

he has to call to substantiate his claim. That was not the intention of this House. If it were possible for me to amend the regulation, I would do so by striking out the limitation, thereby permitting appeals to be lodged with any stipendiary magistrate, and not confine the appeals to the magistrate in Perth.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,200,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew (Central) [4.40]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Supply Bill to pass through its remaining stages at one sitting.

The object of the motion should be clearly understood. I explained yesterday the urgency of the matter. The Supply Bill must be passed as quickly as possible in view of the fact that the month of July and portion of the present month have already passed, and money has been, and is being, expended without the necessary statutory authority.

Question put and passed.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 1.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 9th August, 1934.

	PAGE
Question: Wheat, bulk, in transit	65
Temporary Chairmen of Committees	65
Address-in-Reply, fourth day	66
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £2,200,000, returned	71

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

QUESTION—WHEAT, BULK IN TRANSIT.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1. How many trucks of bulk wheat were condemned on the North Wharf, Fremantle, on Tuesday, 7th August, 1934? 2. How many trucks of bulk wheat have been condemned at the same place since the 1st January, 1934? 3. How many trucks of bulk wheat have been put into ships by night after having been previously condemned? 4. How many trucks of bulk wheat from Leighton—where wheat is supposed to be reconditioned—have been condemned? 5. How much wheat was shipped from this State to Japan last year? 6. How many shipments of bulk wheat have been shipped to Japan since January this year? 7. What percentage of wheat shipped from this State is sent with a certificated cargo? 8. Will he have strict supervision kept over wheat leaving this State so that our wheat trade with other countries will not be jeopardised?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, 13½ trucks. 2, 213 trucks. 3, There is no official record. 4, 11 trucks were rejected by merchants. 5, 2,368,821 bushels in bags. 6, None. 7, Last year 36.87 per cent. 8, The department can exercise supervision only when requested to do so by merchants and when the latter require a Government certificate as to the quality of the cargo.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have appointed the members for Bunbury (Mr. Withers), Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney), and Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) to be temporary Chairmen of Committees during the present session.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [4.34]: I do not intend to deal with the multiplicity of subjects that were traversed by the Lieutenant-Governor in his opening Speech, but there are one or two things affecting the agricultural industry, and more particularly the wheatgrowers, on which I shall have a little to say. It has been rather a nasty shock to read the scathing terms in which the recent Royal Commission referred to the Trustees of the Agricultural Bank, and this notwithstanding that I and others have for a long time felt that the Agricultural Bank needed overhauling and reorganising. The Agricultural Bank, by its very nature, has not been able strictly to conform to banking practice. Really it has been more in the nature of a development board. Anyone who came to this country in the early nineties, as I did, and travelled down from the goldfields through immense stretches of virgin forest country, must realise that in more recent years the Agricultural Bank has been a big factor in revolutionising the face of the country. In common with other representatives of agricultural constituencies, I have to admit that whilst we have not really been using parliamentary interference, we have frequently gone with our pleas to the Trustees of the Agricultural Bank and urged that settlers who were down and out through no fault of their own should be treated with leniency. The bank, perhaps, has not been a business proposition, yet despite any losses that may have been incurred, it has made for the development of the State, and has brought about an immense increase in production. In the course of a 900-mile trip through the southern country recently. I went into districts which, when first I came to the State, were terra incognita. On my trip I saw great stretches of country with many good men working on their blocks, particularly around Walpole and the Frankland River, men who are bound to come out well in the end. When first I knew that country, one could get through it only on horseback, whereas one can now pass through it with ease. On the wheatbelt, enormous stretches of country have been cleared, and so extraordinary has been the development that the Royal Commissioners, in compiling

their report, should have taken these things into consideration and should not have condemned the carrying out of a system for which the trustees of the bank were not entirely responsible. We have to go back to 1914-15 to find where the trouble really started. In those days, men unavoidably accumulated debts which they have never been able fully to overcome. Then we reached the financial depression, in consequence of which many thrifty, careful men on the wheatbelt are having the utmost difficulty in fighting their way through. I do not wish to say any more on this subject, but I should like to ask for sympathy for all unfortunate settlers, and to draw the attention of the Minister for Railways to what was so strongly emphasised by the Leader of the Opposition the other evening. Coming to bulk handling of wheat, admittedly it is a method by which can be effected a reduction in the cost of production. Last year the operations of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited put at least £100,000 more into the pockets of the wheatgrowers than they would otherwise have had. When we consider that the scheme was installed for less than £150,000, this says a great deal for bulk handling. The growers have already saved more than two-thirds of the total capital expenditure on the provision of facilities in the country and at the port, together with all preliminary and experimental expenses. In addition to this, they have paid tolls which, after payment of interest charges, will leave sufficient for them to buy back nearly one-sixth of the total installation. Had the whole of Western Australia been equipped for bulk handling last year, the saving to the farmers would have been £300,000, equal to half the amount paid by the Commonwealth Government as a bounty to the growers. I should like the Minister to remember that the opposition and delay which occurred in the installation of this scheme militated greatly against the making of it an even bigger success. It was on the 4th July that the construction of the first of the bulk handling installation was begun. In the report of the company we read this—

From the outset great difficulty was experienced in securing suitable sites at railway sidings. In the allocation of sites by the Railway Department preference was given to the merchants then holding the annual leases of the sites for stacking *bagged wheat*. Thus, on the 29th August, only two months before delivery at sidings might be expected to commence, the company could only command suit-

able sites at the 48 new sidings capable of storing 2,900,000 bushels, whereas they required sites with a capacity of 6,270,000 bushels.

This was a big handicap from the start, for they were really 300,000 bushels short of their required capacity. Ultimately the company completed arrangements for a storage capacity of 4,000,000 odd bushels of completely roofed permanent bins, including those erected three years ago in the Wyalakehem area, and 2,033,000 bushels capacity of bins without roofs. So, under the scheme there has been provided a far greater capacity of covered-in storage than was ever provided for bagged wheat. There has been a lot of talk locally about those open bins. Owing to slow shipment last year, there was big delay in moving wheat from those sidings, and in consequence there was a certain quantity of unprotected wheat in danger of being damaged. I can give figures to show what the company have done. Notwithstanding the opposition of merchants, and I presume a certain amount of underground opposition, 4,216,000 bushels were roofed and completely protected from the time it was received until it was railed, while of bagged wheat in the previous season, only 1,361,000 bushels were protected. Those figures show that the company, in spite of all the handicaps and initial difficulties, and the delay in obtaining sites, did wonderful work in providing protection to that extent. In New South Wales, when the silos are full, the officials refuse to receive any more wheat. It is a question whether the growers desire the company to accept delivery of the wheat when their bulk-heads are full, or whether they want the company to incur the additional expense of providing protection for the whole of the wheat delivered, although the extra accommodation may be required only once in a decade.

Mr. Ferguson: Or whether the growers should leave the wheat on their farms.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Yes. In New South Wales, however, delivery is not accepted once the storage capacity is filled. I wish to draw a comparison between the attitude of the Government of New South Wales, and that of the Government in this State. For the Sydney terminals no rent or capital charge is paid. The country silos are built on railway land for which no rent is charged. Two types of trucks for bulk

handling were built by the railway department of that State at their own cost, making it possible to obviate the charge for dead freight. In New South Wales there are not the various types of trucks that we have. No railway demurrage is paid by the bulk-handling system of New South Wales. In fact, the Railway Department practically give the bulk handling system control of all the bulk trucks. If the wheat handling department loaded 30 or 40 trucks at one plant, the railway department would send that train through to the terminal as a special train. Mr. Harris the manager of the system in New South Wales, said in evidence that the bulk-handling scheme there was regarded as a scheme to assist the growers. New South Wales is a State with secondary industries of such magnitude that it is not usually considered to regard with much favour the primary producers, but Western Australia is mainly a primary producing State, and we should expect our Government to be more concerned about the wheat growers. Let me draw a contrast between the two States. Every possible charge seems to have been heaped upon the bulk-handling system here. The company could not obtain a wheat wharf. They had to use a site at Leighton and incur an extra cost of something like 1d. per bushel on top of other charges. For country sites, £1 each is charged, which I admit is not an extraordinary figure. The various merchants handling wheat in bags had sites at the siding where something over 1,000,000 bushels of bagged wheat were stored. The bulk handling company, however, had to accept sites in all sorts of corners and inaccessible parts, unprovided with made road approaches, all of which increase the cost of handling. Other sites for bagged wheat had made roads and good frontages to the railway. It seems that every possible charge is being imposed on the bulk-handling scheme. At the port the company were banded from pillar to post, and were ultimately compelled to adopt the most crude methods of handling. The conversion of gantries, which were rendered obsolete by the introduction of bulk handling, was carried out entirely at the expense of the company, who also had to provide other conveniences at the port, including protection from the weather for workers employed on the gantries. The Fremantle Harbour Trust also load the cost

of labour, power and repairs with an additional 20 per cent. Storage accommodation could not be obtained on the wharf, and 1d. per bushel extra charge for railage and handling is incurred on any wheat stored at Leighton. The conversion of 200 railway trucks to enable them to be used for bulk handling cost £2,000, the whole of which was paid by the company. On the supply of canvas liners and extensions to enable other trucks to be used, the company spent about £8,000. Those liners and extensions are debited with freight as wheat, while on the return journey freight has to be paid upon them. Demurrage, when incurred, has to be paid by the company, and such charges are inevitable at times owing to the different types of trucks used. Let me tabulate the various charges imposed here but not in New South Wales, to show the difference between the attitude adopted by the departments in the two States:—

Capital.	£
Railway trucks	2,000
Annual.	
Railage	11,046
Charge for liners and extensions ..	7,052
Plus freight as wheat	642
Extra costs Leighton	2,338
Country sites	2,360
Harbour Trust	1,800
Railway demurrage	800
Railway dead freight	800
	<hr/>
	£26,844

That is the extent to which the local scheme has been loaded. I appeal to the Government to take these matters into consideration. There is a considerable demand for an extension of the system. There has been criticism of the open bins. Last year the company, during a phenomenal season when there was slow movement of grain, against their own judgment and to avoid holding farmers up, accepted the wheat as delivered. Still there has been a good deal of talk about faulty construction of country silos. At Badjalang, where the facilities were criticised, damage to the extent of only £7 was done to the wheat, and £61 was spent on repairs to the structure. At Walgoolan, which was also the subject of criticism, the repairs cost £27. All the great song made against the facilities involved trifles that cost only £95 to put right. The facilities provided in this State have resulted in a gain

to the farmers of £100,000, almost enough to pay for the cost. The accommodation has been installed at a cost of £116,000. The South Australian Royal Commission, which inquired into the question of bulk handling, has recommended that the Western Australian system should be adopted. Built according to the orthodox system in New South Wales, similar accommodation would cost £1,000,000. For South Australia the orthodox system was estimated to cost £800,000. I am satisfied that if the Government carefully consider what has been achieved by the company, no more obstacles will be placed in the way of extending the system to other farmers, whom we wish to see enabled to reduce their costs of production to the lowest possible figure. I am pleased that at last the Federal Government recognise that something must be done to assist primary industry. How to rehabilitate the industry is a complex question. Though I do not approve of many of the comments of the Royal Commission on the Agricultural Bank, some useful suggestions are contained in the report. I have read carefully the condensed report published in the "West Australian," and I believe it contains many proposals that could with advantage be adopted. I think it will be recognised that some action must be taken regarding the Agricultural Bank. I believe that it should be regarded, not as a bank, but as a development board, and that we should not place on the shoulders of good men like Mr. McLarty, Mr. Grogan, and others, the responsibility of adopting a banking policy that cannot be followed, because a certain amount of the milk of human kindness must be introduced into the bank's dealings with people, who would otherwise become charges on the department of the Minister for Employment. The £4,000,000 of assistance promised will encourage the wheatgrowers. I hope that the price of wheat will rise sufficiently to obviate any call being made on the Commonwealth Government, notwithstanding that I like to get as much as possible from the Federal authorities.

MR. WARNER (Mt. Marshall) [4.58]: I have studied the Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor, but I do not intend to detain the House by offering any comment on it. In fact, if I were occupying a seat directly behind the Leader of the House, I would not on this occasion have anything to say

on the Address-in-reply. Seeing that I am not a member of any party, I may express my views regarding a few matters of interest to my district. I shall not enumerate all the various requirements that the seven road boards in my electorate have asked me to put forward. I have already brought them under the notice of the various Ministers, and have received replies that many of them will be given consideration. I am therefore satisfied to await the result. There are a few things to which I would like to refer. For a long time before coming into politics I followed the farmers' movement, and have from time to time advocated the holding of an inquiry into the stored wheat question and the management of the Agricultural Bank. I believe the wheatgrowers are grateful to the Government for appointing these Commissions of inquiry. The investigation into the stored wheat question brought forth very little, and is not yet finished. Of the Agricultural Bank inquiry we have so far had only what the "West Australian" and "Daily News" liked to tell us. No doubt we shall have an opportunity later on of discussing that report. In the early days of this Parliament a lot of criticism was levelled against the appointment of a full-time Minister for Employment and Industry. I listened very closely to all that was said on that occasion. From what I have read and from personal observations, I think the Minister has qualified himself for the position. He has welded together various bodies throughout the country districts, as well as the metropolitan area, such as the returned soldiers, the National Council, the primary producers, the Wheat Growers' Union, and other bodies, until there is ringing throughout the country the slogan "Purchase Local Products." The campaign for the support of local products must eventually put into work a lot of people who are at present being employed on non-productive undertakings, which need not be carried out. The fact that so many people are out of work has a great effect upon the primary producing industry. If they are not working, they have no spending power, whereas if they are put into work they will be able to consume some of that which the farmers are producing. The aim must be to get all men back into work. If we could manufacture in Western Australia all those things that should be manufactured here,

a lot of money would be put into circulation in Western Australia instead of the benefit going to the Eastern States. Quite recently an important local industry was started by a farmers' movement for the manufacture of spare parts for agricultural implements. Not long ago I had the opportunity of going through the factory in question. I know quite a lot about spare parts, having for many years been actively engaged in farming. I know that we pay a lot of money for them, and I also know a good article from a bad one. The parts that are being manufactured in the city are equal to anything that is imported, and are superior to some that I have purchased and used on agricultural machinery.

The Minister for Employment: And they cost 20 per cent. less than the imported.

Mr. WARNER: I have received reliable figures showing the amount of money that can be saved to Western Australia on spare parts alone, money that can in turn be utilised to keep numbers of unemployed busy on this class of work. I have here a list of parts used on threshers, stripper harvesters, knife sections, binders, hay rakes, mowers, ploughs, shares, mouldboards, reapers, harvesters scarifiers and for general purposes. Parts for all this machinery have been imported into the State in considerable volume, but they should all be made here. Many of them could be manufactured at the State Implement Works. I will not quote the figures in detail, but merely give the totals. For 1931-32 the value of the imports of agricultural implement parts was £47,125, in 1932-33 it was £98,247, and for 1933-34 it was £95,832. The parts for the implements I have enumerated are now being manufactured locally. If £95,000 worth of parts could be manufactured here, it would be found that 75 per cent. of the total would go in labour, material and transport within the State. I have been credibly informed that 60 per cent. of the total cost of the parts now being manufactured in the metropolitan area by the farmers' concern, to which I have referred, is spent in labour alone. Every casting that is made must have a separate mould. The moulds cannot be made by any machine; they must be hand made. Those who make the moulds together with the material used in the moulding, represent an expenditure of 60 per cent. of the total cost of the spare

parts now being made locally. Transport is also a considerable item. The manufacture in Western Australia of all the spare parts required for the wheat-growing industry would mean an annual saving to Western Australia of approximately £95,000, and would lead to a large number of men being put back into useful work. According to last year's price list, and the price list issued by the local company, it is estimated that the local parts cost approximately 25 per cent. less than the imported parts, although they are equal to anything that has been brought into the State. I am looking forward to the time when Western Australia will also manufacture its own agricultural machinery, instead of the farmers paying out so large an amount over and above the actual value of that which is manufactured in the Eastern States. This would give the people of Western Australia an opportunity of participating in that business and give the people who would be brought into employment an opportunity to purchase what they require for their own well-being. The time has arrived when all the nations of the world must reconsider the hours of employment. They cannot hope to put back into work all the unemployed on the basis of eight hours a day, and keep them there. That would be utterly impossible. The world would soon be overwhelmed by products that could never be consumed. We must, therefore, look ahead. It is for the legislators of to-day to look forward to the time when the hours of labour must be reduced. The ambition of legislators of to-day should be to study the situation for themselves. When next they face the electors they should be able to prove that they have been going into the position and that they are thinkers, otherwise they should not be asking to be returned to Parliament ahead of any of their opponents who may be thinkers. Whether we like it or not, it appears to me that the hours of labour must be reduced. Machinery that is going into factories to-day will in many cases do the work of 100 men. The only benefit, if it may be called a benefit, that the working classes can get out of the installation of machinery of that kind is that 100 of their number will be put out of work for every one machine. Such a machine owes to the industry 100 working hours. If we had made use of machinery as we should have done, we should have accredited the hours that the machinery saved the industry

to the shortening of the hours of the men engaged in it.

Mr. Ferguson: How many hours does the harvester owe to Australia?

Mr. WARNER: Would the hon. member like to go back to the days of the old sickle? Would he like to declare that the harvester was of no use to the farmer or the wheat-grower, that things were better in the days when we bent our backs and cut one-third of an acre with a reaper hook, and put in a third of a day in threshing the wheat that was cut in one day?

Mr. Sleeman: You will never convince those fellows over there.

Mr. WARNER: I believe that instead of cursing machinery, as most working men do, we should bless it. Instead, however, of the powers-that-be using the machinery in a proper manner, they have allowed it to be used for the building up of the capital of men who do not require any more than they already have.

Mr. Moloney: Most of them have not too much at present.

Mr. WARNER: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, who claims that there is no reasonable ground for a charge of 9d. per ton to be made for the carriage of bulk wheat on the railways. I have gone carefully into that question myself and have studied it closely. I believe that no extra work is being done by the railways for this extra charge. Very little conversion has taken place of the rolling stock to represent the amount that is being imposed by the department. We were told that quite a number of the trucks could not be used for anything else but bulk wheat, but I have here a number of tickets taken off trucks which were used for the haulage of super. The Leader of the Opposition was right when he said the charge should be removed. In my opinion the Federal dole, which was given to the farmers, has been misapplied by the Agricultural Bank. It should certainly not have been held back from necessitous farmers. The whole amount should have been paid out on a flat rate. Even if the officials of the Bank thought it necessary to hold back a certain amount of the money for necessitous farmers, they had no right to withhold it in the case of a number of growers simply because they had a motor car in their possession. Many of my electors have motor cars that no one would dream of buying. None of their neighbours would take delivery of them lest they should be deprived of

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

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

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

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,200,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 14th August, 1934.

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

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, ACCIDENTS.

Rivervale and Maddington Crossings.

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