from the report published in the Press, have dealt with unnecessary severity, with some of those who are alleged to be responsible for the position in which the Bank now stands. The Commissioners no doubt realised that they had a duty to perform, but they might have carried it out in a nicer manner. Another matter to which I wish briefly to refer is the question of street betting. This also is a pet subject of mine. Street betting is even more rampant to-day than it ever has been, and that again is a powerful indictment against our methods of keeping law and order.

Hon. J. Cornell: Governments have been trying to keep it down as long as I can remember.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Governments have never made any real attempt to suppress or control it, and it has now got to the stage where school boys almost can go into alleyways and have their sixpences and shillings on a horse.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Street betting is a good source of revenue.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Not at all.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Yes, by way of the fines that are imposed.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The fines have fallen off lately. Perhaps the police have got tired of raiding the betting shops. There was a time when the police apparently thought it their duty to assist in increasing the revenue of the State by raiding betting shops on Saturday afternoon, but latterly the raids have slumped.

Hon. J. Cornell: The police take the shops in turns.

Hon. W. J. MANN: No, one man complained because he was caught again out of his turn. I shall help the Government in any attempt that is made to control shop betting. We cannot stamp it out, so the next best thing is to control it. Considerable revenue is lost by our failure in this direction. Registered bookmakers have to pay a tax, and I am told that the money that passes through their hands is nothing in comparison with that received by the shop bookmakers who do not pay taxation. For that reason alone, we should control shop betting. I support the motion.

On motion by R. G. Moore, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th August, 1934.

Address-in-Reply, fifth day	Page 85
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	---------

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the 9th August.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [4.35]: In common with other members who have already spoken on the Address-in-reply to the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, I also intend to speak only at short length. The outstanding feature of the debate so far as it has progressed has been a reluctance in members to take any part. This is not at all to be wondered at, because there is nothing in the Speech of the Lieut.-Governor to invoke enthusiasm, and very little to warrant any comment at all. As nearly as possible that Speech fills the definition of a line of geometry inasmuch as it has length and nothing