

certain members, who would not be wisely advised to record their votes on a question such as this.

The Chairman: Anyone receiving a direct pecuniary interest will not be entitled to vote.

Hon. M. F. Troy: What is the penalty if such a member does vote?

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	20
Noes	17

Majority for .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. I. Mann
Mr. Brown	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Church	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy	Mr. Parker
Mr. Doney	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sierman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Troy
Miss Holman	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennelly	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Withers
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Keenar	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Coverley
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Richardson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Raphael

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 11.34 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 23rd November, 1932.

	PAGE.
Questions: Perth Hospital	1903
Licensing Act, fee	1903
Herdsmen Lake holdings, motion	1904
Loan Estimates, 1932-33	1904
Bills: Secession Referendum, Message	1908
Mining Act Amendment, 3a.	1908
Cattle Trespass, Fencing and Impounding Amendment, report	1908
Brands Act Amendment, 2a. Con.	1906, 1904
Bulk Handling, Joint Select Committee's report	1974
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Con. report	1905
Health Act Amendment, 2a.	1906

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

QUESTION—PERTH HOSPITAL.

Mr. J. H. SMITH asked the Minister for Health: 1, What salaries are paid to (a) the S.M.O. of the Perth Hospital; (b) the house and junior resident medical officers; (c) the secretary? 2, Is the salary of any of them affected by the Financial Emergency Act? 3, What increases of salary and allowances have been made to the secretary during the last two years? 4, What were the total expenses on account of cancer appeal paid (a) for organiser or organisers; (b) for publicity work? 5, What is the average cost per day per patient for medical and surgical treatment and for administrative charges? 6, Do not the small salaries offered to junior medical officers tend to prevent the best men being obtained?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, (a) £500, plus board and residence, equalising £150; (b) £133, £164, £189, plus board and lodging; (c) £600, no other emoluments. 2, Yes, all. 3, Nil. 4, (a) £167 15s. 11d., plus £483 15s. 1d. commission; (b) £120 19s. 3d. As per published audited statement of receipts and payments. 5, Year ended 30th June, 1932—average cost per day per patient for medical and surgical treatment, 8s. 9d.; average cost of administrative charge, 4d. (4 per cent.). 6, No.

QUESTION—LICENSING ACT FEES.

Mr. J. H. SMITH asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the Licensing Court sat in country districts early in this month and

issued certificates for renewals, that fees were due 14 days later; otherwise certificates would become void? 2, Does he know that many applications for extension of time for payment have been refused, although the current license is paid to end of the year? 3, In view of the fact that since 1922 all hotelkeepers have been allowed to pay their license late in December, will he consider the advisability of granting an extension of time to enable many who have suffered stress to get the money together?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Yes. It is proposed to extend the time for payment to not later than the 23rd December this year.

QUESTION—HERDSMAN LAKE HOLDINGS, MOTION.

Mr. MILLINGTON (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands: A motion tabled by me, of which the Minister for Lands has the adjournment, occupies on the Notice Paper the submerged position of No. 37. Is there any prospect of that motion turning the corner this session?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The arrangement of the Notice Paper is entirely in the hands of the Premier: I am afraid I cannot answer the question.

Hon. P. Collier: Will you confer with the Premier about it?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, with a view to seeing that an opportunity is given to discuss the motion.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1932-33.

Message.

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read transmitting the Loan Estimates for the year 1932-33 and recommending appropriation.

In Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply to consider the Loan Estimates; Mr. Panton in the Chair.

Vote—Departmental, £70,683:

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER
(Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam)
[4.38]: On the 30th June last the net pub-

lic debt of the State stood at £78,399,047, compared with £75,254,516 at the close of the previous financial year, an increase in the net indebtedness during last year of £3,144,531. This includes the short-term debt incurred to meet the deficit for the year—£1,557,896—as well as for the carrying out of loan works. This is similar to the course that has been followed in the last few years. The short-term or floating debt on the 30th June was £8,076,273, which was an accumulation of several years, almost one half of the amount having been incurred previous to July, 1930, when the London market was closed to us. The floating debt of Australia on the 30th June last was £82,670,000. The creation of such a large amount of floating debt is very undesirable, and it is essential that as soon as conditions return to normal, steps should be taken to fund that amount. To carry out the funding will occupy several years, and in the meantime it would appear that the requirements of the various States for loan works will have to be severely restricted. Part of the floating debt of Australia is due in London, but £45,000,000 of it is due in Australia. In order that it may be realised that this restriction has already been applied, I quote the following figures of State loan expenditure for the past five years, together with the estimate for the current financial year:—

	£
1927-28	4,680,260
1928-29	4,372,269
1929-30	3,693,052
1930-31	1,759,263
1931-32	1,380,225
1932-33 (estimate) ..	1,955,385

The total transactions on our sinking fund from the 1st July, 1927, the date on which the Financial Agreement came into operation, have been—

	£	£
Balance on 30th June, 1927	955,044	
Contributions and earnings	1,786,834	
		2,741,878
Redemptions		1,432,972
		<hr/>
Balance on 30th June, 1932 ..		£1,308,906

Naturally members will desire to know how this money was held. The balance was held as follows:—

	£
National Debt Commissioners ..	131,925
Crown agents	1,093,034
Endowment Policy, "Kangaroo"	83,947
	<u>£1,308,906</u>

The loan for which the sinking fund controlled by the Crown agents is held is for £998,353, and is due in 1934. It will be seen that already we have over-provided for this loan, and the amount is being added to. The Leader of the Opposition will remember that the Crown agents asked for a continuance of the payments to sinking fund. Those funds are covered by investments earning interest. Some of the investments may have to be realised, but I hope not. It is satisfactory to know that our next loan falling due is fully covered by sinking fund. The loan is a very old one, and for many years we have been paying into the sinking fund.

The actual expenditure on loan funds last year was as follows:—

	£
Departmental	75,471
Railways and Tramways	133,814
Harbours and Rivers	71,425
Water Supply and Sewerage ..	480,984
Development of Goldfields and Mineral Resources	27,526
Development of Agriculture ..	588,873
Roads and Bridges and Public buildings, etc.	2,132
	<u>£1,380,225</u>

The more important works carried out last year were—

	£
Railway Construction	104,659
(Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway extension; Lake Grace-Karlgarin railway; Meekatharra-Wiluna railway)	
Harbour Works	70,326
Sewerage and Drainage	82,365
Goldfields Water Supply	77,799
Metropolitan Water Supply ..	54,357
Water Supply in Agricultural and North-West districts	251,174
Development of Agriculture ..	62,777
Agricultural Bank, Soldier Settlement and Group Settlement ..	473,836
	<u>£1,177,293</u>

Regarding the railways mentioned, the rails have been laid but the lines have not been completed, especially the line from Meeka-

tharra to Wiluna. The estimated expenditure for this year under the various headings is—

	£
Departmental	70,683
Railways, etc.	267,000
Harbours	122,500
(Geraldton harbour £51,500 Bunbury harbour £20,000)	
Water supply, etc.	720,902
Development of goldfields ..	26,500
Development of agriculture ..	686,000
Miscellaneous	61,000
	<u>£1,955,385</u>

This amount is greater than that of last year, the respective totals being—last year £1,380,225 and this year £1,955,385. This is due to the special provision that was made for works to relieve unemployment. As usual, at the Loan Council conference, the question of Loan Funds for this year was gone thoroughly into. It was determined to raise for all purposes the sum of £22,000,000, made up of £6,000,000 for ordinary loan works, £7,000,000 for unemployment relief works and £9,000,000 to meet deficits. In addition, a special loan of £3,000,000 for unemployment relief works during the winter months, known as the winter relief loan, was authorised in May under the Commonwealth Unemployment Relief Works Act. Of that sum we have got £290,000, made up of £145,000 given to us by the Commonwealth, and £145,000 which we have to provide ourselves, and which the Committee will be asked to authorise now. Our proportions of these several loans were —

	£
Ordinary loan	1,180,000
Unemployment relief loan ..	500,000
Winter relief loan	145,000
Total	<u>£1,825,000</u>

In addition we expect to receive from loan repayments and local raisings the sum of £130,000, making a total of £1,955,000. When money is repaid on account of previous loan expenditure, it has to be re-voted by Parliament before it can be spent on further loan work. Of the amount of £3,000,000 raised to provide winter relief, the Commonwealth Government are responsible for one-half, which is being paid to the States as a grant. The Commonwealth will have to provide interest and sinking fund. Our share of the winter re-

relief loan, was £145,000, for which we assumed responsibility, bringing our total accommodation up to £2,100,000. Work had been done under the vote before the end of the year, but none of the money was drawn previous to the 30th June. The expenditure of the Commonwealth grant of £145,000 will not find a place on the Estimates.

Hon. P. Collier: That was a grant.

The PREMIER: Yes, for winter relief work. It will not find a place on the Estimates although it will be available for expenditure. The principal works contemplated this year are—

	£
Additions and improvements to opened railways	91,000
Railway construction	127,000
(Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway extension; Lake Grace-Karlgrin; Meekatharra-Wiluna)	
Tramways—Perth electric	20,000
(including electric bus service)	
Harbour works	121,000
Metropolitan sewerage works ..	50,000
Water supplies in agricultural and North-West districts, including works at Harvey and Wellington dam	290,000
Development of mining	26,500
Development of agriculture	686,000
(including working capital for Agricultural Bank, £500,000, and group settlement, £56,000)	
Public buildings, etc.	25,000
Workers' Homes building programme	35,000

The increase in the loan expenditure is due to the special provision of funds for the relief of the unemployed. The problem before the Government is to spread the available funds amongst those who are unemployed, in order that as far as possible each individual may get some work. It will be noticed that the works that are contemplated are such that will require that most of the money shall be spent on labour and as little as possible on material. Where materials are necessary, local products will be chosen, wherever possible. By this means the money will be kept in the State and unemployment in private industry will be stimulated. Wages are paid from this vote by direct means to the men we employ ourselves, and by indirect means to those who are engaged in producing the raw materials required for the work. The latter play a big part in many of these undertakings. Cement and timber, for instance, are extensively used. It is remarkable how great a

quantity of raw materials that are used are now being produced within the State. It is impossible just now to buy rails, if it were necessary to construct railways. If we did so, we should be sending a considerable proportion of the available money out of the State, and so depriving those within it of a chance of getting work. On the 18th instant 8,735 men were engaged on relief works, and 5,201 were in receipt of sustenance, a total of men 13,936. This shows a decrease of 2,455 as compared with the 1st July last, when the total was 16,391, made up of 10,276 on sustenance and 6,115 on relief works. We are now facing our busy season in the harvest fields and elsewhere. For a month or two a good many men will be absorbed in wheat handling and other seasonal work. These men cannot be regarded as being brought back to work of a permanent character. It is very unfortunate that the price of wheat and wool, and practically all agricultural produce, is so very low. Until our principal commodities do realise a better price, we cannot hope that our farmers will be in a position to employ the number of men they once did. Many people have lost their employment because of the falling off in the revenue the State used to derive from those industries, and because trade has become so much restricted owing to that fall in price. Our imports are half what they used to be. We cannot pay for goods from the Eastern States or overseas. We have not the money available from our restricted loan programme, and from the proceeds of our primary products. We must, however, face the situation as it is. It does not seem at all possible that we can get back our trade, which means employment, or get our public utilities back into anything like the position they were in when a much greater tonnage of goods was hauled, until prices do improve. We realise now how dependent we are on primary production. The one bright spot is the increased production of gold. This year it is hoped that 600,000 ounces will be produced, which at present prices should realise 4½ million pounds. That is decidedly a bright spot. Many prospectors are out in auriferous areas and much development is being done on old mines. We can hope for an increased quantity of gold. We are very fortunate in that the revival of the old mines has enabled us to produce this extra quantity of gold so rapidly. If it had had to come from new

discoveries and new developments we should not have got the returns so quickly. Both the Lake View and Star and the Wiluna mines, for instance, were partly developed and are now being fully worked. Then there is also the employment of people as a result of the development of the gold mining industry.

Mr. Marshall: Development is going on at the northern end of Wiluna now, and a lot more work will be found there.

The PREMIER: That is good news. Although that expenditure will provide work, we shall not reap much in the way of an increase in gold output from that source for some time. I believe the northern end of the Kalgoorlie field is also being worked. In the case of other old mines a large expenditure is being incurred in the installation of new machinery.

Hon. P. Collier: The position looks better than it has done for the last 15 years. The industry is saving the State a great deal in these times.

The PREMIER: I think the industry is in better heart than since we came into Parliament. It was on the wane then and the production had dropped a great deal. The position looks better than it has looked for 27 years. That is due to the fact that we are making a fresh start. Although we produced more gold then, the outlook was not so hopeful as it is now. The important factor is the reduction in the cost of production.

Hon. P. Collier: The position has improved in two ways—the price of gold and the reduction in the cost of production.

The PREMIER: The outlook would not be so bright with merely the increased price of gold and the high rate of exchange, if it were not also for the reduced cost of production, which in itself is an extremely hopeful sign.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a permanent improvement.

The PREMIER: It should be a lasting improvement that will tend to keep the industry going. At one time Kalgoorlie seemed to have lived its useful life, but it has now had a new lease of life. Houses at one time were being pulled down and to-day are being put up, and dwellings are bringing high rentals to-day when at one time the owners could not find tenants for them. So the whole position is changed as the result of those two factors—im-

provement in the methods of treatment, and the increased price that gold brings to-day. One does hope that the increased price of gold will continue. It is strange that in these times when no nation apparently wants to be on the gold standard, the price of gold is maintained even against those countries I have referred to. Every time sterling falls, the price of gold increases. Coming now to the works that are mentioned in the Loan Estimates, it will be within the knowledge of members that the Geraldton harbour works are nearing completion. I do not suppose harbour works anywhere can ever be considered really complete. I do not know of any harbour in the world that is actually out of the hands of the builders. The operations that have been carried out at Geraldton are creditable to those concerned and, as a result of their efforts, a good harbour has been provided for the northern part of the State. There is little more to be done there in connection with the breakwater but there is some dredging that has to be undertaken. When that work is finished, the Geraldton harbour will certainly be a very fine one. It is intended to supply the needs of a very rich district, covering a vast area extending from Wiluna to the coast, a distance of over 500 miles. Then there is the rich agricultural territory surrounding Geraldton, apart altogether from the extensive squatting areas in that locality. The harbour at Bunbury has caused anxiety for a long time and every time an election is pending, that work is always mentioned.

Mr. Withers: Not always at election times alone.

The PREMIER: No, we hear of it between times; but it is sure of mention when an election is looming. Of course, Albany is a magnificent harbour.

Mr. Withers: The only trouble is that it is in the wrong place.

Mr. Wansbrough: Not by any means.

The PREMIER: Nature has provided a magnificent harbour at Albany and little cost, comparatively speaking, has been incurred there. Irrespective of what any Government may do, no other port along the coast could possibly have such a splendid harbour, no matter how much money might be spent. As the Albany harbour cannot be made any better than nature has already provided, the people there have nothing to

complain about, but at Geraldton it is a different matter altogether.

Mr. Wansbrough: We have complaints to make.

The PREMIER: In view of the position, we have had to provide harbour facilities at Geraldton, which are not as extensive as those available at Albany, but still eminently satisfactory. At Bunbury the harbour is silting up badly and something has to be done there. I hope that now the work is nearing completion at Geraldton, we shall be able to turn our attention to Bunbury and complete, as far as we possibly can, the work of providing proper facilities there.

Mr. Withers: I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. Wansbrough: A few alterations at Albany would not do any harm either.

The PREMIER: The Bunbury harbour supplies the needs of the timber areas and a large agricultural district. In the circumstances, it is necessary that the harbour there should be available for ships of deep draught, which is not the position to-day. Then again as the harbour is constantly silting up, endless dredging has to be undertaken. As a matter of fact, when the Government provide harbour facilities, it means a continuous outlay in order to maintain those facilities to standard. As against that, there is the revenue that is collected. At Fremantle much work has to be done to repair existing structures. It will be seen therefore that harbours are very expensive concerns and when people complain about harbour charges, they should remember the large sums of money that have to be paid out year after year to meet the special requirements of shipping. People generally do not recognise that phase. The member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum), during his regime as Minister for Works, spent a lot of money at Fremantle in improving the harbour facilities, and, of course, continuous expenditure has to be provided for at that port. When I was in Geraldton the other day a discussion arose as to when the harbour there would be completed. I told the people that, in my opinion, it never would be completed as there was always a certain amount of expenditure that had to be incurred annually in various directions. That is the history of all harbour works, although in some years the expenditure may be more than at other times. From Fremantle to Geraldton the

distance is 300 miles and another 300 miles separate Fremantle and Albany. In the latter instance, there are Bunbury and Busselton intervening. Under existing economic conditions it is not desirable to haul produce long distances by rail. The quick marketing of products is essential if the producer is to be encouraged and stimulated in his work of production. I hope the Estimates will find favour with members. We have done our best with a view to providing work for the people. I refer not only to provision for direct employment, but for employment indirectly by the purchase of local materials wherever possible.

Progress reported.

BILL—SECESSION REFERENDUM.

Message.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

BILL—MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CATTLE TRESPASS, FENCING, AND IMPOUNDING AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 16th November.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.10]: The Bill seeks to amend the parent Act of 1904. Although the Act was amended in 1907, when it was consolidated, one can readily understand that certain amendments may be required in these days by the stockowners themselves. I assume that the amendments embodied in the Bill have been suggested after conferences with stockowners or their representative associations, and have been included in the Bill at their request. Certainly they are important to stockowners, because the brand represents the main means of identification of

valuable stock. In view of the fact that there has been a good deal of cattle stealing, there is always an incentive, unless the Act is tightened up, for breaches of the law to occur. Therefore, I assume that those administering the Brands Act consider the amendments necessary. I do not intend to dwell further upon the Bill at the second reading stage. I have compared the amendments with the Act itself and they appear to be necessary. Provided they have been agreed to by the stockowners who will be vitally concerned, I shall offer no objection to the Bill. There are one or two clauses regarding which I shall ask the Minister to state the reason why they have been included, and, for the present, I shall content myself with supporting the second reading of the Bill.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.12]: I shall not oppose the second reading of the Bill but I tell the Minister frankly that I do not like some of the clauses. Probably when we reach the Committee stage, the Minister may be able to enlighten me, but some of the clauses remind me of the quince in the apple pudding—a little of it is all right. Some of the provisions in the Bill are harmful, in my opinion, if they are to be applied to the North and North-Western portions of the State. For instance, I do not like the clause that provides for the branding of four months old stock, at the dictation of those who have a lien over the property.

The Minister for Agriculture: That particular provision does not apply to the North-West, but to the South-West land division only.

Mr. MARSHALL: But will not the provision regarding the registration of brands and so forth have a State-wide application?

The Minister for Agriculture: That is so.

Mr. MARSHALL: According to the provisions of the Bill, the owner of a brand will have to notify the Registrar of Brands particulars of his brand. There are a number of people in the North-West who will not have any knowledge of the alteration of the Act. Although some may receive a circular notifying them that the necessary information must be provided for the stock inspector or the Registrar of Brands, they may be confronted with difficulties, and should they not be able to

notify the officials in time, their brands may be cancelled and allotted to other owners. There are squatters in my electorate and one I know can neither read nor write. He might be notified by the department to furnish some information to them. If he did not reply his brand would be cancelled or transferred to someone else. I am not saying such cases are likely to be numerous, but they may happen, and if they do they will cause much trouble and inconvenience. I want the Minister to be considerate in connection with the Bill. The member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley) desires particularly to speak on Clause 5. He will be absent from the sitting to-day, and I suggest to the Minister that if the Bill reaches the Committee stage, he should make provision for the member for Kimberley to speak on Clause 5. I ask the Minister why it is considered that the branding of swine and goats should be purely voluntarily. If there is need to register brands for those animals, then the branding should be compulsory, as it is in the case of sheep, cattle and horses. Why should branding be compulsory in one case and voluntary in the other? I can see justification in the one case for compulsory branding, but for the life of me I cannot understand why branding should be voluntary in the other. With one other exception, I will support the measure. Clause 9 provides that a person who desires information with respect to a brand which is registered in the name of another person may make application, or, in other words, search the brand, but he is required to pay a fee of 2s. 6d. for doing so. All the information he may get in return for that fee may be that the brand is still registered and in use by the registered owner. I doubt whether the department are justified in charging 2s. 6d. to furnish that information. The Minister will notice Clause 9 provides that the fee of 2s. 6d. shall be paid both in respect of the application for information concerning a registered brand and in respect of the application for the brand. I suggest to the Minister that that is a little severe. Another charge I disapprove of and will move to amend in Committee is the fee payable when an owner surrenders his brand to the department or makes application for de-registration. The Agricultural Department are becoming experts in charging

fees; in the parent Act we find frequent references to fees of 2s. 6d., and the amending Bill makes provision for the payment of additional fees. The Minister can hardly justify a charge of 2s. 6d. to a man who will go to the trouble of surrendering his brand, or giving it back to the Crown, so to speak, when he has no further use for it. There is an anomaly in the Bill. If a registered owner ceases to use his brand, the Agricultural Department can call upon him to de-register it, and if he cannot justify his right to retain it any longer, it is taken from him by law. In that case he does not pay any fee. I think the department have that power under the parent Act, or else it is provided for in the amending Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: No.

Mr. MARSHALL: The provision is either in the parent Act or in the Bill, but that is not the point. If I am the owner of a brand and am not using it, and if the department go to the trouble of giving me three months' notice of de-registration, they can then de-register the brand or transfer it to some other owner. That costs me nothing. I need not even reply to the department's communication. But if I am a conscientious and worthy citizen I will say, "Probably someone else will want this brand, and therefore I will surrender it to the department." In that case I should have to pay the fee of 2s. 6d.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is wrong.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the way I read the Bill. When we reach the Committee stage, the Minister will be able to argue the point. I hope the Minister will be generous enough to afford the member for Kimberley an opportunity to deal with Clause 5. The Minister knows that cattle raising is the chief industry carried on in the Kimberleys. I do not know what the views of the member for Kimberley are, and I do not desire to delay the passage of the Bill, but I trust the Minister will accede to my request. With the exceptions I have mentioned, I support the Bill.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [5.22]: I am very much in favour of the compulsory branding of sheep, but a person going to a saleyard will find in many cases that brands on sheep are indistinct. If I had my way, I would abolish earmarks, because

I fail to see what use they are. I assure members that on many of our farms they will find sheep with 10 or 12 separate registered earmarks. I certainly think sheep should be branded. I would draw attention to the material used in branding sheep. Tar we well know will last 12 months, but it is detrimental to the wool. Certain oils are not detrimental to the wool, but, if used, it is necessary to brand the sheep twice a year. I have been informed that some oil brands will not last 12 months on sheep. Earmarking of sheep on stations is a convenience, because when a man is drafting a flock of sheep, he can, while standing in the race, tell by the earmarks whether the sheep are two, three, or four years old, and segregate them in separate pens. In the agricultural districts, however, where a great deal of dealing in sheep is done, I fail to see what use earmarks are. I am surprised to find that provision is made in the Bill for the branding of pigs. I never heard of such a thing in all my life. Pigs are of different colours, and I do not know what use a white brand would be on a white pig. Pigs as a rule do not stray. They are supposed to be kept on the owner's property. If they stray on to an adjoining property and do damage, then the owner of the adjoining property has the option of shooting or destroying them. I cannot understand why this provision has been inserted in the Bill, even if the branding is left optional. I am afraid if we insist on the branding of goats, a very great deal of branding will have to be done.

Mr. Marshall: You would not start with this House?

Mr. BROWN: Yes. We could start with this House. Goats may stray and do damage to gardens. If they are branded, the brand may help the owner of the garden to find the man to whom the goats belong, so that he can recover damages.

Miss Holman: The goats, like the sheep, may have changed hands.

Mr. BROWN: If the branding is left optional, I fail to see what use the provision will be. I do think the department should insist upon a distinct brand being placed on sheep. We all know that it is necessary for horse and cattle breeders to have a registered brand, so that if their horses or cattle stray they can be identified. The Bill is absolutely essential to

the welfare of stock-owners, and I intend to support it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Panton in the Chair: the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 4, No. 61 of 1904 Def. "Registrar":

Mr. MILLINGTON: The Minister might answer the question asked by the member for Pingelly with regard to the branding of swine and goats. Why should it be compulsory to brand sheep, cattle and horses, and optional to brand pigs and goats?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In the past brands have not been registered for either swine or goats. It has not been considered necessary, or even advisable, to brand them. Nowadays, however, many people are breeding pigs and it is quite likely that two breeders, side by side, may wish to earmark their stud pigs. Unless it were made compulsory to register the earmark, an evilly-disposed person might have one larger than that used by his neighbour. It is therefore considered advisable that the mark should be registered. In the interests of breeders of pigs it would not be wise to permit them to use any mark they like; it would not be fair to other breeders. The department has received many requests from the breeders of pigs and goats to be allowed to register the marks used on their stock, and the department thinks it desirable.

Mr. J. I. MANN: I hope the clause will remain. What is meant by the branding of pigs is really the earmarking of the animals. When it comes to stud pigs, there is more or less necessity for marking them, for sometimes they are sent to market and there purchased by unscrupulous persons. I do not see any necessity for either branding or earmarking goats, but I hope the clause will remain, for it is certainly necessary in the interests of the breeders.

Mr. MARSHALL: The feature of this branding or marking of pigs and goats is that it is optional. There are occasions when stud owners desire to advertise their stock and to render it identifiable by those

who might wish to purchase it. That, of course, applies to swine, but I do not know of any breed of goat so valuable as to warrant branding or earmarking. I can see virtue in the branding of swine, but not in the marking or branding of goats. I should like to know why provision is made for branding them.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There are 120,000 pigs in the country, and probably the owners of 90 per cent. of them would not bother about marking them. But we have had numerous requests from the breeders of stud pigs to be allowed to earmark their animals, while the registrar of brands has received similar requests for the branding of goats. By way of interjection, the member for Toodyay remarked that a lady at Yanchep has a stud goat herd, and another at Jurien Bay, and that she is anxious to place her registered earmark on those animals. After all, the provision is only optional.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The Minister has not dealt with the objection of the member for Pingelly regarding earmarks. I assume earmarks will be used for pigs.

Mr. Brown: I meant only sheep.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Would earmarking be satisfactory for pigs?

The Minister for Agriculture: The earmark is the recognised brand for sheep or pigs or goats.

Mr. MILLINGTON: But is there any means of overcoming the objection raised by the member for Pingelly? Has the registrar of brands any definite ideas in that regard? The Bill does attempt to make it uniform, to prevent an oversize earmark being used, but I think the Minister might explain how it is proposed to prevent the mutilation of the earmark, which is so easily done.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The only compulsory brand for sheep is the earmark. The wool brand, the question raised by the member for Pingelly, does not come into it at all, because it is entirely optional with the owner, the recognised brand being the earmark.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 6:

Mr. MARSHALL: Why are these alterations of the Act to be made, the insertion

of the words "or left" after "near" and of "or right" after "off."

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Practical stockmen are satisfied when they hear the words "near" or "off" as applied to an animal's ear, but there are in Australia people who do not know which ear is the near one and which the off.

Mr. Withers: They must be new chums!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, but there are thousands of them on the land and owning stock. As for striking out "pitch" and inserting the words "branding oil," woolgrowers in the Old Country have given definite information that a brand in pitch is deleterious to a sheep's wool. In consequence breeders here have been using branding oil instead of pitch.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—New Sections 6A and 6B:

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subsection 1 of proposed new section 6A the word "stud" be deleted.

Amendment put and passed.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subsection 1 of proposed new section 6A, "breeder" be deleted and "owner" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MARSHALL: I take exception to the Government using foreign terms in their legislation. It is difficult enough for members to follow the meaning of some of the clauses, without being further confused by Latin and other foreign tags. I want the Minister to explain exactly what the words "mutatis mutandis" in line 3 of Subsection 2 of proposed new Section 6B mean. It is disloyal to our own tongue when we cannot explain ourselves without calling upon a foreign language. I want the Minister to explain to the Committee what "mutatis mutandis" means.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I understand these Latin words mean making all necessary changes.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subsection 2 of proposed new section 6B, "mutatis mutandis" be struck out.

If that be agreed to, I will then move that "making all necessary changes" be inserted in lieu.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not see how the Minister can object to the Latin words being struck out so that we might substitute words that we can all understand. The clauses should be in our own language so that all our people could know their meaning.

Mr. KENNEALLY: A little earlier the Minister explained that certain amendments were necessary because people in the country did not know the difference between the near ear and the off ear and because of that we had to add certain other words to make the meaning beyond doubt. Could he not now do as the member for Murchison has suggested and insert in plain English the meaning of the Latin words?

Amendment (to strike out *mutatis mutandis*) put and passed.

Mr. MARSHALL: I move—

That the words "after making the needful changes" be inserted in lieu of the words struck out.

The Minister for Lands: But the other words were not struck out.

The **CHAIRMAN:** Yes, I gave it to the "ayes."

The Minister for Lands: Well, may I call for a division now?

The **CHAIRMAN:** No, I distinctly stated the "ayes" had it, and the words were struck out.

Mr. Sampson: There was some confusion because the member for Murchison himself called for a division, which showed that he was not aware that the words had been struck out.

The **CHAIRMAN:** If members are not taking sufficient interest in the Bill, they must not find fault with the Chairman. I gave the decision on the voices. I heard the member for Murchison call for a division but he immediately withdrew the call.

The Minister for Lands: We desire that the words be left in.

The **CHAIRMAN:** It is the business of members to pay attention to the proceedings.

The Minister for Lands: Will you let us have a division now?

The **CHAIRMAN:** No. The Bill can be recommitted at a later stage.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have already moved that the words to take the place of those that were struck out be inserted. I have no desire to be hostile to the Minister or to the Bill, but I positively object to language being used that is not capable of being understood unless it is interpreted by a lawyer. I do not know whether many in this Chamber were aware of the meaning of the words that were struck out. I doubt whether the Minister himself knew the meaning. All the words in the clause should be in plain English and the plainer it is possible to make the language the better it will be.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. Corboy: There is nothing now to take the place of the words struck out and the clause has no meaning.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 9:

Mr. MARSHALL: Will the Minister agree to postpone the consideration of this clause, or agree to recommit it, so that the member for Kimberley, who is not in the Chamber at present, may have an opportunity of speaking on it? I know that the hon. member desired to offer some criticism on it.

Mr. WITHERS: The clause says that the brand shall not exceed in overall measurements 9in. x 3in., nor shall each letter or figure be less than $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches in length or width. The principal Act refers to length only. What will be the position of people owning brands to-day and who will not conform to what is proposed by the clause? The clause also says that if stock is branded with smaller letters or larger brand, that stock shall be deemed unbranded.

Mr. BROWN: It has been the experience or stockmen on branding young beasts to find that the letters have expanded on the hide with the growth of the beast. The brand is usually put on the ribs and when the beast has grown, a considerable part of the hide has been destroyed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause is very plain. It is the instrument that is used for branding to which the measurements refer, not the brand on the hide of the animal. The brand when registered shall be of a certain size. The

brand is not to exceed overall 9in. x 3in., and the letter or figure must not be less than $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches in length and width. The parent Act does not say anything about length or width.

Mr. Kenneally: There may be in existence a brand of the prescribed length, but of less than the width that you now propose.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have not seen a brand so small as $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches in width, and I do not think there is one in existence. It would be so small that it would make only a blotch and would not be visible.

Mr. MARSHALL: How will people fare who have already used brands that do not comply with the measurements stipulated in the Bill?

The Minister for Agriculture: I do not think there is any.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not concerned with what the Minister thinks. A stock-owner in the North-West may have a brand exceeding nine by three inches and his stock would be deemed to be unbranded. What would happen to him?

The Minister for Lands: I do not think you will find one.

Mr. MARSHALL: I wish to be sure. If there is only one, injustice will be done. I want to know how many will be affected.

The Minister for Agriculture: I assure the hon. member that there is not any who will be affected.

Mr. MARSHALL: In order that the member for Kimberley might have an opportunity to speak on this question, I move—

That the further consideration of the clause be postponed.

Motion put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Amendment of Section 14:

Mr. MARSHALL: I move an amendment—

That after "fee" in line 5 of the proposed new subsection 2, the words "for such brand" be inserted.

To charge a fee of 2s. 6d. for information about a brand would be extortionate. It should be sufficient to pay the fee if the brand were granted to the applicant.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Much of the time of the Registrar of Brands

is occupied in answering requests from people, some of whom are not concerned to get the information. It was thought that, by charging a small fee, much of the information now sought and not really desired would not be requested, and loss of time on the part of the official would be obviated. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: Surely the amendment is reasonable. If information is desired, it should be forthcoming. Information would be supplied by a business firm without charge.

Mr. Lamond: Other departments do not charge for information.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have always been led to believe that primary producers were busy people with no time to waste on making unnecessary inquiries. It should be an obligation of the Government to supply any information concerning the business of producers. If the Minister desires to prevent people from troubling the department at all, he should charge a fee of 10s., but if he wishes to assist people in their business, there should be no charge. I suggest that country members should hesitate before accepting the clause without a safeguard. The prescribed fee might be 10s.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment would not meet the hon. member's wishes. A man might write to the department inquiring who owned a certain brand.

Mr. Marshall: Would you charge a fee for that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If it was a genuine inquiry, it would not be so bad, but there are volumes of information relating to brands, and to go through 30,000 or 40,000 brands is a big job. The Minister might agree to a fee not exceeding 1s., and if the request were legitimate, the department might make no charge.

Progress reported.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

Joint Select Committee's Report.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [7.34]: I move—

That the Bill as amended by the Select Committee be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, and its consideration in

Committee be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

HON. A. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [7.35]: I oppose the motion. My speech will take the form of a minority report. As the standing orders do not provide for any minority report upon the report of a select committee, those who disagree with the majority are placed in a very awkward position. We are not allowed to put up anything in the form of a minority report, and state our reasons, but we are confined to recording the fact that we dissent, and must leave the expression of our views until the whole question is discussed in the House. I am grateful to the Premier for making arrangements so that I should have this early opportunity, following the publication of the majority report, to state my views on the findings of the Committee. In view of the circumstances, it will be necessary for me to speak longer than otherwise I would have had occasion to do. For the benefit of other members who may desire to know my views on the findings of the committee, and why it is I disagree with the way in which the figures have been made up, I must place my remarks on record. Unless I do this completely and state the case fully from my point of view, and put up all the arguments I may have to advance, no other means will be afforded to me of recording my reasons for dissenting from the majority report. I have served on a few committees and Royal Commissions since I have had the privilege of being a member of Parliament. The members of this joint select committee are to be commended for the way in which they stuck to their work. They indeed worked very well. For five weeks we sat all day long, and after finishing our work, we came into the Chamber and played our part in the debates. In my judgment, such an important measure as this, necessitating so much work and requiring so much careful consideration because of its immense importance to the country, should have been investigated when the House was not sitting. The task was a big one to put upon the shoulders of members, the while they had their other duties and responsibilities within the Chamber. In order to attend the 10 o'clock meetings, I had to leave Fremantle at 9 a.m., and come to my place in this Chamber when the work of the committee was over for the day. During those

weeks I never once reached home before midnight. I suppose other members of the committee were in the same position. We were cramming two days into one during the whole period. I differ entirely from the views expressed in the report. There is only one part of it I can say I subscribe to fully, and it is that part which deals with the importance of the wheat-growing industry to Western Australia. I subscribe to that view which I suppose is pretty well known in Western Australia. Apart from that, I cannot see much in the report with which I can agree. The drafting of the document is the work of a highly skilled lawyer, who has brought to bear upon it all his skill, and all his experience and training. He missed nothing to support his case, and I think I can say that he has also dragged in a lot of extraneous matter. I differ from the report in many directions. I disagree with the language in which it is couched. It is most extravagant language.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is the word.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It is extravagant in many respects.

Hon. P. Collier: There is nothing judicial about it.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It is special pleading for the case it sets out to support. The report would have carried more weight had it been drafted in a more judicial manner. The language it is couched in will largely defeat its own ends. I propose to deal with the items as they appear in the report, and to commence with the operations on the farm. Altogether 11 farmers gave evidence. It can be said without challenge that ten of those were chosen by the Westralian Farmers Ltd. The committee had no way of securing evidence of its own other than by advertising, and that is not always a very successful means to adopt. The only evidence we got from practical farmers was to all intents and purposes identical with that which the Westralian Farmers published in their booklet, when they got written statements from farmers after the experiments had been carried out at the four sidings. Those farmers were brought along, and repeated the statements to us. They sold their wheat at siding at the usual price quoted for that siding, less $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel to meet the charges under the bulk handling scheme. Four farmers did not

give evidence as to actual costs or savings, and seven gave figures. In the aggregate, those seven farmers produced 73,095 bushels, and claimed that they saved £758 19s. 9d., equal to 2.370d. per bushel. In effect, they claimed a saving in their operations on the farm of a little under $2\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel, from the time the wheat was stripped until it arrived at the siding. I have had the figures checked. They are not accurate, but are near enough. One farmer named Vincent put on an extra man, but made no allowance for that. Another man named Norton rose at 2.30 a.m. and retired at 9 p.m.

The Minister for Works: That is nothing unusual for a farmer.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: He put on no extra man. Most of the farmers used only washed super bags, and some calculated a saving on bags of as much as $3\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel. The distance of carting ranged from one mile to 16 miles. It is true one farmer said his farming operations extended up to 19 miles, but he did not say he had carted that distance. I agree with the statement in the report that it is probable in the future bags will not be used between the farm and the siding for the cartage of wheat. I think that will be done largely in bulk, although not altogether; but that does not mean that the farmer will do away with bags on the farm. He must have containers for his wheat between the harvester and the wagon. While it may be correct that to a large extent washed super bags will be used for that work, it may be pointed out that one farmer told us that he constructed a bin on the farm. The select committee deem that circumstance of sufficient importance to require special mention. The farmer told us that he swept the ground and then enclosed a limited area with galvanised iron. He employed a boy to cart small half-filled bags from the harvester and tip the wheat into the bin. When he had completed his work, he dished the wheat from the bin into the wagon by means of a kerosene tin. The farmer concerned did not make any allowance for labour costs, but I suggest that his labour costs would far outweigh the cost of bags. I disagree with the first paragraph on page vi. of the committee's report in connection with the statement made by the Perth Chamber of Commerce to the effect that farmers living a long way out from the siding would re-

quire two-thirds of the normal bag requirements to hold and transport their crops. In my judgment, that statement of the Chamber of Commerce must apply to farmers at a very considerable distance, and I would suggest that it applies to those who live, say, 20 miles from a siding. We had no such evidence before the committee. Farmers who are operating that far from a siding did not give evidence. The committee, in arriving at their finding that farmers would save approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ d. a bushel between the farm and the siding, assumed that only superphosphate bags would be used and that no new cornsacks would have to be bought. Strange to say, the committee made no allowance for the cost of super bags. If members will refer to Q. 1686, they will see that the witness who was being examined declared he had been offered, and allowed by the superphosphate company, 7s. a dozen for his super bags. I can endorse that witness's statement as a result of my own experience. That means a return of 7d. a bag, which is more than 2d. a bushel, and yet the committee made no allowance at all for those bags. One farmer submitted his figures and made an allowance of 2d. a dozen for his bags. When asked by the chairman of the select committee why he had done so, the witness replied that he had been offered 2d. a dozen for his second-hands bags. So it will be seen that in that respect the report is obviously wrong. Some bags are essential and the select committee in their report make no allowance whatever for the cost of bags to be used on the farm. The only farmer who gave evidence that he had bought bags was a witness named Diver, who said that he had bought a bale of 300 sacks, but those were the only bags accounted for in respect of the total harvest of 73,095 bushels. That is obviously ridiculous.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Was that for the whole lot?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes. The assumption has been that by using super bags, the farmers were not put to any expense. Of course, that is not the position at all. The position was correctly stated by the witness I have referred to, who mentioned that he had been allowed 7s. a dozen for his bags by the super company, and as I have already indicated. I can substantiate that statement because I have received that

allowance myself. On the other hand, the committee made no allowance for that in arriving at their conclusions. Super bags are almost as valuable as cornsacks, because they are practically the same type of bag. If members will refer to the booklet entitled "The Co-operative System of Handling Wheat in Bulk," copies of which have been circulated among members—the pamphlet is generally referred to as the "brown" book, while the later pamphlet that was published is referred to as the "blue" book—they will find, on page 42, an allowance of .135d. per bushel for bags. That is a little over $\frac{1}{8}$ d. That is what the advocates of the scheme allow for use of the bags, and they suggest that 15 per cent. will be required and that those bags will last for two years. They figure it out as being worth .135d. per bushel to be charged against the scheme. But the select committee did not give attention to that phase at all in their report. I suggest that the estimate of 15 per cent. of the bags being essential, and being calculated to last for two years, is quite as extravagant as the Chamber of Commerce's suggestion that 66 per cent. of the bags would be required by the farmers so that I cannot be accused of overstating the case. I will take the figures advanced by the advocates of the scheme, which I have already referred to as being .135d., which reduces the saving to the farmers at sidings to $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. If members refer to Qs. 769, 1476, 1598 and from 1771 to 1777, they will see that the replies to those questions indicate clearly that if the farmer is to receive the full benefit of bulk handling on the farm, he must have additional horses. In the report no allowance whatever is made on account of additional transport requirements. It must be apparent to anyone who knows anything about the workings of a farm, that extra horses will be required if the farmer is to secure any advantage. A big percentage of the farmers in Western Australia work with one team and when the horses are in the harvester, they cannot be employed on the roads. Vice versa, when the horses are on the road, they cannot be in the harvester. If the farmers are to do all their stripping before they start carting, it will mean that they must purchase 100 per cent. of their bag requirements, but the Committee made no allowance whatever in the report for extra horses

for transportation. The committee apparently want it both ways. No one who has examined the case up to the present has advanced such extravagant claims as that. I have to confess that until I examined the position for myself, to ascertain what it meant to buy a team of horses, I did not fully appreciate the position. It was only when I got down to details that I gained that appreciation. I confess I was surprised when I went into it. The figures I have taken out cannot, in my opinion, be challenged. If we take the average farmer who is dealing with 350 acres—I am advised by the Agricultural Bank officials that that would represent the average area under production—and allow that he strips 300 acres for wheat, giving him the State average yield of four bags to the acre, that will mean that he will harvest 3,600 bushels. Thus he would require another team of five horses, for each of which he would have to pay £30, or an outlay of £150. The Federal taxation law permits the farmer to deduct 20 per cent. from his returns, representing a depreciation allowance on his horses. Our State taxation laws do not mention any definite figure but under that heading we can allow at least £30. For the upkeep of those five horses I have allowed for 1 cwt. of chaff and a bushel of oats a week. From my own figures, I know that my horses get nearly 2 cwt. of chaff a week, but I have allowed for only 1 cwt. In fact, I am putting the supposititious team on sustenance rates.

The Premier: That would be on half sustenance rates.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That means I have allowed for oats at 2s. a bushel and chaff at £3 10s. per ton. That works out at 5s. 6d. per week per head of the team. I know that allowance is too low. You, Mr. Speaker, know that the charge here is 2s. 6d. a day. I fully appreciate the fact that the allowance is too low, but I do not want to be accused of overstating the case. On the basis I have indicated, I provide for an outgoing of £71 10s. a year. On top of that, there will be the wages of the teamster for, say, three weeks, and I have allowed the minimum rate of £3 10s. a week for him, so that accounts for another £10 10s. Those are merely actual charges without making any provision for interest. I have allowed that to go in with the provision for depreciation. That

represents £111 for the year which, spread over the average farmer's crop, will mean 7d. per bushel.

Mr. Patrick: Would he be carting wheat all the year round?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: No, but the farmer would have the team that would enable him to do work on the farm, and all the farmer's income must come from his crop.

Mr. Patrick: But are you not charging up the cartage for the whole year?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It takes the whole year to grow the crop, and that is the farmer's only source of income.

The Minister for Agriculture: But you could get the cartage done for half the price you mention, if it were done by contract.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: But I am allowing for three weeks' cartage only.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Where is the contractor that the Minister refers to?

The Minister for Agriculture: He gets 9d. a ton a mile.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: But I have not quoted any distance, so how can the Minister quote any figure like that? I do not think anyone will suggest that my figures are overstated. I appreciate the fact that it will largely depend upon the distance to be traversed as to whether the quantity of wheat I have mentioned can be carted in the three weeks. It must depend upon the distance between the farm and the siding. Without making any allowance for interest, the expenses I have mentioned run out at 7d. a bushel. I have not made any provision for wagon or harness but have taken it that the farmer possesses them already. On that basis, instead of there being a gain to the farmer as the committee state in their report, of 3d. per bushel at the siding, the farmer will show a loss of 4d. a bushel. He will certainly have the team that will enable him to do extra work during the year but that will not affect his income from the crop. That is the only source from which he can derive his income. There is a large percentage of farmers in Western Australia who are in that position. I am stressing that point, because I have not taken that phase into my calculations in dealing with the figures set out in the report. Although so many of our farmers are in that position, the select committee absolutely ignored the bag position that I have referred to, and also the necessity for the purchase of additional horses for transport, whether by

contract or the farmers' own teams. They have made no allowance under those headings at all. If the report is allowed to go out embodying such an important omission in regard to the calculations, undoubtedly the farmers will be deceived. Fancy talking about a saving of 100 per cent. in the bags, and making no provision for extra transport! Anyone who knows the first thing about farming operations knows that that could not be the position. The select committee were handicapped in their investigations because the experiment that had been carried out had taken place in old settled districts that were well developed and where the farms were practically fully equipped. But Parliament itself cannot afford to decide the case upon what was done in the well-developed districts. Parliament should visualise the wheat belt as a whole and decide how this proposition will affect it. My calculations prove that the farmer who requires additional teams will show his loss at the siding, while the farmer who is now equipped with teams will gain at that stage $2\frac{1}{2}$ d. a bushel.

Mr. Brown: What about the farmer with a motor truck?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I venture to say it will cost him more.

Mr. Brown: With his own truck?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: He has to pay for the truck.

Mr. Wilson: He has to buy it.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I do not know that he will do it cheaper with his own truck. I mention that to show how the committee missed a very important point. This experiment was conducted at four sidings. In the report it is stated that the farmers have paid every charge the change over involved. I want hon. members to bear in mind how far the report goes. In the top paragraph of the right-hand column of page vi. it is stated that in the case of those farmers the change over from delivery in bags to delivery in bulk resulted in a gain of approximately 3d. per bushel after every charge which such change over involved had been fully provided for. I say there is not a scrap of evidence to support that statement. Twice I asked for balance sheets of the operations at those sidings and although I was promised them they were not produced. No one knows to-day whether the opera-

tions at those sidings were conducted at a profit or a loss. I was given a statement from the auditor, but that merely showed expenses. No one is in a position, except the people actually concerned, to state whether the experiment resulted in a profit or in a loss. Yet we have the extravagant claim made that every charge which the change over involved had been fully provided for. I will show as we proceed that every charge has not been provided for. Not only did I not get a balance sheet, but I found that the position with respect to the plants at the various sidings was so mixed that neither the Westralian Farmers nor the Pool authorities themselves knew where they stood. Mr. Harper and Mr. Teasdale, both directors of Westralian Farmers, told us that the Wheat Pool had lent them the money, and that they had built the silos with it. When I asked them what interest they paid, neither knew, but one of them said that $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel was to include interest. Mr. Thomson, the manager of Westralian Farmers, said that the plants were owned by the pool, but the two directors of the pool said they lent the money to the Westralian Farmers to build the silos. Neither the Westralian Farmers nor the Wheat Pool know what the position is. The committee cannot say what it is.

Hon. P. Collier: Does the report say anything about maintenance?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: No. To say that every charge involved by the change over has been fully provided for is entirely misleading. It is significant that whereas the toll last year was $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel, this year the charge is $\frac{3}{4}$ d. The charge has been increased by $\frac{1}{4}$ d.

Hon. P. Collier: Although the charges were fully provided for.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Although this report says the charges were fully met. The farmers still pay at those sidings all the charges they would have to meet if the wheat were sold in bags. They only get the same price for their wheat at the siding as the farmer does who delivers his wheat in bags, but out of that amount this year they have to pay $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per bushel as against $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel last year for the bulk scheme. In reply to Q. 4930, Mr. Thomson, the manager of the Westralian Farmers, admitted to me that for every three bushels of wheat this bulk scheme

sent to the mills (and everyone knows the great bulk of the wheat went to the mills) the scheme had to supply the mills with a bag. Those bags were obtained by cutting the mouths of the bags open at Fremantle and tipping the wheat into the hold of the ship. I saw the operation there myself. Mr. Thomson admitted they had undertaken to supply the mills with the same number of bags which the mills would have got had they purchased the wheat in bags. The bags cost 9d. each, and if the increase in the price of wheat that the weight of the bags would have brought is deducted, it means that the bags cost $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. each. That is equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ d. a bushel. So that wipes out altogether, even at this stage, the whole of the advantage that the committee say the farmers got. It has gone even as early as this. In face of that, the committee say all charges have been met. It is true the mills have undertaken to refund to the scheme an amount equal to the difference between what they say is the cost of handling in bulk and the cost of handling in bags, but that amount is quite indefinite yet. In any case, it can only be an insignificant amount. That is the case so far as concerns the delivery of wheat last year from these sidings to the mills. Very little of the wheat was exported. Apart from that which was exported, the wheat was sold to the mills. Therefore, this alleged saving has disappeared already. That applies to all the wheat which was sold to the mills. I venture to say anyone can show a profit if they run a business on those lines—a paper profit. Should we allow a report like this to go out, knowing that the farmers of the State will rely upon it, and upon what is said in this House? We would not be doing our duty to the men who are looking to Parliament to give them some relief. If bulk handling is to become the practice in this State, the mills are not going to lose the price of the bags. They get the bags now with the wheat and if they are deprived of the bags the mills will see that they do not lose what the bags are worth. They have to compete in the open market with the world.

The Premier: That will be a handicap on their flour. They will have to pay London parity, of course.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes. They will make the same deductions that other people make. That will apply not only to our local

mills, but to the mills overseas also. It should also be borne in mind that the scheme was a novel one and everybody was desirous of its success. The farmers gave a hand, where they could. Mr. Shaw, who visited the sidings with the Minister, said at the time that all hands and the cook were helping to make the scheme a success.

The Minister for Lands: That is usual.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, but it does not show in the cost.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Even the railways went out of their way to help. That is admitted in Mr. Thomson's introductory remarks. The railways did not charge demurrage. Notwithstanding that the Railway Department helped wherever they could, they received very little consideration in the report. What happened is that their generosity was capitalised and used against them in the findings of the committee.

Mr. Kenneally: The railways have been told that they know nothing about their own business.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I leave the position as it stands when the farmer gets his wheat to the siding. That shows $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. per bushel, according to the evidence, in his favour. Regarding handling charges, I turn now to the proposals in a pamphlet issued by the Trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia, which contains what we are told is a verbatim copy of a letter sent to the Government by the general manager of the Wheat Pool. On page 8, under the heading of "Handling Costs," it is stated—

It will be noted that operating costs are as follows:—

Interest and repayment of loan, maintenance and renewals—0.625d. per bushel.

Working expenses, acquiring—1.50d. per bushel.

Total—2.125d. per bushel.

That is to handle the wheat from the farmer's wagon to f.o.b. I refer members to the report of the select committee, page vi., paragraph 5, right-hand column—

Instead of a charge of 2.4d. per bushel payment in the case of bagged wheat the farmers delivering in bulk will only pay 1.875d.

I want to know where the committee got that figure of 1.875d. from. There is no mention of such a figure in any part of the evidence. It is not in any publication of

the Westralian Farmers. No one has mentioned it before. How has it got into the report? Where does it come from? It contradicts the offer made to the Government. Yet the whole basis of the calculation of the committee is on that figure.

Hon. M. F. Troy: It is not in the evidence?

Hon. A McCALLUM: No.

Hon. M. F. Troy: It is outside information.

Mr. Marshall: Inside information.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Where does it come from? You will notice, Sir, that the next two paragraphs, which are based on that figure, must be wrong. It is true that figure for the moment will tell in their favour; but it is wrong, and if they are wrong in that, obviously they will be wrong in other respects. I do not propose to base my calculations on a figure of which I never heard before I saw it in this report, a figure that no one has ever mentioned before the committee, a figure which it is impossible to understand. I venture to say that no member of the committee knows where it came from.

Hon. P. Collier: A printer's error, perhaps.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It will lead to a lot of other errors, because so many other figures are calculated on that as a basis. As I have read out from the blue book, page 8, the book which is the official offer to the Government, the figure is 1½d. for handling charges, and a halfpenny in English sterling for capital charges—that is, to take the wheat from the farmer's wagon to f.o.b. All those figures following in that column are wrong; they cannot be right, because they are based on a wrong foundation. I want to take these charges as they appear in this blue book. You will notice there, Sir, that .625d., that is a halfpenny in English sterling—which is ½d. at the moment—which has to be paid in to the trustees to meet the charges in London. And it takes 32,000,000 bushels to meet the interest and sinking fund on this scheme. And when all that is met, the Bill provides that a year's interest as a reserve fund must be set up. So until all charges are met in London, and until a year's interest reserve fund is built up, there can be no alteration of that figure, neither can there be any balance from it. But in the blue book it is stated that this

.625d. includes interest, repayments of loan, maintenance and renewals. So it is obvious that no maintenance and no renewals are provided for until such time as the whole of the capital charges are met in London, and until a year's interest in reserve is established—and it takes 32,000,000 bushels to do that. The Bill further provides that farmers situated over 20 miles from a railway may be exempt from the scheme to the extent of 20 per cent. of the State's crop. It also provides that every farmer has the right himself to market 20 per cent. of his own crop. The Midland Railway Company are out of this, for they decline to deal in bulk wheat. So there are 3,000,000 bushels gone there.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you not think they will come in when they see the wheat going to the Government railways?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: We shall see whether they do or not. However, there are 3,000,000 bushels there, and if this law had been in force last year we would have been below the 32,000,000 mark. And this provides for no maintenance and no renewals. Here is what the Wheat Pool Trustees' own report says. In their letter to the Premier they say they referred it to a firm of architects in the city to confirm the claim that it was a substantial structure they were putting up. This is what the architect says—

Maintenance, repairs and renewals should be amply provided for, so as to retain their effectiveness and to preserve the asset. The effective supervision of the erection of the units is an important factor in their efficient life.

So maintenance, repairs and renewals should be amply provided for. The only provision made for them here is a gamble on the exchange going down, and a gamble on the crop being over 32,000,000 bushels after allowing for all the deductions. Where else is either maintenance or renewal provided for? Nowhere else. After trained architects set it out with such emphasis that maintenance and renewals were so essential, those charges go with no provision at all made for them. So it is obvious that if the scheme had been in operation last year that half-penny toll would have had to be increased. The committee have ignored all that.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Who set up the half-penny toll?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It was the London people who insisted on that as a provisional arrangement for the repayment of the loan. So there is another point ignored altogether. I am sure the Minister for Works, who was advised by his officers, will support that statement made by a reputable firm of architects and which was emphasised by Mr. Tindale when he was before us, namely that for such structures as are proposed here ample provision must be made for maintenance and renewals. But that is the only provision made here for maintenance and renewals. Will any reasonable person say it is ample provision—a gamble on the exchange falling, and a gamble on the crop being over 32,000,000 bushels after allowing for all deductions? Our crop must be over 32,000,000 bushels, and there must be a year's interest in reserve in London, and that is all that is left for that item of expenditure. In a scheme such as this there must be a definite percentage set aside for it; without that the scheme is unsound; no one with a knowledge of these things would support a scheme unless that was provided for. For the handling costs the figure given was 2.152d. The committee's report quotes the figure for operating in bags by merchants as 2.4d. But they have omitted to say that that 2.4d. is covering the merchants' overhead costs. And if the merchants are to operate in the country buying in bulk, they will have to incur a part of that. That covers the whole of the merchants' expenses now, with his agents in the country, all his payments to agents, and for all his clerical and office work and all his records, including interviewing the farmer and buying wheat, together with salesman's charges, wages at the siding and f.o.b. at Fremantle. So a percentage of that 2.4d. must still be met. If the merchants are still to operate in the country they must keep their agents in the country and must still meet a percentage of that 2.4d. What it costs the merchant to finance his organisation in the country will undoubtedly be deducted from the price of wheat he will pay to the farmer. The 2.4d covers all that, and the merchants allow that in the price they quote at the siding. The committee in this report take credit for the whole of the 2.4d. as being

a saving in labour. The actual labour in handling must be separated from the rest of the charge and is not, as the committee assumes, accountable for the whole of that 2.4d. Mr. Thomson, the manager of the Westralian Farmers, had no misgivings on that score, for in reply to Q. 4713, asked of him by the chairman, would the cost of loading as compared with bag handling, represent a large saving, Mr. Thomson said, no, not a large saving. And in answer to Q. 4711, again in reply to the chairman, he said, "In my evidence I show the actual bag handling costs as only a farthing per bushel greater." Yet this committee take credit for the whole of the 2.4d. And even that 2.4d. does not give full allowance for the effect of the 22½ per cent. wages cut, because that did not operate over all those men for the whole of the year. We all know that the lumpers at Fremantle and the lumpers at the siding, and the agents and the staff, all sustained a 22½ per cent. cut. And the Fremantle Harbour Trust have in addition made a rebate of £12,000 this year for handling wheat in Fremantle, for the reason that there is more labour employed in handling bagged wheat than will be necessary for bulk wheat. The savings under that head must be greater to bagged wheat than to bulk wheat. Mr. Thomson says the difference now is very very small. If the merchants are to operate in the country, I suggest it will cost at least a halfpenny per bushel to keep their organisation going in the country, to buy the wheat and be represented: and if, as Mr. Thomson says, the saving will be less than a farthing between the two handlings—that is his reply to Q. 4711—and if the agents are still going to operate in the country, and it costs a halfpenny a bushel to meet their charges there, they are still going to deduct that from the farmers. So I suggest there will be so little saving in the handling that those two will cancel themselves out. I am not making an extravagant claim there, for on Mr. Thomson's figures I think I could make a still greater claim. When the farmer hands his wheat over at the siding he has to meet the capital charge of ½d., which is to come off the 2¼d., which was shown as a saving at that stage, and so his saving will be 1½d. The next step is the railway. The wheat has then to be put from the silo on to the railway and brought to the port. I believe the railways are vital

to the issue. I am amazed at the committee's report under this heading, at the extravagance of its language. And the railway officials have been put in an entirely wrong position. On page ix, the Railway Department are accused of imagining difficulties.

Mr. Kenneally: By the new railway experts!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: On what evidence is that accusation based? It appears that the harbour and railway authorities are treated alike. If their evidence does not suit, they are abused and pushed aside; they are not taken into account. The whole section of the report dealing with the Railway Department is a piece of special pleading. Some of the contentions are diametrically opposed to all sound business reasoning. The reasoning in the second paragraph dealing with the railways is unsound fundamentally. The railway officials say they will require £620,000 of capital, and that will involve an annual charge of £175,000, and it will need 1d. per bushel increase in freight on wheat to meet that charge. This is what the report says on that statement (page viii)—

It is somewhat a staggering proposition even if only given casual consideration. In effect it amounts to a customer of a common carrier being called upon not only to pay freight for the services rendered to him by such common carrier, but in addition a further charge which will pay full interest on the cost of the plant of the common carrier, and an annual redemption charge to pay off such cost. In fact, because he employs such carrier and pays him for his services, he is obliged to buy his plant, but not to become the owner of it. That still remains the property of the carrier.

Nor does it end even at that point. So far as the carrier incurs any annual expenditure in maintenance of the plant, this also must be paid for by the customer.

Hon. P. Collier: Is not that ordinary sound business practice? What else is it?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I do not know how many members have been about the city to-day, but I can tell them that that paragraph was the laughing-stock of the commercial community.

Mr. Withers: And would be the laughing-stock of anyone possessed of commercial knowledge.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I hope the chairman of the committee will forgive me for telling the House that when the report was presented to the select committee, I said, "If

you attempted to conduct your business on those lines, you would be in the Bankruptcy Court quickly." And the only answer was, "Well, I expect to be there, whether or not."

Hon. P. Collier: A man who pens a paragraph like that will surely soon be in the Bankruptcy Court.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: If the customers are not to be charged, where are the capital expenses to be obtained?

Hon. P. Collier: Or the maintenance expenses?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: If the customers are not to pay for the outlay, are we to reach the money from the skies?

Mr. Wansbrough: Fish it out of the Swan.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I know what the next move will be. An agitation will be set afoot that the railways are showing a heavy deficit, and men's wages and working conditions will be attacked. There will be no statement of the kind then, but the men in the railways will be blamed. The Arbitration Court will be invoked, and a balance sheet will be presented to show that the railways are showing an enormous loss and that the wages of the employees must be reduced.

Mr. Church: Or, as an alternative, put up the freights.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes. I wish to examine the select committee's criticism of the Railway Department. The report states that the railways should not make a special charge for trucks specially built for the transport of bulk wheat. It is pointed out that special trucks were built for carrying timber and that no special charges were made. Those trucks are used, not only for the carriage of timber, but also for rails and telegraph poles.

Hon. M. F. Troy: And wheat.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: In reply to Q. 1182. Mr. Tomlinson said it was the best truck they had for the carriage of wheat.

Mr. Withers: Easier to load and unload.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Fancy comparing trucks for bulk wheat with trucks specially constructed for the timber industry—trucks that the Deputy Commissioner says were the best they had for carrying wheat. The report argues that timber should pay a special freight when timber carries one of the highest freights and wheat one of the lowest freights. Where is the reason in that? The report admits that an extra

charge is made for coal, and coal carries one of the highest freights, but it omits to say anything about the bulk trucks for oil. The oil companies built their own wagons and pay freight for having their own wagons hauled about as well as paying for the repairs. How unfair and one-sided that statement is!

Mr. Kenneally: The committee also omitted to say that the specially constructed coal trucks were for the department's own use.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I believe they were used also for bunker coal, but they were not insisted upon by the coal industry, whereas alterations were wanted by the wheat industry, and not by the Railway Department. The point is that the timber trucks, according to the Deputy Commissioner, are the best trucks for wheat transport. The criticism I say was very one-sided and the facts should not be covered up. The evidence we had was that money invested at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would repay the capital in 35 years. The life of a truck is given as 30 years if well maintained, but if not well maintained, the life would be shorter. If no provision were made for maintenance and depreciation, what would happen when the trucks were worn out? If the railway customers are not to pay, who is to pay? I cannot understand the committee's reasoning at all. It seems to me to be altogether ridiculous. The Commissioner's report shows that wheat and fertiliser represent 55 per cent. of the ton mileage of the railways, and yet together they return only 37.24 per cent. of the railway revenue. The paragraph is beyond my understanding and I shall be surprised if the House subscribes to it. The report disputes the Deputy Commissioner's claim that £48,000 is required for converting 4,000 trucks. If members turn to the report or the Government committee, they will find that those officials asked for £38,000 for trucks for the Fremantle zone alone. Yet for the whole system, according to the evidence, only £10,000 more will be required. On page ix of the report it is stated that super was successfully carried in the bulk trucks last year. This statement is made against the contention of the railway authorities that the bulk trucks would have to be hauled one way empty. As a matter of fact, only 80 converted trucks were sent to the country last year with super as an ex-

periment. Q. 3796 contains the following statement by the Chief Traffic Manager in reply to a question whether any complaints had been made about the use of bulk trucks for super transport—

Not a great number. I have two or three concrete cases. The station-master at Kununoppin said, generally speaking, the consignees complain that the trucks are awkward to unload because of the ridge poles and the curtains in front of the door, and those curtains being torn cause complaints when the truck is put into wheat traffic. The traffic inspector at Merredin says that during last season the station-masters complained of the inconvenience caused to consignees in unloading super from bulk wheat trucks. I have another one from the superintendent at Narrogin, who quotes a case at Corrigin, where the consignee, in taking delivery, complained that it was awkward to unload super out of this class of truck. Then, as I mentioned this morning, there was a case from Elandring. The lumpers have a plank and run it straight into the truck. With this bar over the door they were prevented from doing so, and they had to get it to the edge of the truck and wheel it up to the end of the truck.

Mr. Tomlinson, in reply to Q. 1176, said only five sidings were involved, and the department received a good many complaints. The Chief Mechanical Engineer, Mr. Broadfoot said that trucks lined with flat iron must be kept for bulk wheat; holes would be made in the iron if the trucks were used for other freight. Q. 3634 sets out that if the trucks were put into the super works to load super, they would lose a full day, and the railways would require more trucks. On that evidence the committee found that the trucks were successfully used for the transport of super. If the trucks are to be used for super, the evidence is clear that they will have to be put into the super works and that a day will be lost. The calculations of the Railway Department are that the trucks must be kept running all the time, and it will mean that more trucks will be wanted and that a higher capital expenditure will be involved even if the other disadvantages are overcome. On the question of haulage of empties, the report discounts the idea that bulk trucks cannot be used to convey super and other goods to the country. The report states—

But it is unnecessary to pursue this matter further, since not only in this State but also in New South Wales trucks adapted for carriage of wheat in bulk are also used for carriage of other goods. (5181.)

In Q. 5181, Hon. W. D. Johnson asked the witness—

In regard to the covered wagons with the pole and the sheet; what happens to those wagons in the off season?—They are used for ordinary traffic.

The report quotes this as being an authority for the fact that those trucks return loaded during the wheat season. If we turn to the report of the Government committee, page 18, we find that the Commissioner of Railways in New South Wales was asked—

Are the bulk wheat trucks used for goods other than wheat?

The reply was—

Yes. They are not required for wheat between the close of one wheat season and the commencement of another.

The select committee's report says they are used during the wheat season. That is what the select committee put up. Members will see how misleading that is. The question is what happens to the wagons in the off season, and the select committee's report refers to the wheat season. That will enlighten members as to how far the select committee have gone in misrepresenting the case. It appears to me to be absolutely inexcusable. In the off season the railways have a surplus of trucks. There is no necessity for them to use this rolling stock. When wheat is not being hauled there are more trucks than the Railway Department require. That explodes that contention, and discounts the intentions of the committee to belittle the railway efficiency. I now wish to deal with the question of empty haulage. The select committee's report quotes Qs. 1270 to 1273 as showing no allowance for existing empty haulage. It states that they are asking under the bulk handling system for a charge for all empty haulage that operates to-day, as well as that which would operate under the bulk handling. There is no doubt that in one question the chairman did catch Mr. Tomlinson, although I do not say he did it deliberately. He asked Mr. Tomlinson a question. The witness said he had made no allowance for the existing empty haulage under that heading. Earlier he made a statement, in reply to Q. 1245, that this meant £78,000 increase over the present annual running

costs. In reply to Q. 3700, put by Hon. L. B. Bolton—

Under ordinary conditions do not a lot of trucks run empty?

the witness replied—

I have allowed for those trucks, but there will be 2,000 more under the scheme.

In reply to Q. 3710 put by the chairman—

What figure have you allowed for the trucks that run empty to the country at present?

Mr. O'Connor's answer was—

We would have 2,000 more trucks at 25 miles per day. The bulk trucks would go up empty, and the trucks that take super to the country would come back practically empty. Trucks that go to the goldfields and that are now run into the Southern Cross wheat sidings would have to come back to the coast for more super. They could not be used for more wheat, except for a limited quantity of bagged wheat.

In one answer to a question Mr. Tomlinson stated that no allowance was made, but that was I think a slip, because earlier he gave the reply I have quoted. The Chief Traffic Manager makes the position quite clear. There can be no question after reading the Commissioner's report but that the existing empty haulage is in the vicinity of £150,000 a year. The select committee's report asks for only £70,000. The position is that at the moment out of every 100 trucks which go to the country, 40 go out full, and 60 per cent., go the country empty. If the bulk handling scheme is instituted those 40 trucks will still go out full. They will be required to take goods, but they will come back empty. Instead of the whole of the 100 trucks coming back full, only 60 will come back full. This accounts for the empty haulage to which the select committee seem to take such strong exception. The committee further declared there was no allowance for decreased tare. These converted trucks will have a greater carrying capacity according to their weight than existing trucks will have. Owing to the decrease in the tare, according to the weight they carry, the report says that no allowance has been made. Q. 3624 clearly sets out the position. The statement is made that 43,900 tons of carrying capacity will be put aside that is now useful. In order to replace that 43,900 tons the railways are only asking for 28,000 tons, which means a difference of 15,900

tons. That is where the allowance is made. It is made by not asking for so many trucks. That is also the answer to the paragraph in the report which says that according to Mr. Thomson the decreased tare should be worth £66,300 to the railways. That argument might have been all right if the railways had asked for the same amount of tonnage, that is if they had asked for the additional 43,900 tons equivalent to the 43,900 that were going out. They did not do so, and only asked for 28,000 tons. The committee entirely overlooked that fact. It must be remembered all the while, when dealing with the railway position that this scheme, if introduced, will not mean an additional ton of wheat for the railways to carry. It will be just the same amount of wheat, but carried in a different way. The report says that the Commissioner asks for an additional $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a bushel. We did not have the Commissioner before us, as he was out of the State. We got this information through Mr. Sutton, who said that Mr. Evans had given it to him. Second-hand information is accepted, and sworn evidence is rejected. If we turn to page 34 of the report of the Government committee, we find that the Commissioner asked for an additional $\frac{1}{2}$ d., but made it clear that this did not cover all the costs. In the next paragraph he sets out the items of expenditure which are not covered. I would also point out that the whole of the Government committee's report dealt only with the Fremantle zone. The select committee do not stop there, but recommend an additional $\frac{1}{4}$ d. I do not know where they got that figure, for no one has ever suggested it. Even the second-hand information is discounted by 50 per cent. An additional $\frac{1}{4}$ d. is recommended, but there is not a tittle of evidence to support such a proposal. It may be a coincidence, but the figure stated by the Commissioner of Railways is halved, and the figures given by Mr. McCartney on behalf of the Fremantle Harbour Trust are also halved. I do not know why that has been done, but it is in the report. The select committee disagree with the figures supplied by the railway officials, but they accept estimates from non-railway men. I wish to show how much reliance can be placed upon men outside the railways, whom the committee seem inclined to accept in preference to the railway men. In the first letter written to the Premier in August, 1931, page

6 of the report of the Government committee, we find that the Westralian Farmers when making a proposal for bulk handling suggest that 10,000 trucks are necessary. The railways are asking for 6,000 trucks, and the Westralian Farmers now say that 6,000 trucks are too many. The same letter sets out the railway costs at £70,000. Between August, 1931, and April of this year, that figure has gone up to £76,000, as a result of a second letter to the Premier. The railway officials, however, say that the figure is £620,000.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course they know nothing about it!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: On page 3 of the brown book, comparisons are made between the wheat and the passenger traffic, and the number of passengers conveyed is stated to have been $29\frac{1}{2}$ millions. A reference to the report of the Commissioner of Railways shows that these figures belong to the Perth tramways. They are only $20\frac{1}{2}$ millions out.

Mr. Kenneally: That is nothing for them.

Hon. P. Collier: Who, the Westralian Farmers?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes. They are comparing the passengers carried on the Perth tramways and an average ride of two miles, with a bushel of wheat the average haulage of which is 154 miles.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not far out.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: These are the people who are responsible for the figures that the committee are accepting in preference to the figures supplied by trained railway men. Parliament will shoulder a heavy responsibility if the evidence of railway officials is discarded, and information is accepted from men who have shown by their previous statements how little they know about the matter.

Hon. P. Collier: Why should the railway officials make wrong statements?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That is the point. What axe have they to grind? What would it serve them to mislead?

Hon. M. F. Troy: Nothing at all.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: They cannot possibly have any interests to serve by misrepresentation. On the other hand, they have everything to lose. They have their jobs at stake.

Mr. Wansbrough: Their figures are always conservative.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The railway witnesses told us that they had cut their figures

to the bone and had made no allowance for additional locomotives, notwithstanding the extra mileage to be hauled. They could very reasonably have asked for more locomotives and made provision accordingly in their calculations, but they did not do so. Evidently it does not pay to be moderate and to keep one's statements within the proper margin, when facing an inquiry of this description. As for the Midland railway, the committee in their report use language that is even more extravagant than that employed with regard to the Government railways. If members turn to page vii. of the report they will find the last paragraph reads as follows:—

No reference has been made to the views put forward by Mr. Poynton because, in addition to wanting to know more about bulk handling before he tackled it (2327) (which, as above explained, constitutes the general refuge of opponents of the scheme)—

Everyone who does not accept the views of the select committee apparently runs for cover and wants a "refuge"—

—Mr. Poynton definitely stated that even if his company received £25,000 a year by way of extra freight for the carriage of wheat in bulk—

Now come the words that I particularly want to emphasise—

—(which represented all alleged loss and all cost of new rolling stock and alteration of existing rolling stock), he would nevertheless say no and not allow wheat to be carried in bulk on the railway controlled by him (2327).

Let members mark that position! The select committee say that the £25,000 represented all the alleged loss and all the cost of new rolling stock and alteration of existing rolling stock. If members refer to Q. 2204, they will find that, in answer to the chairman, Mr. Poynton said that the estimated total capital expenditure was £151,750, yet the committee in their report say that £25,000 covers the loss!

Hon. N. Keenan: That is per annum.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The report does not say so.

Hon. N. Keenan: But, of course, you know that is what is meant.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The committee do not say it is per annum but say it covers the lot.

Hon. P. Collier: That is all the statement can mean.

Hon. N. Keenan: No, that figure covers the charge per annum.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Then the report does not say so.

Hon. N. Keenan: I am sorry to interrupt you.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The statement that appears in the report is absolutely misleading. If it is not intentional, I will accept the hon. member's explanation, but there is no question about what the report says. Anyone reading the report could come to no other conclusion. I cannot agree that the evidence of the railway officials has been shaken. Furthermore, I will not accept the evidence of non-railway men as against that of railway officials. I will not shoulder that responsibility, particularly in view of past statements of those to whom I have already referred. Those statements were proved to be absolutely unreliable. The railways are now losing over £200,000 a year and unless they get the extra 1d. in freight, that annual loss will be increased. In those circumstances, I propose to allow that additional 1d. in freight and by the time the wheat gets to Fremantle the saving will be reduced to ½d. per bushel. Even so, that does not allow for the set-offs that I have referred to previously. I have not allowed anything for additional teams and only bags in accordance with the figures that the Westralian Farmers themselves submitted. The committee in their report say it is impossible to estimate the savings at the port. But the Wheat Pool authorities have not even discussed the scheme with the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners. It is amazing to me that a scheme of such magnitude could be considered, elaborate plans and specifications prepared, propositions made to the Government and a Bill placed before Parliament, without its being even discussed with the Harbour Trust Commissioners. The Westralian Farmers quoted 1½d. to the Government as the cost from the farmer's wagon to f.o.b. but made no allowance for any payments to the Harbour Trust Commissioners at Fremantle. On page 42 of the brown book, there appears a table setting out the costs under their different headings.

Hon. P. Collier: I think that is the Domesday Book by now!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: In that table, the Westralian Farmers give a comparison be-

tween bag and bulk costs right through from the time the wheat leaves the farm until it reaches overseas. In their figures, they give the bulk handling charges as representing 1.750d., but in their offer to the Government they reduced that figure to 1.300d. The capital charges under the bulk scheme are left at .625d., which represents 1½d. English sterling, with exchange added. Then for Harbour Trust rent, shortage of out-turn, etc., they provide .500d., or 1d. a bushel, but they make no allowance in the figures for the charges I have just referred to. There is another charge for cornsacks for stiffening cargo aboard the boat—I will deal with that phase later on—and under that heading they provide for .135d.

Hon. P. Collier: These figures are supplied by the Westralian Farmers Ltd.?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes, they appear in their brown book. But none of these figures is included in the 1½d. per bushel that I have already referred to. The committee's report entirely ignores that phase and makes no provision for it at all. I cannot imagine that the Harbour Trust authorities will grant the use of a tremendous shed, with two up-to-date berths, extensive wharf accommodation and a network of railway lines, and hand those facilities over to those controlling the bulk handling scheme absolutely for nothing. It is unthinkable. Under existing conditions to-day no wharfage is paid on wheat, although it is paid on wool and timber. Wheat represents 50 per cent. of the cargo dealt with at Fremantle, but contributes only 15.8 per cent. towards the upkeep of the harbour and capital charges. Allowing for rebates granted this year, the wheat shippers will contribute 4.5 per cent. only of the surplus revenue, notwithstanding that they account for 50 per cent. of the cargo dealt with at the port. In New South Wales and South Australia 1s. per ton wharfage is paid on wheat. If we take the figures that the Westralian Farmers themselves submitted, and the ½d. per bushel payment to the Harbour Trust, and the .135d. that has to be allowed for cornsacks for stiffening cargo on the boats, the whole of the benefits claimed for the scheme have disappeared. Indeed there is a balance of a fraction on the wrong side.

Mr. Marshall: That is twice that the scheme has gone by the board.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I have quoted the Westralian Farmers' figures in support of their own case and have dealt with the matter point by point, as the select committee dealt with the subject in their report. I have not included any allowance for teams or for bags that go to the mills, and so on. I have simply dealt with the position by following the committee step by step through the report. So I have shown that there will be no saving unless we are prepared to shut our eyes to all the additional charges, which must be met by someone. Let me put the matter in another way. The report gives 2.4d. as representing the handling charges for bagged wheat. The figures of the Wheat Pool for bulk wheat are: For handling, 1.500d.; toll, .625d.; Harbour Trust, .500d.; cornsacks for stiffening, .135d. Then if we deal with the other phase regarding wheat purchased by merchants in the country, we have to incur an additional charge of ½d. Allowing for that, it leaves the pool figures at 3.260d. for wheat that the merchants buy, which shows the bulk figures to be worse off by .860d. per bushel. Then if we add the additional freight and the cost of bags on the farm, etc., it will be found that the cost works out to within a fraction of a penny, the figure I previously quoted. As a set-off against that, even if the figures balanced—I claim that these figures show that there is a loss to the extent of a fraction of 1d.—we must remember the risks that have to be taken under several headings. First of all there is the price fixed by the handling authority, the Westralian Farmers Ltd., at 1½d. for one year only. Mr. Shaw, who visited the sidings where the experimental installations were placed, said that he was positive that the figures given could not be lived up to. I do not propose to go into those figures extensively but he calculated that one man with a Clarke shovel had to shift 30 tons of wheat every hour for eight hours a day. Members will appreciate what that job means when they realise that the man, by using the shovel, shifted half a ton of wheat a minute.

Mr. Panton: What sort of shovel did you say he was using?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Do you want to buy one?

Mr. Panton: Not if I have to use it in that way.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Mr. Shaw, who is a practical man, said he is positive that the figures of the Westralian Farmers cannot be lived up to. In the brown book, where the full details are given, it will be found that allowance has been made for employers' liability, but there is no allowance made for workers' compensation or for compliance with the law relating to weights and measures. Under the present system those charges are passed on by the Westralian Farmers and also by the merchants to the man at the siding. But it will not be possible to operate this method by contract. It will be necessary to employ men direct, and therefore charges will be incurred for workers' compensation and compliance with the Weights and Measures Act, which charges, as I say, are now met by the men themselves. No provision is made by the scheme for these charges, nor is provision made for renewals and repairs, as I have already stated. Allowance is not made for a possible fall in the price of bags or for a fall in exchange rates. These charges may become lower than they were in pre-war time. Another point: If a boat is chartered to carry wheat in bulk, a reduction of 2s. 6d. per ton is made. I quote from a charter party under which a ship is engaged to load in this State shortly: "If wheat in bulk, 2s. 6d. a ton less than the above rates on an entire cargo." The charter party then proceeds to say, "In the event of the vessel loading bulk wheat in Western Australia, South Australia or Victoria, the cost of stevedoring in loading not to exceed 9d. per ton, any excess to be for charterers' account. This applies only to the quantity of cargo loaded in bulk, not to any cargo shipped in bags for safe stowage." Therefore, all charges above 9d. per ton for stevedoring have to be borne by the scheme. According to the printed report, under the Government scheme the average charge is 1s. 9d., so there is an additional 1s. per ton to be accounted for there. No inquiry has been made into the position at the outports. We have no evidence how the scheme will be operated at those ports. It is very questionable whether the Railway Department can transport 1,000 tons per day into those ports, as they are fed by single lines. It is very questionable indeed whether the railways could cope with the requirements of the charter party which provides for the delivery of 1,000 tons per day in bulk, as against 500 tons in bags. I

know that at the moment the Railway Department are pushed to deliver 500 tons per day to the outports, yet under this scheme they will be called upon to double that quantity. The committee did not investigate that aspect of the matter. Still another point: The ships that call at Fremantle have to be topped off. Last year 29 vessels came to Fremantle from the outports to be topped off. No inquiry was made into the position of those vessels. I quote now from a copy of a charter party that was given in evidence before the committee—

Should the charterers elect to load in bulk they must supply a sufficient quantity of cargo in bags required by the Commonwealth Navigation surveyors for safe stowage to comply with the grain regulations under the Navigation Act, 1912-20, or any amendment thereof, but shall not be bound to supply more cargo in bags than required for this purpose.

Evidently, the law requires that before these vessels are permitted to proceed to sea, they must be loaded with a certain number of bags. Whether these vessels will be permitted to leave Geraldton, Bunbury or Albany to be topped off at Fremantle, we did not investigate. I asked twice that evidence in that connection should be called. The reply I got was that one layer of bags on top of bulk wheat would be sufficient. I venture to say that if a single layer of bags were placed on top of bulk wheat the vessel would not proceed many miles before the bags would be lost sight of; they would sink in the wheat. But the law is that a certain number of bags have to be shipped. We did not investigate that matter, so no one can say what will happen there. It is also possible that if vessels put to sea loaded in the way I have described, a very heavy insurance premium will be demanded. I have made no provision for extra teams in the figure I have given. All those items have to be taken into account to get an even balance, or .1d. loss. The committee have ignored those charges. My finding is that there is no saving whatever to the wheat-growers of the State if the scheme be adopted. So far as world markets are concerned, it is stated that the freight is 2s. 6d. per ton and wheat will be sold cheaper in bulk overseas. I am not going to labour that point. I am of opinion that the items will probably cancel one another out. If there be any difference, however, it will

be against bulk handling, but I do not think the difference serious enough to weigh very much. We set out to investigate the loss that bulk handling would cause to Government institutions or semi-Government institutions. The report says the committee could not get definite figures. In my judgment, neither examination nor cross examination succeeded in breaking down the evidence of Mr. McCartney or of the railway officers. It seems strange that the committee could get definite figures in support of bulk handling, but that when it came to dealing with the Railway Department, the Harbour Trust and men out of work, the committee could get no definite figures. In my opinion, the figures can be stated quite as definitely for one side as for the other. The railway losses will amount to £175,000 per annum. A strange point is revealed, when considering the Railway Department, by the answers to questions 1349, 1352 and 1353. The evidence there shows that 150 additional men will be required on the railways and sets out to explain what work will necessitate the employment of those additional men. It states that 330,000 additional train miles will have to be run and that 150 additional men will be required for maintenance, etc. While the report gives credit for the 150 additional men, it discards the question of the 330,000 additional train miles.

Hon. P. Collier: The 150 additional men are required because of the extra mileage.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes. That is the only excuse for their employment. I submit that we have never had such a one-sided document submitted to Parliament. The evidence shows the Fremantle Harbour Trust will lose £39,783 per annum; and in an attempt to break down Mr. McCartney's evidence the report says he is wrong in surmising that ships will work overtime. Overtime, the report says, is uneconomical. I have known the Fremantle harbour for 34 years—before it was opened—and I do not think that during the whole of that period for one week—I was going to say one day—overtime was not worked. The Chairman said overtime was uneconomical, and so does the report. Overtime is frequently a very payable proposition. The Chairman has weird ideas of the use of machinery in industry. He says that if a

machine is introduced to displace manual labour, a saving in money must be effected. I served my apprenticeship to and worked in an industry where a great deal of machinery is used, and I have seen hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of machinery discarded because it was uneconomical. It did not pay. Everyone knows that, speaking generally, a machine will do work quicker than it can be done by manual labour, but not always. For instance, no one has yet been able to invent a machine to handle bricks from the time they are carted to a building until they are put alongside the bricklayer quicker than a man can take them in his hands and carry them up. Not even in America has such a machine been invented. Very frequently machines are introduced which prove more expensive than manual labour. If bulk handling is introduced at Fremantle it will displace manual workers by the hundred. Only a few men will be working there. The Chairman said it would be uneconomical to work the plant overtime. There will be no overtime rates payable for electric current, yet the aim of every employer who has introduced machinery into his business is to keep his plant running 24 hours per day, if possible, in order to get back his capital outlay. The report says that Mr. McCartney is advocating something that is extreme and that his fears are unfounded. The report says it will be uneconomical to work overtime, but I venture to say the desire will be to get the boats loaded as speedily as possible in order that they may proceed to sea. The report goes on to claim as a set-off to any loss the Harbour Trust may sustain that the scheme will save additional berths and stave off the extension of the harbour for many years. As members know, I was responsible for introducing into this House years ago a proposal to extend the Fremantle harbour, but things have changed materially since then. There is much more accommodation at Fremantle now than there was then. No reasonable man to-day would advocate or urge any extension of the Fremantle harbour. When we get back to normal times we will want this extension. We have to find out what the normal times are going to be; it may be that the abnormal times we are now passing through will be the normal times of the future; who can say? So I do not regard that as any case to

set up against the evidence of Mr. McCartney. The report says that every disadvantage, imaginary and real, has been urged by the railways against the proposal. My idea is that every objection, imaginary and real, has been brought in to support this case. I do not think that statement, applied by the report to the railway officials, could be more aptly applied than it can be to the committee's report itself. Paragraph 5 on page x. of this report reads—

The reduction of wharfage on the importation of cornsacks will undoubtedly constitute a loss to the revenue of the harbour for which there is no set-off either in the present or the future. But it would be a somewhat extraordinary proposition that because an industry has ceased to make use of some article formerly imported for its use, because of its use being uneconomic, that such industry should make good to the harbour authority the wharfage lost on the abandonment of such importation.

Nobody ever suggested that, or ever put forward such a proposal. Mr. McCartney made it quite clear that the proposals would not interfere with the Fremantle Harbour Trust; that it would be able to meet all its financial obligations and that the only difference would be as to the paying of surplus revenue to the Treasurer. Yet that kind of report is put out by the committee. Nobody said it, but of course it will be good propaganda out amongst the cockies: "Look what these people propose to do! Notwithstanding that you do not want any more cornsacks, they still want you to pay for them." That is how this report will be read. But nobody ever put forward such an idea. We have no definite figures as to the loss at Geraldton, Albany or Bunbury, but the loss the Treasury has to stand between the Fremantle Harbour Trust and the railways is £215,283 per annum. That is the difference the scheme is going to make to the Treasury. The report also omits to state anything regarding the number of men who will lose their work in consequence of the scheme. This report finds figures only for one way and cannot find any on the other side. Mr. McCartney said that at Fremantle 500 men at £3 a week and with 52 weeks in the year meant that £80,000 in wages would be lost. Mr. Fox, the secretary of the Fremantle Lumpers' Union, said it would be 550 men, and Mr. Thomson, in answer to question 5002, said he would not question the figures given by Mr. Fox and Mr. McCartney. Then Mr. Bogle, in answer to question 2199, said

that at Geraldton 300 fewer men would be employed, and that £27,000 would be lost in wages. We had it in evidence from the secretary of the Bunbury Harbour Board that at Bunbury 366 men looked for work on the wharf and that approximately 50 per cent. of the work lay in the handling of wheat. Mr. Sticht said that under bulk handling only 20 men would be wanted at Bunbury, which means, of course, that 168 will have to go out. Mr. Wansbrough, another witness, said that 160 men were employed handling wheat at Albany and that he had seen 250 men employed on bagged wheat there. Mr. Sticht said that only 15 men would be required at Albany, which means that 145 would have to go. At the sidings, the Westralian Farmers say there were employed 800 men, and the merchants say 2,000. Let us split the difference and call it 1,500. According to Mr. Fethers, manager for Messrs. John Darling & Sons, he employed 40 or 50 clerks, and 50 per cent. of them would have to go. That also applies to other merchants. In answer to question 4998, Mr. Thomson said that under bulk handling his office staff probably would have to be reduced by 10 per cent. When speaking previously, I estimated a figure for the bag sewers. I said there were 10,000 farmers in the country, and that the bag sewers probably would number 5,000. But say we reduce it to 2,000. That leaves us the figures represented by loss of employment as follows:—Fremantle, 525; Geraldton, 300; Bunbury, 168; Albany, 145; the sidings, 1,500; the bag sewers, 2,000; office staff, say, 200. That means throwing out of work 4,838 men. Of course, they are not employed all the year round, but they are employed for part of every year and their work generally forms the basis of other work which they can do. As a set-off there will be 150 men employed on the railways, and I do not know how many teamsters will have to be employed by the farmers, but let us suppose it to be 1,000. That makes a set-off of 1,150 men, and so the net number of men that will be thrown out of work will be 3,678. The great hulk of those men will be clamouring around the Minister's office for sustenance. That position has to be faced. The committee's report supports the Wheat Pool scheme. I disagree first of all with the proposed method of finance. In case it is thought I have any feeling in regard to the Wheat Pool or the Westralian Farmers as against the mer-

chants, I want to repeat what I said in the House previously, namely, that ever since I have grown wheat I have been the biggest customer the pool has had in my district, and I have never sold a bushel of wheat to a merchant other than to the Westralian Farmers. All my wheat has gone either to the pool or the Westralian Farmers. So if I have any feeling at all it should be that way. But I disagree entirely with the proposed method of finance, and all the trustees who gave evidence said they felt bound by the negotiations that had taken place in London. On page xii of the committee's report, paragraph 8 reads as follows:—

"The rate of interest at which this money was to be borrowed was not fixed, nor was there any evidence in regard to such rate before your committee other than a statement, which was said to be without authority, that such rate of interest would not exceed $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

"Other than a statement which was said to be without any authority, that such interest would not exceed $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent." On the last occasion that I spoke, I quoted here a letter that is in the Government committee's report. The letter was sent to the Government where the $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. is given. I was actually told during the inquiry that that $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. was a figment of my own imagination. In question 280, I said to Mr. Harper, "But your letter making the offer to the Cabinet stated a rate of $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent." Mr. Harper replied—

That is the maximum. They agreed to a maximum. We said we were not prepared to go to the Government and ask them to do something while we either had not got the money or did not know the rate at which we could get it. While Mr. Thomson was in London, I sent him a cable on this aspect. He wanted us to put up an offer to the Government without being bound in any way, and without knowing that we had got the money. I cabled back refusing, and saying that I would not be a party to making any offer to the Government, more or less flying a kite, until the Government definitely knew that the money was available. Then, when he did all that and no rate of interest was fixed, for nearly a week cables went backwards and forwards, and I still said I was not prepared to put up an offer unless it was a pretty concrete one. The people in London said that if they tried to fix the rate of interest, they would have to protect themselves, as making a contract for some months ahead; would have to protect themselves in their interests against us. However, they advised us to leave the rate of interest. I cabled back asking

would they give us a minimum, and I think you will find that that figure mentioned to the Government is the maximum rate at which they would undertake to raise the money. However, I still think this would be better evidence coming from Mr. Thomson, who was charged with the negotiations, and who knows all the details and has all the documents. Then Mr. Thomson, in answer to Q. 4906, said—

Having read the answer you refer to, all I can say is that Mr. Harper was in error in saying that $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. was ever agreed to by the people in London, because that rate of interest was never mentioned. It was a matter purely for the Co-operative Wholesale Society, with whom we were not negotiating.

Mr. Teasdale also said in his evidence that $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. was agreed to as a maximum. I am not going to believe that Mr. Harper sent that letter to the Premier without being assured that $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. was right. I think now when it is exposed and when it is pointed out that, given a monopoly of the handling of the whole of the wheat of this country without any limit to the charges made for handling, to give a mortgage over the whole of the assets of the scheme and then, in addition, to get a Government guarantee that the whole of the capital and the whole of the interest will be repaid in ten years—I say that to ask $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for money under those conditions was so outrageous that everyone now wants to disown it.

Hon. M. F. Troy: It was outrageous, too.

Hon. P. Collier: But that letter would not have been sent to the Premier unless the figure had been fixed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Mr. Harper said that he cabled about it. Another point: When the question of this loan was first mentioned, the member for Fremantle raised the constitutional aspect, and questioned whether it was not outside the jurisdiction of this Parliament owing to the Financial Agreement, and contended that it would come under the Loan Council. But during the inquiry we had given to us a copy of the prospectus drafted by the people in London and which is to be issued on the market of London for the raising of this money. And this is the way that prospectus reads—

This issue has been sanctioned by the Loan Council of Australia.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is a lie.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Well, that is the heading to the prospectus.

The Premier: It has not been issued.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: No, it has not been issued. But this is the draft of the prospectus sent here for approval. It leaves no doubt as to what is in their minds. On page xiii. the following appears—

But there are other reasons which appear to your committee to be strongly in favour of borrowing in London. In the first place it is known for certain that the moneys can be obtained in London. No one could give the like assurance as regards Australia, and any failure to obtain the money in Australia would necessarily utterly damn the prospect of obtaining it elsewhere.

Against that I quote an extract from a letter addressed to the Premier on the 12th May, 1932, as follows—

On the question of finance I noticed in the Press recently that your Government had not been successful through the Loan Council in raising the necessary funds. If this be so, and your Government finds itself in some difficulty in making funds available for this essential work, would you feel inclined to consider the financing of the scheme by means of an issue of bonds backed by the Loan Council or other authority? If so, I am able and prepared to furnish such a scheme, submit estimates, and execute the contract for the whole of Western Australia on a reasonable system of payment by bonds.

That was put forward by Teesdale, Smith, Ltd., Temple Court, 422 Collins-street, Melbourne. No interest rate was mentioned, but it was stated quite distinctly that the money was available, and it would be only a question of negotiating as to the terms and rate of interest. The House is aware that the Minister for Works, in his report to Cabinet, stated that in addition one firm had submitted in writing a proposal to design and do the work at an approved figure and accept payment in 4 per cent. Western Australian Government bonds. Yet, in face of that, the report says that no one can guarantee that the money is available in Australia. According to this morning's paper the McKay Harbour Board, Queensland, have just secured a loan of a million of money in Melbourne for harbour works. Such a statement as that made by the committee is utterly misleading. There is no necessity to hawk this loan around Australia. According to reports it was hawked around London for some months. The money is here in Australia. The banks are

refusing to take money on fixed deposit. There is any amount of money available in Australia for investment in sound securities and with such security and such backing as this loan would have, there is no doubt that the money could be obtained in Australia. The report states that if it were attempted to float the loan in Australia there would likely be objection on the part of the Commonwealth Government and other State Governments. I venture to say that the objection is likely to be more substantial if the money were borrowed outside Australia. There can be no more objection to a Government borrowing inside than outside Australia. The London money market is still closed to the Governments of Australia. The Commonwealth Government cannot raise money in London; they are now raising a loan in Australia. I dislike increasing the overseas liability of this country at the moment. I am sure that the Premier has experienced anxious nights. Every man occupying a responsible public position in the Commonwealth must have had anxious nights during the last few months as to whether Australia would be able to meet its overseas obligations. If a drought occurred or if we experienced even a poor season, it is almost certain that we would not be able to meet our overseas obligations. If we increase the overseas liability of our little community by £70,000 a year, it is a consideration. I venture to say that if an emergency occurred—I hope it will never occur—but if a drought overtook us and credit was required overseas; the Commonwealth Government would step in and take the £70,000, because they would see that the obligations of the nation were met rather than allow default and at the same time allow a private institution to meet its obligations. The next point I object to is that of control. It is interesting to note that the first proposal for bulk handling went to the Government on the 15th July, 1931, and emanated from Westralian Farmers Ltd. Then Westralian Farmers Ltd. sent the general manager, Mr. Thomson, to London, and as late as April of this year, according to the printed document supplied by the Minister, Westralian Farmers Ltd. wrote to the Government and put forward a scheme. It is only recently that the Wheat Pool of Western Australia have come into the picture; the proposals right

up to the last few months emanated from Westralian Farmers Ltd. My view is that if a monopoly is to be granted, it must be granted to a body entirely dissociated from the marketing of wheat. The Wheat Pool authorities market approximately 50 per cent. of the State's output; Westralian Farmers Ltd. will handle the monopoly and they are active competitors with the merchants. It will be argued that regulations are proposed to debar the men employed in the bulk handling scheme from canvassing for wheat or from acquiring wheat. But what will happen? I do not care how the regulations are framed, this is what will occur: Westralian Farmers Ltd. do their business through the local co-operative organisations. The local agent will employ the lumpers at the siding and they will receive the wheat. They have not to go out to canvass for it. The law will say that it is compulsory for the farmers to cart the wheat to the siding. At that centre Westralian Farmers Ltd. will operate their organisation. The few men—the lumpers and others engaged on the bulk handling—will, of course, be entirely separate from the organisation, but they will be situated in that particular district. By those means Westralian Farmers Ltd. will place themselves in a position to meet a big percentage of their costs in wheat buying. They have their organisation created: the few men who handle the bulk wheat will be separate—their overhead expenses, office charges, staff, etc., will be separate, but those expenses will be financed out of the scheme. I wish to quote an extract from a letter sent to the committee by the representative of Bunge (Aust.) Proprietary Ltd., wheat merchants. It was not the fault of that gentleman that he did not appear before the select committee. He waited in the corridor for two days, and on the day, we were prepared to hear him, he could not be present. He forwarded a letter, a paragraph of which reads—

The actual position under the Bill is that a monopoly in handling is given to the pool trustees, who will employ a handling organisation at the rates set out in the pool offer. This handling organisation is a competitor in buying and the disposal of wheat with other interests forced to deliver to them. The handling costs to be paid by the trust to its handling organisation will cover that organisation's country agents and overhead costs, and possibly a margin of profit. In effect, by

penalising buyers outside their own handling organisation, by such outside buyers having to pay, in addition to handling charges, a buying commission to their agents and their own overhead, an absolute buying monopoly is granted to the handling organisation. It would not be possible for any company competitively to buy wheat when, under this Bill, one of their competitors is granted a buying advantage of a minimum of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel.

I think that is sound. This proposal means that we are going to give that organisation an advantage over wheat merchants of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel. If the prediction set out in that letter is correct that all the wheat merchants will have to go out of the wheat buying business and only one firm is to operate, it will be a poor lookout for the wheat-growers of Western Australia. I strongly object to such a monopoly. As the body to control the scheme, if it is to come—I hope it will not come—my first choice would be to use the State's existing organisation and machinery. The Railway Department have an organisation right through the country, and they could do the whole job. The railways, with the harbour authorities, should be the people to control bulk handling if there is to be a monopoly. My second choice would be to have an independent trust, who should be given statutory power to raise their own capital and adopt the scheme which they considered best. The committee differed, however, and have suggested the Wheat Pool, and I dissent from their proposal. What is going to happen if the Bill be passed? The first thing will be that the Government will be called upon to find £620,000 for the railways. Where are they going to get it? There is no possibility of the Government finding that amount for the railways. The Minister, when moving the second reading of the Bill, quoted South Africa as having introduced a bulk handling scheme. I have a copy of the pamphlet issued in 1924 when the scheme was proposed. It was issued by the Commissioner of Railways, and one would almost think one was reading one of the documents issued by Westralian Farmers Limited. It sets out the gains and losses for bulk and bag handling, the same comparisons as have been made here, and it indicates a saving by using the elevator system of 1s. 3d. per bag. I have a copy of the report for 1929 of the Commissioner of Railways who is in charge of the scheme. There is no monopoly: only one-fourth of the crop of South Africa is handled by the scheme: the growers

of the other three-fourths still prefer to export in bags. During the period it has been in operation, since 1924 up to 1929, there was a deficit on the scheme of £254,633. With all these bright and alluring figures, and the estimate of a saving of 1s. 3d. a bag, there is a deficit over the period of a quarter of a million of money. If there is any loss in Western Australia it is not a Government concern. The only people who can be called upon to meet the deficit are the farmers, to whom it must be passed on. Apart from them there are no resources from which the charges can be met. The report further stated that no country that has once established bulk handling has ever discarded it. It is not easy to discard it when you give a monopoly for an established system. I would remind members that there have been three inquiries, namely, by the Commonwealth, by Victoria and South Australia. Three commissions were sent here to inquire into our proposals for bulk handling, but not in one case has there been a recommendation for the scheme that is proposed here. We have to face the recommendations contained in the select committee's report. These proposals will create a revolution in the business of wheat merchandising. They will interfere with the whole of vested interests. They will put out of business people who have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds in building it up. They will throw thousands of men out of work. They will fasten upon the farmers an unpayable proposition, which may mean that their second position will be worse than their first. I have given figures to-night that absolutely discount the figures quoted by the select committee, that explode their contentions entirely, and I submit that the case they have set out is founded on false premises, and that the figures I have submitted cannot successfully be challenged. I trust that before Parliament agrees to adopt any system such as is suggested in the report, considerable hesitancy will be shown. I am sorry I have had to occupy so much of the time of the House. This is a question which is of vast importance to the State, and disagreeing as I do so strongly with the committee's findings, and feeling they have left such a lot unsaid and said such a lot which is not in keeping with the position, I consider I was justified in dealing with the matter at length and putting all the information before members.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

BILL—BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. Mr. Pantou in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 9—Amendment of Section 14:

Mr. MARSHALL: With a view to expediting the business of the Committee I should like to withdraw my amendment in favour of another one, which I understand the Minister will accept.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. MARSHALL: I move an amendment—

That after the word "fee" in line 12, the words "not exceeding 1s." be inserted.

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

Clauses 10 to 20—agreed to.

Clause 21—Amendment of Section 45:

Mr. MILLINGTON: This clause amends Section 45, which deals with cattle and horses. The amendment to the Act means that any sheep under the age of six months shall be deemed to be unbranded. Do the Crown Law authorities consider it necessary to have this amendment to the Act? In the first instance it is provided that any cattle under the age of 18 months are dealt with in one way, whereas the cattle aged four months may be branded at the instigation of those holding a lien over a property.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have referred that particular point to the Crown Law officers and they assure me there is no necessity for Section 45 to be altered seeing that it will apply to stock throughout the State, whereas the subsequent clause applies only to stock in the South-West land division.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 22.—New Section. Owner of mortgaged stock of the age of four months or more must brand such stock in certain cases:

Mr. MARSHALL: I want the assurance of the Minister that this provision will not apply to the North or the North-West, but to the South-West land division only.

The Minister for Lands: It is perfectly clear that it applies only to the South-West.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Government could not apply it to the North or the North-West.

The Minister for Lands: Of course not.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 23 and 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—New Section after Section 40. Inspector or police officer may seize stock illegally branded:

Mr. MARSHALL: The clause is particularly drastic. Merely because he suspects a breach of the Act, an inspector or police officer, without the necessity for any warrant at all, may visit premises and seize stock or skins.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This clause will apply to the whole of the State. On many occasions representations have been made to me by the Royal Agricultural Society, the Pastoralists' Association and practically every stock owner's organisation throughout the South-West to have these provisions included in the measure. Much sheep stealing has been going on in recent years in the South-West, and it is generally considered that if the police have the powers set out in the clause, much will be done towards the suppression of sheep stealing.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not like the clause and I shall vote against it. Particularly am I opposed to the latter part of it, which sets out that no person shall remove or mutilate the ears on any sheep or skin.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The provision that the hon. member refers to is the most effective by which the police can detect sheep stealing. It is not likely that the provision will be enforced in the North because sheep stealing does not take place there. In the South-West, where sheep stealing does take place, these provisions are regarded as the greatest safeguard.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 26—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

“BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Panton in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 407:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I intend to strike out the proviso and to insert one that it was proposed to include in the Road Districts Act Amendment Bill. I move an amendment—

That proposed new Subsection (4) be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—
“Provided that no person who, as being trustee of any estate by virtue of any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act, 1924-1932, or the liquidator in the winding up of a company under the Companies Act, 1893, has become the owner of any rateable land, shall on that account be personally liable to pay out of his own moneys or otherwise than out of the estate in his hands any rates due on such land when he becomes owner thereof as aforesaid, or be so personally liable as aforesaid to pay any rates assessed on such land thereafter if he proves to the satisfaction of and obtains a certificate in writing from the Minister that a continuance of his ownership of the said land is essential in the interests of that estate, or that he is unable to dispose of the said land.”

The proposed new subclause 4, as printed, merely protects the trustee against rates which are owing when he becomes the owner of the land. That does not go far enough. These trustees have no personal interest in the ownership of the land, and it seems wrong that they should be liable to pay out of their own pocket rates accrued due when the land was vested in them, or rates accruing due thereafter, if it is considered right that the property should be held and not sold immediately. The proposal is a reasonable one.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Has there been a case where a trustee has been sued for payment of such rates?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know that a trustee has had to pay them out of his own pocket. Owing to the risk they run, trustees on occasions have refused to allow land to be put into their names.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Does the trustee become the registered proprietor?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: He becomes the legal owner, as opposed to being

the equitable owner. He becomes the registered proprietor, because when a deed of assignment is executed, it is recorded at the Titles Office. He becomes registered in the same way as a person becomes registered as proprietor by transmission.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 16th November.

HON. S. W. MUNSIE (Hannans) [10.30]: I agree almost entirely with what is contained in the Bill, and I congratulate the Minister on having succeeded in getting it through another place first. The measure is almost on all fours with that which I introduced in 1928. Unfortunately it was late in the session when it reached another place and in consequence it was not completed. I agree with the Minister that the Bill can be dealt with better in Committee than at the second-reading stage, but nevertheless there are in the Bill several principles about which I wish to say a word or two. The first is the alteration of the definition of "infectious diseases." That is a step in the right direction. At present we have in the several States of the Commonwealth varying definitions of diseases classified as infectious. At a health conference some years ago it was decided to put all these definitions on a uniform basis, but some of the States have not yet introduced the necessary legislation. In our existing Act we have a definition under which are classified as infectious diseases several which to-day are not looked upon by the doctors as being infectious at all. It is almost impossible for this State or for the Commonwealth to keep statistics of infectious diseases up to date unless we can get a uniform definition. I agree thoroughly with the making co-terminus of the boundaries of health authorities and local authorities. Then there is the provision for the election of health authorities. I apologise for having contradicted the Minister the other night by saying that there

is already power to elect members of health authorities. I now realise that we have not that power. What happened was that when a certain local authority in the metropolitan area refused to carry out the behest of the Commissioner of Public Health, I as Minister disbanded that local authority and got some residents to convene a public meeting. At that meeting more than the required number of candidates were nominated, and it was stated that the Health Department did make a provision for a ballot to constitute a health authority. The regulations under the Health Act to-day would give that authority if there were more than the number required at a public meeting; a ballot of the ratepayers who attended that meeting could be taken and a number of persons elected to constitute a health board. In the Bill the Minister is taking power to have members of health boards elected the same as are members of a road board. With that I heartily approve. Then we have an amendment which in many instances will cheapen the cost of administering health matters in small localities. Under this amendment sanitary boards instead of health boards will be appointed. The cost will be considerably less than is the cost of a health board, and in many small centres sanitary boards are all that is required. The Minister is taking power to combine several local authorities in country districts and appoint one health inspector to serve the group and to give the Commissioner power to allocate to each of the combined local authorities its share of the cost of that inspector. The same provision was contained in the Bill I introduced, and I certainly think it is the best method to adopt in the interest of the health of the people. I say that because frequently there are to be seen public advertisements of local authorities calling for an official to fill the positions of secretary, engineer and health inspector. On every occasion the qualification of health inspector is the last mentioned. As a matter of fact no qualification for that officer is advertised; so long as he can satisfy the local authority that he has some knowledge of health matters he can be appointed as secretary and engineer and to act as health inspector.

Mr. Parker: But a health inspector has to pass examinations.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Yes, before he can be appointed definitely and solely as a health inspector. But as I say, in many small places he is appointed as secretary, engineer and inspector of health. In my opinion the health inspection is the most important of the three duties, and the appointee should be fully qualified for that task. I think the provision made in the Act will overcome the difficulty the Minister now has in administering health boards throughout the State. To-day there is a good deal of overlapping amongst the health authorities. For instance, such an authority might have what they call a health inspector, but not infrequently we have to send a health inspector from the department to do the work of that man, and it involves considerable travelling expenses. There was another point I had thought to deal with, but I see by the Notice Paper that the Minister proposes to delete Clause 10 altogether. In Committee I shall want to know the reason why, because I think it is a vast improvement on the corresponding provision in the existing Act. Then it is proposed in the Bill to give the local authorities power to borrow for the purpose of installing septic tanks. I thoroughly agree with that. Provision is made in the Bill that where a local authority has to take action against a tenant or a landlord who has failed to comply with the requirements of the Health Act, and the owner refuses to do the work, the local authority can step in and do the work. Actually they have that authority under the existing Act, but the charge made is a charge on the property, the building on the land. It happened on two or three occasions while I was Minister that certain work had been done and the cost debited against the building, but previous to the local authority being able to collect the money, the building was pulled down or burnt down, and there was no chance of collecting against the land. The Bill provides that when a local authority has spent money to compel someone to comply with the Health Act, the charge will lie against the land and remain a charge against the land, even though it be sold. I am pleased that that provision has been passed in another place. The next important provision deals with the sale of patent medicines. I am pleased that the Minister in-

tends to go so far as to prohibit the publication of quack advertisements in the Press, as well as on the wrappers of patent medicines. There is not the slightest doubt that some people are prepared to advertise anything. When I was Minister for Health, a calendar was printed for distribution, and the individual who issued it included a list of the ills that his patent remedies would cure. They would cure almost any known disease, including cancer, T.B. and many diseases of which the cause, much less the cure, was unknown to the medical profession. The individual possessed no degree and had had no training in medicine, and yet he was selling quack medicines and telling the public that he could cure almost anything under the sun. I am glad the Minister intends to prevent that sort of thing and that he also proposes to go further than I went by making it illegal to advertise quack remedies in the Press. The Minister proposes to include an amendment to delete Subsections 2 and 3 of Section 240. That being so, what arrangement has the Minister made to secure notification of cases of T.B.? Those two subsections mention the amount to be paid to a medical officer in such cases, and make it obligatory on medical officers throughout the State to notify the Commissioner of Public Health of every case of T.B. that comes under their notice. Unless some other provision has been made for the notification of T.B. cases—T.B. is a notifiable disease under the Act—I shall object to the deletion of those subsections.

The Premier: You are not permitted to refer to clauses of the Bill during the second reading.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I have referred to them, and it is too late for the Premier to object. The Bill provides that it shall be an offence for any person wilfully to neglect or refuse to have his child treated if recommended to do so by a medical officer. That provision will probably give rise to some discussion, but I hope the House will agree to the power being granted.

Mr. Sleeman: Give us some reason for it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I intend to do so in Committee.

Mr. Sleeman: Give the reason now so that we can consider it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: There are a dozen and one reasons why the power should be granted.

Mr. Sleeman: Give us one good reason.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The State employs three school medical officers, for the payment of whom the taxpayers find the money. Parents of children inspected are put to no expense whatever. The medical officers examine children and often find defects about which the parents know nothing. While I was Minister it was a common experience—and I am satisfied it is still a common experience—for the medical officers to discover that a child of tender age is ruptured. The trouble is reported to the parent and the parent takes no notice. From information I received from the Commissioner of Health, and from other medical men, I am satisfied that if such children were treated while still children, only a minor operation would be required. On the other hand, if the children were allowed to grow up, the rupture might be the means of their being disabled for life. Certainly the time is almost sure to come, particularly if the individual concerned is a male who has to do laborious work, when he will be compelled to undergo an operation and in an adult it is a fairly serious operation.

Mr. Sampson: And not likely to be so successful.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That is so. Such defects should be attended to in the interests of the children. After the school medical officers have notified the parent, the family doctor must agree. No prosecution can take place, unless it is agreed after consultation that an operation is necessary. When that stage is reached, it should be the duty of the parent to have the operation performed in the interests of the child. There are other complaints that the school medical officers discover in children and that need treatment, but rupture is a fairly serious one. If the State is going to be generous enough to find from revenue the wherewithal to provide three qualified medical officers to examine school children to discover defects, and if parents are then to be allowed to refuse to have the children treated, what is the use of continuing to employ the school medical officers?

Mr. Sampson: Do you think it should be taken out of the hands of parents?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Yes, if they refuse to have the work done. The only other important principle contained in the Bill is that which lengthens the period of training for midwifery. To-day if a wo-

man has had no training as a nurse she is entitled to receive only 12 months training in the King Edward Hospital. If a nurse has served for three or four years, and has got a medical certificate, and she goes to the King Edward Hospital for midwifery training, she has to stay there for six months. The Bill alters the terms to 18 months and nine months respectively. That is not too long a period in either case. With one or two exceptions I support the second reading. I am not in accord with the provision with regard to the crowing of roosters, and I do not think the Minister's amendment will meet the situation.

On motion by Mr. Marshall, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 24th November, 1932.

	PAGE
Questions: Electoral rolls	1998
Cost of litigation	1999
Standing Orders suspension	1999
Bills: Loan, £2,176,000, 1R.	1999
Cattle Trespass, Fencing and Impounding Amendment, 3R.	1999
Brands Act Amendment, report, 3R. postponed	1999
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, report, 3R.	2001
Wheat Pool, 2R., Com., etc.	2001
Miner Workers' Relief, 2R.	2009
Financial Emergency Act Continuance, 2R., Com., report	2018
Health Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	2023

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

QUESTION—ELECTORAL ROLLS.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: A few days ago the member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock) asked me a question regarding the printing of rolls and electors engaged on relief work. I said I would be in a position to answer that question before the end of the week. The position is that the roll will be printed as at the 30th November, and prints will be available during the