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REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OUTPORTS OF THE STATE

To His Excellency Sir James Mitchell, K.C.M.G., Lieutenant-Governor in and over the State of Western Australia and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

May it Please Your Excellency—

We, the members of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Development of the Outports of the State, have the honour to present to Your Excellency our Report as follows:—

HISTORY OF APPOINTMENT OF ROYAL COMMISSION.

On Wednesday, 5th September, 1945, Mr. H. H. Stytants, the member for Kalgoorlie, moved in the Legislative Assembly the following motion:—

"That, in view of the congestion and delays to shipping at Fremantle and having in mind the desirability of utilising and developing the port of Esperance in the interests of goldfields areas, and other outports in the interests of their respective localities, a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon—

(a) The extent to which it is possible to make fuller use of the outports of this State at the present time;
(b) the steps necessary to ensure that all outports may be more fully used in the post-war period;
(c) the effect any such steps would have on the trading community in the towns from and to which traffic may be diverted;
(d) the capacity of the transport system, both rail and road, to cope with any such steps recommended, and the effect of any such steps upon the transport system, especially if zoning is involved, in connection with freight rates and other matters affected;
(e) whether the administration of harbours throughout the State should be concentrated under one harbour authority and to what extent existing legislation would need to be amended for this purpose."

The Legislative Assembly agreed to the motion on Wednesday, 10th September, 1945, and the following members were appointed to serve on the Committee:—Messrs. Stytants, Hill, Hour, Triat and Willmott, M.L.A. Further power was granted to the Select Committee on Wednesday, 26th September, 1945, to adjourn from place to place for the purpose of taking evidence.

It was found necessary prior to the prorogation of Parliament by the Lieutenant-Governor which automatically dissolves the Select Committee, for its conversion into a Royal Commission, and accordingly the members were appointed as an Honorary Royal Commission by the Lieutenant-Governor on the third day of April, 1946. The Royal Commission was published in the Government Gazette on the fifth day of April, 1946, and empowered members to inquire into and report upon the matters which had previously been referred to them by the Legislative Assembly.

MEETINGS.

Twenty-one meetings were held, the first meeting being on 2nd October, 1945, and the last on 26th July, 1946. Nineteen of these meetings were held as a Select Committee and two as a Royal Commission.

WITNESSES.

Evidence was taken by the Commission at the following places:—Busselton, Augusta, Nannup, Bunbury, Geraldton, Mount Barker, Albany, Denmark, Kalgoorlie, Norseman, Esperance and Perth. Evidence was given by the following:—

1. Mr. G. V. McCartney, Manager Fremantle Harbour Trust.
2. Mr. J. S. Young, Engineer for Harbours and Rivers, P.W.D.
4. Mr. K. G. Forsyth, Manager Harbour and Light Department.
5. Mr. S. J. Hood, Chief Civil Engineer, W.A.G.R.
6. Mr. R. M. Evans, Chief Traffic Manager, W.A.G.R.
7. Mr. C. H. Salmon, Chairman Australasian Steamship Owners Federation (W.A. Branch).
9. Mr. H. J. R. Hooper, Deputy-Director of Shipping for W.A., and representative of British Ministry of War Transport.
10. Mr. A. P. Kennedy, Chairman Overseas Shipping Representatives Association.
11. Mr. V. B. Mursell, Assistant Manager, Cuming Smith and Mt. Lyell Fertiliser Company.
The evidence comprising 732 typewritten pages is attached to this report.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

Early in the inquiries of the Commission it was apparent that the outports of this State are not being used to the extent that is warranted. The Government has spent vast sums of money in providing wharves, jetties and other facilities for the handling of the produce of the hinterland of these ports, but for various reasons the shipping and commercial interests have not availed themselves of them, preferring to go past the ports by sea, with cargoes that should be landed at outports, and, in the case of land produce, paying large sums of money in railway freight charges in order to get it away from the zone that it is produced in and from the port where it should be shipped.
The shipping companies have an aversion to calling at too many ports and, in the main, commercial interests appear apathetic as to where their imports are landed, being content to pass the additional rail freight on to the retailer and consumer.

There is a marked tendency to concentrate both loading and unloading of cargoes at Fremantle, but this does not constitute all the out of zone work being done. Thirty-five per cent. of the timber cut in the Busselton zone for the years 1938 to 1945 was loaded past that port and shipped at Bumbury. Wheat that is grown in the Albany zone is being shipped at Bumbury and Fremantle, due principally to the fact that Albany has no bulk handling facilities.

Although the witnesses representing the shipping companies stated that they are prepared to call for reasonable tonnages of cargo at any port, your Commissioners are not convinced that they are always willing or eager to do so. At present there is an acute shortage of ships and consequently little competition among companies for cargoes, but this will not always be the position because, bearing in mind the huge total tonnage of cargo ships now being built in shipyards throughout the world, in the not distant future shippers will be seeking cargoes and will go to ports that they now avoid, if it can be done.

Many instances were heard of where what could be considered a reasonable tonnage had been carried, in some cases, past the destination port and landed at Fremantle, then sailed back to the district to which it had been consigned. A possible solution of this problem, when shipping is again in plentiful supply, is to have a conference of commercial and shipping interests under the auspices of the Government to arrange that goods will be loaded and unloaded at the port of a district to which they are produced and consigned. If co-operation was practised between commercial interests and the shipping companies, greater tonnages would be available at outlets, both inwards and outwards, thereby making it an economic proposition for a ship to call. With co-ordination and co-operative planting, much can be done to use our outlets more extensively.

Your Commissioners are of opinion that lack of facilities for handling cargoes at outlets is not a factor that contributes largely to the reluctance of shipping companies to make greater use of these ports. The lack of sufficient tonnage of cargoes is the main cause forinfrequent services, and this objection could be overcome by greater co-operation between shipping companies and commercial interests operating in exports and imports. Although lack of facilities for handling cargoes is not considered to be responsible in any great measure for infrequent call of ships at outlets, it is thought that certain improvements should be made as early as possible and when finances permit.

LIGHTING FOR LOADING AND UNLOADING OPERATIONS.

The inadequacy and unsuitability of lighting of jetties when ships are loading was stressed at every port inspected, and your Commissioners are satisfied that the complaints are justified. Generally no cluster lights are available for hire to ships and at Esperance the electric current is not supplied along the wharf, although the local electric power supply manager states that his plant is of sufficient capacity to supply it.

Where the current and lights are supplied, they are inadequate and unsuitable at all ports visited.

A recommendation is made that where electric current is available, cluster lights be provided for hire by ships and that wharf lighting be of a type, hooded, so that a flood lighting effect is given to those working on the wharf and trucks, care being taken to ensure that the hoods are down far enough to prevent the lights blazoning in the eyes of the workmen and others on the ship. Light standards should be placed at convenient points on all ship berths and be high enough to give the maximum benefit to those loading and unloading cargo.

MECHANICAL AID FOR SHUNTING RAILWAY TRUCKS AT SHIP'S SIDE.

A difference of opinion exists regarding power to shift railway trucks at the ship's side so that hand shunting can be abolished. Some witnesses advocated electric capstans, while others favored tractors.

In Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, electric capstans are considered to be obsolete and have fallen into disuse, although already installed. Tractors are used at all these ports. To enable tractors to be used on wharves and jetties at our outlets it would be necessary to fill in with asphalt, or some other suitable material, up to the level of the top of railway rails to enable the tractor to operate smoothly and efficiently. This need only be done for the length of the actual berth or berths. Not only would it provide a level walking surface without danger of tripping over rails, but also forms a protective covering from weather where timber is used in the decking of jetties. Tractors are suitable for either pushing or pulling, are mobile and can quickly shift from one berth to another.

If it is considered too expensive to provide a level surface to the top of the rails, pneumatic tyred tractors could be used, as is done in South Australia, where they are still in use.

In that State they have recently put into use five of this type of tractor, where the railway rails are standing up above the level of the jetty or wharf surface. Although they are considered to be a success, the wear and tear on tyres and steering gears must be heavy.

These tractors will haul or push 150 tons on level roads and 14 of them have been in service since 1929. They are 27 horsepower. The cost of one of these units pre-war was £332, plus the cost of the frame, which was £110, making a total of £432. The present cost is £200, not including sales tax, and the frame would cost £150. The estimated cost of installing an electric capstan is about £760, but, as before stated, they are considered by all port authorities to be obsolete. A recommendation is made that a tractor be provided (after the necessary leveling has been done at berths) at Geraldton, Bumbury, Busselton, Albany and Esperance. Geraldton, being a modern wharf, would not need any building up to provide a level surface, the railway rails being sunk into the wharf deck.
PROVISION OF CRANES TO ASSIST SHIP'S GEAR, LOADING AND UNLOADING.

Provision of mechanical appliances to assist the ship's gear in expediting the loading and unloading of cargo does not always have the desired effect. In the port of Sydney, very few cranes are used for this purpose, the ship's gear meeting all requirements, and the chairman of the N.S.W. Maritime Services Board states that very little demand is made by shipping interests for assistance in this direction.

The Melbourne Harbour Trust Commissioners go in very extensively providing electric cranes for assisting the ship's gear loading and unloading, and supply figures to show that where cranes are available they are in strong demand by shipping interests.

The South Australian Harbour Board has a limited number of cranes available, and favours the provision of them. Fremantle and Bunbury have a considerable number of cranes, and the experience at these places is that the shipping interests avoid themselves of the use of the cranes to a large extent.

Your Commissioners are of opinion that when sufficient cargoes are being handled at any port, a crane should be provided to expedite the handling of goods in and out of the ship's holds. Some of our outlets would not warrant the provision of a crane, and for these places at present, the ship's gear will suffice. The type recommended is the high-level types of three-ton lifting capacity, similar to those in use at Fremantle. These were built by the State Implement Works about 18 years ago, under license from Babcock Willeocks & Co., and they cost about £6,500. Their estimated cost today would be at least double that amount. Probably improvements have been made since their manufacture, and would be incorporated in any new machines.

Although a high percentage of lifts would not exceed 15 cwt., it is recommended that a crane of three tons lifting capacity be provided.

In view of the amount these cranes cost, it is essential that a fairily high tonnage of cargo will have to be handled, but it is thought that if the provision of a crane will be an added inducement to shipping interests to make more extensive use of the outlets, the expenditure will be justified.

EFFECT UPON THE TRADING AND GENERAL COMMUNITY.

If it can be effected that each port will receive the bulk of the imports required for its hinterland and the production of its zone for export, it will have a decided uplift in the prosperity and employment of the inhabitants. A reduction of transport costs means reduced costs to the producer, and such reduced costs will encourage more production. The further the port is from Fremantle, the greater the need to encourage shipping to use that port. A policy which will encourage and reduce costs to producers away from the capital port will considerably assist to bring about a better distribution of population over the State, and increased prosperity to the State as a whole. Lack of cargoes is the greatest difficulty at present, due mainly to the fact that goods produced in the port zones are not shipped from their natural ports, and imports are landed at other places and railed to the outputs.

CAPACITY OF TRANSPORT, BOTH ROAD AND RAIL, TO COPE WITH ANY ALTERATIONS.

The effect on all transport would be to make lighter the efforts necessary to cope with the traffic offering. At present, much long-distance haulage is being done that is uneconomical and places a great strain on the Railway Department, in particular. If each port handled the cargoes that should come through it, shorter haulages would result, with consequent less demand upon rolling stock and engine power.

ONE AUTHORITY TO CONTROL ALL PORTS WITHIN THE STATE.

At all ports controlled by the Railway Department, general dissatisfaction was expressed at the manner in which the controls were operated.

These criticisms are not wholly justified; the department has many difficulties to contend with, and these have been accentuated during the war years.

With the exception of Bunbury, each centre visited favoured the establishment of one authority to control all ports of the State and, after carefully weighing all the opinions expressed, and from information and experience gained by port authorities in Eastern Australia, your Commissioners are of opinion that better results would be achieved if a board were created that would control all our ports.

The question of one authority for harbour administration in Western Australia has been discussed and lapsed periodically since 1922, and a precis of events concerning it appears on pages 68 to 71 of evidence given by Mr. K. G. Forsyth, manager of the Harbour and Light Department, Fremantle, and is as follows:—

To give the Committee some idea of what has happened, and also the opinions of various men such as previous chief harbour masters and under secretaries, I have made a precis of our file on the question. It is as follows:—

On the 29th March, 1922, the then Chief Harbour Master, Captain Winzar, when dealing with the necessity for the revision of the various Ports and Harbours Acts administered by the Harbour and Lights Department, wrote:—

I beg to submit for the consideration of the Government the advisability of bringing all the ports and harbours of the State under one management subject, of course, to the control of the Hon. Minister.

Captain Winzar went on to state that he considered that if the harbours of this State were controlled on similar lines to those of South Australia it would be far less expensive than the existing arrangement and would be more efficient. He also pointed out that the Manager, State Shipping Service, had some time previously made the same recommendation which had not till then received Government consideration.

The Under Secretary, the late Mr. H. C. Trehawke, in referring to the matter to the Hon. Chief Secretary, Mr. Broun, stated:— "There is no doubt in my mind that the Government will find it desirable to take action in this direction sooner or later . . . "

No action was taken by the Hon. Chief Secretary, and the matter lapsed.

The Chief Secretary was then controlling our department, and that is why he came into the matter.

In February, 1929, as the result of a request from the Geraldton Chamber of Commerce for the formation of a Geraldton Harbour Board, the question of appointing one harbour authority was revived by the
Under Secretary, Chief Secretary's Department, who asked the then Chief Harbour Master, Captain Harris, for his opinion. In the course of a lengthy minute dealing with the subject, the Chief Harbour Master made the following comments:

The general advantages derived from one control is the creation of a single body through which all maritime matters pass and which gives uniformity of action and decision. This tends to create officials who devote the whole of their time to port management and become experts in that direction with the natural continuity of general principles. Inter-port jealousy, which seems to grow up under the present conditions, would be done away with as all the ports would appeal to the one tribunal, and this would prove an economy in general work and capital cost, and thus avoid many works at various outports being taken in hand by different departments, as at present. There is no advantage gained in forming small harbour boards at outports; and I consider all such responsibility should be placed under one central board which would be under the control of a Minister. If it is not considered feasible to include Fremantle, then I would suggest a controlling board for all the other outports, which Board would administer the numerous Harbour, Boat Licensing, Navigation, and other Acts. If this were done we would gain the experience of Master Mariners, Engineers and other technical officers and would obviate the building up of a highly technical staff in each respective place. Not only this, but Pilots, Harbour Masters and other officers would be available for all ports, and uniformity in control and regulations would exist.

That includes the whole of Fremantle.

Then again there would be an immense economy in the construction, maintenance, and repairing of the various jetties, breakwaters and buoys along the coast.

In the same minute, when comparing the South Australian system with our own, Captain Harris referred to the Act in South Australia as a "suitable piece of legislation," and stated inter alia: "The public in general knows that there is only one board with which to communicate in connection with the harbour functions contained in the 70 subsections of Section 102 of the Act; whereas in Western Australia, as before stated, it is difficult to know who controls the various marine functions."

Finally in conclusion, the Chief Harbour Master summed up as follows: "I would like to see passed a Harbour Board Act to control all marine functions at all ports, and if Fremantle cannot be brought into line then let a commencement be made with all outports. Fremantle could then stand as it does at present, while a Harbour Board under ministerial control would administer all the functions of all the outports, such as concretional works, dredging, maintenance, handling of all cargo, pilotage, jetty leasing, and the licensing and survey of boats, etc., under both the Navigation Act and the Boat Licensing Act."

In a memo addressed to the Hon. Chief Secretary, the Under Secretary supported the views of the Chief Harbour Master and stated: "It is considered that an urgent need exists for remodelling the whole system of harbour control. The Under Secretary also noted the file later under date 18/3/29—"Discussed with Engineer-in-Chief. He favours a board."

I take it the Engineer-in-Chief in those days was Mr. Stilman.

After much correspondence on the matter the Hon. W. H. Kitson, instructed as follows under date 25/10/29: "Please take steps to have a Bill prepared for introduction next session (should the Government so decide) to provide for embodying in one Act legislation necessary for administration of all State Harbours, including Fremantle, under a board of three commissioners."

This was done by the late Mr. W. V. Ward, and submitted to the Hon. Mr. Kitson on 3/4/30. However, by this time a change of Government had taken place, and the matter remained in abeyance. The file was referred to the incoming Chief Secretary, Hon. Mr. Keenan, for his information, but no action was taken by him.

Early in 1933 the matter was reviewed again by the Chief Secretary, Hon. C. F. Baxter, who instructed that a draft Bill be prepared. This was done by the late Mr. Ward and Mr. F. I. Bray—new Commissioner for Native Affairs, who was then in the Chief Secretary's Department.

In submitting the draft Bill to the Chief Secretary the Under Secretary, Mr. F. J. Hueslin, stated inter alia: "Without a detailed overhaul of the administrations, it is impossible to estimate the probable savings to be effected by amalgamation of the three authorities. The grouping of the three together will itself effect some economy. In the case of the Bunbury Board, Mr. Ward and I had the opportunity, when serving on a committee of inquiry appointed by the Hon. Mr. Keenan, of obtaining first-hand knowledge of their affairs and we estimated that at least £5,000 per annum could be saved there. The suggestion is hazarded that at least £20,000 per annum could be saved by the proposed amalgamation which will be brought about by this Bill."

The subject was submitted again to Cabinet who decided that the Bill be not proceeded with in that session.

The question again lapsed and the following year another change of Government took place.

The matter was revived again in 1938 by the Hon. W. H. Kitson, and a committee was formed under the chairmanship of Mr. Tindal and comprised the Under Treasurer, Crown Solicitor, Chairman and Manager of Fremantle Harbour Trust, Engineer for Harbours and Rivers, Mr. Hood of the Railway Department, Chairman of the Bunbury Harbour Board, and a representative from the Wheat Branch.

The Committee met on several occasions in Mr. Tindal's office, but a representative from Harbours and Light Department was not invited until its first meeting when the Under Treasurer telephoned the Manager, the late Mr. V. W. Ward, to say that Mr. Tindal wanted him to attend a meeting at his office.

At that meeting the Crown Solicitor announced that he had prepared a Bill that would place all Harbour authorities under one head. This Bill was based on the one prepared 10 years previously by Mr. Ward on the instructions of the then Chief Secretary, Mr. Kitson, but it had been so reduced and limited that it dealt practically with only matters relating to the handling of cargo.

The Chairman remarked that there appeared no reason why the ports of the other parts of the State could not be placed under the one control. Mr. Ward vigorously opposed the Bill in the proposed form on the grounds that it did not go far enough.

The Crown Solicitor saw that there was something in Mr. Ward's argument and later sent for him. After discussion he advised Mr. Ward that they had decided to discontinue with the Bill that had been prepared, and to prepare one on the lines of the other Bill mentioned above.

In 1939 war intervened and it is presumed that the matter lapsed again until now when it has been revived as the result of the recent motion of the hon. member for Albany.

As the whole of the case in favour of appointing one authority to control all ports and the benefits and advantages that would result is set out in the evidence and examination of Mr. Forath when before the Commission, also the history and contents of a Bill prepared by Mr. Justice Wolff, then Crown Solicitor, for this purpose, Mr. Forath's evidence and examination is set out in detail. The history of deliberations of a committee appointed by the
Government early in 1945 to inquire into this question is also recorded, as follows:

HISTORY AND CONTENTS OF A BILL PREPARED BY MR. JUSTICE WOLFF WHEN CROWN SOLICITOR.

By Mr. Triat: Has a draft Bill been prepared?—Yes, I have a copy with me.

Is that the draft Bill respecting which Mr. Ward was questioned?—Yes.

By Mr. Hoar: Does that bring in Fremantle as well?—Yes. Would you like me to deal with that Bill now?

By the Chairman: Yes, will you please do so?—Of course the Bill has never been before Parliament. It is purely a draft and is very extensive, having 121 clauses, which are necessary when dealing with matters affecting harbour control seeing that it covers everything. It is based, I would say—I did not have anything to do with the drafting of the Bill, but I have checked it up and have commented on its provisions for submission to the Crown Law Department with a view to ascertaining whether the points I raised were covered—on the South Australian Harbour Trust Act and the South Australian Harbours Board 1929, together with various sections called from the Maritime Services Act of New South Wales, sections taken from Fremantle Harbour Trusts' Act and the Acts affecting the Harbours and Light Department, together with the second terms of the Victorian Shipping Act of 1828. The Bill provides for a harbour board consisting of three full-time members, I submit that if they are to be a harbour board at all it is necessary, we have one consisting of full-time men only. Even from my limited knowledge in the administration of the department under my control I can say with confidence that in my opinion no body of men meeting for two or three hours each week can ever hope to administer our ports and harbours effectively. I consider that work is as much a full-time job as any associated with other parts of the Government service. Under a system of full-time members we would get, as one of our former Chief Harbour Masters has pointed out, men who were experts in harbour administration. They would grow up with the job and become experts. Furthermore, it would provide an opportunity for young men to accept positions under them and make it their career. You would get men who would become expert in that particular section of Government work alone. With that end in view the Bill was drafted so as to provide for those full-time members of the board and of course that board will be constituted as the Government may decide. In that respect the Bill is based on the South Australian Act where there are three full-time members of the board and two part-time members. In Victoria there are 12 Commissioners who are part-time officials. In Fremantle we have five part-time Commissioners. The first part of the Bill deals with definitions and so on and the second part provides for the constitution of the board, salaries, the period during which the commissioners will hold office and other relative matters.

Does it provide for representatives of different sections of the community?—They are to be full-time members and will be full-time civil servants.

Will their activities be directed along different lines?—The members would have different sections of the work to look after. You will understand that in giving this evidence I am expressing my personal views. If you are to have a board to control all the harbours in Western Australia, you will recognize that part-time men would represent various business interests in the community. Such a board must sit at one place and naturally it will sit at the main port at capital city. Therefore as the board will meet at least every week it would naturally, seeing that it cannot well men having business interests largely affected by the main port, sit at the main port. Obviously if one of the members was a business man at Albany he could not afford to neglect his business interests in order to travel to Port every week to attend meetings. The board to be set up is to control the whole of the harbours of Western Australia and no longer how hard he may try to act impartially an individual would be concerned mostly with the port where his business interests were largely centred.

In my opinion, if the Government is to set up a board it should select men divorced from any particular interest in any out port in order that the board whole may be able to exercise sound judgment and extend fair treatment to the problems of every port, without any member having to consider if he agrees to something whether it will interfere with his interests in another port.

By Mr. Triat: So far as possible they should not be financially interested in anything else?—No, they should be men occupied with the boards. The members of the board should be engaged full-time as men associated with the Chief Secretary's Department, the Agriculture Department, or other department, are employed on a full-time job. I consider one of the engineers should be an engineer in charge of the engineering section. Further, I consider that any board that is set up should have its own engineering division and not be dependent upon an outside authority for getting engineering work done, or being subject to the whim of any outside authority who could say that he did not consider it right to do what the board wanted and therefore would not do it.

By the Chairman: Such as the relationship existing at present between your department and the Public Works Department?—Yes. If I consider something in necessary for the more efficient handling of our jetties or write some repairs I would have to submit the proposition to the Public Works Department. If one of the departmental engineers does not consider the work necessary, nothing is done. That is why we have asked for a Bill to provide for our facilities at our North-West ports. Of course I would have to have a fight with the Treasury to get the money but that would be a different position. Then again I think that any harbour board that is established ought to have financial autonomy. This is where I shall probably clash with the Treasury officials and possibly with the Government. If you are to have a harbour board (that will be dictated to by a Treasury official as to whether or not certain facilities for requirements are necessary), it will be the most difficult. The men I envisaged on the board will be told what they should be dictated to by Treasury officials who know nothing whatever about harbour administration. Unless that difficulty is overcome you might just as well leave the control of harbours as it is at present, or otherwise the position will be quite unsatisfactory. As it is at present if the Treasury will not consider the work necessary, nothing is done. If the Treasury will not make money available you should not get it. Then again I consider that any harbour board that is established should have the power to borrow money in the open market in the same way as the Melbourne Harbour Trust can do. You probably noticed in the Press recently that the Melbourne Harbour Trust borrowed £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 for improved harbour facilities in the Port of Melbourne. It is manifestly obvious that the Treasury cannot make money available and therefore if harbour improvements are required the money must be obtained from somewhere.

By Mr. Hoar: You suggest running the harbour administration separately from the Government?—No, it would be under the control of the Minister. The Bill does not provide for that. I made a note to the effect that there does not appear to be any provision for ministerial control and that a provision should be inserted to give the Minister control you simply do not get it.

By the Chairman: It would have to be subject to the approval of the Minister?—Yes, and presumably any important matter would be submitted to Cabinet.

By Mr. Triat: If the board had financial control, do you think it would be able to meet its obligations?—As regards running expenses, we pay our way on cargo handling and on the pilotage services. When you use national funds we do not get the full capital cost of the harbour installations is. The Fremantle Harbour Trust apparently shows a surplus each year; the Bunbury Harbour Board has a deficit on its accounts.

Do you think it would be possible to meet commitments if the board had control?—That would depend upon the capital cost not down. In connection with the plan, the minister, I have a note that the sur-
plus on the Fremantle Harbour would go back to harbour administration instead of into consolidated revenue. Division 3 of the third section repeals the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, Albany Harbour Board Act, which was never proclaimed, and the Bunbury Harbour Act. It dissolves the Fremantle Harbour Commission and the Bunbury Harbour Board, and vests the property, rights and liabilities of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners and the Bunbury Harbour Board and certain other boards in the Western Australian Harbours Board. Division (a) transfers certain powers, authorities, duties, functions and obligations exercised and discharged under or by virtue of the Navigation Act and certain other Acts. It repeals certain Acts administered by the Harbour and Lights Department, such as the Ports and Harbours Act and the Shipping and Pilotage Consolidation Act and Jetties Act and puts the administration of the Navigation Act under the control of the Harbours Board instead of the Harbour and Lights Department. This measure does not cover the provisions of the Navigation Act which is administered by the Harbours Board, but transfers the authority to administer such Act to the Board.

Division 3 defines the powers, obligations and duties of the board and gives it exclusive control of all harbours in the State and all navigation therein and provides that the board shall be charged with the maintenance and preservation of all property vested in it under this measure. It shall have exclusive control and management of all lighthouses, lightships, buoys, beacons and other sea marks within the limits of the jurisdiction of the board other than are vested in the Commonwealth Government. The board is also empowered to make and maintain roads and jetties, wharves, landing places, piers and sheds, and the board shall cause them to be kept in good repair and well lighted. All the functions necessary to the board are provided. Division 4 covers the officers, servants and labourers of the board. Division 5 covers pilotage, which is taken out of the various Acts now controlling pilotage.

Division 6 covers lights, buoys and signals. Division 7 deals with wrecks, obstructions and damage. Division 8 deals with actions against the board. Division 9 deals with harbour dues and wharfage charges and gives the board power to raise such dues and charges. Division (10) which is one of the most important, contains the financial provisions. This measure does not give the board financial autonomy. It provides that all dues shall be paid to the Treasurer to the credit of the general revenue of the State.

By Mr. Trist: You have said that you do not agree with that — That is so. It also provides that all expenses under this measure shall be paid out of money appropriated by the Treasurer for the purpose.

By Mr. Hear: Have similar boards in other States financial autonomy — The South Australian Board has not.

Do you know of any State where the board has financial autonomy — The Melbourne Harbour Trust has, at any rate, in the matter of borrowing powers. This measure does allow for borrowing powers apart from the fact that all revenue must be paid into Consolidated Revenue. The provision states that the board may, with the consent of the Treasurer and the approval of the Governor, borrow money for the purpose of the administration of this measure.

The last division sets out, in 55 clauses, the regulations which the board may make dealing with the functions and the numerous duties developing upon the board. Then there is a miscellaneous section dealing with anything necessary to be covered and not provided for in the other sections.

By Mr. Trist: Who is responsible for that draft Bill — It was drawn up by Mr. Justice Wolff, when he was Crown Solicitor.

As the result of an inquiry by a Select Committee — No. As far as I know, Mr. Justice Wolff drew up the Bill in collaboration with the previous manager of the Harbour and Light Department, who had an extensive knowledge of the department, he having been employed in it since 1904. His name is Mr. Ward.

How would that Bill avoid overlapping — There would be one authority working under the Navigation Act. At present, jetties are controlled by the Railway Department, under the Government Railways Act. To all intents and purposes a jetty is a railway jetty. Those jetties would come under the control of this proposed board. The Harbour Trust Act would be repealed and the Fremantle Harbour Trust would come under the control of this Act. The same applies to the Bunbury Harbour.

What saving would be effected — I could not give a figure, because it would be necessary to get the opportunity to overhaul all the systems and all the places where they were falling down. It is difficult to say what economies could be effected — at least £10,000.

If that Bill were passed by Parliament and all these matters came under the one control, would that have a detrimental effect on the Fremantle Harbour — I cannot see why it should.

Fremantle would in your opinion, function just as efficiently — I see no reason why it should not.

By Mr. Willmott: If the Fremantle harbour were excluded from the provisions of the Act, would you think there would be enough work to warrant the appointment of the commissioners mentioned in the Bill — We were only asked if we thought the board had been done in Victoria. Until recently, the Sydney harbour was under the control of a separate authority, but it is now under the control of the Maritime Services Board, created by a Bill which was never proclaimed, and the Bunbury Harbour Board. If this were done, I think there would be enough work to warrant the appointment of the commissioners mentioned in the Bill.

By Mr. Hear: Your idea is that if Fremantle had a multiplicity of regulations made by the board, but not the Harbour and the numerous duties developing upon the board. These in the main are the same, with a few domestic differences to cover particular parts. All these by-laws and regulations could be made by one authority, thus avoiding a multiplicity of regulations made by various authorities. There would be the abolition of overlapping. For instance the Railway Department has regulations dealing with inflammable oils at the ports of Albany and Geraldton which are the two main points that have bulk installations controlled by the Railway Department and the Harbour and Light Department.

The second point is that you would have a uniformity and continuity of policy. There would be four different authorities for harbour administration and improvement. Then there is a multiplicity of regulations dealing with anything necessary to be covered and not provided for in the other sections. It is a common occurrence for a person to go to one authority to another until he reaches the right one. At present there is a duplication of regulations and by-laws. These in the main are the same, with a few domestic differences to cover particular parts. All these by-laws and regulations could be made by one authority, thus avoiding a multiplicity of regulations made by various authorities. There would be the abolition of overlapping. For instance the Railway Department has regulations dealing with inflammable oils at the ports of Albany and Geraldton which are the two main points that have bulk installations controlled by the Railway Department and the Harbour and Light Department.

The second point is that you would have a uniformity and continuity of policy. There would be four different authorities for harbour administration and improvement. Then there is a multiplicity of regulations dealing with anything necessary to be covered and not provided for in the other sections. It is a common occurrence for a person to go to one authority to another until he reaches the right one. At present there is a duplication of regulations and by-laws. These in the main are the same, with a few domestic differences to cover particular parts. All these by-laws and regulations could be made by one authority, thus avoiding a multiplicity of regulations made by various authorities. There would be the abolition of overlapping. For instance the Railway Department has regulations dealing with inflammable oils at the ports of Albany and Geraldton which are the two main points that have bulk installations controlled by the Railway Department and the Harbour and Light Department.
controlling authority had or could get the necessary finances, as is apparent today. Policy would be uniform and laid down to a set plan covering the whole aspect of port administration instead of as today each authority doing a bit here and a bit there without any correlation of the work of the various ports. The third point is that there would be freedom from local jealousies and inter-port competition. All ports would appeal to one authority which if constituted of full-time administrators would not be interested in local jealousies, but in efficiency and service in port facilities. It is quite possible that under the scheme I have envisaged there would be set up local advisory committees in each port to bring various aspects of the particular ports before the notice of the one board. For instance, there could be an advisory committee at Albany, another at Bunbury, and an advisory committee at Geraldton, which, being on the spot, would realise that certain things were needed and would submit their opinions to the controlling authority for consideration. That board would not be worried as to whether if it provided facilities at Albany, that would be detrimental to some other port but would act in the best interests of the State. I have a note to the effect that it would be fatal to have a a the one control in the hands of a part-time trust or board. For these reasons: (1) The head of officers being necessarily at Fremantle members would be representative of metropolitan interests only with scant consideration for outports. (2) If the representatives of outports could sit on the controlling body it could function without jealousies. (3) Most important you cannot administer ports efficiently at meetings lasting a few hours a week. It is a full-time job. My fourth point in favour of one harbour administration is that there would be a remunerative service of which the size would provide scope and attraction for qualified professional officers; and as harbour administration is an expert's job, it would result in the State finally having the services of men who, by devoting their full time to port management would become experts. At present many of our most promising professional men who are just starting out are generally lost to the State as they are forced to accept positions in other ports if they wish to improve their positions. At present there is no one officer in this State who is expert in every aspect of port management. I know a good deal about the ports I control, but not about Fremantle. I would never have an opportunity to knowing a great deal about Fremantle unless I worked for the Harbour Trust. To be an expert in harbour administration under the present system a man would need to be a member of three or four different authorities. My fifth point is the facility and improvement in efficiency and economy. One port would not be equipped with up-to-date facilities, while others used plant which is out of date, and consequently, costly to transfer from one port to another. Plant would be interchangeable and usable throughout the State instead of being laid up when the particular controlling authority was not using it. There would be economy through the non-duplication of plant, tools and materials. At present each authority has to get its own tools and materials and have its own workshops whereas if there were one authority there would be a central workshop doing the work. There would also be economy through the non-duplication of administrative staffs and we could then go into the question of having one modern system of accountancy or office work.

Minutes of Committee Meeting.

Minutes of the meeting held at Treasury Buildings, Perth, at 2.30 p.m. on Monday, 15th September, 1945, of a committee appointed to inquire into and recommend on the possibility of the control by one authority of all harbours throughout the State.

Present: Mr. R. J. Dumas, Director of Works, Department of Public Works; Mr. G. V. McCartney, Manager Fremantle Harbour Trust; Mr. S. J. Hood, Chief Civil Engineer, Railway Department; Mr. H. W. Byfield, Assistant Under Treasurer, Treasury Department.

The Chairman briefly outlined the events leading up to the formation of the committee and read the following direction as received from the Hon. Minis­ter for North-West:—

‘Approval has been given for the appointment of an investigatory committee to inquire into the advisability of having one controlling authority for all ports and harbours throughout the State. Please you arrange for the committee to make whatever inquiries may be deemed necessary, and report in due course.’

Mr. Hood, in sitting the views of the Railway Department, said that this department controlled the handling of cargo at the outer ports comprising Esperance, Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, and Port Hedland, and it was thought that it could do so in connection with other railways. Wherever you please arrange for the committee to make whatever inquiries may be deemed necessary, and report in due course.

The Chairman pointed out that there were 15 ports in Western Australia in five controlling authorities and two maintenance authorities.

After a general discussion it was decided that the Chairman should obtain from the authorities at present controlling the ports throughout the State, all figures in connection with their operations and show where possible it was estimated that savings could be effected by the institution of one authority.

The next meeting of the committee is to be called after due notice by the Chairman.

This meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

(Signed) K. G. FORSYTH,
Chairman.

5/3/45.

Harbour Administration.

Minutes of the meeting held at Treasury Buildings, Perth, at 2.30 p.m. on Monday, 15th September, 1945, of a committee appointed to inquire into and recommend on the possibility of the control by one authority of all harbours throughout the State.

Present: Mr. K. G. Forsyth, Manager, Harbour and Light Department, Fremantle, Chairman; Mr. G. V. McCartney, Manager, Fremantle Harbour Trust; Mr. S. J. Hood, Chief Civil Engineer, Railway Department; Mr. H. W. Byfield, Assistant Under Treasurer, Treasury Department, Perth. An apology was received from Mr. R. J. Dumas, Director of Works.

The minutes of the previous meeting, as circulated, were confirmed on the motion of Messrs. Hood and Byfield.

Considerable discussion followed regarding the report circulated by the Chairman in question of the previous meeting. General discussion ensued concerning the question of united control from the aspect of finance, the more effective use of plant and a more unified system of port development under one authority than under the present system.

Mr. Hood was of the opinion that there was a lot to be gained by the formation of one authority.

Mr. McCartney considered that the finance of the suggested authority was the most important aspect, as if such authority could not have, or obtain, sufficient money to carry out its purpose than it was useless from the outset and there would not be any advantage in its formation.

The Chairman agreed with this contention.

It was decided finally that as a decision could not be arrived at in the absence of Mr. Dumas, whose opinion was necessary, the meeting would adjourn until a date suitable to all members of the Committee.

This present meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

(Signed) K. G. FORSYTH,
Chairman.

15th September, 1945.

Economics that could be effected.

As requested, I have prepared a report showing what economies I consider could be effected by placing the control of all ports and harbours, and the administration of the State's maritime legislation, under one authority as compared with the present system of divided authority.
To do this it has been necessary to work out some form of set-up to obtain a comparison with existing costs. It is not claimed that the set-up adopted for the purpose of this report is the best that could be evolved, as many alternatives will probably be found and necessary as experience is gained if the one control becomes an established fact. It is felt, however, that it would cause the least disorganisation in the change over and it is certain that many more economies will be able to be effected in the light of experience.

In considering this question of one control it would appear that the authority would need to be made up of three divisions or sections. Fremantle, by far the largest and busiest port, is a full-time job in itself and would need to comprise one of these divisions under the immediate control of one member of the board. The other outports, the control of all other navigable waters and the various Acts, now administered by the Harbour and Light Department, would comprise another section under the immediate control of the Chief Engineer to the Board, who would be the third member of the Board.

This set-up, therefore, provides for a controlling board of three full-time members, responsible to the Minister, each being responsible for a section of the work, having a thorough knowledge thereof and being able to meet together often to discuss matters of policy, plan for harbour improvements so as to obtain uniformity and continuity, and consider the various problems of port administration. The Minister would appoint one member to act as chairman at such meetings. In effect, the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commission and the Bunbury Harbour Board, would be abolished, the Harbour and Light Department, if it were to exist, the Railway Department would relinquish all control of wharves and jetties, and three full-time board members would take the place of the managers of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, Harbour and Light Department and the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers. The resultant body to be known as the Western Australian Harbours Board.

In this report I have dealt with the questions of the comparison of costs purely from the aspect of salaries and wages of permanent staff only. It was necessary in arriving at an estimate of the cost of salaries and wages under the present system to ignore the inflations and deflations of staffs caused by the war and to estimate for a normal staff in normal years, thus including those members of the various staffs who are serving with the Services and excluding the temporary officers employed in New Zealand. If it is attempted to compare the figures set down as the estimate under the present system of divided control with the actual salaries and wages paid during the financial year by the various authorities, they will not agree. Similarly, in setting down the proposed staff for the suggested board, the same principles had to be adopted.

I propose to make the comparison port by port, commencing with Fremantle at which would be situated the head office of the board, then dealing with the North-West ports, and finally with the other outports.

**Fremantle:**

Estimated cost of salaries and wages under the existing system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbour and Light Department</td>
<td>4,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour and Rivers Branch, including the Fremantle Harbour Works</td>
<td>38,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle Harbour Trust</td>
<td>91,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£133,793</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated cost of salaries and wages under the suggested board amounts to £132,486, representing a saving of £1,307. No alteration was made in the clerical staffs, the staffs of the separate authorities having been taken over to the board in their entirety. The reason for this is that no attempt has been made at this juncture to lay down any system for the clerical work of the board, but it is certain that with the modernising of the present systems of the various authorities and the formation of a new system. In the board's office, a further considerable economy could be effected. No alterations were made in the navigation and wharf sections, but in the engineering division some difficulty was experienced in arriving at the staff required. Although this section of the present Fremantle Harbour Trust staff is more or less static, that of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Works is governed by the volume of work on hand, work which has been considerably augmented by Defence works. Obviously, it was impossible for me to foretell what works the suggested board would undertake, if constituted, so it was necessary to ascertain from the Harbour Works what they considered to be a normal staff. In the merger, this staff was retained insofar as the permanent staff was concerned, but some economy was able to be effected in its supervision. It is probable, however, that in actual practice avenues for further economies would open up. The largest saving was in respect of Commissioners' fees, which was partly offset by certain increases which had to be allowed for.

**Wyndham:**

Under the existing system, the Wyndham Met­works operate the jetty on behalf of the Harbour and Light Department, retaining for this service the handling and lightage charges, the jetty charges being paid to the credit of the latter authority. A pilot is sent from south during the autumn to handle overseas vessels, and the North-West branch of the Public Works Department would provide a permanent foreman for maintenance work on the jetty, to beacons and other Government buildings, etc. Under this arrangement the same control might be allowed to continue, any variation being uneconomical, except that the foreman could become an officer of that body. The only expense to the board, casual labour being obtained, as required.

Cost: Foreman £10 5s. 1d. per week: £356 per annum. No alteration.

**Derby:**

The existing staff at this port consists of the wharf­inger, clerk, driver and caretaker, employed by the Harbour and Light Department, and a foreman employed by the Public Works Department, responsible for maintenance and repairs to the jetty, lighthouses, goods sheds and other Government buildings in the town, and work on stock routes and wells. This staff could be retained, the only difference being that they would become servants of the board. The wages would be advanced to the status of wharfinger-supervisor as at other North-West ports. By arrangement with the board, these officers could attend to the maintenance and repair of Government buildings, while the upkeep of stock routes and wells could become the function of the Main Roads Board, which, I understand, has taken over attention to roads in the North-West, until recently a function of the North-West Branch of the Public Works Department. The cost of permanent staff under this system would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbour and Light Department</td>
<td>10 17 1.p.w. 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8 7 1.p.w. 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>7 12 1.p.w. 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>7 12 1.p.w. 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>9 10 6.p.w. 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase over existing costs—£50 per annum.

**Broome:**

Here the existing system is much the same as at Derby, except that the wharfinger is also the super­visor, and the port being larger carries an extra clerk. By adopting the same arrangements as outlined for Derby, the cost of permanent staff would be as set
out hereunder, there being no alteration on the present cost:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wharfinger-Supervisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  p.w. 530 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  p.w. 430 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed Clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1  p.w. 430 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loco driver (steam)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1  p.w. 485 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1  p.w. 397 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1  p.w. 498 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£2,807 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No alteration.

**PORT HEDLAND:**

The Port Hedland jetty is worked by the Railway Department in conjunction with the Port Hedland Marble Bar railway, running one train per week. In addition, the Harbour and Light Department employs a lightkeeper who also acts as Clerk of Courts on behalf of the Crown Law Department; and the Public Works Department employs a foreman as in the other ports. The total salaries and wages paid under the present system is as follows:-

**Railway Department:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer-in-charge</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 p.w. 394 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1  p.w. 301 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1  p.w. 415 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1  p.w. 519 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  p.w. 420 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1  p.w. 375 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganger</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  p.w. 420 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers (9)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  p.w. 2,657 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£6,430 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Harbour and Light Department:-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lightkeeper (Clerk of Courts £352 p.a. plus £90)</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>p.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Department-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6  d. 515 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£7,405 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The railway under present conditions is not an economical proposition for the Railway Department and if the jetty were taken over by the board would become still less so. The alternative would be to close the railway, allow motor transport to enter for the haulage between the port and Marble Bar and replace the present steam locomotive with a petrol or Diesel job as at Derby, Point Samson, or Onslow for haulage from the jetty head to goods shed and yard. The staff then required to operate the port would be as follows, adopting of course the same arrangement in regard to maintenance and repairs as at the other ports previously outlined:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wharfinger-supervisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  p.w. 549 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1  p.w. 430 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1  p.w. 380 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker and Lightkeeper £680-£80 p.a. 445 p.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£2,710 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would mean a saving of £4,666 per annum on wages and salaries alone. The closure of the railway would, however, affect a still further considerable saving too far as the Railway Department was concerned.

**Point Samson:**

The staff employed at this port is much the same as that at Derby except that the wharfinger is also the P.W.D. Supervisor, and no foreman is employed by that department. The loco driver is only a casual employee, being engaged as required. There is no reason to alter the present arrangements for the time being at any rate, and the cost to the board would be as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wharfinger-supervisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  p.w. 549 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1  p.w. 430 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1  p.w. 380 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total £1,690 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No alteration.

**Oswald:**

Here also the general arrangements as for the other North-West ports apply, and if the outlines given for Derby was adopted there would be no alteration in the costs at this port, the staff under the Board being as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wharfinger-supervisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  p.w. 549 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1  p.w. 430 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1  p.w. 380 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total £1,381 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No alteration.

This completes the survey of the North-West ports, but if the system outlined in respect of the maintenance etc. were adopted there would be certain other repercussions in Perth. With the jetty maintenance the concern of the Board's Engineering Division, the maintenance of Government buildings, etc. also being carried out by that body by arrangement, and the work in connection with stock routes and wells being taken over by the Main Roads Board in conjunction with their North-West road work, there would not be any necessity for a North-West branch of the Public Works Department and a further economy would be effected by the closing down of such branch, estimated at say, £2,360.

Let us now turn to the other outputs of the State, most of which are larger than the North-West ports just dealt with.

**Geraldton:**

Under the existing control the Railway Department operates the wharf, all other port functions are under the control of the Harbour and Light Department, and the maintenance and repairs are attended to by the Railway Department engineers and the Harbours and Rivers Branch of the Public Works Department. The station master and the assistant station master act as wharfingers, whilst the harbourmaster is the controlling officer on behalf of Harbour and Light Department. Making allowance for a proportion of the time of the station master and the assistant station master only (set down at 10 per cent.), and not including any time on account of the permanent way gang and other railway men engaged from time to time on wharf repairs, the estimated cost of salaries and wages under the present system is as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway Department</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour and Light Department</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total £3,320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
estimated 32;3 and Messrs. Dumas and was dealing with the matters. The services of the pilot crew could be employed more fully than is possible at present, and under the new arrangement the estimated cost of salaries and wages would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Estimated Saving, £3900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbormaster and port superintendent</td>
<td>£875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>£351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coxswain driver</td>
<td>£351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£2,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above staff allows for the handling and delivery of cargo by the Railway Department under contract to the board as at Bunbury. Estimated saving, £3900 per annum.

References:
The jetty at this port also is operated by the Railway Department and a pilot is sent by the Harbour and Light Department on each occasion that an overseas vessel visits the port. As at Bunbury, the small number of vessels using the port would make a full-time staff uneconomical, and the Railway Department could be asked to operate the jetty under contract to the board. Here again the repairs and maintenance to the jetty would come within the province of the engineering division of the board.

This completes the survey of the various ports and summarized the position as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Saving, £3900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>£1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hedland</td>
<td>£6,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldton</td>
<td>£690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunbury</td>
<td>£1,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>£368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add North-West Branch, Perth</td>
<td>£2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total saving</td>
<td>£11,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hon. the Minister for North-West, Department of Agriculture, Perth.

Harbour Administration.

With regard to the question of uniform harbour administration in Western Australia, I have to advise that the committee, appointed to investigate this matter and advise the Government thereon, has completed its deliberation.

The committee comprised the following:—K. O. Forsyth, Manager Harbour and Light Department (Chairman); H. J. Dunns, Director of Works, Public Works Department; S. J. Hend, Chief Civil Engineer, Railway Department; G. V. McCartney, Manager Fremantle Harbour Trust; H. W. Byfield, Assistant Under Treasurer, Treasury Department.

Copies of the following minutes, reports etc., are attached hereto for your information:

1. Minutes of meeting held on 26/2/45 and 19/9/45.
2. Precis of events concerning the question of uniform harbour administration, as taken from H. & L. File 4120 and submitted to the committee.
3. Copy of report of economies which could be effected, as submitted by the Chairman at the request of the committee.

Some difficulty was experienced in arranging meetings at times to suit all members of the committee. At a meeting held on 24th ultimo at which only the chairman and Messrs. Dumas and Byfield were present, it was decided that in order to reach finality the chairman
should circulate each member, submit the following recommendation and obtain the view of each member:—

"After due consideration of all aspects of the question of the formation of one authority to control the ports and harbours of the State, the committee recommends that in view of the present state of affairs and the indefinite future, the time is not opportune to make any change in the present control."

The opinions of the various members are summarised hereunder:—

Messrs. Forsyth, McCartney and Byfield: Agreed. Mr. S. A.: Agreed, but reiterated the view of the Railway Department that all ports and harbours, together with all transport, should be under the control of one State transport authority on the lines of the South African system.

Mr. R. J. Dunas: Was of the opinion that the recommendation should be enlarged to read as follows:—

"After due consideration of all aspects of the proposal for the formation of one authority to control all ports and harbours of the State, the committee recommends that the time is not opportune to make any change in the present system of control. Proposals for development of several of the regions and of the ports themselves are now under consideration by the Government and, until these have advanced a stage further, it would appear unwise to attempt to set up an organisation based on conditions existing today.

It is the opinion of the committee that nothing should be done which would possibly hamper the natural development of ports other than Fremantle."

The contents of opinion therefore was the committee recommended to the Government that after due consideration of all aspects of the question of the formation of one authority to control the ports and harbours of the State, the time is not opportune to make any change in the present system of control.

(Sgd.) K. G. FORSYTH,
Chairman.

An Epitome of Harbour and Port Controls in Eastern Australia.

In South Australia, the South Australian Harbour Board controls everything of a marine nature. It does everything including the survey of ships, the control of inland waters and the control of boats and harbours. In Victoria, the Melbourne Harbour Trust controls the Port of Melbourne, the Geelong Harbour Trust controls the port of Geelong and the Marine Board of Victoria controls all other ports, including that part of Port Phillip outside the spheres of operation of the Melbourne and Geelong Harbour Trusts. In New South Wales, the Maritime Services Board controls everything, including the Port of Sydney. Not very long ago the Sydney Harbour Trust was included in that board. In Queensland, the Department of Harbour and Marine controls the port of Brisbane, and the main outlets are controlled by local harbour boards. There is the Cairns Harbour Board and a few small ones. In Tasmania, the ports are controlled by local harbour boards. The Melbourne Harbour Trust Commission is the only controlling body that has financial autonomy. This means that they can borrow money for administration requirements without any outside interference, the consent of the Commonwealth Loan Council only being necessary. The Commissioners are empowered, for the purpose of defraying all such expenses of operation and development of the port, to borrow and take up at interest any sum of money to the limit prescribed by the Act, and which at present stands at £7,500,000. As the requirements of the port with its progressive development demands, so the Commissioners request the Legislature to amend this section of the Act that prescribes the borrowing limitation.

Of some ten million pounds capital expenditure (some before the creation of the present Trust) less than four million pounds is owed to the lending public. Twenty per cent. of gross earnings are paid into Consolidated Revenue.

Your Commissioners recommend—

(1) That one authority be created to control all ports in W.A., under the control of a Minister.

(2) That it consists of three full-time Commissioners.

(3) That this authority possess financial autonomy similar to that of the Melbourne Harbour Trust Commission.

(4) That provision be made for local honorary advisory committees at all ports to assist the central authority.

(5) That this authority be given powers to call together, from time to time, all parties interested in shipping matters for the purpose of ensuring that all ports of the State are used for the handling of imports required in, and produce to be exported from their respective zones.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED AND EXISTING ACTS AMENDED TO PERMIT ONE AUTHORITY TO CONTROL ALL PORTS.

To determine the extent that existing Acts would need to be amended and new legislation introduced to permit of one authority controlling all ports the Solicitor General (now Justice Wallace) was requested to examine this phase and report to your Commission. His evidence and examination is as follows:—

By the CHAIRMAN: The Government is anxious to make better use of the outlets of the State, and for the purpose of collecting information in that connection has appointed this Select Committee to make inquiries. One of the terms of reference—paragraph (e)—refers to the possibility of advisability of placing all harbours throughout the State under one port authority, and also to the committee's collecting information as to how much of the existing legislation it would be necessary to alter in the event of the committee's recommending that the ports should be placed under one authority and in the event of the Government's accepting that recommendation. We thought you would be able to supply the committee with that information; that is, as to the existing legislation which it may be found necessary to alter, and new legislation which it would be necessary to introduce to place all ports under one control. If you are able to inform the committee on those points, we shall be much obliged.—I have prepared a statement referring to all existing laws which have relation either to a major or minor extent to ports and harbours. They are taken in their alphabetical order in the name of the title, and not chronologically. I propose to set out all the existing legislation and then I can discuss to what extent you would need to amend it or repeal it and substitute new legislation to give effect to a policy of one controlling body. The first Act to which I refer in my statement is the—

1. Albany Harbour Board Act, 1926.

(a) This is an Act to constitute the Albany Harbour Board, to regulate the appointment of the members of the board, to define their powers and duties, and for other purposes.

(b) Section 1 provides that this Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

(c) Up to the present time it has not been proclaimed.

(d) The wharves, and I believe the harbour at Albany, are controlled and managed by the Com-
The Jetties Act, 1926, S.12.

I am not sure as to the harbours as distinct from the wharves. I know that wharves are administered by the Commissioner. My statement continues—


(a) This Act in its present state provides only for the licensing of rowing boats which are let out on hire.

The amendments, and in particular the passing of the Navigation Act, have virtually taken all the substance out of the Boat Licensing Act in relation to everything except rowing boats which are let out on hire.


(a) Is an Act to constitute the Bunbury Harbour Board; to regulate the appointment of the members of the board; to define their powers and authorities; and for other purposes incidental thereto.

(b) This Act has for some years been and still is in operation.

(c) A board appointed under the Act controls the harbour at Bunbury.


(a) Is an Act for the regulation of coasting vessels and cargo and other boats entering the ports and harbours of this State.

(b) It empowers harbourmasters to direct the movements of coasting vessels and of cargo and other boats in any of the ports or harbours of this State.

(c) Harbourmasters may appoint places of mooring for vessels and the vessels are forbidden to moor or anchor within 150 yards of any public jetty without the permission of the Harbourmaster.

(d) In the case of harbours controlled under special Acts, for example the Fremantle Harbour, the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act will supersede the Coasting Vessels Act, 1871, but at other ports administered under the Harbour and Lights Department, this Act would apply.

I think it may be found by consultation with the Harbour and Lights Department that they are not using that Act much, but rather they have been making regulations under the Shipping and Pilotage Ordinance Act with which I shall deal later. This seems to have been more a supplementary Act passed in between the Shipping and Pilotage Act, 1855, and the subsequent Ordinance Act of 1873. The latter, incorporated with the 1855 Act more or less made this particular Act unnecessary, and I think you will find it is not being administered. The Harbour and Lights Department could give you that information. I have not had time to ask them.


(a) Is an Act to regulate the carriage of passengers by vessels engaged in the coasting trade.

(b) The operation of this Act was suspended pending the Royal Assent by Her Majesty being given thereto.

(c) Such assent was never given.

(ii) Section 4 provided that every port authority aided by way of police was to administer this Act in relation to the ports under its control.

(e) Many of the provisions in this Act have since become provisions in the Navigation Act, 1904, of this State.

So you may take it that although it is still on the Statute Book it is practically dead.


(a) Is an Act to constitute the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commission; to regulate the appointment of Commissioners; to define their powers and authorities; and for other purposes.

(b) The provisions of this Act govern the administration of the Fremantle Harbour.

I do not propose to set out the provisions of that Act because you will get the information direct from the Harbour Trust Commissioners.


(a) Paragraph 16 of Section 23 authorises the Commissioner of Railways to make by-laws for regulating the admission of any vessels to any wharf, jetty, berth or mooring connected with and forming part of a railway, and their use and removal from the same.

(b) Under by-laws made under the said section the Commissioner of Railways, controls the wharves in various harbours, for example Albany, Geraldton, Carnarvon, Port Hedland, Esperance, etc.

There the railways run right on to the wharf and by administrative Act the land and the wharf have been incorporated in the railways so that they become part of the railways, and the Commissioner of Railways makes by-laws under Section 23 to control and regulate the management in the use of these wharves.

(c) The harbours themselves, as distinct from the said wharves, are I believe, controlled by the Harbour and Lights Department.

8. Harbours and Jetties Act, 1925, as amended by the Act, No. 25 of 1940.

(a) Is an Act to amend the law relating to the liability of owners of ships for damage to harbours and jetties and works connected therewith.

(b) Section 2 enacts that the owner of a vessel and the master of a vessel shall be answerable for loss or damage caused to a wharf or jetty by the vessel, or by any fault of the navigation of the vessel, notwithstanding that the vessel was in charge of a pilot and that pilotage was compulsory.


(a) Is an ordinance to consolidate and amend the laws for the regulation of shipping and of pilotage and other dues in the harbours of Western Australia.

(b) It is amended by the following ordinances—

(i) The Act 37 Vict. No. 14, 1873, which is an Act to alter and extend the provisions of the Shipping and Pilotage Ordinance Act, 1855;

(ii) The Shipping and Pilotage Acts Amendment Act, 1883, which extends the provisions of the Shipping and Pilotage Acts, 1855 and 1873.

(c) Under these Acts the Harbour and Light Department administers all those harbours which are not administered under particular Acts.

(d) Under Section 2 of the Ordinance of 1855 the Governor may make rules to be observed by all masters and commanders of all ships or vessels in any ports or harbours of the State and by all persons duly appointed or licensed to act as harbourmasters or pilots in such ports or harbours. Under Section 6 the Governor may grant licences to persons duly qualified to act as pilots for any ports or harbours. Sections 6 and 7 impose certain duties on pilots. Section 11 imposes duties on harbourmasters and provides for payment of harbour dues and pilotage fees. Sections 13 to 21 create a variety of offences in relation to the conduct of persons in ports and harbours. Schedules to the Act prescribe rates of harbourmasters' dues, pilotage dues, light dues and tonnage dues.

(e) The Act of 1873 repeals Sections 4 and 5 of the Act of 1855, prescribes new rates and charges and imposes a duty upon masters of vessels entering any port or harbour to pay such dues and charges. Section 2 empowers the Governor to remit or vary such dues and charges in certain cases. See
tion 3 empowers the Governor to make rules and regulations for the maintenance of good order in ports or harbours. Section 4 authorises the harbormasters to order masters of vessels to shift berth, and under Section 5 harbormasters can order the removal of wrecks. Under Section 6, a harbormaster is empowered to order or cause the removal of unsound vessels from ports or harbours; and Sections 7, 8, 9 and 10 create certain offences.

2. The Act of 1883 gave to the Governor in addition to those powers of the Act of 1873, or of the Act of 1878, or of the Act of 1880, further powers of remission of in respect of the said dues.

10. The provisions of this Ordinance mainly provide penalties for persons causing obstruction in navigable waters and other waters by permitting timber logs, sand, ballast and stones, etc., to pass into such waters.

11. (a) The Ordinance 17, Vict. No. 4 of 1856 is an ordinance for the better preservation of the navigable waters in Western Australia, and for the further security of life and property therein.

(b) The provisions of this ordinance mainly provide penalties for persons causing obstruction in navigable waters and other waters by permitting timber logs, sand, ballast and stones, etc., to pass into such waters.


(a) Is an Act to provide for the construction, maintenance and preservation of jetties and other works and to make better provision for securing and regulating the use and management thereof.

(b) The term "jetty" means any jetty, pier, wharf, grid, slip or landing place.

(c) Section 4 authorises the Governor to make regulations for the management, use, maintenance and preservation of all jetties generally, and particularly in relation to the following matters:

(i) Regulating and appointing and empowering officers to regulate and appoint the manner, times, places and order of mooring and fastening vessels at public jetties, and of loading, unloading, handling, warehousing, storing and depositing goods at, from, or on public jetties or any premises appurtenant thereto or used in connection therewith.

(ii) Regulating and empowering officers to regulate the landing and embarking of passengers and the taking in and delivery of ballast at, on or from public jetties.

(iii) The appointment of persons to preserve order on jetties, the regulation of the traffic thereto, and prescribing the means of transport to be used thereon.

(iv) The regulation of the use on jetties of cranes and other conveniences belonging to the Government.

(v) The cleansing, repair, maintenance and preservation of jetties.

(vi) Requiring consignees, consignors and others desiring to land or load cargo at any port to make use of a public jetty when such jetty is available.

(vii) Imposing on the master of every vessel moored at any public jetty or in connection with which a public jetty is made use of an obligation,

(a) To report his arrival to an officer within a specified time;

(b) To produce the vessel's certificate of registration to any officer on demand;

(c) To give an officer a true and complete copy of the manifest of the cargo or other consignment of all goods intended to be unloaded or landed, together with the names of the respective consignors thereof;

(d) To give an officer the prescribed notice of the intended time of unloading.

(viii) Imposing on intending shipper of goods from any public jetty an obligation to furnish to an officer full and true accounts of the goods intended to be shipped.

(ix) The imposition, fixing, levying, collection and payment of—

(a) Berthing dues;

(b) Wharfage dues;

(c) Handling charges;

(d) Storage charges;

(e) Charges for use of cranes;

(f) Handling charges;

(g) Other charges

for the use of public jetties or in respect of goods loaded, carried or stored on or from any jetty, or in or from any premises appurtenant thereto, or in respect of any incidental services rendered by the department or any officer.

(x) Defining and limiting the liability of the Government in respect of goods landed, discharged, deposited, stored, carried or left on or in any public jetty; or

(xi) Exempting the Government from liability for or in respect of damage or loss of goods in certain specified circumstances.

(xii) Prescribing times for making claims against the Government.

(xiii) Prescribing the conditions to be inserted in any lease or license granted under the Act and the license fees payable.

(xiv) The suspension and cancellation of licenses.

(xv) Section 5 of the Act defines the manner and extent to which such regulations may be made to apply. They may be made to apply generally or in particular localities to certain classes of persons, and so on.

Under Section 6 the Governor may authorise the Minister to construct any jetty, acquire any private jetty, or lease, close or remove any public jetty. Section 7 authorises the Minister to grant a license to any person for the erection or maintenance or use of any jetty.

Section 8 forbids the construction of any private jetty except pursuant to a lease or license granted under this Act. Section 9 authorises the Governor to make regulations regarding buoys, and Sections 10 and 11 create offences.

12. The next Act is an Ordinance to regulate the collection of tolls. 14 Vict. No. 7, 1890, authorised the imposition and collection of tolls and dues by reason of the use inter alia of wharves and jetties, but as far as I am aware, no use is made of this Ordinance in relation to harbours.
The Harbour of people using Mr. have defined line of development from give identical developed that this question has been under consideration. In the course of the various pages, the Chairman, in both of those States I think there is a harbour authority controlling all harbours. You will realise that Mr. Justice Wolff has been on the bench for a number of years, and that that was done before he went on the bench.

Does this constitute the personnel of that committee (indicating list)?—I think that is probably correct, but I do not recall that Mr. Forsyth mentioned their names to me. I understand that it was an unofficial committee, that is, a body of men who were not members of Parliament. That is as far as I can take you, gentlemen. If you compare the Albany Harbour Board Act with the Bunbury Harbour Board Act, you will see that they are almost identical, and that all the provisions contained in those Acts are also contained in the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, with certain other particular provisions that were necessary and peculiar to Fremantle. I do not exactly say there would be only one way in which to approach this matter, if there is to be a single controlling body, and which is to have completely new legislation which would scrap all existing legislation.

I do not know that I have any questions to ask, except to say that, in my view, I have prepared by-laws for administration by the Harbour and Light Department, and other by-laws for administration by the Commissioner of Railways. In those two sets of by-laws I endeavoured to get the best of both from the one side and from the other, so that there would be no overlapping. The two bodies ultimately accepted those by-laws, and I believe they are in operation. It means that there is a fairly clearly defined line of demarcation between the activities of the one and the activities of the other.

Where the trouble arises in a number of cases is in the matter of control at the point where a ship begins to unload its inflammable oil on a wharf. The ship, while it is not tied up to the wharf, is subject to the by-laws administered by the Harbour and Light Department, but as soon as it is tied up to the wharf, then the safety of the wharf comes into the picture and the Commissioner of Railways is the authority concerned. Where the trouble arises, I think, is in the position of control at the point where a ship begins to unload its inflammable oil on a wharf. The ship, while it is not tied up to the wharf, is subject to the by-laws administered by the Harbour and Light Department, but as soon as it is tied up to the wharf, then the safety of the wharf comes into the picture and the Commissioner of Railways is the authority concerned.

The position which indicates, I would say, the necessity in relation to one harbour of not having divided or duplicated control of matters of general policy, I would not attempt to express any opinion at all.

By Mr. HOAR: Do municipal councils have any authority or control over jetties?—In some cases they have control, and in others they have not. There are provisions in the Road Districts Act and the Municipal Corporations Act that give road boards and municipal councils authority to make by-laws in relation to jetties, but there has been a tremendous amount of difficulty in working out to what extent they can make valid by-laws, for the reason that in every case the control and management of a harbour is involved. I will explain it better this way: Take the Fremantle Harbour Trust. The Fremantle Harbour extends right up to there and the Fremantle Harbour Trust has the right to make by-laws in relation to the pier and all sorts of things under the provisions of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, in relation to the harbour. The Trust has a certain measure of right to say what people shall and shall not do, and the municipal council cannot promulgate by-laws that will override that power. Another phase that crops up and makes the position rather complicated is the fact that, under the Jetties Act, jetties are either public jetties or private jetties. Public jetties are those provided by the Government, and private jetties are those constructed by other than the Government. The establishment of a jetty other than a public jetty has to be done under license from the Government. The Minister administering the Jetties Act at the moment is either the Chief Secretary or the Minister for the North-West—I am not sure which. In the course of the statement we have just heard, I have mentioned matters that can be done by means of by-laws or regulations for the control of public jetties. There again there can be conflict as between municipal council by-laws and by-laws promulgated under the Jetties Acts.

Which is another argument in favour of centralised control?—Yes, definitely. Before the Jetties Act was passed, a lot of trouble developed by reason of the fact that no statutory authority existed to control any jetties other than jetties of private jetties. The result was that jetties were put up and leases were granted and then difficulties began to crop up. To overcome some of these—and amongst other difficulties was the conduct of sailing boats in Crawley Bay—acting on my advice after reference of the matter to me by Mr. Shipcott who, as chairman of the Parks and Gardens Board, was in control of the water frontage there, we issued a proclamation under the Ports and Harbours Act of 1917, establishing the port of Perth. We defined the boundaries of the port as commencing at one end of the railway bridge near the old Lunar Station, and at the other part by the bridge over the Canning River and by the Causeway. Then Mr. Shipcott appointed himself, or was appointed, harbourmaster of Perth, and ultimately he became the Lord High Admiral. Even then, he was able to issue by-laws for the regulation and conduct of sailing craft and of people who induced in swimming in Crawley Bay. You will realise that this presents only a clumsy way of overcoming a legal obstacle. I think that with single control, the position would be far better from the administrative point of view, as well as from the point of view of people using and frequenting harbours.

By Mr. WILLMOTT: In connection with the Busselton Jetty, am I right in saying that the first portion of the jetty proper is controlled by the municipal council up to the point where the railway jetty joins the main harbour, and the balance is controlled by the Commissioner of Railways, and yet the light which is situated at the head of the jetty is under the control of the Harbour and Light Department?—I would not be a bit surprised. I was not quite sure about the position regarding the first part of the jetty until you mentioned in your opening remarks just now. I am aware that Mr. Forsyth, the manager of the Harbour and Light Department, from Mr. Evans, the traffic manager of the Government Railways. That is one case within my ex-
If the municipality is not anxious to take a lease, the question will arise as to what is to be done with it. The Commissioner wants to be rid of it because he is not using it and maintenance is a burning question. Whatever is done, the jetty can be used only as a sort of promenade. In no circumstances would it be used for the berthing of vessels.

There is another legal difficulty that is receiving consideration. It is relevant to this inquiry, though I do not know what the ultimate result has been, I refer to the position regarding the old Rockingham Jetty. This was constructed by and belonged to Millars' Timber and Trading Company when the company was bringing timber from Jarrahdale and shipping it from Rockingham. I think Mr. George Greig either bought it or obtained a lease or acquired some right, title and interest in it, and it was being used by the hosts used by holiday-makers going from Geraldton to Rockingham. Questions have arisen from time to time as to whose responsibility it is to maintain that jetty, or make provision for its use by ships wishing to berth there. The Fremantle Harbour Trust disclaimed any interest in it because it was not its jetty, and yet it comes within the Trust's sphere. I have given advice on various questions relative to the matter from time to time, but beyond making a general statement, I cannot say what the issues are now. That is an instance of how numbers of legal questions may crop up where there is no single control over a harbour.

By the CHAIRMAN: Harbour control appears to be more or less loose—Yes.

COMMENTS ON PORTS VISITED.

GERALDTON (1).

There is a modern wharf and a good harbour at this port, although the water depth is not sufficient to accommodate vessels of deep draught, such as refrigerated ships.

There are three berths, the wharf being under the control of the Railway Department and the harbour under the Harbour and Light Department.

More shed accommodation is required, there being only one and that is used principally for bulk handling of wheat, a small portion is used for storage of general goods. A shed for storing and sorting of general cargo would be of great assistance at No. 2 berth and it could also be used at times for the storing of wheat when one bulk ship follows closely on another.

No. 1 berth, where the bulk wheat shed stands, is used for loading ships with wheat and should another ship with general cargo arrive, all goods have to be conveyed by trolley from No. 2 berth to the cargo shed, which is one end of the wheat shed. There is only about 60 feet of space that can be used for general cargo.

A shed of standard size 300 feet long would provide sufficient accommodation for many years to come. Geraldton provides a classical example of a port that has, and is, being deprived of the trade that should come through there.

Prior to 1935 Geraldton provided most of the trade requirement of the Murchison, but in that year an alteration in railway freights practically made Fremantle the port for the Murchison, although Wiluna is 722 miles from Fremantle compared with 444 miles from Geraldton. Space does not permit to set the whole matter out in this report, but it is fully dealt with in masterly fashion in the evidence of Mr. E. G. Russeix on pages 389 to 396 of the statements made to the Commission in Geraldton.

It was said in evidence that freight is 9d. per ton more from Geraldton to ports north of there and Singapore, than it is from Fremantle to Singapore. On State ships the ostensible rate to North-West ports from Fremantle was 2s. 6d. per ton more than from Geraldton, but shippers were receiving a rebate which made the rates from Fremantle to these ports less than the freight from Geraldton.

Freight on wool, per ton, from north-west ports as far as Derby, is the same to Fremantle as it is to Geraldton. A proposal was submitted to declare a zone of production embracing the Victoria district, all agricultural and pastoral production country from a line commencing on the west coast near Green Head through Coorow on the Midland line, thence to Roebourne, then north-east to Wiluna, thence west to join up with the boundary of the Northampton magisterial district at Mt. Murchison and then to the coast and embracing all agricultural and Murchison pastoral country within and around that boundary.

All wool from the lower Gascoyne, it was claimed, could economically be transported and included in appraisements at Geraldton and with a slight allowance of freight the wool from all north-west ports could be brought to that port. A witness, Mr. K. A. Cameron, was called from the Woolbrokers' Association to give that body's opinion on the proposal. The following are extracts of his evidence:

(2) Wool brokers can see no reason why north-west wool should be included in any proposal to establish wool sales at Geraldton, because naturally to Fremantle and it is extremely doubtful whether the suggestion of sending to Geraldton would be favourably received by growers in the districts referred to.

(3) The success of wool sales at Geraldton would depend almost entirely on the ability of buyers to get their wool shipped to the various destinations required. Unless direct shipping could be supplied, the extra cost of getting to Fremantle would have to be taken from prices paid. In Mr. Bogle's evidence he mentioned that shipping was a major problem, as wool probably would be shipped mostly in parcels of from 500 to 1,000 tons. This would represent roughly from 3,000 to 6,000 bales.

That is working on an average of six bales to a ton.

With the present facilities at Geraldton, catalogues could not exceed 4,000 bales, so it is unlikely that the parcels referred to would reach as high as 500 tons for one destination.

(4) The present wool stores at Geraldton are small and uneconomical to operate. When brokers were asked by the Federal Government to appraise wool at Fremantle, the extra costs of handling at that centre were computed, checked by the Department of Commerce and paid by the Government. Brokers agreed that modern wool stores would reduce the cost of handling.

Your Commissioners cannot agree that these wools come naturally to Fremantle. Geraldton is the nearest port and if appraisals, sales and export took place at, and from there, Geraldton is the natural port for these areas, but the point raised as to whether wool producers would agree to their wool going to Geraldton instead of Fremantle is an important one. With the continuance of present conditions, i.e., the same freight to Fremantle as to Geraldton and the possibility of a stronger buyers' market at sales in Fremantle, it is unlikely that this proposal would find favour with wool producers north of the lower Gascoyne.
The following recommendations are made regarding this port:—

(1) That a shed of approximately the standard size provided at Fremantle be erected alongside No. 2 berth.

(2) Lighting at the ship's side to be provided as recommended elsewhere in this report.

(3) That a tractor be provided for movement of trucks at the berth sites.

(4) That State ships should provide as near as possible to a regular service on journeys both north and south.

(5) That a modern wool shed should be erected.

(6) That the Blue Funnel, or any British shipping line, be issued with a Continuing Permit for Geraldton the same as for other north-west ports.

The provision of an electric crane is not considered to be warranted at present owing to the small amount of cargo, other than wheat and phosphate rock, that is handled, but should the tonnage of general cargo increase to a reasonable amount, a crane would expedite the loading and unloading of any ship.

BUNBURY.

The harbour is controlled by the Bunbury Harbour Board, appointed by the Government. The Harbour and Light Department control the pilots and navigation lights and the Railway Department act as contractors for haulage to and from the jetty on behalf of the Bunbury Harbour Board.

This port is fairly well equipped so far as facilities for handling cargoes are concerned. There are facilities for bulk handling of wheat, although under somewhat unorthodox conditions, the silo being on land, away from the jetty and involves double handling and special rolling stock.

There are no facilities for bulk storage of petrol or oil. The district that could be served with these commodities, if bulk storage facilities were provided, is a very large one and should warrant the installation. Your Commissioners are strongly of the opinion that all districts should be able to draw their petrol and crude oil requirements through their own ports, and ships enabled to draw their supplies of bunker oil at outports. There are many railway routes converging at Picton Junction and it was alleged by witnesses that a bottleneck is created between that station and Bunbury and congestion of traffic occurs. The Railway Department's witness, Mr. O. Watson, claims that this is not correct but agrees that at times delay does take place on this section.

Bunbury's greatest drawback is the continuous silting up of the harbour and until this is effectively controlled it will be a costly and unsatisfactory port to maintain. For many years before the last war it was costing about £10,000 per year for dredging and this is far too much, when considering the small amount of cargoes handled.

To get an expert opinion as to whether the silting can be controlled and at what cost, Mr. R. J. Dumas, Director of Public Works, was furnished with a number of questions and called by the Commission as a witness. His answers to these and other queries are set out on pages 712-717 of the typewritten evidence.

Mr. Dumas considers that the silting can be controlled at a cost of approximately £500,000, and if this is done the cost of maintenance should be very light. In view of the large sum involved, and as we now have an engineering expert here in the person of Col. Tydeman, we suggest that he and Mr. Dumas confer as to the best method of controlling the silt.

The greatest depth of water available at any berth has been 27 feet 6 inches, but owing to silting this depth is not now available. Mr. McKenna, Chairman of the Bunbury Harbour Board, stated that judging from pre-war experience, 90 per cent. of their troubles would be eliminated if they had 27 feet 6 inches of water because 90 per cent. of the cargo ships do not need more than that depth. The bottom of the harbour is basalt rock and it will prove costly to deepen the harbour sufficiently to take refrigerated vessels. At present there would not be much cargo for this class of ship.

The estimated cost of providing two berths of 32 feet with a passageway to the ocean and sufficient manoeuvring room is £500,000. As already over three-quarters of a million pounds has been spent there and the estimated cost of preventing constant silting and providing two berths with 32 feet of water is £1,000,000, it will require a great tonnage of cargoes to warrant this expenditure.

It is recommended that the first requirement is to put in hand the works to prevent silting. When it is established that silting is no longer taking place, no dredging will be needed to maintain a 27 feet 6 inch depth of water. This depth should be generally sufficient for present needs and the further question of providing two berths of deeper water can be held in abeyance for further consideration as the development of the district warrants.

Further recommendations are—

(1) That bulk storage facilities for oil and petrol are warranted.

(2) That the provision of a double line between Picton and Bunbury should be proceeded with at an early date. This will not incur any additional expense because it will form part of the double line already authorised between Armadale and Bunbury.

(3) Improved lighting should be installed at the berths as recommended elsewhere in this report. Cluster lights are available for hire to ships if required.

(4) A tractor is recommended for haulage of railway trucks at the ship's side. The estimated cost of installing four electric capstans here is £2,650. One tractor costing about £700 would do the work if required of the four capstans.

BUSSELTON.

The jetty at this port is 5,850 feet long with a breadth of 47 feet, berthing accommodation 640 feet and is under the control of the Railway Department. The port is controlled by the Harbour and Lights Department. The usual berth used is on the east side although the official of the Lumpers' Union stated that the western berth was most used prior to a shelter shed being erected on that side. This shed obstructs the loading operations of a ship at that
berth. Inquiries reveal that some skippers prefer the western berth and it is considered that an error was made in the location of the shed. The average water depth is 24 feet at both berths.

There is a considerable divergence of opinion regarding the suitability of Busselton as an “all the year round port.” Representatives of shipping companies say that many skippers have an objection to going into Busselton and our own professional officers are divided in opinion regarding its safety in all seasons. Although many questions were put to witnesses, no definite case of accident to a ship could be traced to the open nature of the roadstead. It was stated that, pre-war, South African ships would not use the port and took on all their cargoes at Bunbury during the months May-October.

According to a number of witnesses last year, the ship “Beltana” collided with the jetty, doing considerable damage. The ship berthed and took on certain loading, but the following day the captain stated that as bad weather was coming up he was going to pull out. This he did, and left behind cargo that cost £1,500 in railway freight to send on to catch the “Beltana” at Bunbury. No rough weather eventuated. It is alleged that the skipper blamed the port and weather for the collision between the ship and jetty, while all the local people say that the weather was quite good.

As the witness for the Sawmillers’ Association, Mr. W. R. Turner, when giving evidence before the Commission on 2nd July, 1946, stated that the Adelaide Steamship Company and McIvor, McEacharn & Co. have, by a recent decision, instructed that their ships are not to put into Busselton during the winter months, and the former company is hinging its argument upon the case of the “Beltana” collision, it is suggested that the State Government, that has many thousands of pounds invested in harbour facilities at Busselton, institute an inquiry into the “Beltana” incident to ascertain if it was the weather and open nature of the port that caused the accident, or some other reason.

The greatest drawback the port has is the shallow depth of water. Any ship drawing more than 22 feet of water cannot be fully loaded there, consequently they are only partly loaded and taken on to Bunbury to complete the loading and this sometimes results in timber passing Busselton that should be loaded at that port. A further disability is another port (Bunbury) about 35 miles away.

A suggestion was made by the local committee to extend the jetty about 500 feet in a north-westerly direction. This would permit of deeper water and allow a ship to ride a north-west storm bow on, instead of side on, as at present. According to charts supplied to the Commission by the Harbour and Lights Department, a great deal of dredging would be necessary, not only along the site of the proposed extension, but a long distance out to sea, to get a depth of 30 feet of water, and the amount of cargo being handled does not warrant at present the heavy expense that would be involved. Not many ships call for a full cargo of timber, and generally they are able to take on all the timber required.

During the war years 39 per cent. of the timber produced and exported from what should be the Busselton zone, i.e., the Busselton-Margaret River and Busselton-Nannup railway lines, was shipped from Bunbury. Based on figures supplied by the Railway Department to the local committee, 80,785 tons of timber grown and cut in the Busselton district over the six years ending 30th June, 1945, was shipped at Bunbury. There does not appear any good reason why nearly all of this timber could not have been handled at Busselton. If it had been loaded at Busselton, it would have meant £1,844 in dues to the jetty, and £3,420 distributed as wages to the waterside workers annually. As the period referred to covered mainly war years, it can be assumed that tonnage handled were below normal. Apart from timber and potatoes, there does not seem to be any other commodity available for export at present in sufficient quantities to warrant a fair-sized ship calling there.

For loading timber the ship’s gear seems to have been sufficient in the past, and the loading rate is considered to be good.

Lighting of the wharf is inadequate and no additional lighting is available (such as cluster lights) to assist in loading. Recommend that cluster lights be available for hiring to ships and that lighting as recommended elsewhere be provided on the wharf. Light points to be installed at more frequent intervals along the wharf route.

A mobile tractor would greatly assist in abolishing hand shunting when the locomotive is not at call.

Because the railway lines are laid on top of the jetty planking, it will be necessary to bring the surface level with top of rails as outlined in General Recommendation.

FLINDER’S BAY.

There was once a jetty here but it was closed to traffic on the 31st June, 1926, and collapsed in 1935. Ample depth of water is available a short distance from the shore, but there does not appear to be much prospect, for many years, of the district producing sufficient commodities for export or requiring imports in quantities that would justify the re-building of the jetty.

A great amount of timber was shipped from here in the past, and there is still a small amount of it produced in the area, but this can be raised to Busselton, only a short distance away.

If a railway were constructed to connect with Nannup as suggested by witnesses, this would only rob Busselton and Bunbury of the timber from that district, and would involve longer haulage than at present, and is therefore not recommended.

ALBANY.

The harbour is under the control of the Railway Department, and the Harbour and Lights Department control the pilots and navigation lights. Albany’s greatest problem is lack of ground space along the foreshore. This is caused through the hills coming right down to the water’s edge, and could be overcome by dredging and reclamation work. Everything is suitable to a scheme of reclamation along the foreshore, and it should repay any expenditure incurred.
By leasing the reclaimed land to firms for the erection of warehouses, it would recoup all expenses within a short space of years in addition to allowing the erection of sheds for stowing and sorting when a modern wharf is constructed there.

At present the railway shunting yards are congested owing partly to much of the space being taken up with sheds leased to business firms. If reclaimed land were provided on lease for these people to build their warehouses upon, relief would thus be provided in the shunting yards. Albany is the natural port for the southern portion of the State and should be developed as such. It is probably worse off than any other port visited regarding certain facilities, such as fertiliser works and wheat bulk-handling facilities.

The witnesses from the Cuming, Smith & Mt. Lyell Farmers' Fertilisers Ltd., Mr. V. B. Marsell, in a confidential report to the Commission, set out figures to show that it would not be economical to provide and operate fertiliser works at Albany at present, and that the additional cost per ton incurred would more than offset the extra railway freight on fertilisers sent from the metropolitan works into the Albany zone. From the company's point of view this is probably correct. Under the present arrangements it does not matter to the farmer: whether his superphosphate comes from the Picton Junction or metropolitan works, the companies pay the additional freight on out-of-zone fertilisers, but as this traffic is a losing one to the Railway Department it must cost the State a large sum of money annually to haul superphosphate into the Albany zone from the metropolitan works instead of from Picton Junction.

It appears that, on a zone system, all the output of the Picton works could be absorbed in the Bunbury zone and that large quantities are taken from there into the Albany zone and the Bunbury zone supplied from the metropolitan works. This is surely uneconomical. If superphosphate works were established at Albany, all their zone fertilisers could come from there. Picton should supply the Bunbury zone, and the metropolitan works the Fremantle zone. The Commonwealth Government now subsidises superphosphate production 3d per ton.

Albany is losing all the loading of shipped wheat because there are no bulk-handling facilities installed there. This is taken from the Albany zone, principally to Bunbury, but some to Fremantle. This is uneconomical, also unjust to the port of Albany.

In 1940 a committee was constituted by the then Minister for Lands and Agriculture, Hon. F. J. S. Wise, to inquire into and report upon the proposal to establish wheat bulk-handling facilities at Albany. They favoured the project and their report and recommendations to the Minister is as follows:

PW14/40.
6th June, 1940.
The Hon. Minister for Lands and Agriculture,
Perth.

Dear Sir,

The Special Committee constituted by you to investigate the proposal for installation of bulk-handling facilities in the Albany zone had had two meetings, one at Albany on 19th and 17th ultimo, and another at Perth yesterday.

The full committee was present on each occasion, the personnel and interests represented being:- Mr. H. E. Brainne, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.; Mr. F. L. Williams, Albany Chamber of Commerce; Mr. C. E. Bolt, Albany Municipal Council; Mr. N. P. Davis, Growers; Mr. C. P. Mathca, Treasury; Mr. W. L. Thomson, Railway Department; Mr. E. Tindle, Director of Public Works.

The decisions arrived at are conveyed by the following resolutions, unanimously agreed to:-

1. That this committee recommends to the Minister that bulk-handling installations for 1940-41 in the Albany zone be provided with in accordance with the proposed building programme included in the statement submitted by Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., the following 15 sidings to be equipped:

Woodmanilling, Broomehill, Pingrup, Corrigin, Ongerup, Toomup, Borden, Keharingup, Gawograup, Pallinup, Toolbrunup, Karingup, Nyabing, Moormanning and Boddington.

2. That this committee agrees that in principle the port of Albany is the port through which wheat in the Albany zone should be shipped (Messrs. Williams and Bolt).

3. That it be a further recommendation to the Minister:

(1) That terminal facilities be provided at Albany in time for the 1940-41 season subject to the following provisions:-

(a) that funds can be made available;

(b) that the Australian Wheat Board will absorb the extra handling cost at present estimated at Is. 15d. per ton, or the charge be met by some other method;

(c) that weather conditions within the next three weeks justify the installation;

(d) that sufficient time and labour are available for the erection of the facilities;

(e) that if these conditions fail, the erection of port facilities be deferred;

(f) that the importance be stressed of providing facilities at Albany at the earliest possible time, having regard to the possible increasing cost of material and difficulty of obtaining suitable labour. (Messrs. Davis and Brainne.)

The salient features of the proposal were discussed at length and these may be set down as follows:-

1. On the grounds of equity, the Albany zone had claims for the installation of bulk-handling facilities, in order that it might be brought on to terms with the already equipped zones of Fremantle, Geraldton and Bunbury.

2. The quantity of wheat to be handled at Albany was relatively small, 20,000 tons; consequently the least possible capital expenditure consistent with efficient handling only would be justified.

3. The maximum capital expenditure would be in the region of £11,000.

4. The terminal equipment proposed by Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited could be installed within the figures mentioned in 3, and this could be relied on to do the necessary work.

5. The terminal equipment proposed was storage of 4,500 tons of wheat on a site between the Deep Sea and Town jetties at Albany and jetty equipment on the Deep Sea jetty capable, with four elevators proposed, of handling 140 tons per hour.

6. The cost under the proposals of handling the wheat at Albany is estimated at 2s. 8½d. per ton; the shipping charge, representing the same service at the already equipped ports is 1s. 7½d.; thus a surcharge of 1s. 15½d. per ton would be necessary to meet the extra cost at Albany, amounting to £1,719.

7. The shipping charge of 1s. 7d. per ton is uniformly levied at each of the already equipped ports, and may be regarded as the average cost of the service.

8. In order to secure uniformity in the four zones (including Albany), it is proposed that the 1s. 15½d. should be absorbed by all zones, thus bringing the shipping charge to 1s. 7½d. per ton on the exportable State harvest of 550,000 tons.

9. At the present time, the Australian Wheat Board has control of all exportable wheat and under the arrangements made with that board, the 1s. 7d. per ton shipping charge gives place to 1d. per bushel (1s. 6½d. per ton).
10. A present difficulty exists in absorbing the extra ½d. per bushel; Mr. Brain has, however, expressed hopes that the Australian Wheat Board may be persuaded to meet the extra cost; if the Australian Wheat Board will not meet the charge, other means will need to be found in order that all zones may be brought on to the same terms; this is referred to in Resolution 3 (1) (b).

11. The alternative of raising the Albany zone wheat to Bunbury as a permanent measure was not favoured, on the grounds both of equity and additional cost; it being estimated that an additional ½d. per bushel would need to be covered to cover same.

It may be necessary, however, as a temporary expedient to rail to Bunbury.

The present conditions so far raised the question of the present justification of incurring expenditure on the installations and it was considered by some members of the committee that a final decision in this connection should be deferred for two or three weeks.

On the other hand, it was pointed out that the difficulties of securing competent labour owing to war conditions were increasing and likewise the cost of material and the securing of same. These conditions would need to be equated.

12. Referring to Resolution 3 (1) (a), Mr. Brain expressed the probability that his company finding the necessary capital for the terminal, conditionally on their being permitted to operate same.

13. If 13 is valid of, it should be conditional on the right being reserved to the Government to take over the terminal at any time at its then depreciated value.

14. It should be noted that the calculated necessary shipping charge for Albany has been based on rather uncertain premises and the necessity therefore is suggested for a review of same at the end of each season, or until a reasonably solid basis has been arrived at.

15. Appended is an informative statement of costs by Mr. C. P. Mathews; this was submitted to the committee.

16. It will be noted that installations within the Albany zone only have been considered by the committee. Consideration of additional country installations in other zones has been left for the Standing Committee on Bulk Handling to deal with.

Much valuable assistance was given the Committee by officers attached to Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited (Messrs. A. E. Stephenson and G. H. Jones) and by Messrs. F. E. Shaw (Mechanical Engineer, P.W.D.) and J. Stevenson Young (Engineer for Harbours and Rivers, P.W.D.).

The committee desires to place on record its appreciation of this, and of the clerical assistance afforded by the company's staff.

Yours faithfully,

E. TINDALE,
Chairman of Committee.

ALBANY BULK HANDLING.

Proposal to install Bulk Handling Facilities in the Albany Zone.

Statement prepared by Mr. C. P. Mathews, 29/5/40.

Alternatives:

(a) Equip sidings in the Albany zone, and install terminal facilities at the port of Albany.

(b) Equip sidings in the Albany zone and rail to Bunbury.

Merits and Dismerits of Alternatives A and B.

The handling of wheat in bulk as against bags is estimated to save growers approximately 4d. per bushel. Freight on bulk wheat is 9d. per ton more than on bagged wheat. This is equal to 4d. per bushel.

The cost of terminal facilities would therefore mean a saving to growers of approximately 3.75d. per bushel.

The estimated cost of operating a terminal at Albany (as per Statement "A") is per ton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
<th>2 3 ½</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The shipping charge at Fremantle, Bunbury and Geraldton is per ton</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional cost per ton at Albany

1 1 ½

Additional cost of 1s. 15d. at Albany amounts to an additional total cost per annum of £3,719.

Spread over an exportable harvest of 580,000 tons, the additional cost would be 7½ penny per ton.

Advantages to farmers of shipping in bulk at Albany as against Bunbury is 7d. per bushel, which is equivalent to £3,240 per annum on an output of 30,000 tons.

If the Albany zone was equipped and the wheat railed in bulk to Bunbury instead of raling bagged wheat to Albany as at present, the farmers in this zone would save 3½pence per bushel.

If facilities are installed at Albany and the farmers in that zone bore the whole of the extra shipping charge of 1s. 1½d. per ton, they would show a saving of .384d. per bushel as against raling the wheat to Bunbury. This is made up as follows:

Additional cost of raling to Bunbury .713d. per bushel.

Additional cost per ton of 1s. 1½d. .375d. per bushel.

.384d. per bushel.

If terminal facilities are installed at Albany, with the consequent increase of 1s. 1½d. per ton above the rates charged at other ports, viz., 1s. 7d., the following questions will have to be decided:

(a) Should the farmers in the Albany zone bear the extra cost of .375pence per bushel (1s. 1½d. per ton)?

In this respect, the question of equity should be considered.

(b) Should the additional cost be spread over the whole of the State by an increase in railway freight rates?

This would necessarily be a question of Government policy.

(c) Can a means be devised whereby the Australian Wheat Board will bear the cost? In this connection Mr. Brain has advised that there is every probability of the board meeting this cost—

(1) a direct payment of the amount to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.; or

(2) as a recoup of a special charge.

GENERAL.

The following points have been brought under notice, and should be considered in dealing with the question of installing bulk facilities at the port of Albany:

(a) Retention of shipping at Albany.

(b) The question of equity of Albany's claim for similar facilities as provided at other ports.

(c) Shipments by farmers in the Albany zone from the nearest port.

(d) The effect on the cost per ton at Bunbury terminal of an increased quantity handled at that port.

(e) If wheat shipped to Bunbury, no additional shipping costs to be provided for.

STATEMENT "A."

Albany Terminal.

Operating Costs—on basis of 30,000 tons per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost per ton in £</th>
<th>Total Cost in £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest at 5% on reducing balance</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortisation—Repayment of Capital by</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Annual Installments of Administration</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance at 7½%</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost per ton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost per ton in £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jetty—Based on 30,000 tons.</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Running costs—

Power—Say average load of 20 k.w.h. for 8 hours per 1,000 tons at 1½d. per unit | .30

Rigging and removing plant—Initial and final operations £30 per 7,500 tons shipped | .96
Labour—total 20 men at 3s. 6d. per hour—70s. per hour for 140 tons
W.A.O.R. charges—weighing 17,600 tons at jetty at 3.5d. per ton . 50
Hire of power lines—same £100 per annum
Maintenance—allowing £200 p.a. 1.40

Silo—Based on 12,600 tons.
Running Costs—
Weighing ex silo 3.00
Power 1.50
Labour—In—11 men at 3s. 6d. per hour at 80 tons per hour 5.92
Out—11 men at 3s. 6d. per hour at 50 tons per hour 5.16
Machine maintenance—allowing £160 per annum 3.07
Shifting Machinery and General Tidying up after ships—allow £45 p.a. .86
Maintenance on Silo—at £40 p.a. .77
Rent of Silo Site at £26 per annum 1.07

21.35 based on 30,000 tons = 21.35
Allowance for Contingencies £850 9%
Allowance to meet difference between interest due in the earlier years and the average over 20 years included in the costs 2.00 4.00
Total 1.89

28/11/45.

With the probable shifting of the timber milling activities further south and the provisions of a connecting railway between Normandun and Northcliffe, Albany would be the most convenient port to ship timber from, if a modern wharf is provided.

The zones operated by the Railway Department are based on mileage only, but if grades were considered as well, some alterations of benefit may be made, but in all cases a certain amount of latitude must be allowed and zoning not rigidly adhered to.

The grades from Wagin to Albany and those from Wagin to Bunbury are slightly in favour of the former. By re-grading 10 miles of line at a cost of £75,000 a maximum grade of 1 in 80 could be got from Narrogin to Albany on the “down” journey. If Albany is to be developed as the port of the southern portion of this State it would certainly repay the cost to have this 10 miles of line re-graded. It is well to remember that re-grading is always a temporary means of relieving the congestion complained of. In the event of wool sales being held at Albany, the provision of a fruit inspection shed would be necessary, as the shed now used for that purpose, would be required for wool sales.

The electric lighting on the jetty is inadequate and power mains should be installed to enable a three ton crane to operate.

The complete set up is unsuitable and the provision of a modern wharf, in line of jetties, is the apparent solution. Without a knowledge of the intentions of the Government in this regard the following recommendations are made—

Long Range Policy.

1. Provision of a modern wharf with road access and sufficient berthage space to handle the cargoes now (and for a number of years ahead) offering and capable of being added to when the trade of the port warrants it.

2. Wheat bulk handling facilities that would permit of direct loading from silo to ship should be installed to enable all wheat produced in the Albany zone to be shipped from that port.

3. Fertiliser works are required to prevent the present wasteful haulage of out of zone super and provide back loading from Albany.

4. When the above projects are fulfilled, re-grading of 10 miles of railway line between Narrogin and Albany to give a maximum grade of 1 in 80 should be done.

Short Term Policy.

1. Because the berths are a considerable distance from the town, facilities should be provided to allow the wharf labourers to have their meals and hot water supplied.

2. Lighting on the jetty at berths should be improved and power mains installed.

3. Because of the large quantities of fruit loaded and a likely increase in the export of meat, an electric crane should be provided to expedite the loading of this produce.

4. The ramp at the eastern end of the goods shed in the railway yard should be removed and additional shed accommodation provided for sorting, storing and delivery of cargoes.

5. A tractor is required to move railway trucks at the ship’s side.

6. If the bulk handling facilities mentioned in paragraph (2) of the Long Range Policy is unlikely to be provided for a considerable time it is considered that they should be installed along the lines of the recommendation of the Bulk Handling Committee of 1940.

Esperance.

The jetty is controlled by the Railway Department, and the port by the Harbour and Lights Department. Berthage accommodation is 557 feet on both sides of the jetty, but is limited to ships of 400 feet in length. Depth of water varies from 25 to 38 feet, along the length of berths. Loading draught is 28 feet. The jetty was completed in 1938 and facilities are provided for handling and storing bulk oil supplies.
Esperance is the natural port of the eastern goldfields being 182 miles nearer Kalgoorlie than Fremantle is. If this port is to be developed and ships call at more frequent intervals, steps will have to be taken to organize the general cargo lines required at Norseman and Kalgoorlie and eastward and northward of that place to ensure sufficient tonnage to warrant a more frequent service.

The Chamber of Mines is very keen to get all their supplies from the Eastern States landed at Esperance and the Chamber of Commerce has undertaken to assist in organizing the general cargo requirements of the eastern goldfields for delivery there also. Norseman mining and commercial interest has also promised support.

No wheat or wool is available for export, but there is a local salt company producing about 3,000 tons per annum but little of this is shipped away; nearly all of it comes to the metropolitan area by rail. All the fuel oil requirements of the mining industry is handled in bulk and there is a storage tank provided by the mining companies.

At present a ship from the Eastern States calls at intervals of about three months with approximately 800 tons of cargo. The main drawback to this is the infrequency of the service, because it is not suitable for general merchants to have deliveries only at quarterly intervals, also on some occasions only about eight days' notice is given importers and exporters that the ship is to load in the East. This does not allow sufficient time to get cargoes ready and delivered to the port for loading.

The following recommendations are made:
1. That the Chambers of Commerce and Mines respectively at Kalgoorlie, and the mining and business interests of Norseman confer and give an estimate of the tonnage that could be guaranteed per call, with a ship a month from the the East.
2. When this is done the State Government should approach the Director of Shipping and request that a 6 months' trial be given of a monthly service. It is confidently expected that from the outset of a regular monthly service, sufficient cargoes will be guaranteed to continue it. One firm alone has stated their willingness to divert over 500 tons per month from the trans. railway and the Port of Fremantle, if a regular monthly service is guaranteed.
3. That because a large percentage of the explosives imported from the Eastern State is used in the goldmining industry, the explosive ship should call regularly at Esperance and discharge all cargo there for the eastern goldfields. To enable this to be done magazines would be required at Esperance for storage of explosives, owing to rail transport regulations.
4. There are no amenities, such as a shelter shed or cover from the weather, or a place for the men to have their crib. This should be brought under the notice of the Federal Stevedoring Commission.
5. Provision of a tractor for moving trucks at the ship's side while the locomotive is away shunting elsewhere, is recommended. This would save much time and hand shunting. There is not sufficient electric current available to operate a three-ton crane, but the ship's gear should be able to handle this tonnage expediently.
6. A request was made to have the light replaced at the head of the jetty. This will be done before this report appears in print.
7. No navigation lights are provided on the islands along the channel approaching the harbour and skippers will not come in or go out during the hours of darkness and much time is lost. These would be sea going lights and the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. It is probable that the installation of radar on all ships will solve this problem in a few years' time. As a number of these lights would be necessary it is not considered the amount of shipping likely to use the port at night time would warrant the installation and operating costs.

Electric Lighting on Jetty.
8. No electric current is supplied to, and along the jetty, although the local electric power company states their willingness to supply it, if a request is made. It is considered desirable to have electric light to facilitate handling of cargo at the ship's side and minimize the risk of accident, therefore it is recommended that electric lighting be provided along the jetty and at the berth sites.

Shunting Roads at Berths.
9. These are not considered to be suitable and it is recommended that an alteration be made, the nature of which could be decided upon by the Railway Department and Mr. Hearn, stevedore at Esperance. Two proposals were considered, one being much more expensive than the other, and it is probable that if the above-mentioned parties confer, the cheaper scheme can be made suitable.
10. Surcharge of 5s. per ton—This is considered to be unconscionable. The full rate is charged from the loading port to Fremantle and the imposition of this surcharge cannot be justified. Every effort should be made by both State and Commonwealth Governments to have it abolished.

HOPETOUN.

The Commission did not visit this port but after a careful study of the chart and a report from the engineers of Harbours and Rivers, Mr. S. Young, regarding the condition of the jetty there and an examination, of the potentialities of its hinterland, your Commissioners cannot recommend any action to have this port re-opened.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion it is pointed out that only the major points submitted in evidence have been dealt with in this report, because it would not be practicable to deal with all phases of the problems outlined, covering 732 pages. Every centre visited had gone to much trouble in preparing their case for presentation to the Commission, and great credit is due to the able manner in which it was dealt with. The thanks and appreciation of the Commission are extended to all of those who assisted to put up such a complete case for decentralisation, through better use of our outlets.

I would like to state my personal appreciation and thanks to my colleagues of the Commission for the great assistance given to me as Chairman and the diligent manner in which they applied their energies.
to the problems presented. Much credit is due to the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. F. E. Islip, and his able assistant Mr. L. P. Hawley, for the efficient manner in which they carried out the clerical duties arising out of our inquiries.

"Hansard" reporters also did a splendid job, often under difficult conditions, and to them is extended the appreciation of all members of the Commission, in recognition of a task well done.

The daily Press, as usual, gave great assistance in advertising our meetings, as also did the local papers in the various districts visited, and to them our thanks are tendered.

Dated at Perth this 1st day of August, 1946.

H. H. STYANTS,
Chairman.

L. L. HILL,
Member.

E. K. HOAR,
Member.

L. J. TRIAT,
Member.

W. H. F. WILLMOTT,
Member.

F. E. ISLIP,
Secretary,
Parliament House, Perth.