

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 28th October, 1942.

	PAGE
Questions: Government hospital nurses, as to payment	1052
Shipbuilding, as to sites	1052
Potato prices and goods transport	1052
Fisheries, as to confiscated boats	1053
Grass fires, as to assistance by troops	1053
Remarks by Mr. Speaker	1052
Bills: Vermin Act Amendment, 1R.	1053
Motor Spirit and Substitute Liquid Fuels, report	1053
Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation), returned	1053
Motions: Railways, Mr. Watts's inventions, to inquire by Select Committee	1053
Government Stock Saleyards Act, to disallow yarding regulations	1057
Army distinctions and control	1063
Dairy Industry Act, to disallow cream-processing regulation	1070
Rubber, economy in use	1075

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (5).

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL NURSES.

As to Payment.

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Health: 1, What wages are paid to girls training as nurses at a Government hospital during each year of the training period? 2, If employed in a Government hospital in the first year after qualifying, what wages are they paid during that year? 3, Does the subsequent acquisition of the obstetric and infant health certificates by a nurse result in any additional pay, and if it does not, what is the reason why no additional payment is made? 4, If there is an additional payment, what does it amount to? 5, If there is no such additional payment because of the provisions of an award, does he consider that an extra payment should be made and will he take steps to arrange for the same?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (for the Minister for Health) replied: 1, South-West Land Division: 1st year, 13s. 4d. per week, plus board and lodging; 2nd year, 17s. 11d. per week, plus board and lodging; 3rd year, £1 5s. 8d. per week, plus board and lodging; 4th year, £1 13s. 4d. per week, plus board and lodging. Kalgoorlie: 1st year, 14s. 10d. per week, plus board and lodging; 2nd year, 19s. 11d. per week, plus board and lodging; 3rd year, £1 8s. 6d. per week, plus board and lodging; 4th year, £1 17s. 1d. per week, plus board and lodging; "B" Class, £2 14s. 7d. per

"C" Class, £2 6s. 6d. per week, plus board and lodgings; "B" Class, £2 14s. 7d. per week, plus board and lodging. Kalgoorlie: "C" Class, £2 9s. 3d. per week, plus board and lodging; "B" Class, £2 17s. 4d. per week, plus board and lodging. 3, Yes. 4, 3s. 10d. per week. 5, Answered by 4.

SHIPBUILDING.

As to Sites.

Mr. WITHERS asked the Minister for Industrial Development: 1, Has the site been chosen for the construction of 12 wooden ships to be built in Western Australia; if so where is it situated? 2, Were any other sites inspected; if so, where, and by whom? 3, Are all the 12 ships to be built at the one place? 4, In the event of an extension of wooden shipbuilding in Western Australia, will other sites be considered, such as Bunbury and Busselton?

The MINISTER replied: 1, Yes, in the metropolitan area. 2, Yes, at various sites on the river by the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers. 3, Yes. 4, Yes.

I might add that Senator Fraser visited Busselton and Bunbury a few days ago for the purpose of discussing with the local people the possibility of wooden shipbuilding activities being established in those parts of the State.

Remarks by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question, I wish to inform the House that there is a custom growing up amongst members of making statements when asking questions. I would ask members to abide by Standing Order 110 and not make statements when asking questions.

POTATO PRICES AND GOODS TRANSPORT.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it possible to secure reconsideration of prices as fixed by the Deputy Price Fixing Commissioner? 2, As metropolitan growers cannot produce potatoes, washed or otherwise, at the price of £13 per ton, which is the maximum price payable in Western Australia, while in New South Wales it is £22, will he discuss the matter with the Deputy Commissioner and endeavour to obtain fair consideration for Western Australian growers? 3, Also, would he direct attention to the difficulty faced in the transport of goods to this State,

including fertilisers, the need of which is not only bringing about a very difficult situation in production, but is economically unsound?

The MINISTER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The price being paid for potatoes has been under discussion with the Commonwealth authorities as late as yesterday. Every endeavour is being made to obtain fair consideration for Western Australian growers. 3, The transport of essential goods is constantly receiving attention.

I draw attention to the second part of the question. I refrained from accepting the comment submitted as fact and ignored it in my reply.

FISHERIES.

As to Confiscated Boats.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for the North-West: 1, How many fishing boats and other craft, belonging to interned aliens, are now held in Western Australia under National Security Regulations? 2, What was the value of these boats when confiscated? 3, What precautions are being taken for their proper care and maintenance? 4, What is the estimated depreciation on the entire fleet since being taken over by the Government? 5, What is the weekly cost to the Government in maintenance and incidental charges? 6, Is it the Government's intention to utilise those boats in the near future? 7, Would it not be possible to train naval trainees with these boats and thus safeguard their economic value?

The MINISTER replied: 1 and 2, In the interests of national security it is not desirable that these figures be made available. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, The Department of the Navy has sole jurisdiction in regard to these boats, and is responsible for their welfare and ultimate disposal.

GRASS FIRES.

As to Assistance by Troops.

Mr. McLARTY asked the Minister for Agriculture: In view of the shortage of manpower, and the consequent danger from grass fires, has the Government made any representations to the Military authorities to provide assistance by troops stationed in areas where outbreaks of fire may occur in agricultural districts?

The MINISTER replied: Yes. I have already taken up this matter with the Army authorities.

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. Seward and read a first time.

BILL—MOTOR SPIRIT AND SUBSTITUTE LIQUID FUELS.

Report of Committee adopted.

MOTION—RAILWAYS, MR. WATTS'S INVENTIONS.

To Inquire by Select Committee.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [2.22]:
I move—

That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report upon the utility of the inventions of Mr. W. Watts relating to railway tracks, and whether and to what extent the adoption of such inventions would be of advantage to the Western Australian Government Railways.

After hearing what I have to say in moving this motion I hope the House will feel that an inquiry by a Select Committee will be well worth while. I might state at the outset that I have, of course, no financial interest, direct or indirect, in any of the inventions the subject of this motion. Mr. Walter Watts, the inventor of these appliances, was for 45 years in the service of the Western Australian Government Railways, mostly at Midland Junction workshops. He retired with the office of foreman-blacksmith. During his service important works relating to railway tracks were left to him to carry out. On occasions he was entrusted with and played a material part in many of the difficult railway track problems including, in particular, the intricate question of the tracks laid on the North wharf at Fremantle for the purpose of carrying into that port and placing on board ship the wheat which came from our wheatgrowing areas. In addition, he took a particular interest in the railway tracks of this State, which formed not only his work but his life's interest. In connection with the tracks, he has evolved a number of inventions, and I propose to mention five of them that are relevant to the motion.

One of these known as the pivot joint, was adopted by the Western Australian Government Railways, and a small sum, about £130, was paid to Mr. Watts for his invention. When the patent ran out, it was adopted by various railway systems in the Eastern States, and is now in use in Western Australia, South Australia, New South Wales,

and on the Commonwealth railway systems, without any additional payment having been made to Mr. Watts. As I remarked his patent rights had expired. I mention this only in passing as it is not included in the subject-matter of the motion. Mr. Watts is not complaining because the invention was made use of without his receiving much reward for it, even though it is now so widely used in the Australian railway systems. Being deficient in mechanical knowledge, I feel a certain lack of qualification in explaining clearly to the House the nature of these inventions. However, I shall do my best.

Mr. Watts has invented an improved pivot joint for which he now holds the patent rights. The pivot joint is described as an invention for all movable rails which permits all bolts to be screwed up tightly and still allows the rail to have a degree of free movement. Where the ends of rails almost meet they have, in the past, been held together by means of a fish-plate, and the rails are therefore perfectly rigid. In Mr. Watts's invention there is a kind of bracket which clamps the end of each rail and allows a slight but restricted movement, the result of which is that instead of having some degree of curve play where a rail is bent, this slight but restricted movement permits of an engine and rolling-stock passing around the bend with a minimum of friction, a minimum of shaking and a minimum of wear and tear on the rolling-stock. This is the improved pivot joint—a bracket fixed to each end of the two rails where they almost touch, allowing of a certain amount of play in the rails at the point where they almost come into contact.

The second invention is known as the trussed sole-plate support. This prevents the rail ends or joints from being deflected while, at the same time, it allows of expansion and contraction. Where the rails almost meet, the trussed sole-plate support is a bracket like a little bridge about 12 inches or 15 inches long, and it clamps each end of the two rails near the junction and maintains a rigid bridge. The result is that contraction and expansion are allowed for, and at the same time the ends of the rails are maintained in the same plane so that, instead of, in course of time, bending downwards and getting out of alignment with each other, there is maintained a continuous horizontal plane between the ends of the rails, and engines and rolling-stock are able to move over the joints with a minimum of

friction, noise, and wear and tear on the rolling-stock. As one passes over a railway line, there is a regular sound and feeling of knock-knock and tap-tap. That is due to the ends of the rails getting out of alignment. This invention is one to maintain the ends of the rails in complete alignment and obviate the knocking and wear and tear.

The third invention is called the spring-wing rail crossing, the purpose of which is to fill up the flangeways and make a continuous level running track for heavy and fast traffic on the main lines. It also makes for greater comfort for the travelling public.

The fourth invention is the full-rail switch and locking device. This is used in connection with the improved pivot joint, and means that where there is a switch in a railway line there is generally a tapering blade that lies along the rail. By means of this invention, the tapering blade is brought up to the main rail and there is imparted to the rolling-stock a firm support and maximum coverage for the wheels. The blades, which come to a very fine taper in these switches, do not break off, and the rolling-stock is not exposed to the danger of causing derailment. Generally the whole switch by this device is made much more secure and reduces wear and tear on the rolling-stock. Behind the full-rail switch is a similar idea. At crossings, by means of this invention, the rails are brought close to each other, and the rolling-stock, instead of running on a small part of the rail, as it does at present, is able to rest on the full width of the rail. Thus much more stability is given to rolling-stock, there is less wear and tear, and it is almost impossible to have a derailment.

The fifth invention is a locking device which, with the full-rail switch, will operate and lock in the same movement. At present switch rails are operated by one movement and then locked by a second movement. The improved locking device invented by Mr. Watts is one by which the switching of rails can be operated and locked in the one movement, and the device automatically opens if the engine-driver overruns the signals without any damage being occasioned to the track.

I feel somewhat diffident in attempting to explain these inventions to members, so I pass to the opinions of those who can

be regarded as qualified to judge of their utility. If the House agrees to the appointment of a Select Committee, working models of the inventions made by Mr. Watts will be brought to the House, and they will demonstrate precisely how these inventions operate. I shall now read some remarks made by the Commissioner of Railways in "Weekly Notice" No. 41, for the week ended the 25th October, 1935. This is a publication addressed to railway employees. Mr. Ellis says—

Keep Down Derailments.—Last year it cost us £398,937 to maintain our rolling stock, nearly £50,000 more than it did in 1934. That expense is a big drain on our resources and is a severe handicap against our reaching that goal, which all railway men desire to reach, making our railways pay.

The cost is far too heavy, and I am seeking the co-operation of every one in the service to help reduce the figure this year. Some idea may be gained of the severe drain this maintenance cost is when you realise that out of every pound earned for the carriage of passengers, goods or other work done, almost 2s. 6d. was spent in keeping our rolling stock in order.

Out of the £398,937 mentioned, £124,002 went in maintenance of our goods vehicles. Here is something where I am sure an improvement can be effected.

One of our expensive items is derailments. Apart from the heavy repair bill, there is the loss due to the damaged wagons being out of service; unfortunately, the amount representing that loss cannot be assessed. Everyone in the service can help and I am looking forward confidently to your co-operation to bring about an improvement in our expenditure, especially in our repair bill.

So we find in Mr. Ellis's statement in 1935 that in the preceding year it cost just under £400,000 to maintain the rolling stock. On the 14th May last year a letter was written to "The West Australian" by Mr. R. N. Johnston, who recently retired from the position of Works Manager of the Western Australian Government Railways. I shall read some extracts from his letter—

During the last 11 years of my service as works manager at Midland Junction, I was in close contact with Mr. Wally Watts, the foreman blacksmith, under whose personal control all points, crossing and track generally were manufactured, and I found he was a genius on this particular work. He devoted his energies and a considerable span of his life to the study of improving the safety of the track and has made in his spare time and at considerable expense, models of his ideas, all of which are devoted to the improvement from a safety point of view, and would, if adopted, prove a decided economy. These models have been inspected by engineers from all States and also by engineers from overseas railways.

Whilst the latter are willing and anxious to make use of them, the general query is, "Why has not your own State adopted them?"

One particular item is the truss support under the rail joints. I saw this tested on a standard testing machine and the results were perfect. The use of this truss would eliminate the shock which causes so much discomfort to the passenger; but what is more serious is the shock and wear to both the rolling stock and the destruction of the rail ends. With this truss in use, such a job as taking the whole of the double track from East Perth to Armadale in order to cut off the worn ends would have been avoided.

It is hard to conceive what the barrier is to the adoption of Mr. Watts's patents in future works. Is it that our railway engineers have not the courage to depart from the standard text books of their childhood days? If our British nation was endeavouring to fight the present war with the standards of the last, we would have been defeated long since. I am writing this letter to try to arouse public interest, so that at least Mr. Watts's patents be subject to a more careful and expensive scrutiny by a committee of expert engineers of both States and Commonwealth, not forgetting the economical interest. If this is done, I feel sure improved track and economies of public funds will result.

In another report the inventions are examined by Mr. J. W. R. Broadfoot, member of the Australian Institute of Engineers. Mr. Broadfoot is a consulting engineer and was lately Chief Mechanical Engineer of the Western Australian Government Railways.

Mr. J. Hegney: Did he write that report after his retirement?

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. The letter is dated the 12th May, 1942, and I ask permission to read it. It is not very lengthy and it is written by a man whose authority must carry weight. Mr. Broadfoot says—

At the request of Mr. W. Watts I made an inspection of the models and plans connected with "Watts' Patent Track Appliances" and witnessed a demonstration of these given by Mr. Watts himself. Some of the appliances were known to me, others I saw for the first time. The models are either full-sized or true to scale working models, each being made to function perfectly. Demonstration of the various devices was given as under:—

1. **Pivot Joint.**—This is an improved design on the original patent which is now in general use on the Western Australian Railways and is largely used also in South Australia and Commonwealth Railways. Whilst the principle involved is much the same as in the original patent, Mr. Watts has definitely improved the device in details to such an extent that he had no difficulty in securing the patent rights.

Mr. Watts, I am informed, benefited but little out of the original patent, as it was not adopted until the patent had expired, but the fact that it was adopted warrants consideration being given to the improved design, which embodies all the advantages of the original patent, together with other distinct improvements.

2. Trussed Sole Plate Support.—This device was entirely new to me and I was greatly impressed with its far-reaching possibilities. Full-sized models showed the construction and application in detail and practical tests in comparison with the solid rail and present-day joints as carried out at Midland Junction clearly indicate its superiority over both. It has the advantage over either electric or thermit welding in that the expansion and contraction of the joint is not interfered with. It is more easily applied and can be fitted at lower cost. Several methods of application were demonstrated to show the adaptability of the device to various types of fishplates.

3. Spring wing rail crossing.—The wear and tear on the old type of rigid crossing specially in jumping flangeways is excessive and in consequence maintenance costs are high. In this design Mr. Watts has eliminated much of the wear and tear by bridging the flangeway and maintenance expenditure will therefore be considerably reduced. Smoother running will be a definite advantage, leading as it does to reduced rolling-stock repairs.

4. Full rail switch.—One of the greatest sources of danger and maintenance expenditure in railways is caused by derailments especially at points and crossing. In his full rail switch Mr. Watts has designed an appliance which will minimise both these objectionable features and have a much longer life than the present-day design. Local trials have demonstrated that this switch is superior to the old method but so far it has not been adopted. Demonstrations have been made before engineers of the New South Wales, Commonwealth, South Australian and Western Australian railways and the only conclusion I can come to is that due consideration and appreciation has not been given to the value of these appliances. In conjunction with this switch Mr. Watts has incorporated a locking device which can operate and lock in the same movement and automatically opens should the engine-driver over-run the signals. Derailments and damage to permanent way are thus obviated.

General.—In all his designs Mr. Watts has had three points of view, viz., safety of the track, reduction of maintenance costs and adaptation to existing tracks.

After inspection of the working models in his possession and hearing his detailed description of the improvements he has effected, I am strongly of the opinion that the adoption of his ideas would result not only in greater safety, but would effect such savings in running costs that the expenditure involved would be fully justified.

I now propose to read extracts from a further letter written by Mr. Johnston, formerly Works Manager of the Western Aus-

tralian Government Railways. The letter was written under date the 8th May of this year. A complete copy of the letter is available for inspection if any member would like to see it. Mr. Johnston says—

In accordance with your request I have visited the home of Mr. W. Watts at Guildford and refreshed my memory regarding the many and varied models of railway track and I find that the more time one spends in the study of same the more one asks why are these ideas lying dormant when they should be in use to such distinct advantage.

From my own knowledge of the long uphill battle which Mr. Watts has gone through, the history of the birth of the Owen gun pales into significance when compared with the history of the Watts' patents up to this day.

Later Mr. Johnston says—

I venture to say that no State in the Commonwealth of Australia has suffered to the extent of Western Australia, where the policy of cheap, light development railways was laid down, designed to carry the lightest type of locomotive at low speed, and has been patched up to carry heavier loads and higher speeds. Even when better and safer equipment was offered no track engineers would even look at it seriously. Possibly because the inventor was not in possession of a University degree.

As manager of the workshops for many years I know too well the effects of defective crossings and road in the repair costs to the stock and I have been appalled at the frequency of what were soundly manufactured crossing when issued, being returned to have faulty and worn parts built up—and it is not the wear but the effect of the blows which have occasioned wear and racked the whole crossing loose on its bed-plates. Then what of the locomotives and stock that has been pounding over such a road, all of which is avoidable if the new designs are only given a chance to demonstrate this.

Mr. Johnston says finally—

Now regarding the Truss Joint.—I look upon it as a world prize-winner, and having been closely associated with the preparation and testing I can speak with perfect confidence. It is the perfect solution to the bad joint problem. It is infinitely less costly of application than either the electric welding or thermit welded processes and its application preserves the natural expansion within safety limits. It improves the lateral stability of the road and ensures the maximum life of the rail, to be availed of by the avoidance of bad joints. It will require less road inspection and maintenance, is applicable to either old or new conditions and in my opinion will make a bad road possible and a good road better and safer for both increased loads and speeds. The Truss joint is the most practical solution of the bad or loose joint problem which is brought about by yielding joints, and if it does all I claim—and the tests show clearly that it will—the benefit to the repair bill on rolling stock and road maintenance will be enormous.

Those are the opinions of two men—Mr. Broadfoot and Mr. Johnston—who held high office with the Western Australian Government Railways. It is a plea by them for a fair and proper test of these inventions of Mr. Watts. From my reading of the correspondence I am not satisfied that any reasonably adequate test has been given to these patents by the officials of the Railway Department. If they can prove that these tests have been given and that the tests justified the rejection of the inventions, I am sure the Select Committee will be interested to hear the evidence they have to give on those points. If the claims of the inventor and his friends are correct, the saving to the State will be difficult to compute. I have had it stated to me that it will run into hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum, but even if it meant a saving of only £100,000 or £50,000 a year or less, the inventions would be well worth adopting. At this time, when there are such demands for manpower, and when there are increased demands on our rolling stock to handle heavier loads, the investigation of the possibilities of these inventions is well worth while.

If the appointment of a Select Committee is agreed to, there will be an opportunity for the committee to hear the professional officers of the Railway Department and men like Mr. Broadfoot and Mr. Johnston and I suggest, too, that some of the gangers from the Government railways should be asked to give evidence. It would be of distinct use to hear what the practical men have to say, men who day by day are concerned with the difficulties of track maintenance, and could express a practical opinion as to how far these inventions are likely to serve the best interests of the State railways. The working models can be brought to Parliament House for inspection by the Select Committee. I have been to Guildford and inspected them myself at Mr. Watts's house. I am quite unqualified to express an opinion on mechanical matters, but I have been convinced, from what I saw and from what Mr. Watts told me, that the interests of the State might well be served by the investigation that the Select Committee could make. If some other way could be found to ensure that the inventions received an adequate test, that might be considered but, so far as I can see, the only way to get a rapid and effective investigation would be by means

of a Select Committee of this House, which could go into the matter and report to the House for the guidance of the Government as to whether or not these inventions are worthy of an adequate test by our State railways.

I hope the House will feel that in Mr. Watts, whom I had not met previously, we have a man who has not only given meritorious service to the railways, but who has also possibly developed inventions of very great value, not only to this State, but to the whole world. We are apt not to be so much impressed by a local inventor whom we see every day as we are by some man who comes from foreign parts. Here we have a man who is one of our own people and who has done a tremendous amount of work, and evolved appliances that have received high praise from qualified experts. I hope the House will feel that this is a Select Committee whose investigation will not take long, which will not require to examine many witnesses, but which will fulfil a useful purpose in ensuring that justice is done to the inventions of Mr. Watts, and will at the same time determine whether the financial interests of the State will not be greatly advanced by, in the first place testing, and in the second place possibly adopting some or all of these inventions.

On motion by the Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

MOTION—GOVERNMENT STOCK SALEYARDS ACT.

To Disallow Yarding Regulations.

Debate resumed from the 9th September on the following motion by Mr. Seward:—

That regulations under the Government Stock Saleyards Act, 1941, gazetted in the "Government Gazette" of the 10th July, 1942, and laid on the Table of the House on the 5th August, 1942, be and are hereby disallowed.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

[2.58]: I am not quite sure that the member for Pingelly, in moving for the disallowance of these regulations, gave fullest consideration to the effect of his motion if any or all of those regulations to which he objected and those to which he has no objection were disallowed. The stock saleyards were established by the Government in 1911, under the Abattoirs Act, of 1909. Although the Abattoirs Act was designed to control abattoirs only, it was found that for the control of saleyards adjoining the

abattoirs, specifically as fat stock sale-yards, it was necessary to have some regulations. In introducing the Government Stock Saleyards Bill last year I endeavoured to make it very clear that although the regulations had been abided by, there had been an understanding and a mutual arrangement that they would not be contravened; that had they been tested in point of law it was possible it would have been found that they were ultra vires. Because of that, following the introduction of the Government Stock Saleyards Act, it was necessary to review and revise all the regulations existing and to consider regulations known to be necessary better to control the activities of fat stock saleyards generally.

In the past it has been possible only to control stock saleyards—and their conduct, I submit, has been very satisfactory—because of the willingness of the stock agents and others who use the yards regularly, to agree to be controlled and to have their operations there regulated for them. The hon. member endeavoured to make a point when he said he doubted whether the producers had been consulted when the regulations were framed. Several interests were consulted but more particularly those that use the yards. The stock agents were conferred with several times in order to obtain their views regarding regulations under which yards in other States, under conditions similar to our own, are effectively controlled. It can be stated that in a general way the stock agents are the representatives of the producers in connection with the handling of their stock. They not merely make arrangements to receive the stock for sale; they cull stock on arrival; they divide them into suitable lots; they finance against the stock; they do all sorts of things in pursuance of their task of acting in the best interests of the growers in the handling of their stock.

It will be generally admitted that the stock agents are those who should best know what was most suitable for the control of saleyards in the interests of the producers and for supplying the best facilities for the handling of stock. The stock agents, in short, make all the necessary arrangements on behalf of the owners. As for the improvements to the yards, as and when funds are available those facilities will be provided. They have been improved from year to year, and although we have not been able to keep quite abreast of the programme we set

a year or two ago, very substantial alterations have been effected. During the current period, owing to the continued wet conditions, difficulty has been experienced in giving effect to the improvement schedule for this year. An attempt was made to remove the sleeper-floored portion which for a very long time has not been at all satisfactory, and to put down a concrete floor.

The member for Pingelly, in moving for the disallowance of the regulations, submitted that the concrete floor, according to the information he had received, was wholly unsatisfactory because of the lack of effective drainage, seeing that it had been laid on a flat base. That is not quite in accordance with the facts. I took the opportunity, subsequent to the motion being moved, to visit the yards on one of the wettest days during this winter. It may have been that the hon. member was speaking of the area where the work had not been completed and where some little local difficulty was being experienced for the time being. When the work is completed, I have the absolute assurance of the man in charge of the operations that the drainage and other factors will be quite satisfactory.

It will be remembered that the member for Pingelly, when moving his motion, said that if the position was as represented to him someone was very culpable and should be severely dealt with. I understand, as a result of my visit to the yards and from my conversations with the officer in charge of the construction work since then, that when the job is finished there will be no difficulty regarding drainage. Many objections were raised by the hon. member to the regulations but I ask the House to peruse them and take note of their simplicity. They appeared in the "Government Gazette" of the 10th July last. Members will find that they are very concise and easy to understand. The member for Pingelly took exception to several of them. He first complained that the condition of the yards militated against the best interests of the producers in that sheep were stained. He said they could not lie down without becoming stained, and generally that the condition of the yards was prejudicial to the prices producers would receive. That is not the position at all.

Variations in prices have sometimes obtained, and to some extent losses have been incurred. That has not been due to the unsatisfactory condition of the yard. It must

be remembered that sheep and cattle often have to travel long distances to the saleyard. At times they have to travel for a day or so between the point of loading and the point of unloading. We have found that farmers themselves have not been merely inconsiderate to the sheep or cattle they despatch, but most inconsiderate to their own interests by reason of the manner of loading and the numbers they endeavour to force into trucks. Is there any member representing a country constituency who has not had that experience?

Mr. Patrick: I have never overloaded trucks.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Probably the member for Greenough would never overload his stock into trucks, but I am convinced he has seen trucks arriving at Midland Junction or in transit that were no compliment to the persons who loaded the sheep. Further than that, very few people extend the consideration to their sheep or cattle that is essential prior to their being loaded into confined spaces. The animals are rushed along the road just in time for loading. They are hot and ready to lie down. Almost immediately in very many instances such sheep, when they lie down in the trucks, must inevitably become dirty and stained and certainly unfit to arrive at the end of their journey in the best condition. The same thing applies to cattle. Very often trucks arrive showing undeniable evidence that the cattle were not loaded in a manner best calculated to foster the interests of the producers.

The second point the hon. member endeavoured to make was that the responsibility for handling stock from the time of arrival until sold rested with the agent. Decidedly the responsibility should rest with the agent who is the person paid by the producer to watch his interests from the time the stock arrive until they are delivered to the ultimate purchaser. If the Minister were to be held responsible for loss, escape or injury concerning any stock in the care of an agent, then the agents and their employees would have very little to worry about if any stock escaped when being untrucked or drafted. The agents are paid for rendering such services and, generally speaking, they endeavour to live up to their obligations during that period. I think it can be admitted, speaking in a wide sense, that producers have had good service from the agents

who use the Government facilities; but if Regulation 7 were disallowed or altered to suit the ideas of the member for Pingelly, it would mean that the Government would become responsible and be liable for losses due to carelessness on the part of stock agents during the time the animals were in their custody.

Under Regulation 3 the officer in charge has power to direct a person to place stock in the pen allotted to the agent to whom they are to be delivered. The hon. member took exception to that provision, but unless we are to have chaotic conditions arising from the lack of control over arrivals and deliveries, we must have some such regulation. Without it, a drover could take stock to the yards and place them where he thought suitable, or a buyer could put his stock anywhere. The work must be regulated. Unless that is done two men, for instance, could claim one pen. Obviously it is necessary to exercise control in order to maintain good order in the yards. An officer must be empowered to direct operations and require a person to use the pen allotted to him, and so forth.

Regulation 14, to which the member for Pingelly objected, has not yet been fully enforced, but as members who have visited the Midland Junction yards know—the member for Toodyay and others frequently visit them—the Government is having work carried out in connection with the holding yards. When it is completed, the regulation will operate and an endeavour will be made to direct deliveries as well as receivals. Regulation 15 was also objected to by the hon. member. Under it we have authority to check the stock leaving the yard by road with the delivery note issued to the purchaser. During the course of a sale a purchaser may desire quick delivery of his stock, and he might cause chaos in the yards by trying to drive his animals through other stock.

Mr. Thorn: And he might hang on to some of the other stock.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, and we must safeguard against that position. It would be quite possible for some of the other stock to be picked up with the lot purchased.

Mr. Seward: I do not object to Regulation 15.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I can quote what the hon. member said

regarding that regulation! He definitely objected to Regulation 17 which provides a check against anyone buying from one agent and re-offering his purchase through another agent on a rising market.

Mr. Seward: That is Regulation 18.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I will deal with that in a minute. In objecting to Regulation 17 the hon. member said there should be only one charge in connection with the yarding fee for sheep if they were submitted twice in the owner's interest, a sale not having been effected the first time. The illustration the hon. member gave covered circumstances not likely to occur. I understand that agents do not willingly agree, if an owner has withdrawn a line from a sale on a rising market, to its being handed over to another agent for subsequent sale on the same date. That does not affect the position of a farmer who culls, re-sorts and re-submits sheep for which the bids obtained have not been satisfactory. But the regulation is imposed to deal with farmers who may not be satisfied seeing that they have not received the top prices, and then themselves remove their stock from the yard. They use the facilities that are available.

I submit that the person who makes use of facilities that are available in order to get the best out of the market on a particular day, should pay for the use of those facilities; and that is all that the regulation provides for. The member for Pingelly also objected to Regulation 25 which simply empowers the controller of the stock-yards to take possession of animals that arrive dead in trucks or arrive dead at the yards. Obviously it is most necessary that someone should have the responsibility of taking charge of dead stock and removing them. The position in the past has been very unsatisfactory. I remember on one occasion seeing dead stock lying about in several places, but that does not obtain today. The responsibility now rests with the Controller to take charge of dead stock and remove the carcasses to the digestors, skin and all. To avoid the undesirable happening of dead stock lying about and to have them removed as early as possible, this regulation was made. Now, what happens with regard to the skins? Although agents have the right to take charge of those stock and to pay butchers for the skinning of

them, and although it is according to regulations for the skin to be the property of the owner of the sheep or beast, that is very rarely done, because after the skinning fee has been paid—the charge for dressing a dead sheep is 2s. 6d. and for a bullock £1—there is not much left for the owner.

Unless it is a decent sort of sheep or beast the agent, on behalf of the owner, asks that the Controller should take charge of the dead beast and have it treated accordingly. That is the common practice, according to the regulation governing crippled stock. The hon. member said he had some objection to that regulation. We have little option in the matter. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals will not permit the sale of an injured beast. Injured beasts must not be offered for sale. So that what we have done is to provide that the officer in charge takes control of an injured beast, removes it, has it slaughtered, and sells it to the highest bidder on behalf of the owner. Can anything be done better than that? I admit that the regulation is not explicit insofar as the practice obtaining is concerned, but it says that any stock arriving in the saleyards in a crippled or disabled condition is not to be offered for sale by auction, and that the officer in charge is to arrange for immediate removal of such stock to the abattoirs after the stock agent has arranged with a butcher to dress the animals. What happens after that is, as I stated, that the carcass is sold after inspection and discarding of the injured portion if necessary, sale being made to the highest bidder.

Now as regards Regulation 16, dealing with dues and fees! I submit that the mover was misinformed when he quoted 6d. per head for cattle, bulls, cows, bullocks and calves handled. I will now give to the House a complete schedule of charges of all other States applying to cattle, sheep and pigs—

	Sheep and lambs.	Pigs per head.	Cattle.	Calves.
Adelaide	1d.	6d.	1s.	6d.
Melbourne	1d.	4d.	1s.	6d.
Sydney	1d.	6d.	9d.	6d.
	(under 30 lbs., 3d.)			
Brisbane	1d.	5d.	9d.	8d.
Midland Junction	1½d.	3d.	9d.	6d.
	(under 20 lbs., 1d.)			

Thus if we compare Melbourne with Midland Junction, we find that cattle are 3d. per head lower for yarding fees at Midland Junction, while sheep are ½d. dearer

and pigs 3d. per head cheaper than in Melbourne. If we compare the type of equipment necessary in the two places, we find that in the Melbourne saleyards the pens in which the sheep are offered are as big as some of our holding yards. It is obvious that in Melbourne sheep are sold in lots of 400 or 500. We have found it necessary to deal with 20 and less of the type that the various buyers need. I have been quite unable to find any evidence of the statement that stockowners and agents have requested a reduction in yarding fees. They may have requested reduced agents' fees, but not reduced yarding charges.

It will be noted that the fees charged in Western Australia are comparable to, or less than, those in other States, except in the case of sheep and lambs. If we were to make the charges to which the hon. member objects level with those of the Eastern States, we would get results highly pleasing to the Treasurer, since we would receive a greatly increased income. However, as I say, the higher cost of supervision necessary to deal with lots at Midland Junction makes the charge of 1½d. per sheep quite a reasonable one. What would it amount to in a year to the average owner if a reduction of ½d. were made in the case of sheep? Probably not more than £2 in his year's income. But if we were to bring up the other charges consistently with charges in other States, it would mean possibly an addition of £6,000 to the income from the yards, an increase which must be paid by the producer. So that, taking a line through the charges, we submit that in the case of pigs we are considerate in giving the producer a concession according to the value of the animal sold, and that in the case of sheep and lambs we are giving an added facility that other States do not provide.

It is highly necessary to maintain statutory control by reasonable regulations in such an instrumentality as this. I repeat it cannot be shown that there is anything irksome at all in these regulations. They are straightforward, clear and reasonable and when our local conditions and circumstances are compared with those of the other States, they seem to be reasonable and, I submit, are in line with the service that the yards render to the community. During the last six months the Government has spent approximately £2,000 on concreting sheep pens, and work is now proceed-

ing on the flooring of sheep holding yards. It is also anticipated that a considerable sum will be required before next season to improve cattle-drafting yards. Without the regulations which the mover of the motion desires to have disallowed, the Government is not prepared to spend these large amounts. The hon. member raised objection to another regulation, No. 27, which provides charges for yarding of stock after 24 hours. Now, the test of these regulations is their reasonableness, and a comparison may be made with what obtains at Robb's Jetty. There never has been an occasion when agents or owners have demanded reduction of yarding fees at Midland Junction for services over 24 hours.

In the case of agents, it is well known that they have suitable paddocks to which to remove their stock subsequent to sale, when the stock are to be resold or held over. It is necessary to have some control in that regard, because occasionally people do not appreciate reasonable terms even under reasonable regulations. Therefore, examining the position generally, it is essential to have specific regulations and highly necessary to have rigid ones; but I say to the hon. member that although he can see in some of them things which he considers prejudicial to the interests of the producer, he cannot cite one case where unreasonableness has been exhibited in giving effect to the regulations. All of these regulations are necessary, and from the point of delivery at the beginning of or before a sale every aspect that could be considered in the proper and reasonable conduct of saleyards generally has been covered. The matter has been administered fairly, and therefore everybody has been treated quite fairly.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly—in reply): The Minister has made several slips in the course of his remarks. I interjected that I took no exception to Regulation 15. I quoted it in my speech, but I did not object to it nor did I take any exception to Regulation 15. I cordially agree with the Minister, and I think I said so when moving to disallow these regulations, that some person of responsibility must be in charge of the yards. That is only reasonable. Stock are put into those yards, and someone has to be responsible for their safety from the time when they are first yarded to when they are sold.

I fully realise the necessity for these regulations on that ground. What I do object to, however, is that while the stock are in the yards, the person responsible for their safety is not responsible—put it that way. If stock are lost between the time when they are delivered to the yards and when they are sold, the controller is not responsible for that loss. The Minister says the agent is responsible. If so, the position clearly is that the added cost will fall upon the owner of the stock. When the stock arrive at the saleyards they are put in the pens under the direction of the controller and cannot be moved at all without his sanction.

In case of damage or injury to the stock, or death of the stock, the agent is responsible, and therefore there are two authorities in charge of the stock. The controller is not responsible if he puts 50 sheep into a paddock overnight and brings back only 49. Who is going to pay for the missing sheep? The Minister says the responsibility must not be placed on him or on the controller. If the agent is to be responsible for the animal injured or lost, then certainly the agent will not allow the controller to move the animals about unless there are adequate safeguards to protect the owner. As I say, two people will be in charge, the agent and the controller, with the result that the added expense will have to be borne by the unfortunate owner of the stock. If these regulations are to remain in force—and I agree with them generally—then the responsibility for the animals while in the yards must be placed on the controller of the yards.

The Minister referred to the flooring. I think I said, when moving the motion, I had been informed on the most reliable authority that at that time the flooring was not all that could be desired. It was not properly drained. I am pleased to have the Minister's assurance on that point, and I accept it. I quite expect now that any future flooring will be in proper shape and properly drained. The Minister also said that the loss in value of sheep through their skins being stained was not occasioned altogether by the conditions in the yards; it may probably be due, he said, to the condition of the trucks or the condition of the yards where these sheep were loaded or the conditions under which they were loaded. I quite agree with that. But I said that if the yards were not properly drained, if water were permitted to lie in the yards, then undoubtedly when the

sheep were delivered from the trucks they would lie down in the yards and so their skins would become stained.

With regard to the Minister's comments about the overloading of trucks, that may possibly occur, but it must be remembered that quite frequently an owner may order a special truck. Instead of getting that particular type of truck, he may find that a smaller truck has been sent, so the responsibility is not always on the owner for crowding the animals into the particular truck in which they had to be loaded. With regard to stock being crippled or killed in transit, I did not raise that point. I raised the question of what happened to the animals in the yards, that is, between the time of arrival and sale. My complaint was that there was no authority to arrive at the value of an animal that had, say, its leg broken while in the yard and then had to be taken to the abattoirs.

As to the regulations dealing with the charges, I am sorry the Minister could not justify the charges other than by making a comparison with the charges made in the other States. That is only one comparison.

The Minister for Agriculture: I referred also to the nature of the facilities available.

Mr. SEWARD: That is so. All I can do is to quote from a letter that I have received from the Town Clerk of Melbourne, Mr. H. S. Wooton. He says—

In reply to your letter making inquiries concerning the scale of charges to users of the City Council's sayeyards, I have to inform you that the council's charges are as follows:—

For each head of cattle, including	
bulls, calves, cows and bullocks	6d.
For each head of sheep or lambs	1d.

These charges are paid to the council by the stock agent; the council has no direct dealings with the owners.

I can but take it that that is the practice prevailing in Melbourne. That letter was sent to me in response to a letter I sent to Dalgety & Co., who pointed out that they had no authority in the yards.

The charges in Adelaide, according to a letter from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, are as follows:—

For every horse, mare, gelding, ass and mule	1s.
For every ox, bull, cow, heifer and yearling	6d.
For every calf under the age of one year	6d.
For every pig sold for 15s. or more	6d.
For every pig sold for less than 15s.	3d.
For every sheep or lamb	1d.

Another important factor—in my opinion, the most important factor—that must be borne in mind in fixing these charges is the capital cost of the yard. The Minister has pointed out that the capital cost of the yards at Flemington and elsewhere in the Eastern States is considerably greater, and that they deal with a much bigger number of stock. I also point out that probably those yards were roofed. Ours are not, and so our capital cost is less. Consequently, I contend our charges should be based on the capital cost of our yards and that the present charge is far too high. When moving the motion, I pointed out that, based on our charges, the annual revenue from the sale-yards would be over £7,000 a year. In ten years that would produce £70,000 in yard fees alone. I was unable to obtain accurate information as to the cost of these yards, but taking the total cost (with the abattoirs) at £180,000, apparently £90,000 should be allocated to the saleyards, so that in 12 years the State would receive back in yarding charges the whole of the capital costs. The Minister asked what it would mean to a farmer if he had to pay £2 a year more in freight on his sheep. The only way in which the unfortunate farmer can possibly make his industry pay today is by cutting down all his expenses.

The Minister for Agriculture: He would have to market 1,000 sheep to incur that extra expense.

Mr. SEWARD: Mr. Stacey would have to pay three times that.

The Minister for Agriculture: He must be fortunate.

Mr. SEWARD: That is a very considerable amount. I have just stated that the farmer has to watch all these charges. There are many farmers who send sheep down to the market every week.

The Premier: Oh!

Mr. SEWARD: Pretty nearly every week. One has only to look at the agents' lists to see that that is so. That is going to mean a good deal to those farmers. Unless we can keep these charges down to a minimum, an unfair burden will be placed upon them. The Government should not look for any profit out of these saleyards, and should make the charge as liberal as possible so that people will be encouraged to use them. I am afraid the Minister has not convinced me of the necessity for the regulations. I quite agree that many of them are necessary

and should not be disallowed, but I cannot be blamed for that. I cannot pick out two or three regulations and ask for their disallowance, but must move for the disallowance of all. I have the assurance of the Minister that the stock owners were not consulted when the regulations were drawn up. Stock agents have an intimate knowledge of stock but the owners have a vital interest and there may have been some points, particularly in connection with the fees that have to be paid, on which the outlook of the owners was more important than that of the stock agents. I am not convinced of the justice of the regulations and must adhere to my decision to move for their disallowance.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	23
				—
Majority against	14
				—

AYES.		
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson	
Mr. Hill	Mr. Seward	
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Waits	
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney	(Teller.)
Mr. Patrick		
NOES.		
Mr. Berry	Mr. Needham	
Mr. Coverley	Mr. North	
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen	
Mr. Fox	Mr. Thorn	
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Tonkin	
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Triat	
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock	
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Wilson	
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Wiso	
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Withers	
Mr. Marshall	Mr. J. Hegney	(Teller.)
Mr. Millington		

PAIRS.		
	AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Abbott	Mr. Mann	Mr. Holman
Mr. J. H. Smith	Mr. Stubbs	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Warner	Mr. Willmott	Mr. Raphael
		Mr. Stoyants
		Mr. Rodoreda

Question thus negatived.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT (FUNDS APPROPRIATION).

Returned from the Council without amendment.

MOTION—ARMY DISTINCTIONS AND CONTROL.

Debate resumed from the 9th September on the following motion by Mr. Doney:—

Having regard to recent grave changes in near-lying theatres of war this House is of

opinion that increased mobility will be secured and the best interests of Australia be served—

- (1) by discontinuing the distinctions in use today in respect of the designations and general treatment of Australian troops belonging to the A.I.F. or the A.M.F.;
- (2) by using the resultant joint body of troops for war service either in or out of Australian territory, thus more satisfactorily and quickly ensuring the successful defence of this country; and
- (3) by reducing the Commonwealth Government's control of the Army to a minimum.

Further, that the Premier immediately acquaint the Prime Minister and the several State Premiers with this decision, at the same time requesting prompt action to effectuate it.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [3.42]: It is with pleasure that I rise to support the motion and sincerely hope it will meet with the success it deserves. I am very much afraid that, in view of the dictatorial attitude of the present Commonwealth Government, not very much notice will be taken of any decision this Assembly may reach. This is a very burning question throughout Australia today, and it is a shame that there should be a division in our Forces. We have a half-baked scheme for conscription. I think every member will agree with that. Why not go the whole hog and have one army to defend this country? The division of our Forces into the A.I.F. and the A.M.F. has brought about many unpleasant clashes between the two bodies.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Mr. THORN: Yes, there have been very regrettable incidents, particularly on the return of our A.I.F. men from overseas. I can assure the Premier on that point. He may not have heard of them, but there has been quite a number of unpleasant incidents. I have no authority to quote some of these instances but to my mind they were very regrettable. I think that one occurred at Moora. We, as Australians, do not want that sort of thing to happen. Take the difficulties with which we are faced under our present organisation!

Recently there has been a strong agitation for the merging of these two Forces. After the members of the A.M.F. had distinguished themselves in New Guinea there was an announcement from the Minister for the Army that it was inadvisable to merge the two Forces, because the A.M.F. was

proud of the fact that as an Australian Militia Force they were able to distinguish themselves so ably. This is only a red-herring. The Minister for the Army will have to put up a stronger case to convince me it is not necessary that those two Forces should be brought together. Take the position of our mandated territories! What a ridiculous thing to think that at the present time the two Forces are fighting in territory under the control of the Commonwealth in New Guinea, and yet if it were necessary for them to advance into the Dutch area of New Guinea only the A.I.F. could go forward. Do we think for one moment that that will be the position? Do we think that our military commanders will put up with that sort of thing; that, if they have an efficient Army in New Guinea, they will stop the A.M.F. at the border when the battle is on? It is only confusing the issue.

Again, we have the Solomons! Half of the Solomon Islands is under the control of the British Government and the other half under Australian control. Today our American allies are putting up a great fight to hold the islands. If it becomes necessary for Australians to go to their aid probably only members of the A.I.F. will be sent. For those reasons I do not see that we can justify the present position. I am glad the member for Williams-Narrogin brought the motion forward. It gives the House an opportunity to express its views. I do not want to be too critical of the present Government in its war effort, but it stands to reason that all thinking people must appreciate the great confusion that may take place when we have to pursue the enemy beyond the bounds of Australian-controlled territory.

We often talk of the day when we will take the offensive, and how necessary it will be to drive the Japanese home again. How are we to do that? We are not going to do it with divided forces, but only by united effort. The one thing that is most desirable in Australia today is that we shall have no distinction between the Forces. I sincerely hope that, for the good feeling that should exist in our Army and for the success of future operations in this war, some method will be derived by those in authority to unite those two Forces and make one combined unit of them. It is for those reasons that I have much pleasure in supporting this motion.

MR. BERRY (Irwin-Moore): This motion has my support. Thorough organisation is absolutely essential if it is the intention of the Allies, including Australia, to win the war. I therefore contend that anything in the nature of a division will prevent that organisation from coming about. In this particular instance on the question of the C.M.F. soldiers and the A.I.F. soldiers we are unquestionably creating a division. Every member knows that serious disaffection between these two bodies is rife. Only yesterday I heard of an instance at one of the local camps. I will not go into details, but it was a case in which there were 150 odd A.I.F. soldiers in camp with 500 C.M.F. soldiers. The position was anything but good. Therefore, if it is our intention to organise correctly, we must have no division in our Army. It is impossible to have it. That has already been proved to us in disaster after disaster and, particularly, in regard to the disaster at Singapore where a somewhat similar situation arose. There were all sorts of troops—volunteer troops: regular troops and Air Force and others of one sort and another. They were disorganised because they were not under one control. At the twelfth hour many of the men left Singapore without being able to join the unit to which they belonged.

I assume that this motion is intended to correct that state of affairs should it arise here. Should we be subjected to a sudden invasion is there one central authority to say that the A.I.F. will operate and another to say that the C.M.F. will function separately, or that both will operate as soldiers of Australia, and soldiers of whom we are proud?

Again, in the case of taking the offensive, which is something we must do and do quickly otherwise the matter will become more complex with the passage of time, are we going to behold the sorry spectacle of C.M.F. soldiers saying good-bye to their brothers in the A.I.F. who are leaving to reconquer the territories we have lost? We may say that it is not our business to re-take Singapore, but there are 20,000 Australian souls there and it is our business! It is our business to be ready in the Solomon Islands just as much as in New Guinea. Our Navy is operating there now, but I do not know whether any members of our Military Forces are. It is the duty of Australia to see that every man pulls his weight in full for the Allied effort. That will not be done

if certain of our soldiers are to be allowed the privilege of staying back while their brothers go oversea to do the big job which has to be done. The member for Williams-Narrogin was told, by way of interjection, that this savoured of conscription. What is wrong with conscription, if it is general conscription?

Mr. Patrick: We have it today.

Mr. BERRY: Yes. You, Mr. Speaker, know, probably as well as I do, that within the next month or so directional powers will be sent to this country so that we may direct men to do civil jobs in any part of the country to which the officer in charge of that particular department desires.

Mr. McDonald: He can do that now.

Mr. BERRY: It is not definite yet.

Mr. Hughes: It is economic conscription.

Mr. BERRY: Yes. Where is the difference between that and saying that our soldiers must be soldiers? Many of these C.M.F. soldiers, if they stick to it, will regret their action. I do not hesitate to support the member for Williams-Narrogin. I do not hesitate to say that if we are to win this war we must organise without a single division, and there is not one member in this House who would gainsay that. I hope this motion will receive the support of this House and that, in their wisdom, members will see that it is directed to the appropriate sources for proper action.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington): I support the motion because I feel there should not be any division in the Australian Army. If we had one Army, it could be more easily managed from an administrative point of view, and our leaders would know exactly how many men were available for all purposes. I do not know of any other country where an army has two such divisions. A British soldier has to go to any part of the Empire that is in danger, and the same remark applies to the soldiers of other great Dominions. A Canadian soldier is available to fight wherever his services are required, and this also applies to New Zealanders and others.

Consider the other arms of our Fighting Services! There is no discrimination amongst Naval men. They have already fought in all parts of the world. The Australian Navy has made a name for itself wherever sea battles have been fought in this war. When our men join the Navy, they

know they will have to go wherever their services are required. This applies also to members of the Air Force. Our airmen do not join up solely to protect Australia. They are fighting in every theatre of war. Why, then, this division in the Army? There is a danger of creating a bad feeling between the two sections.

Mr. Berry: It has already been created.

Mr. McLARTY: I do not wish to say anything that might intensify that feeling.

Mr. Withers: Is there not a difference in the physical condition of the men in the two forces?

Mr. McLARTY: That applies everywhere.

Mr. Withers: But if a man is not fit for the Navy or for the Air Force, does not he go into the Army?

Mr. McLARTY: If he is fit for the Navy or Air Force, he has to go wherever his services are required. According to the Commonwealth "Hansard," Federal members have drawn attention to the ill-feeling existing between the members of the A.I.F. and A.M.F. The A.M.F. has done a good job and is doing a good job in Australia today, but it is not desirable that this division should exist. Taking the broad view, I think we can say that this war will not be won in Australia. It is generally agreed, in fact, that if we are to win this war, it must be won outside Australia. This being so, it is unfair to ask one section of the Army, —the volunteers for the A.I.F.—to go abroad, while others, who have not volunteered, are allowed to stay in Australia.

Mr. Hughes: There was some fairness in that.

Mr. McLARTY: Perhaps the hon. member will tell us what it was. American troops have come here in large numbers, and I understand they had no say as to whether they would remain in America or go elsewhere. They go wherever their services are required. It cannot have a good effect on those of our Allies if we say, "It may be necessary for you to go to some of the islands north of Australia to help to defend this country, but we are not going there." The hon. member was justified in bringing forward the motion. The Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament is strongly advocating that this division in the Army should cease to exist. If we had one Army I believe it would be a better Army, that the

administrative side would be facilitated and that our leaders would know exactly the number of men available for service in each theatre of war and how they could best be used.

MR. WATTS (Katanning): I propose to support the motion, subject to a slight amendment. Before moving the amendment, I will give reasons for supporting the motion which, I think, has very wisely been brought forward by the member for Williams-Narrogin. Before the war with the Japanese commenced, it might have been all right to draw these nice distinctions between the two sections of our Forces that are defending Australia. Before that time we were somewhat detached from the scene of operations. So far as land engagements were concerned, I suppose the nearest was 6,000 or 7,000 miles away. It was reasonable, then, to separate the compulsory trainee, whose duties it was assumed would be unlikely to be onerous and unlikely to be extended beyond local operations, and the A.I.F., who had volunteered for service in any part of the world.

With the entry of Japan into the war, however, Australia became in effect a battleground. Actually the terrain of this continent has not yet been subject to land operations, but the country over which the Commonwealth holds mandates—New Guinea and the Solomon Islands—has been and is now the subject of very severe hostilities, and the Government tells us quite frankly and clearly almost daily that victory or defeat in the battles taking place in those territories may easily amount to victory or defeat in relation to the invasion of this country. So we have only to move a step further and consider some of the other islands of the Pacific or of the North, an island such as Timor, over which we have no mandate and which is not Australian territory. We are told that while the defence of Australia necessitates the defence of Timor, as well as of New Guinea, because New Guinea happens to be a mandated territory and Timor is not, we must separate our Forces.

I am satisfied that, at this stage of Australian history, the nice distinctions legitimately enough drawn in the first place should be abolished. The two islands of the Solomons group—Bougainville and Buka—were mandated to Australia, with Papua,

in 1920. Previous to that, portion of New Guinea and of the Solomon Islands was in German hands. So I say we have reached a stage when this distinction becomes invidious, and the Commonwealth Government would be well advised, in all the circumstances and for the reasons put forward by me and by other speakers, to withdraw the distinction, and let us stand, as the member for Irwin-Moore put it, as one Army, ready to fight in defence of Australia in any part where it may be necessary for our soldiers to go, acting according to the advice of the Service Chiefs and those in authority to consummate the defence of this country.

But there is one portion of the motion which was specifically referred to by the member for Williams-Narrogin and because of a suggestion he made I propose to ask the House to delete that portion from the motion. The hon. member, addressing himself to the subject, informed us that on further consideration of paragraph 3 he was quite prepared to agree to its removal. Of course he himself, as mover, was unable to propose the necessary amendment. I agree with the view that to include in the motion a proposal to reduce the Commonwealth Government's control of the Army to a minimum would be unwise. In these days I am becoming something of a Federalist, and under our Commonwealth Constitution the Commonwealth Government legitimately has every right to the control of Australia's Defence Forces.

Mr. Hughes: Are you a unified Federalist?

Mr. WATTS: No. But under the Constitution the Commonwealth Government is entitled to the control of the Defence Forces of Australia. Therefore it would be useless on the part of the mover, who I believe, now holds views different from those he held before, to retain those words in the motion. Accordingly I move an amendment—

That the words "(3) by reducing the Commonwealth Government's control of the Army to a minimum" be struck out.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin—on amendment): When moving the motion I intimated at the end of my remarks that in the interests of unanimity within the House I was anxious to have paragraph

(3) deleted. Accordingly I raise no objection to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth): I cannot support the motion, which includes a few words that are highly dangerous, though I am in full agreement with it up to the end of paragraph (1). I venture to assert that if members examine paragraph (2), not many of them will support it. The paragraph reads—

(2) by using the resultant joint body of troops for war service, either in or out of Australian territory, thus more satisfactorily and quickly ensuring the successful defence of this country; and

A motion for conscription for overseas service—

Mr. Doney: You can put that proposal up, if you want to.

Mr. HUGHES: It is not a kind of conscription I would assent to. I believe in conscription, but not the kind of conscription this motion provides for.

Mr. Doney: It does not offer—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Williams-Narrogin will keep order.

Mr. HUGHES: The motion looks sufficiently innocuous until one examines the wording of paragraph (2). If carried, it will amount to a declaration by every member of the House who votes for it in favour of conscription for overseas service. The Menzies-Fadden Government definitely declared against conscription for overseas service, on the ground that it was unwise to raise the question at the time. If I follow Mr. Fadden, will it be suggested that I am doing wrong? Mr. Menzies was in office, I think, after Japan entered the war.

Members: No!

Mr. HUGHES: If Menzies and Fadden have changed their views, why not put up a motion accordingly in the Commonwealth Parliament?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They did that.

Mr. HUGHES: Are not they still members of the War Cabinet?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Certainly they are.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: What voice have they got there?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Subiaco will keep order.

Mr. HUGHES: The present Prime Minister and his Government have declared themselves definitely against conscription for overseas service. I think Mr. Curtin

himself said it was highly inadvisable at that time—two or three months ago—to raise the question of conscription to divide the country on it.

Mr. McDonald: He proposes to have this referendum instead.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Being told in one breath to get behind the Commonwealth Government and not bring up anything contentious, we remain silent, although there are many things we could complain about. We are told, "Don't throw a spanner in the works; don't raise contentious matters. Do everything you can to help the war effort. If you cannot do that, stand aside and do not get in the way."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Do you subscribe to those words?

Mr. HUGHES: Absolutely!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I will remind you of them.

Mr. HUGHES: I was even egotistic enough to offer my services to the Commonwealth Government. After waiting a few months, I received a memorandum from an office boy in Francis-street, saying that there was no position in which my services could be employed. The inference I drew was that hitherto I had been labouring under a delusion with regard to my efficiency, which was less than I had believed. Frequently, if one cannot help actively, it is the better course to keep out of the way and allow people who can do the job to get on with it. Otherwise one is like the man who comes along when one's motorcar is in a bog and, when one is trying to drag it out and has practically succeeded in releasing the vehicle, grabs an axe and a shovel and gets in everybody's way, whereas the best thing he could do would be simply to stand aside and let the job be finished by those engaged in it. So we are now definitely raising a most contentious question throughout Australia. I will inform the House why I am not in favour of sending our boys oversea. If we are going to have conscription, let us have conscription of human beings and conscription of wealth and conscription of property. But no-one known to me is in favour of conscription of wealth.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: We have that within Australia now.

Mr. HUGHES: Have we?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: I will tell the hon. member why I do not think we have conscription of wealth. Every day on picking up the newspaper one sees expensive advertisements pleading with readers to put money into war loans or war bonds. I presume that the appeal is addressed to people who have money to put into war loans and bonds, and not to people who have no money available for that purpose. Next, the Government goes on the air and one hears the most appalling piffle about collecting shillings and so forth for the war loan and war bonds. Thus if one has money in the bank that is needed for the war effort, one can please oneself whether one lends it or not. When one does put it in, one knows that the money will be repaid eventually with a high rate of interest. So there is no conscription about that. On the other hand, if one happens to be a poor kid with a motorbike for which he has paid £160, and it is worth £160 to him, the Military Department takes the bike away and gives the youth £80—just enough to pay off the vendor of the bike.

No question there about the youth's right to get the equity in his cycle! They take £80 from him—just take it as a capital levy. They say, "We want your bike. You owe £80 on it to a big firm in the city. We will pay it and take your bike." No consideration whatever is shown to that youth; there is a capital levy; the whole of his capital in the cycle is taken and no questions are asked.

When somebody has the temerity to raise a protest, some chocolate soldier at Francis-street says, "Don't you know there is a war on?" If, instead of having a £60 equity in a motor cycle the youth had £6,000 on deposit in a bank, the authorities would not dream of saying, "Turn over your £6,000." Instead, the authorities will spend endless money in appealing to him to put the £6,000 into war loans, and he pleases himself whether he does so or not. Many people today have cash credits at the banks which they are not putting into war loans. They are deliberately using that money to make profits. At present, owing to the restrictions on the sale of property, houses are going cheap. The man who can pay cash for a working man's home can get it cheap today. If we had an equitable system of conscription, that man would not have the cash available, because the Commonwealth would

say to him, "Transfer that credit to the Commonwealth Government interest free. We are not going to ask you to do it."

[*Mr. Withers took the Chair.*]

Mr. Doney: Are you still on the motion?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. It is curious that while some people are willing to conscript human life they do not believe in conscription of money and wealth. Our youth, whose services are required in the Military Forces, is not asked any questions at all; as soon as a youth attains 18 years, he must enter the Military Forces, no matter what training he is undergoing or what it means to his future. He has to go and he is told, "If you are lucky, you will keep your life." He is paid much below the basic wage—about 60 per cent. of the basic wage. He is told he is doing it for his country. The other day, as I watched returned soldiers marching down St. George's-terrace, I wondered whether in the years to come those men—who had come back from the Middle East and some of whom were wounded—would be called upon to pay taxes to pay the interest on the money borrowed to feed and clothe them while they were in the Middle East.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They will not be called upon to do that.

Mr. HUGHES: Things will be different after this war? The indications are that they will not.

Mr. Marshall: They are paying taxes now.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. They have not to wait until the war is over.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: After the war, the new order starts.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is nothing in the motion about the new order.

Mr. HUGHES: Nothing is in order unless the new order is mentioned. If members want to make a declaration favouring total conscription, then the Commonwealth should say to the citizen who has £1,000 and to the youth of 18 who has his life, "We are taking that £1,000 and we are taking that boy's life. If we do not use the £1,000, we will give it back to the citizen, and if the youth is not killed, of course he will live." I am 100 per cent for that. It is total conscription.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: The life is worth more than £1,000, surely!

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it is worth much more than £1,000, but relatively it has no value, because the Government takes it and does not give any compensation at all. It does not pay the youth even the basic wage.

Several members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: We should not be wasting valuable time and money appealing to people to lend their money.

Mr. Thorn: If people shared your view, they would not risk their lives at all.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, they would. They would go further; they would share their money. I would not limit conscription to boys. There should be no age limit. Let every man, irrespective of age, join the Military Forces and do work he is capable of doing. Let the test be medical fitness, not age. If a man is fit at 46 to do certain work, he should do it.

Mr. Doney: Have you given them an opportunity to make the test a purely medical one?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. In addition to making a carte blanche offer to two Commonwealth Governments, when I filled in my census card I repeated that I was willing to serve in any capacity for which I was mentally and physically fitted. I suppose I was playing safe; nevertheless I took the risk. I went further. When I came to the clause as to exemptions, I waived my right, as a member of Parliament, to exemption. If there comes a time when there is a place in the Fighting Services where I can be used I shall therefore be available. The member for Williams-Narrogin challenged me on the point.

Mr. Doney: I was hoping to draw from you an admission that you had been down at the recruiting office.

Mr. Thorn: They had me hopping round for a couple of hours.

Mr. HUGHES: Whilst I acknowledge I have no mental capacity that makes me useful to the Fighting Forces, I reject that proposition in regard to the member for Toodyay.

Mr. Thorn: That is quite all right. Do not worry about me. I can look after myself.

Mr. HUGHES: I certainly am not going to allow to pass unchallenged a motion for conscription of human life. If a comprehensive motion is moved for total conscription, that is, conscription of wealth and

conscription of life, it will have my support. I think it exceedingly unfair to single out those people in the community who merely have their lives to give, and to treat those who have wealth in an entirely different way. If the Commonwealth Government is going to take the lives of our youths, why should it not take the property of the old men who really do not need it very much now? They are getting old. They have enjoyed life and had the best of it. What does any man 60 years old want £60,000 for?

Mr. Doney: When you are that age you will change your views.

Mr. HUGHES: Age is catching up with him and he is cooling off. His requirements are becoming less and less. He wants less food, less clothes, and less pleasure.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Speak for yourself.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Subiaco says, "Speak for yourself." I was not including both sexes. I should say that at the age of 60 the cooling period is coming. It is the twilight. All he wants is a volume of Shakespeare and a meal and a half a day.

Mr. McLarty: You will stick to your volume of law books!

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know. I hope I do not still have to be working at 60. Why not take steps to save me from myself and take my wealth, so that it will not accumulate into vast sums in the next ten years?

Mr. Thorn: I would like to take it from you.

Mr. HUGHES: I will make a deal with the hon. member. For a shilling he can have all my assets, if he will take over all my liabilities.

Mr. Thorn: I will take you on quick and lively! You have to put up a stronger case than that.

Mr. HUGHES: A deal! The hon. member can get it for a shilling. He has only to sign a contract and make it legal.

Mr. Thorn: Bring it along!

Mr. HUGHES: I ask members to look carefully at paragraph (2) before they make a declaration for the conscription of human life without conscription of wealth. If we are going to make a declaration for conscription, let it be done as a straight-out motion that this House urges the Commonwealth Government to introduce conscription. Then we will all

know clearly what we are voting for and where we stand. I am not prepared to vote for the motion while it contains paragraph (2). If I am in order, I will move that it be deleted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, the hon. member cannot go back.

Mr. HUGHES: Very well.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MOTION—DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT.

To Disallow Cream-Processing Regulation.

Debate resumed from the 9th September on the following motion by Mr. Doney:—

That new Regulation 39A, made under the Dairy Industry Act, 1922-1939, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 5th June, 1942, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 4th August, 1942, be and is hereby disallowed.

MR. McLARTY (Murray - Wellington) [4.27]: I was hoping the Minister for Agriculture would speak to this motion, which I trust will be defeated. I feel that if the Minister will oppose the motion he will be meeting the wishes of a great number of dairymen in this country. The regulation to which the member for Williams-Narrogin objects was introduced because dairymen have been advocating for quite a long time that the quality of butter should be improved. If the regulation is disallowed we shall take a retrograde step, because its disallowance will not help to improve the quality of butter.

Mr. Doney: Have you taken into consideration the cost of the new regulation?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes; I read the hon. member's speech carefully and took into consideration the matter of cost. The hon. member said that this regulation, if allowed to continue, would increase the cost of butter or lead to an increased cost to the producer of butter-fat of a penny a lb.

Mr. Doney: Do you agree with that?

Mr. McLARTY: I do not know. I am not too sure that such would be the case, but I do know that if we are going to lessen the quality of our butter the cost to the producer will be very much more. I have discussed this matter with producers in the dairying districts, and I have not found one of them who is favourable to the motion. Numbers of prominent producers

have expressed the hope that the Minister will stick to the regulation and that it will not be disallowed. The member for Williams-Narrogin has admitted that the Agricultural Department has not been harsh in regard to the administration of this regulation. If I remember rightly, he said it was necessary that there should be some safeguard. I consider this regulation is a safeguard. While it exists, certain factories at least will be on their guard and will turn out a better quality butter. I think the Agricultural Department framed this regulation with the idea of being able to insist that certain factories should keep up the standard and produce the quality of butter desired. If the regulation were disallowed, we would probably have certain factories paying a price for cream which was not legitimate and turning out butter which they called first-class, in the hope of selling it in a few days in order that the quality would appear up to standard. If such butter had to be kept long, however, it would not be up to standard.

The hon. member also suggested that the regulation should not be enforced against certain factories, or should not be enforced until the factories had a certain quantity of cream to grade. If the regulation were applied to one factory and not to another, it would be most unfair. Again, it would give those factories to which the regulation did not apply a decided advantage over those to which it did apply.

Mr. Watts: Did not that happen with the old regulation of 30 per cent.?

Mr. McLARTY: We have not got the 30 per cent. We have this new regulation. I was going to say that such factories to which the regulation would not apply would have the advantage of selling their product on the local market, while other factories against which the regulation was enforced would have to do all the exporting and bear the cost.

I hope the Minister will oppose the motion. The hon. member probably brought it in because of the pressure he received from producers in the dairying districts. It is quality we want. To disallow the regulation would not help us to get quality and, once we let the regulation go and the quality of our dairy produce suffers as a result, it will take years to bring it up again; and consequently producers, manufacturers and all sections of the dairy industry will suffer.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury): I hope the regulation will not be disallowed. The Act and the original regulations were introduced for a specific purpose.

Mr. Doney: Do you know whether that specific purpose was carried out?

Mr. WITHERS: I was going to refer to that. When moving the motion the hon. member said that although regulations were framed in 1937 for 30 per cent., they were not given effect to, but he is afraid that because the figure has been raised to 50 per cent. they will be given effect to. Why the difference between 30 per cent. and 50 per cent.? Nevertheless, I think that the 30 per cent. regulation has had its effect. One must crawl before one walks. First of all we encourage the producer and the factory to do a certain thing. We say that we have not forced them, but they have got up to a fairly high standard. We do not want one particular district to interfere in the manufacture of first and choice grades of butter to the detriment of those districts which are practically depending on that class of product for a livelihood. I would like the hon. member to take into consideration what this 50 per cent. means. It is 50 per cent. of the butter-fat supplies.

Mr. Doney: Are you quite sure?

Mr. WITHERS: Yes. The regulation states—

Fifty per cent. of the weight of butter-fat contained in such cream.

Approximately 83 lbs. of butter-fat of the over-run would make 100 lbs. of butter. So that when 100 lbs. of butter is made, it is not 50 per cent. of 100 lbs., but 50 per cent. of 83 lbs., which is 41½ lbs. The same thing applies to the 90 per cent. of first-grade. It is only the butter-fat. With the over-run, it is not on the actual 100 lbs. of butter, but on the butter-fat content. Surely it is not a hardship to ask these people to do that. If they are not in a position actually to maintain that standard all the year round, and if the department has not been harsh on them during the previous four or five years in which the Act has been in operation, is there any reason to go to these people and say, "Because you have jumped up to 50 per cent. or 90 per cent., you are going to be penalised?" I do not think so. We want to encourage these people to give us the article.

The member for Williams-Narrogin made use of words to the effect that he stands or

falls by the merits of the regulation, because he wants to help in keeping up the quality of Western Australian cream to ensure our success on export markets. That is what we are after but, if these regulations are disallowed and a particular factory (or factories) is allowed to get below this percentage to such an extent that we are not getting that good quality butter, then we are not doing the right thing by the dairy farmers of this State. I have attended a number of annual conferences in this State of members of the Institute of Dairy Manufacturers and Secretaries. Some four or five years ago I was at Harvey and heard the Commonwealth Dairy Adviser, Mr. Wigan, say to the manufacturers of butter at that centre, "I will bring in a man off the street, and he will be able to make choice butter out of choice cream, but I defy any of you factory managers to make choice butter out of cream that is not choice." He definitely stressed the point that it was up to the dairy managers to see that the producers, and everyone else in this country, got a better deal and that our manufactured butter should compare favourably with other export butters of the Commonwealth.

The mover of the motion mis-stated what he meant to say, because he said something that is definitely opposite to what is in the regulations. He said that the new regulation would come into effect within four days. The regulation does not say that. It states that the manufacture and grading of cream would not take place earlier than four days. The cream has to be four days old before it is graded.

Mr. Doney: I may not have said that, but I certainly knew it.

Mr. WITHERS: The Commonwealth regulations prescribe that butter shall not be graded until it is four days old. I do not want to delay the House. I have discussed this matter with factory managers and others in my district—and I think that I and the member for Murray-Wellington represent those who are concerned—and I have not up to date heard of any opposition to these regulations. These people appreciate, as I and others do, that the Government has perhaps been a little lenient in this matter, and they realise that it can be lenient in the future only to a degree. For the betterment and protection of the industry, I hope that the regulation will not be disallowed.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Gnildford-Midland): I desire to support the regulations as they stand. As one who has had some business connection with dairying in this State, I commend the Minister for framing the regulations so as to regulate better the manufacture of butter in Western Australia. There is no doubt that the regulations as framed apply, and apply technically, to those districts where dairying is possible. They prevent the impossible district from discounting the possible district; or, in other words, they prevent inferior cream from reaching a market and discounting the choicer creams of the suitable dairying districts.

Mr. Seward: Did you eat some of the butter we had in the House last week?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course there is always a bad churn of butter. When the hon. member was on his farm he made many blunders in that regard. A factory can have a great run with the proper grade of cream, but a sudden change of climatic or other conditions may make it difficult to maintain the standard. The point is this, that the aim of this State is to get the maximum quantity of choice butter, and choice butter cannot be manufactured from inferior cream. Nor can we get choice or first-grade cream when it has to be transported over long distances, left at sidings before it is despatched, allowed to stand at the siding again after arrival, and then again transported.

There are portions of this State where people have attempted for years to produce first class or choice grade butter. They have not done it yet, except for one or two months of the year. During the rest of the year they are discounting, generally, Western Australian butter. That is the kind of thing we must avoid. We have not been able to put it right because of the need for a regulation of this kind. I do not know that this regulation is perfect, but it is a step in the right direction. In the South-West of this State where, of course, the choice butter is being produced and whence all our export butter has come, the people interested are, I should say, unanimously in favour of this regulation. But, as I have said, there are other parts of the State trying to do the impossible. While I commend the efforts made there, we have to appreciate that it is not possible for those districts to produce choice butter. We must

ensure that the difficulties experienced in that regard do not discount or discredit Western Australia as a butter-producing State. I commend the Government for having introduced the regulations and hope that the regulation which is being challenged will be allowed to stand.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

The regulation challenged by the motion is a very important one under the powers conferred by the Dairy Industry Act. All the regulations framed under the Act have for their objective the production of a better commodity within the State where the industry is in force.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Where it should be in force.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, where it is in force. The point upon which the member for Guildford-Midland focussed attention—the geography of the industry in this State—is unfortunately a fact. In the circumstances it is extremely difficult in some districts and at some factories to live entirely up to the requirements of some of the regulations under the Act but, because that is so, I would be very hostile to any endeavour to defeat such regulations on the ground that difficulties might arise in administration, management and manufacture owing to the exacting demands in all circumstances. That, however, is the important point in relation to any operation associated with dairying. The most exacting requirements are demanded of the industry if it is to live within the ambit of quality and, unless it can do that, it cannot live at all. So I ask the member for Williams-Narrogin, who objects from the point of view of Narrogin, to look much further afield and examine what will happen if the regulation is disallowed.

The regulations are the only means of controlling factory efforts in this industry. The regulation particularly objected to by the hon. member deals with powers that vary requirements regarding the quantity of butter to be made from choice and first-grade cream. The authority and backing of the department in this connection come from a body known as the Institute of Dairy Factory Managers—technicians in this industry, men trained to know not merely factory requirements of sanitation and manufacture but also what is expected of the commodity, both in Western Australia and

in an export sense. The department believes, and the operatives agree, that 90 per cent. of first-grade butter from first-grade cream is a reasonable explanation, and it can be shown that factories in this State not only can but also have achieved figures in excess of that requirement. It was at the request of the Institute of Dairy Factory Managers that the percentage was raised from 30 to 50 as the expectation of manufacture from choice cream.

The department, in administering these regulations, has adopted the very policy that the member for Williams-Narrogin advocates, namely the sending of authorised inspectors from district to district, but obviously when dealing with widely-scattered factories these inspectors cannot be in constant attendance. We believe that, if grading is correctly carried out, the percentage of first-grade and choice butter made from first-grade and choice quality cream should be right up to the expectation that the regulations demand. While it might be impossible to administer this regulation on a flat basis, because of geography and the different conditions prevailing in various districts, I do not think we would be penalising the industry in any way or even exacting demands that Narrogin cannot live up to if we implemented the regulations to the very letter.

Mr. Doney: Do you agree that there will or will not be an extra $\frac{3}{4}$ d. or 1d. per lb. if small quantities are made into choice butter?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot follow that line of argument. Producers cannot suffer so long as they are paid for the better quality. If they are paid for the better quality, they must deliver it.

Mr. Watts: You do not know whether they are paid for it or not.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If it is a question of local factory management, that is not a reason for quarrelling with me. The requirements exacted by the department at the point of manufacture certainly give a lead to those factories which are adversely situated and have to draw cream from districts in ideal dairying districts. It might be news to members to learn that three factories have ceased manufacturing since the regulations were gazetted, because we were able to insist on a quality production that heretofore we had not succeeded in giving effect to. The principal

reason for one factory closing was the inability, due to the obsolescence of the plant, to manufacture high-quality butter. I consider it is in the best interests of the producers that those factories are out of action.

Mr. Doney: Other than the obsolescence of the machinery, what were the reasons?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Lack of cleanliness, sanitation and general treatment of the product sent to them. During last March and April three factories did not manufacture any butter of choice and first-grade, and so the department took drastic action. As I have said, since the regulations were gazetted three factories have been closed, and I think that action was taken in the best interests of the industry and of the producers. In the case of two of those factories, there was no excuse; they had the facilities, but the places were very difficult to police. We cannot have officers of the Department of Agriculture using all the methods at their disposal to induce factory managers and operatives to do their best, if they cannot live up to the requirements of the regulations.

The member for Bunbury was right regarding the four days provision in the regulations. There is nothing revolutionary in this method of grading. It is very necessary that the test should be made four days after the manufacture of the butter. By processes known to factory managers, there is a way of sweetening cream and, if the finished article is not to be consumed within a day or two, the right time to examine the butter for quality is four days after its manufacture or later. That provision is one that is required if an honest grade is to be made of butter, whether in store for a month or in store for a lengthy period awaiting export. In regard to qualities of butter manufactured in different districts, although I submit that at no time has the enforcement of these regulations penalised Narrogin, I can quite understand the hon. member's concern if Narrogin is forced at all times to live up to the exacting requirements of the regulations.

Mr. Doney: Do not forget that I was referring to small factories.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. However, I realise also that the hon. member, knowing as well as I do the factory in his home town and the districts from which it draws supplies—the nature of its difficulties in that regard—is aware

that I had no attitude other than the one that we wish to be tolerant and helpful, and not in any way to impose unfair conditions through these regulations.

I realise that in the pioneering days of many industries, districts and areas are settled which are not wholly suitable for the particular industry. We have experienced that in every branch of agriculture, including the very difficulty that obtains in the production of butter-fat in the wheatbelt, which has been a nightmare to those interested in the butter industry of Western Australia. Instead of the cream being consigned daily as on the Northern Rivers of New South Wales—where, indeed, cream is collected twice a day, and under the best dairying conditions in Australia—we were lucky sometimes if from the wheatbelt cream was despatched once a week. An accumulation of cream in the hot summer weather neither sets nor carries in the way to be expected by a producer of butter. A factory in that area recently closed because of its inability to handle that type of cream. With the background belonging to the dairying industry of this State, any attempt at retrogression in point of quality should be vigorously opposed in this House, and by everyone who has an interest in the industry.

I will give an indication of the ability to manufacture the various types of butter in winter and in summer. Take the July to November period last year, the winter period, when production of choice butter was about 10 per cent., and of choice and first-grade 82 per cent.! At times during that period we had all of the butter manufactured in the State within the choice and first-grade range. But during the summer months, January to April, 1942, we were able to make no choice butter responding to the exacting demands of Commonwealth points measure of choice and first-grade. The production of those two qualities had slipped 68 per cent! When it is remembered that that includes all the best dairying districts of the State, one sees what a rigid control is necessary to endeavour to lift the quality rather than allow it to slip in any way.

Now with regard to the department's policy in refusing second-grade cream! Three years ago the rejection percentage was 27, two years ago it was 20, and last year we got it down to 12. Surely, therefore, by rigid control of factories, by the sending

of officers actively engaged from farm to farm, we are achieving something worthwhile. I think that generally the department's policy is loyally supported by most factories. Some factory managers have difficulties to contend against which the others do not experience. The department has every sympathy with the factory manager who by his situation is forced to accept cream from distances and districts unsuitable for dairying practice generally. However, if those factory managers will be honest and endeavour to do the right thing in handling the product, so that it should not be detrimentally affected by the addition of qualities that are not good, we will give them every help and no hindrance. Therefore I hope the House will whole-heartedly vote against the motion of the member for Williams-Narrogin. If there is an industry that requires an active policy to succeed, it is the dairying industry. I hope, therefore, that the mover will not vigorously support his first contentions, but will realise that the motion is not in the interests of the industry generally.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin—in reply): With what the Minister has just said, regarding cleanliness in particular, I whole-heartedly agree; but of course the question of cleanliness does not arise under the motion and has not, except for the few words of the Minister, been discussed. I agree, too, without reservation, that there is and has been for many years entire good-feeling existing between the officers of the Agricultural Department and factory managers everywhere. With the Minister's additional remarks I do not agree. The hon. gentleman said I claimed that effective operation under the regulations would entail on smaller factories considerable additional expense. That is so. I do not understand why he did not follow that up in the direction of giving reasons why he differed from me. When moving the motion nearly a month ago, I submitted that if 10 tons of choice cream was being put through a factory, that would be economically sufficient, because it would warrant expenditure upon extra plant and additional manpower and so forth. At the same time I tried to make it plain that those factories—the smaller factories putting through no more than say two or three tons per week—would find separate treatments uneconomical to an extent

that would entail on them costs of something between $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and 1d. per pound above the usual amount. I thought that would be an argument carrying an appeal to the Minister. It seems to me that the calculation is elementary enough.

When originally speaking to the motion I said I was quite willing to let my objections rise or fall upon their merits. I endorsed the Minister's contention that it is his duty, and his department's duty, to seek improvement in the quality of butter. The member for Guildford-Midland said the regulation was operating very effectively indeed. I take it he was referring only to the old regulation. My references have been to the new one, which has just been promulgated. It is difficult to see how remarks of the member for Guildford-Midland can be applied to the old regulation, because it was never put into effect at all. The point is, of course, that the Government threatened the 30 per cent. basis but did not enforce its threat. The hon. member should know that. It is attempted to arrange by this new regulation a figure of 50 per cent., at the same time making it known to those interested in the subject that it is not the Government's intention to enforce that, nor, for that matter, in times like these would it be possible to carry it into effect because of shortage of manpower. It is not my intention to repeat what I said when moving the motion a month ago.

Mr. Withers: You would not be replying if you did.

MR. DONEY: That is right. I am quite willing to permit my motion to go to the vote.

Question put and negatived.

MOTION—RUBBER.

Economy in Use.

Debate resumed from the 9th September on the following motion by Mr. Cross:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the serious shortage of rubber supplies, together with the possibility of further restrictions for civilian requirements, immediate intensive action be taken so as to obtain the most effective use from used tyres in the interests of the State and in order to further assist in the war effort.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.7]: I see no reason for disagreeing with the motion, which expresses a worthy sentiment. I do not know how far

it is within the province of this Parliament to take any active part in the matter, because it is covered to a large extent by National Security regulations. The Commonwealth Government, through National Security Regulations, has apparently formed the opinion that rubber is an essential commodity and that it is proper it should be covered by regulations made by the Commonwealth Government. But so far as the motion is one which draws the attention of the community to the necessity for conserving rubber and the importance of avoiding its waste, it seems to me to be quite worthy of support. The member for Canning, in the course of his remarks, expressed some apprehensions about rubber being wasted. He referred to one or two dumps, in which there had been rubber which he understood was to be treated as scrap and sent away for re-treatment. He thought that in those dumps there were various rubber components which were capable of further service.

Since the hon. member made his speech, two of the manufacturers have interviewed me and asked me to state that there need be no apprehension as to danger in this respect. They told me that under the National Security Regulations, and the procedure laid down by the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Department of Supply, every safeguard exists to ensure that articles which are capable of further use or of being reclaimed or re-treated, are being adequately cared for. The procedure is that all donated articles of rubber are accumulated at dumps which are under the control of the Army. The Army is responsible for the safe custody of the rubber when held in those depots. When the rubber arrives at the depots, it is examined by a committee consisting of three persons. One is an Army salvage representative, or suitable Army technical officer. The second is a representative of the rubber industry, and of course he would be an expert in his particular vocation. The third is a representative of the Rubber Workers' Union. These three persons have the responsibility of deciding what articles are fit for re-use without treatment, whether tyres and tubes or other articles are fit for re-treading or re-capping or repairing; and what scrap is fit only for reclamation. I am assured by the gentlemen who saw me that the committee operates effectively, and that

the position is such that no real danger exists of articles capable of being re-treaded or re-capped being sent away for boiling down for reclamation.

The two manufacturers did point out, however, that any person not an expert who went to some of these dumps and examined the tyres apparently discarded might easily imagine them to be capable of further use, whereas in fact it would not be possible to re-cap or re-tread them because, although they might appear to be sound, there is some internal fracture or defect which makes it quite impossible for repairs to be effective. If the rubber is incapable of being re-treaded or re-capped, then it is sent to the Eastern States to be boiled down, or whatever the process is, and re-claimed. It is then made up into entirely fresh articles. The people concerned in the classification of rubber articles donated by and collected from the public desire me to assure the House that there is no real danger of any waste occurring under the rigid system which has been set up. As to the motion, I need only add that it is in general terms and that there is no harm in this House urging that the utmost economy should be observed in the use of rubber, and the utmost care taken in collecting any scrap rubber for the assistance of our war effort.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan): I agree with the member for West Perth that the motion cannot do any harm, but I am afraid it is limited in its usefulness and, in the final analysis, amounts to but a pious hope. The motion is, however, topical. It relates to a matter of great importance. One has only to consider the gravity of the war position to realise that, owing to the shortage of rubber, the utmost economy should be observed in its use. If possible, scrap rubber should be collected and re-vulcanised. The introduction of the motion was a good move. Military requirements make the conservation of the supply of rubber very essential. With the development of the internal combustion engine over the past score of years, the use of rubber has grown out of all proportion. I realise, however, that what is needed in this matter is the formulation of new legislation, and I propose to move an amendment which, in view of the seriousness of the position and the justification of action to this extent, will, I hope, receive the support of the mover of the motion. Per-

haps that is a lot to expect, because it may indicate a broadness of vision and generosity of view which are not always possible; but I believe that the hon. member, on reviewing the position, will agree that legislation is essential if the motion submitted by him is to make any progress or be of any help.

Rubber is put to thousands of different uses, but the special use to which reference has been made is in regard to covers and tubes of tyres, mostly of motor vehicles. In this connection there are certain elements, certain principles, which must be cared for; otherwise, there will be not only a shortage but actually such a dearth of supply as may easily bring about an exceedingly difficult if not impossible situation. One matter that requires attention is insistence upon inflation pressures being maintained. A motor tyre should not be inflated to too high a pressure, nor should it be allowed to drop to too low a pressure. It is a matter of great importance that inflation pressures, knowledge of which is available to all those interested, should be observed. Another matter of very great importance—and I realise I am extending the scope of the motion—is the speed at which a cover is used. Excessive speeds are very destructive of the life of motor tyre covers. For instance, a speed of fifty miles an hour means double the tread wear that is the case when a car travels at 30 miles an hour. When travelling is at 100 miles an hour, there is 12 times the amount of destruction.

The Minister for Lands: You will have to slow down your speed!

Mr. SAMPSON: We must all slow down our speed. I have often felt—though I have not said it very often—that the Minister could well come down a little. Sometimes he has reached altitudes which, if not dangerous to himself, are certainly very destructive to covers. I would not say he has done that to my knowledge since the Japs came into the war. This is a very serious matter. We cannot regard it too seriously. The destructive effect of travelling at 130 miles an hour is 30 times that of travelling at 50 miles an hour, but the former is a speed which the ordinary traveller does not reach. Many drivers, however, do travel at 70 miles an hour. Nowadays that is not only a matter of neglect of road sense but is a positive wickedness. It is a national sin, and something which should receive very

serious punishment. A speed of from 30 to 35 miles an hour is the most economical, but there are so many people who, the moment they get into a motorcar, a truck, or other motor-propelled vehicle, must go as fast as possible, and they are not always the best drivers. The Minister for Works knows that the man who rides a motorbike fast through the main streets of the city is usually a poor motorcycle rider when he is in the country. When he has an open road, his heart fails him. It was the same with push-cycling.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing in the motion about push-cycling.

Mr. SAMPSON: Push-cycles have tyres, although I do not anticipate that there will be any serious consideration in regard to that, following this motion.

Mr. Patrick: There is a shortage of them, too.

Mr. SAMPSON: At the same time, it is important—

Mr. Watts: They are all controlled.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, they are controlled under the National Security Act. I wanted the opportunity of saying that a man who drives fast a motor vehicle, car, truck or any motor-propelled vehicle is not necessarily a capable driver. Often he is not mentally balanced, but it is necessary that drivers should exercise the greatest economy in the use of rubber. Fast cornering is another danger and a menace to safety. I am not so much discussing that as dealing with the conservation of rubber. Fast cornering entails considerable friction, and that is a matter that should receive consideration. Members may ask: How are all these difficulties to be overcome? I think amendments could be made to the Traffic Act. It would be a splendid amendment to that Act if it were possible to save our motor covers and other rubber articles. Its effect would be to urge the Government to take steps to provide legislation, and thereby do something of a valuable nature in regard to war matters.

The correction of driving habits is important. Some people will never correct their bad habits unless they are compelled to. Some of these matters to which I have referred cause rapid tread-wear. They are, in brief, high speed, high speed over rough roads, rapid acceleration, fierce braking and fast cornering. I am sure that members, taking the serious view they do of a matter

so important as this, will give this proposition their best consideration. Today tyre conservation is of such importance that we cannot allow this matter to continue without taking steps to secure the utmost economy. Another point is the condition of brakes on different vehicles. When it comes to speeding and overloading, the examination or maintenance of a correct braking system is of first importance. The object I have in view could be achieved by making increased use of the powers under the Traffic Act and its regulations. Whatever is required should be done, and no objection could possibly be raised. Serious wastage of rubber occurs with public conveyances such as our trolley buses, privately-owned buses and also with commercial vehicles.

We have all noticed at times how thoughtlessly commercial vehicles are driven and how thoughtlessly motorcars are driven. They are accelerated with such severity as to do grave injury to the tyres. If one were to examine the road with a microscope after one of these quick getaways, he would see very small pieces of rubber. Equally important is the sudden stoppage of a vehicle. There are occasions when such a course is necessary. There is an old saying to the effect that, "If you want a brake you need it right away and it must be effective." There are plenty of drivers who never give consideration to their tyres. I am calling them tyres as it is the popular term, but it is not the term which would be accepted by those closely associated with covers and tubes. Speeding up must be stopped, and it becomes the duty of this House to do something towards that end.

Another matter is that of maintaining the correct pressure in the tubes. A private motorist might drive as short a distance as 10 miles a week, or he might drive 100 miles. There are, however, drivers of commercial vehicles whose work necessitates, perhaps, their driving up to 2,000 miles per week. That being so we have to see that they exercise all care and do not abuse the vehicle they are driving. It will be found on occasions that the persons who do not own the motor vehicles are far more reckless in their driving than is the case where the driver is the owner. Any defect in a vehicle, such as defective brakes, the bad alignment of wheels, or overloading, greatly reduces the life of covers. That point cannot be stressed too much. The pressure in the

tubes of trolley-buses and other conveyances used by the public should be regularly checked. That would have a wonderful effect in reducing wastage.

As members know, there are officers of the police force who go round Perth making sure that the traffic laws are being observed. We could add to the duties of these officers by instructing them to check tyre pressures, and also to note where covers are showing signs of wear. It is a fact that where a cover shows signs of wear and the canvas shows through—to however small an extent—that cover is due for recapping or retreading. No one should be allowed to continue to use a cover in such a condition. The observance of a table of correct air pressures for particular vehicles would also mean a great saving. The checking of vehicles on frequent occasions is necessary.

Mr. Patrick: You ought to print a small pamphlet on it.

Mr. SAMPSON: There are pamphlets available, and every member, including those who are not conversant with motor vehicles—and I understand the member for Greenough is more frequently a passenger than a driver—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think we will get back to the motion.

Mr. SAMPSON: The cars parked in the city could be examined by any police officer and he would render a good service indeed. The cross-switching of tyres, and the noting of the presence of cuts or irregularities which would indicate that repairs to covers were necessary, are other needs. That would not be difficult and a simple air pressure gauge would be the only tool needed to carry out the work. I am aware that all these matters are but incidental to the motion, but they are important. This week a report from New York was published in "The West Australian" stating that synthetic tyres were being manufactured, and that the difficulty with regard to covers and tubes in America was over. A day later, fortunately, that statement was corrected. The difficulty has not been overcome; nor is it likely to be overcome for some time. As stated in the cable message, the Axis powers have 90 per cent. of the rubber production of the world and, as the allied nations are left with but 10 per cent., there is justification for the exercise of the strictest economy.

I hope members who read the statement that ample tyres would be available to American motorists 30 days hence will realise that it was entirely wrong. According to a cable message in this morning's "West Australian" the British Ministry for Supply has ordered a census of laid-up motor vehicles, including tyres, to discover what vehicles and tyres are available and where stored so that when requisitioning becomes necessary, they can, without delay, be used for essential war requirements.

The Minister for Lands: I think this motion deals with rubber, not stone-walling.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister has quaint notions of what constitutes stone-walling.

The Minister for Lands: I thought you were quoting the "Northern Times."

Mr. SAMPSON: No, but I can understand the Minister's being under that misapprehension owing to the easy flow of language.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister interrupted me most improperly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then take no notice of him.

Mr. SAMPSON: The census ordered in England indicates the view taken of the position there. Before the fall of Singapore, the United States of America obtained 700,000 tons of rubber, actually but little more than the annual need of the U.S.A.

Mr. Cross: I told you that when moving the motion.

Mr. SAMPSON: Then the hon. member will not doubt that part of my statement, and I need not pursue the matter because to that extent we are in agreement. Members are well acquainted with the difficulties confronting the Empire. Those difficulties are equally pronounced in Australia and I feel it is our duty to do all we can in order to conserve, salvage and reclaim all the rubber possible. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"and to enable such to be effected, the Government should forthwith legislate for the compulsory collection and conservation of rubber, and particularly for the requirements of pneumatic tyres; also for regular check and maintenance of correct air pressure, cross switching of covers to ensure even wear, alignment of wheels, limitation of speed including cornering, adjustment of brakes, and generally to take such steps as will ensure long life of covers, including repair of damaged covers and recapping and/or re-treading when the canvas becomes visible."

MR. CROSS (Canning—on amendment): While I agree with a good deal of what the member for Swan has said, I oppose the amendment because the 'insertion' of the words would amount to useless padding. The member for West Perth was somewhat off the track when he stated that there was already in existence a committee comprising a representative of the military authorities, a representative of the rubber companies, and a representative of the rubber workers' union. That cannot be correct because there is no rubber workers' union in this State.

When I moved the motion, the position was very unsatisfactory. A representative of a rubber company was doing most of the inspection and he was not an expert either in tyres or in re-treading. It does not matter much whether the motion or the amendment is carried. The Minister for Industrial Development moved with exemplary speed to get into touch with the Minister for Supply and Development and the Commonwealth Government and as a result of this motion appointed what is really a new committee consisting of a Military adviser, a representative of the rubber companies and a re-treading expert. The committee has been empowered to examine all tyres and recommend to the Commonwealth Government any action that may be taken to conserve tyres in the interests of this State. The Military representative is Major McMullen, and the re-treading expert is Mr. Thomas Carlisle, of Stirling-street, Perth. I have been informed that the committee is examining the tyres when all its members are present because that is the most satisfactory method. If tyres can be re-treaded they are placed on one side.

The committee is putting up a recommendation to the Commonwealth Government to institute a compulsory examination of all tyres periodically, with a view to having them re-treaded at an appropriate time. If used tyres are of any further use at all, they will be conserved in this State. They will make a recommendation as to the amount of raw rubber to be released in order to re-tread tyres. I understand that the Minister in charge of the Commonwealth Department of Supplies is prepared, when the time comes and the necessary information is available, under the National Security Act to introduce regulations governing worn-rubber supplies in the

State and carrying out the purposes I have indicated. Therefore I regard it as useless at this stage to carry the amendment, because the thing will be done much more quickly than, as suggested by the amendment, through the Commonwealth Government, if it has not been done already. What my motion aims at, to prevent tyres from being sent out of the State, has been carried into effect. The export of tyres is barred, and this State will receive the benefit.

MR. WATTS (Katanning—on amendment): With the object that lies behind the amendment of the member for Swan I am in agreement. Efforts which have been made for collection of tyres and used rubber have up to the present been highly spasmodic in their nature. I question whether there has been one-tenth of the rubber collected that is scattered about Western Australia. There has been little or no organised collection of it, and yet we have in our minds very clearly established the fact that there is a great shortage of rubber, and the further fact that the position is likely to become worse before it becomes better. With the object of the amendment, therefore, I am in entire agreement. It suggests that the mover hopes the Government will legislate for the compulsory collection of rubber.

Mr. Cross: That will be done under National Security Regulations.

Mr. WATTS: But it has not been done. There may be some objection to State constitutional amendments for that purpose. The matter should be inquired into. I do not hold that we should call for National Security Regulations if we have the necessary authority in this State to assist the war effort. The collection of rubber is, on the information before us, bound to be of substantial assistance to the effort of the Commonwealth. However, as I have said, there may be constitutional objections which cannot be overcome. That aspect should be investigated at once. If such objections are not encountered, legislation could with advantage be submitted to this House. The hon. member proceeds to deal with the conservation of rubber, and he adds details suggesting that the Traffic Act might be amended to achieve the conservation of rubber in use on various vehicles of most kinds. I admit the value of that suggestion, small value in some cases and great value in others; but

I do not hold that an amendment of all the words used should be added to the motion. Accordingly I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "rubber" in line 2 with a view to inserting other words.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Mr. WATTS: I move a further amendment—

That the words "including such amendments to the Traffic Act as may be considered practicable and necessary" be inserted in lieu of the words struck out.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	19

Majority against 8

AYES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Hill
Mr. Keenan
Mr. McDonald
Mr. McLarty
Mr. North

Mr. Patrick
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Seward
Mr. Watts
Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Berry
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Fox
Mr. Hawke
Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Hughes
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kelly
Mr. Marshall

Mr. Millington
Mr. Needham
Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Shearn
Mr. Triat
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wise
Mr. Withers
Mr. Cross

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Abbott
Mr. Mann
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Warner
Mr. Willmott
Mr. Boyle

NOES.

Mr. Holman
Mr. Fanton
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Raphael
Mr. Styants
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Wilson

Amendment thus negatived.

Amendment, as previously amended, put and negatived.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.