

been evolved as the result of negotiations between the merchants and the company, and is designed to meet the position in regard to lack of storage facilities at ports. The board constituted under the Bill will be a more representative one than that which has hitherto acted, and will consist of the Commissioner of Railways or his nominee, a nominee of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, a nominee of the merchants and a nominee of the company. The chief functions of the board will be to arrange shipping rosters, so as to make best use of all facilities available for the handling, transport, storage and delivery of wheat, and to prevent disorganisation or congestion which would cause undue delay. They will also see that adequate supplies of wheat are transported to the ports to meet the demands of shippers.

Provision is made to ensure that the holder of a warrant shall be entitled to receive an equivalent quantity of wheat of the same quantity and quality as stated in the document, but not the identical wheat. Certain rights in regard to sampling, and provision for arbitration in cases of dispute, are also included. The powers of the company to impose charges for their services are restricted. They will be permitted to impose a toll charge of $\frac{5}{8}$ d. per bushel, or such lesser charge as may be fixed from time to time by Order-in-Council, and they will be permitted to impose a handling charge of not more than $1\frac{1}{8}$ d. per bushel, and such other charges as may be approved by the Governor. They will not be allowed to make any other levies or charges except such as are fixed or prescribed in the Bill, and the Governor will have power to reduce any of those charges if he considers it necessary to do so. In the event of alterations in charges, they shall not affect the holder of any warrant issued before the alteration took place. The company will be granted a lien against all wheat delivered to their care in respect of the toll and any other charges payable. The company will be obliged to submit a balance sheet and revenue account to the Minister in control, each year, and he will table it in both Houses of Parliament. The company are also obliged to keep such other records as may, from time to time, be prescribed, and their accounts shall be open to inspection at all times by any officer appointed by the Auditor General. Other necessary machinery provisions are included

in the Bill. The measure is chiefly one for consideration in Committee. I trust that members, after having given it full consideration, will place any proposed amendments on the Notice Paper so that I can have them carefully examined and be advised upon them. Then I shall be in a position to give reasons for or against their adoption. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 11th December, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions : Agricultural Bank, liens against wool ...	2417
Transport Board, Claremont bus service ...	2418
Bills : Limitation, returned ...	2418
Bulk Handling, 2a. ...	2418
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 2a., defeated ...	2431
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), Council's amendments ...	2439
Reserves, Council's amendments ...	2440

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK.

Liens Against Wool.

Mr. WARNER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that the Agricultural Bank are enforcing the statutory lien against wool in the drought area where farmers have little or no wheat proceeds? 2, Is he aware that in consequence most of the farmers affected by this action will be unable to carry on? 3, Will he endeavour to have the Bank adopt a more reasonable attitude in the drought stricken areas?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No; although Section 51 of the Agricultural Bank Act gives the Commissioners a

statutory lien over wheat and wool proceeds, when circumstances warrant, each case is considered separately and decided on its merits. 2, No. See Answer No. 1. 3, The Bank is adopting a reasonable attitude in such cases. When the enforcement of the statutory claim absorbs the whole or such portion of the crop and wool proceeds as would embarrass the settler, applications for refunds receive sympathetic consideration.

QUESTION—STATE TRANSPORT BOARD.

Claremont Bus Service.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, In view of the frequent protests by residents of Claremont for permission to board buses between Loch-street and Bay View-terrace, has any action been taken? 2, Have the Transport Board been advised by his department that they no longer fear the competition of Karrakatta bound buses with the Mount's Bay-road trams, and would consent to one stopping place being allotted to the buses between Loch-street and Bay View-terrace? 3, If this advice has not been given would it be accepted by the Transport Board?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, 2 and 3, No.

BILL—LIMITATION.

Returned from the Council with an amendment.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [7.34]: I move—That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. SLEEMAN: (Fremantle) [7.35]: I wish to say a word or two on the motion for the third reading. The Bill has been introduced by the Minister for Lands, and the best point made by the Minister is that the Bill will give a monopoly to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., who, of course, are part and parcel of the Wheat Pool and of Westralian Farmers Ltd. This represents a great reversal of form on the part of the Minister, because some years ago, when a Bill was introduced to grant a monopoly of bulk handling in this State, the

Minister opposed it on the ground that it would be a monopoly. Now we have him bringing down a Bill providing for a monopoly. I hope to be able to show the Minister that he has not been very consistent on this occasion as compared with his attitude when the previous measure was introduced to inaugurate bulk handling. Listening to the second reading debate and to the discussion in the Committee stage, one might have been led to believe that the poor farmers had no friends anywhere, with the exception of members on the Opposition side of the House. They would have us believe that every man's hand is against the farmer. I do not think that is correct. I believe that the farmer has just as many friends on the Labour side as he has amongst members of the Opposition.

Member: He has more.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I believe so, too.

Mr. Sampson: His good friends are here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Colleagues of the member for Swan have stressed that the only friends of the farmer are to be found on that side, and that the hand of everyone else is against him. The hon. member would lead us to believe that all the wages men throughout the country, and especially the waterside workers, want to ruin the farmers. It reminded me of something we heard at Mullewa once; we were assured that all would be ruined. Members opposite would lead one to believe that everybody was out to ruin the farmer. When considering this Bill there are several points that should receive attention. The first is the probable effect of the measure, not on the waterside workers or on the farmers, but on the State generally. The Fremantle Harbour Trust and the Railway Department will be affected. Of that there is no doubt. The amount of revenue that is being received by the Fremantle Harbour Trust now and the amount they will receive under the bulk handling scheme will be very different. Then we have to consider the wages lost to workers in industry. Included in industry are not only the waterside workers, the effect upon whom has been stressed so greatly in this House. Some people would have us believe that the only people who will be affected by the introduction of bulk handling are a few waterside workers. That is not so. Quite a large number of waterside workers will be affected, but quite a large number of other workers will also be affected. Amongst

them I may mention the people who do the bag sewing on the farms, the railway men, the stores clerks, and the tally clerks on the water front. The tally clerks are not generally referred to as waterside workers, though they work on the water front. Then we have to consider what the men are paid at present and the amount that will be paid under bulk handling. We have also to consider the capital cost of the wheat sheds and the gantries on the wharf at Fremantle, which have cost so much money. I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that the Fremantle wharf equipment is amongst the most up-to-date in Australia. The gantries and wheat sheds cost a large amount of money, and I want to know what is going to happen to them. Will they fare the same as the men in the industry? Will thousands of pounds worth of buildings and machinery be scrapped without a chance of getting back the money they cost? Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. will not pay anything towards the cost of scrapping all that valuable plant and machinery. I think it is a strong point that something should be done to ensure that the machinery and plant are not scrapped without compensation being paid for them. Then the ports generally will be affected. Comparatively speaking Geraldton will be affected almost as much as Fremantle. Albany will certainly be affected, and Bunbury in my opinion will be doubly affected. If I am any judge of the situation, Bunbury will get neither bagged wheat nor bulk wheat. Bagged wheat as sent to that port at present will no longer be forwarded, but the wheat will be shipped through Fremantle in bulk. Thus Bunbury is likely to be the greatest sufferer of all the ports.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They have made provision for it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: They have not, and the member for Nelson knows it. The hon. member is not making any provision. Three years ago, when the Bill was before Parliament, the hon. member waxed eloquent against the constitution of the board then proposed and said it was not right. He wanted an independent board, and, he indicated who should constitute the board. Perhaps I had better remind the member for Nelson what he wanted on that occasion. At present he wants a monopoly, but on the 6th Decem-

ber, 1932, he moved an amendment as follows:—

That paragraph (a) be struck out with a view to inserting the following words:—“The trust shall consist of five persons, three of whom shall be bona fide wheatgrowers who are not associated with any wheat-buying partnership or organisation connected with the purchase of wheat, one member to be the nominee of the Commissioner of Railways and a chairman to be appointed by the Government.”

That was what the hon. member wanted three years ago. Where has he stood on this Bill? Has he moved any amendment to secure a board of that constitution? What has happened? Have the whips cracked and has the hon. member been nobbled? The hon. member now wants a monopoly and nothing but a monopoly. If he will make a speech on the third reading of this Bill instead of interjecting, it will be interesting to hear where he stands now. I should like to know what benefit bulk handling will confer on the farmer and what other members of the community will have to pay for it. It is all very well to say that the farmer will be ruined or will lose a lot of money if bulk handling is not introduced. We have to reckon up the advantages and disadvantages and see how much the farmer will lose and what the rest of the community will lose. Then we shall be able to strike a balance and determine whether it will be better for the State generally to have bulk handling, or whether it will be better to continue as at present. Any drastic disturbance of present conditions would have a detrimental effect and might easily outweigh any benefits to be obtained from bulk handling. I hope that even at this late stage something will be done to ensure that the community as a whole will have their interests considered and that the State generally will not be made to suffer in favour of one section of the people. No one desires to place obstacles in the way of the farmer. I know that members opposite think I am raising obstacles to prevent the farmer from getting bulk handling. If I thought that bulk handling would benefit the State as a whole, I would agree to it. But I want to see provision made for the men who are going to be displaced from industry and broken in health by the introduction of bulk handling. Care must be exercised lest the loss to the community be greater than the State

can bear. There is a breaking point. I know from what Ministers have said recently that the finances of the Government are not too good. At the present time we are told that the Government cannot do better than they are doing for the relief workers. Those men have something that is far from being a full-time job. If thousands of additional men are to be thrown on the scrap heap, they will have to look for relief work. I am not going to be a party to taking men from occupations which they have followed for years and turning them on to relief work. Steps must be taken to ensure that that does not occur. The Government desire to assist the farmer. I say that by initiating bulk handling, they are not going to work in the best way to attain that end. For even that section of the community there is a better means of rendering assistance. If the Government seriously wish to assist the farmer, they will look around for some other method. Many sections of the community, especially the farming section, have a one-eyed outlook, and seem to think bulk handling is the only means of aiding agriculture. As much as any man in the community I wish to assist the farmer, but I hold there is another way of doing it. Unquestionably, the farmer must be kept on his farm. During the past two years or so farmers have been abandoning their holdings in numbers. The Government should assist them to remain on their farms. It is the duty of the Government to take the farmer's wheat at a guaranteed price. Without being definite to a penny or two, I should say the farmer ought to be guaranteed about 3s. per bushel. The member for Beverley (Mr. Mann) shakes his head. Will the hon. member say at what price wheatgrowing will pay in Western Australia as part of a system of mixed farming. Many of our so-called farmers grow nothing but wheat. We are told some of them will not keep fowls because "they make a mess in the manger." The Government should determine at what price wheatgrowing will pay as part of mixed farming. With a reasonable guaranteed price, the farmer could be kept on his holding. After receiving that price the farmer will have no more to say regarding the wheat, whether it is handled in bags or in bulk or in buckets. By helping the farmer as sug-

gested, the Government will be helping all other sections of the people. If the wheat does not bring the guaranteed price, the Government will have to stand up to the loss and find the balance. Should the wheat bring more than the guaranteed price, that will be so much to the benefit of the Government and will mean nothing to the farmer. I do not wish to see the introduction of a system of bulk handling of doubtful benefit to the farmer and throwing hundreds of men out of work, thus involving the State in an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds to support men rendered compulsorily idle. As to the bags question, mostly the argument in favour of bulk handling seems to be that the saving to the farmer will be the cost of the bags. As to that cost there is much difference of opinion. However, it is time the Government saw that the farmer got his bags at a much lower price than he has been paying hitherto. The bag combine is one of the strongest combines in the world. We have never tried to assist our farmers in that direction. I would favour the sending of a State ship to India for transport of bags to Western Australia. There would be obstacles placed in the way of our Government obtaining bags at the Indian port, but I believe they could eventually secure them much more cheaply than the present price, besides bringing them here at a much cheaper rate of freight. Any organisation now trying to buy bags in India is refused the chance. The bags must be handled by the agents of the combine in India and brought to Western Australia in the combine's ships, and the combine's agents here must make their profit as well. I do not think either of the propositions I have made should be turned down absolutely. Each of them should receive serious consideration from the Government. The guarantee of a reasonable price for wheat, besides keeping farmers on their holdings, might bring back some of the farmers who have already left their holdings.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have said that the Government have not the funds needed to keep men in employment.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would cost the Government much more to keep the additional unemployed consequent on the introduction of bulk handling. The Leader of the Opposition surely will agree with me that the

Western Australian farmer must receive a reasonable price for his wheat. Does the hon. member throw up his hands in despair and simply say, "Nothing can be done"?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Where would the Government get the money to keep the unemployed in full-time employment?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member had better ask the Ministry that question. I am definitely against the bulk handling system, which cannot prove beneficial to the State. I am perfectly sure I am right in making that statement. If members opposite or members on this side of the Chamber think differently, they are entitled to their opinion. My definite opinion is that bulk handling will not be for the benefit of the State generally. It will throw large numbers of men out of work, and the dust involved in its operation will have a prejudicial effect on the health of the men remaining employed at the handling of wheat. The Leader of the Opposition doubted whether the system creates any dust. I should like the hon. gentleman to go down to Fremantle wharf and work at bulk handling for a day or two.

Mr. Mann: There is dust on the farms, too.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That is true, but the man on the farm works for himself and of his own volition.

Mr. Mann: That is a very poor argument.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The man on the wharf has to take the work or starve. On Fremantle wharf there are hundreds of men who would not go there at all if they could get anything else to do. It is about time some provision was made to protect the health of the men who will have to work at bulk handling if that system becomes an established fact. It will be no remedy to give those men 4d. or 6d. per hour more for working in dust. The proper course is to give them a 4-hour day for a day's pay. In that way the amount of dust swallowed by them would be minimised. Humane considerations demand that we should not allow men to ruin their lives. I quote from page 19 of the report of the Royal Commission on bulk handling—

The Displacement of Labour which arose from the Bulk Handling of Wheat during the 1933-34 Wheat Season:—

Your Commissioners have found considerable difficulty in obtaining definite information regarding the effect of the displacement of labour arising from the bulk handling of wheat during

the 1933-1934 wheat season, particularly in country districts.

At country railway sidings, where wheat is handled in bags, the work is usually done under contract, at a fixed rate of commission, by agents, who, in turn, either directly employ labour to carry out the actual physical handling required or sublet the stacking and trucking of the wheat to sub-contractors who do that kind of work.

At some sidings, under bag handling, from six to ten men were engaged in carrying out the necessary physical handling of the wheat.

During the past two years at sidings where bulk handling facilities have been installed, the number of men employed by Co-operative Bulk Handling, Limited, has been from two to four. Hon. members will note that at sidings where from six to ten men were employed formerly, there are now from two to four employed. The report continues—

According to the information obtained by your Commissioners, very few, if any, additional men have been employed on the farms as a result of bulk handling.

At the port of Fremantle a fairly large number of men have already been displaced in the partial change-over from the bag handling to the bulk handling system.

Owing to the fact that bulk handling has now been in operation for two years, any further displacement of labour which may be brought about by the extension of the system should not be so seriously felt as would have been the case with a sudden change over.

In question 4398, Mr. Thomas Fox, M.L.A., ex-Secretary of the Fremantle Lumpers' Union of Workers, stated that if all the wheat shipped at Fremantle during the season 1933-1934 had been in bags, 212 men would have been employed at a cost of £43,991, but if it had been shipped under the present system of bulk handling only 87 men would have been required at a cost of £18,000, showing a loss in wages to the lumpers of £25,991. Mr. Fox further stated that the bulk wheat actually shipped for the 1933-1934 season necessitated the employment of 41 men at a cost of £8,603, but if a similar quantity of wheat had been shipped in bags, 119 men would have been employed and received wages totalling £24,780, showing a loss in wages to the lumpers of £16,177. As it was necessary, however, to store wheat at Leighton, the employment of 10 additional men at a cost of £2,104 was called for, thus reducing the difference in loss of wages to £14,163.

Mr. Fox's statements show that approximately two-thirds less men are required to handle wheat in bulk than in bags.

This has been supported by the Manager of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, Nichols and Company, Limited, Stevedores of Fremantle, and by Mr. John Thomson, Joint Secretary of Co-operative Bulk Handling, Limited.

Your Commissioners are of the opinion that a further reduction in the number of men required for the handling of wheat in bulk will take place, with the erection of proper and more efficient terminal elevators.

The same ratio of displacement of labour will probably apply at Geraldton, Bunbury, and Albany, when the necessary plant is provided at those ports for the handling of wheat in bulk.

As will be seen, two-thirds of the men now employed will be displaced. Two-thirds of the men now employed on Fremantle wharf and two-thirds of the men employed on all the other wharves—Bunbury, Geraldton and so forth—will lose their employment. My belief is that Geraldton will be affected even more than Fremantle. To sum up, two-thirds of the men usually employed in the handling of wheat will be displaced by the introduction of bulk handling. In addition, the men on the farms sewing bags and so forth will be thrown out of work. Are all those workers to be displaced without something being done for them? If 1,000 men are to be displaced—I regard that as a very low estimate, for I think the number will be more than double that figure—and they average £2 a week only, that will represent £100,000 a year. What do the Government intend to do to compensate those men on account of the loss of wages? I have no objection to labour-saving machinery if it is of benefit to the State and the employees derive some advantage, but I certainly have objection to machinery throwing men on to the scrap heap without provision being made for them. The men should be compensated either by money or the provision of suitable jobs. Even those men who will be employed under the bulk handling system may be in a disadvantageous position and their hours of labour should be reduced. In their report, the Bulk Handling Royal Commission stated—

During the wheat season 1933-34 the amount raised by way of the toll was £28,749 5s. 8d. After deducting therefrom interest on debentures, depreciation on country and port buildings and plant and allowing for other items, both debit and credit, . . . Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. showed a surplus of £20,670 7s 6d. on the season's operations.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I got some of that, and so did every other wheatgrower.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Then the member for Guildford-Midland and the other wheat-growers should be willing to pay something back in order to compensate the men whose health has been, or will be, ruined through the industry. The bulk handling system does not represent all gain to the farmer, and the report of the Royal Commission bears that out. There was a one per cent. loss of wheat

under the system, and, for instance, 80 tons were lost on an 8,000-ton shipment.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That applied to one shipment.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But, as is mentioned in the report, no one seems to know how it happened.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The explanation has been discovered now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That discovery must have been made since the Royal Commission submitted their report. On the other hand, under the bag system there was a gain of 80 tons on a shipment of 8,000 tons. I do not know that the farmers got the advantage of that gain.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Pool got it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The farmers say that they did not get the advantage.

Mr. Seward: Yes, they did.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I think Westralian Farmers Ltd. may have benefited. Therefore I say the farmers should consider whether the bulk handling system is everything that is claimed for it. The system has entailed additional cost to the Railways because special trucks have had to be provided for bulk wheat. Opposition members seem to resent the fact that the Commissioner of Railways has charged a little more for bulk wheat on account of services rendered. Some of these people and their farmer friends want everything and are not prepared to give anything away. In New South Wales the railway authorities claim that it costs more to carry bulk wheat than bagged wheat. On the other hand, if the Government are satisfied that the bulk handling system will benefit the State generally, it is certainly not right to grant a monopoly to one company and shut out other sections just as much interested in the bulk handling of wheat. If it is beneficial to the State as a whole it is not right to grant a monopoly to 10 men who really represent Westralian Farmers Ltd. If members peruse page 6 of the report of the Bulk Handling Commission they will see how the directors and others associated with Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. are also associated in official capacities with Westralian Farmers Ltd., Westralian Wheat Farmers Ltd., and the Wheat Pool of Western Australia. I claim, therefore, that there is no difference between Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., the Wheat Pool, Westralian Wheat Farmers Ltd., and Westralian Farmers Ltd. Notwithstanding that fact, the Minister for

Lands last night agreed to an amendment giving the directors of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. the right to engage in buying and selling wheat.

Mr. Seward: You should ask for the Minister's resignation.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If bulk handling will be of benefit to the State, the Government should have appointed a board to control it rather than hand over a monopoly to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Although the Royal Commission did not say so in those words, they indicated that they would have preferred a different type of control. In their report they stated—

Using the foregoing premises, after viewing it from all angles, especially the avoidance of over-capitalisation, your Commissioners have reached what they believe to be a logical and practical conclusion, that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. should be allowed to continue and extend their operations at country sidings.

Your Commissioners' conclusion that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. should be permitted to continue and extend its operations at country sidings precludes the economic possibility of anyone else competing with them in the bulk handling of wheat. That being so, your Commissioners are of the opinion that the operations of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. should be subject to legislative control to protect those vitally interested.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: There is plenty of protection in the Bill!

Mr. SLEEMAN: Does the hon. member think there should be no protection?

Hon. C. G. Latham: If you do not want to take away that protection, you should support the Bill.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If we are to pass the Bill, it must include that necessary protection. I am not prepared to leave everything to the company and allow them to go for their lives.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: You seem to be opposed to the Bill.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am definitely opposed to the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition tried to make us believe that he too was opposed to the Bill, but that was only his sham fight. He will grab it with both hands when he gets the chance. He has wanted this monopoly and virtually he has got it, so we will see now whether he is really in favour of what he tried to make the Committee believe. The paragraphs I have read show conclusively that the Royal Commissioners thought that a better way to control this business was by a board such

as the Grain Elevators Board in Victoria. But they said that since Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. already had control of 53 sidings, that company should now be given control over the lot. The fact remains that if Bulk Handling Ltd. had not had control over these 53 sidings the Royal Commissioners would have recommended the appointment of a board such as the Victorian board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Victorian board had never handled bulk wheat.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That is so, but we know that when bulk handling is introduced in Victoria it will be controlled by the Grain Elevators Board of that State. We know how Bulk Handling Ltd. came to get control of those 53 sidings. The story is by no means to the credit of those who gave them that control. Four years ago a Bulk Handling Bill was brought down to this House, but was rejected. Our friends opposite who were then in power failed to put the Bill through, but during the following recess, when we were on the eve of an election, members opposite granted those 53 sidings to Bulk Handling Ltd. They had no right to do that; it was done behind the back of Parliament and in defiance of Parliament. Because Bulk Handling Ltd. secured those sidings in that way, under the lap, the Royal Commissioners said that although they did not believe in the system, they must let Bulk Handling Ltd. have control of it. In spite of all that is known against the system, we have the Minister bringing down a Bill to give a complete monopoly to Bulk Handling Ltd., and last night the Minister agreed to an amendment giving those interested in the bulk handling system the right to buy and sell wheat. When the Government decided to grant a monopoly of this business they should not have given it to any particular person, but should have offered it to the highest bidder so to speak. Others should have had the same chance to get it as had Bulk Handling Ltd., which is simply a branch of Westralian Farmers Ltd. If there were going to be a monopoly, everybody interested should have been given a chance to secure it. A few years ago it was said that the farmers were being robbed. I remember when those who were supposed to be the friends of the farmers advised them to hold on to their wheat in the certainty of better

prices. The farmers held on accordingly and in the end lost a considerable amount of money, while the people who dealt with the merchants secured that money. When the price of wheat was down, even in the early part of this year, Bulk Handling Ltd. were freely offering the farmers' wheat to the shippers and others.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Since you know so much about it, why do not you take on the job?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The only reason is that I am concerned about the interests of the poor men in Fremantle who are struggling to make a living.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yours are mere crocodile tears.

The Minister for Mines: If the hon. member were to take on the job, he would be only another one making a profit out of it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, I suppose that I too would want my pound of flesh. The farmers should not be fleeced by those who are supposed to be their friends. We have heard it declared that bulk handling would serve to keep weevil out of the wheat. As a matter of fact, what I classed last night as this Charlie Chaplin meccano system seems to be breeding weevils, for there is ten times as much weevil in evidence now as there was in the days of bagged wheat. It is a disgrace to say that the present system of bulk handling will keep out the weevil, although the orthodox system of bulk handling might do it. From Yarding 730 tons of weevily wheat was sent down, but was rejected.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I will have a wire about that to-morrow morning for you.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have had several inquiries made about Yarding. The Leader of the Opposition should be proud of this Charlie Chaplin system which was going to keep out weevil, but which actually is breeding weevil.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do you know that there is more weevil at Geraldton where there is no bulk handling than is to be found in any other part of the State?

Mr. SLEEMAN: This is a system to protect the farmers' wheat. Yet 730 tons of wheat from Yarding have been rejected as being weevily. The hon. member ought to talk to some of the waterside workers about weevily wheat, and about wet wheat.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are great authorities.

Mr. SLEEMAN: They know what they are handling. I doubt if the Leader of the Opposition knows as much as that, for I have seen him handling Bills here and he did not seem to know much about the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not reflect on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That is not a reflection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am the judge of that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Waterside workers when they are handling weevily wheat know all about it and have to be pretty cunning when they go home. Also when they are handling wet wheat they know all about it because of the abominable smell.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You put up the same story when we were shipping wheat in bags.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, and I took the ex-Minister for Works to see it. I said the wheat was being ruined by the wet and that people who were supposed to be the friends of the farmers were the very people who had the wet wheat. The ex-Minister for Works and the ex-member for Pingelly and the late Mr. Griffiths when they saw the wheat told me I had not exaggerated, that indeed I had rather understated the position. That was the historic occasion when a member of this House brought a member of the Westralian Farmers Ltd. to me to ask what the fuss was about. He came up to see if I could not be quietened.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Did he offer you something?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No. He said the trouble in this country was that we could not get enough moisture into the wheat. He wanted to secure a rake-off.

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume the hon. member is going to connect up this with the motion.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, Sir. I said to that gentleman, "I suppose you will be getting bulk handling here shortly," but he said no, that this country was not suited to bulk handling. Yet these are the very people who are now urging the State to go ahead with bulk handling. They want to go ahead because they find bulk handling is a good milch cow for them. But for bulk handling we should have found Westralian Farmers Ltd. non-existent by now. I was distinctly

told on that occasion that this State was not suited to bulk handling.

Mr. Patrick: Who told you that?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Ask the hon. member who brought that gentleman to me.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Tell us the whole story. You are leaving out the interesting parts.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Leader of the Opposition knows the hon. member and can ask him the name of the man in question. It is not a kind thing to drag a man's name through the House when he is not here to protect himself. Does the Leader of the Opposition doubt the accuracy of my statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the hon. member not to take notice of interjections.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will return to the figures dealing with weevily wheat. Nungarin sent down 150 tons, Bilbarin 192 tons, Dalwallinu 45 tons, a small siding 22 tons and Mandiga 16 tons, a total in a few days of 1,065 tons of weevily wheat. That is the scheme that is going to save the farmers! No doubt an effort was made to get this wheat aboard ship, to mix it up with the other wheat and destroy the lot. Had a select committee been appointed, we should have heard more about that. The Westralian Farmers have cleared in commissions about £10,000 from Bulk Handling Ltd. The Royal Commissioners were of the opinion that it would be better if a lower amount of toll were charged, thus giving the farmers the benefit of the actual cash paid to help them to meet their financial liabilities. The amount received by Westralian Farmers Ltd. in respect of the 1933-34 season by way of profit was £10,204, equal to .221d. per bushel. The Commissioners felt that the maximum profit of Westralian Farmers Ltd. under the 10-yearly contract should be reviewed. Bulk handling is likely to lose us important markets. Japan does not go in for bulk wheat, and some of the Eastern States are getting business that this State is missing. I have here a cutting from a newspaper dealing with that subject and published some time last month. It says that in a little more than a week Japan purchased 750,000 bushels of bagged wheat from Victoria. That trade was worth £125,000 to the farmers and merchants. A fair amount of flour was also bought by Japan during the period for shipment to North China.

Mr. Seward: How much wheat was available in Western Australia then?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have a telegram from the Japanese Consul in Sydney to the effect that most countries prefer bagged wheat, except a few which are equipped with special facilities for bulk handling. Surely the Japanese Consul knows whether his country prefers bulk wheat to bagged wheat.

Mr. Patrick: Japan buys very little wheat.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Japan is one of our biggest customers.

Mr. Seward: You are mixing up wheat with wool.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I wish now to refer to the evidence of Mr. Tindale, the engineer.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He would be a good authority on bulk handling!

Mr. SLEEMAN: He is a good enough authority to say whether the meccano set was efficient or not. He said there was a lack of elasticity about the loading facilities, and that the maximum rate of loading was 400 tons per hour per vessel. According to him the life of country bins was 15 years, and if any party was prepared to spend an inordinate amount on maintenance the business could go on indefinitely. Mr. Fethers was an interested party.

Mr. Patrick: He wanted to transport wheat in bags and cut the bags open.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We could feel the weight of his opinions last night.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Last week one of the newspapers published a photograph of wheat being handled in bulk, showing a man holding a bag ready to cut it open. Mr. Fethers said the ships could not take full cargoes of bulk wheat from Geraldton. He also said that the £20,000 should not be included in any comparison of costs between one system and another. He claimed that the farmers did not gain any benefit in cash from that charge. He regarded bulk handling as a function of the Government because it was a public utility and should be controlled as such. Only by that means could everyone be assured of co-operation between Government departments. He did not put up any brief for a monopoly in bulk handling. When he claimed the business should be controlled by the Government he was voicing my opinion too.

The Minister for Agriculture: Mr. Fethers would carry some weight.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Only with the Government. We could hear him last night. He is quite all right to quote.

Mr. SLEEMAN: When it suits me to do so. I have no desire to suggest that Mr. Fethers was right in everything he said. He was questioned about the Grain Elevator Board in Victoria. He said that if such a board were appointed here the authorities would have to ensure that there was proper co-operation with the Government departments. Mr. McCallum of Dalgety's said—

By careful observation, study, and wide inquiries made in different spheres, particularly from the masters of grain-carrying steamers, I arrived at the conclusion that the shortages are the result of several factors, the principal one being sweat.

Many experts will maintain that grain should gain weight in transit; but such a contention is absurd, and will not stand any sound reasoning. I need not explain to you gentlemen that grain does sweat in transit, especially in the holds of ships, and in some instances sweats fairly extensively, especially during a spell of heavy weather when the holds cannot be properly ventilated. Sweat means that something is being lost all the time, the sweat escaping during ventilation; and of course it is impossible to do without the ordinary ventilation. I have seen cargoes arrive which had sweated so much that the grain was caked and heated, and some of it almost on fire. Several factors were responsible viz., the grain was too young or green when shipped, and immediately on leaving port the ship met with heavy weather, which continued for many days, and made necessary the keeping of the hatches well battened, thus accentuating the sweating.

Grain which is too young or green when shipped, will sweat more than properly-seasoned grain. For instance, maize shipped from the Argentine loses more weight in transit than maize shipped from other countries, the reason being that maize from the Argentine can be shipped "too young." The Argentine Government has a good system of inspection; but I have it on the best authority that when a shipper is anxious to catch a good market, he can "arrange" for his grain to be passed as suitable for shipment although not really so, the result being that such a cargo on arrival in the United Kingdom would show a shortage of as high as nearly $1\frac{1}{4}$ or may be $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Cargoes of maize from South Africa show the least shortage of any, mostly averaging less than $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., the reason being that the South African Government has, I suppose, the most rigid system of grain inspection. It is impossible to influence the Government inspectors to pass grain for shipment which is not actually seasoned enough to stand a long voyage.

Every cargo of grain is bound to lose weight through sweating, but as I have pointed out, the volume of sweating varies. I have known boats to arrive which had run with open hatches for 10 days at a time. This, whilst allowing

the sweat to escape, which is imperative, however, diminished the total volume of sweating. If Western Australian wheat is averaging one per cent. shortage overseas, then I would be bold enough to say that those responsible are allowing wheat to be shipped which is too young. Before wheat is shipped it should be full grown, well seasoned, after bagging or bulking, in an atmosphere which tends to reduce sweating. The reason Western Australian wheat is being shipped young may be to catch markets, and through lack of proper study of wheat shipping. I may say that I have no idea what method of wheat inspection is in force in Western Australia, but you will be fully conversant with the position. In any case, I am convinced that the whole wheat position from grower to overseas port of discharge needs a thorough reorganisation. The bulk handling scheme has been rushed too much, as my experience shows that bulk wheat tends to sweat more than bagged wheat, hence greater shortages will result. Bagged wheat stowed in the hold of a steamer allows of the passage of air between the bags and the air playing on the bags has much the same effect as air on a waterbag viz., a tendency towards coolness and little sweating. Bagged wheat does not cake, and does not become overheated.

And so on right through. I do not want to read any more of that. It shows the disadvantages of bulk handling generally. I also wish to quote from the speech of the ex-Minister for Works, Mr. McCallum.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do you mean the memorable one which he had printed and which Dalgety and Co. sent out by the hundred?

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is going to be printed again now in "Hansard." He said:—

If members will refer to Q. 1686, they will see that the witness who was being examined declared he had been offered, and allowed by the superphosphate company, 7s. a dozen for his super bags. I can endorse that witness's statement as a result of my own experience. That means a return of 7d. a bag, which is more than 2d. a bushel, and yet the Committee made no allowance at all for these bags. One farmer submitted his figures and made an allowance of 2d. a dozen for his bags. When asked by the chairman of the select committee why he had done so, the witness replied that he had been offered 2d. a dozen for his second-hand bags. So it will be seen that in that respect the report is obviously wrong. Some bags are essential and the select committee in their report make no allowance whatever for the cost of bags to be used on the farm. The only farmer who gave evidence that he had bought bags was a witness named Diver, who said that he had bought a bale of 300 sacks, but those were the only bags accounted for in respect of the total harvest of 73,095 bushels. That is obviously ridiculous.

that shows the kind of evidence dished up at some of the select committees. I read that

extract merely to show the evidence given in regard to bags. We will now see what the present Minister for Lands had to say on bulk handling. At page 962 of "Hansard," Volume 1, 1932, he said—

It would be most unwise to introduce any methods by which marketing in the East would not be payable to our wheatgrowers. I am not prepared, however, to dispute the statements made by the Minister with regard to these facts; but what I am prepared to dispute is that the scheme proposed in the Bill will ensure to the producer either that reduction in costs which he seeks, the advantages claimed, or that liberty of action which is so necessary to the development of the farmer. Further, I doubt whether the scheme would not, in fact, handicap the farmer's operations, upset his farming economy, and do damage to the State generally.

The Minister wanted liberty of action; he did not want a monopoly. He did not want private enterprise to be interfered with.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is the view of the Opposition.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have heard the Opposition say they do not want to interfere with private enterprise.

The Minister for Lands: I hope what you have read will be useful to you.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister said he doubted whether the scheme would not, in fact, handicap the farmer's operations, upset his farming economy, and do damage to the State generally. We do not wish to bring into existence a system which the Minister four years ago said was going to handicap the farmer, upset his farming economy, and do damage to the State generally. We do not want that to happen in this State, and we hope the Bill will not go on to the statute-book, because there is no doubt what will happen if it does. The Minister went on to say—

In the first place the Bill gives an absolute monopoly of wheat handling to the Wheat Handling Trust, which is to be the trustees of the Wheat Pool under a new name; and the Bill provides a maximum penalty of £100 to be enforceable against any wheatgrower who has the temerity to deliver wheat to any but the trust's agents. Had such a provision been included in a Bill sponsored by this side of the House, it would have been said that by such a coercive Act, we were commandeering the farmers' wheat, as was said in the early days of the war, when wheat was taken over by the State and Commonwealth Governments. It would have been said that we were imperiling the very structure of society by socialistic legislation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I told you that we had become Democrats and you the Conservatives.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member is democratic when he wants a monopoly like this. He is sitting back and saying to the Minister, "What a rotten Bill this is," but when it comes to a vote he shows where he stands. He has been putting up a smoke-screen and bluff for the last three or four days.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are putting up a fairly substantial barrage now, but with very little effect.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It may not have much effect, but that will not be my fault. If the Leader of the Opposition votes as he has indicated he will during the last few days, the Bill should go out, but we cannot see him voting as he talks. He talks one way and votes another. Mr. Troy continued—

It would be said that we were dealing a death-blow to private enterprise, and insidiously stifling that competition which hon. members opposite declare to be the life of trade. It is an amazing thing that a Government of the opinions held by hon. members opposite should introduce a policy which provides against freedom of trade, and which seeks to place upon the statute-book a measure violating their ideas. . . . It does interfere with freedom of trade. The trust will have an exclusive right throughout the State to receive wheat at railway stations or sidings where bulk handling facilities have been, or may thereafter be, provided.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are reading too fast. We cannot follow you.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Mr. Troy continued—

Further, the Bill provides penalties for farmers who violate the provisions of the measure. If a farmer does this or that or does not do this or that, a penalty is provided for him. But no penalty at all is provided for the Trust.

As I pointed out before, the Minister said the scheme would handicap the farmer's operations, upset his farming economy, and do damage to the State generally. I do not stand for that, and that is why I have been doing my best for the last two or three days to see that the Bill does not go on the statute-book. I hope it will not. Mr. Troy went on to say—

Last year many farmers who sold their wheat to merchants secured prices which the Pool will not realise.

I think I mentioned this myself earlier in the evening. He continued—

If I may mention my personal experience, I sold a quantity of my wheat to Dalgety's at 3s. 4d. a bushel at the siding. I could have sold all my wheat to Dalgety's, and I knew I should have done so, if I had consulted only my own interests. On the other hand, I had

given my word to the Pool that I would dispose of half of my wheat to them, and I kept my word. Dalgety's paid 3s. 4d. a bushel to the farmers at my siding who sold their wheat to that firm, but I do not think we can look to any such results this year.

These people, who cannot pay the poor struggling farmer the same price as the merchants pay, are going to control this monopoly, with a guarantee of only £20,000. This branch of a poverty-stricken firm, with a guarantee of only £20,000, will control the bulk handling system. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister, will, even at this late stage, reconsider the Bill, put it into the melting pot, or throw it out, or do anything he likes but put it on the statute-book. I say it is a disgrace. Then Mr. Troy went on to say—

I did my part of my business with the Pool last year, and I will do so again. I realise the value of the merchant in the wheatgrowing industry, because he can provide a market for the farmers' wheat.

He did not want it handled by the Trust that was going to operate under that Bill, but it is now going to be handled by the monopoly that will be set up if the Bill now before the House passes. Mr. Troy went on to say—

I do not insist that the Trust will hamper the merchant, but the Minister has already pointed out that in New South Wales the Trust controlling the bulk system there did hamper the wheat merchants in that State. Later on, I shall quote to the House, in support of my contention, particulars regarding the position in New South Wales. Then again, if it were not for the credit provided by the merchants, a large proportion of the acreage this year would not be under crop. The merchants advance money to promote the growing of wheat, and to finance other phases of the industry.

In reply to all that we are going to push a monopoly on to them, and they will have no say at all. Mr. Troy went on to say—

At the end of ten years I do not think there will be any assets.

That is where I agree with the Minister most emphatically. He continued—

The bulk handling scheme outlined under the Bill is the scheme condemned by the Minister and the expert committee he appointed, as entirely unsuitable for Western Australia. By the courtesy of Westralian Farmers Ltd., I was able to inspect the bulk handling scheme installed at Wyalkatchem, Benjabbering, Trayning, and other centres last year. The Westralian Farmers are to be commended for their action in initiating such an experiment. The operations were very interesting, and so far as they went, were suitable for the then existing circumstances. But I cannot imagine

a scheme of that character being of much value to the producers of the State at the end of ten years.

The farmers have been promised a scheme at the end of 10 years, and in the Minister's own words of three years ago, they could get nothing at the end of 10 years. That is another reason why the Bill should not be placed on the statute-book. Mr. Troy continued—

Bearing in mind the construction methods to be employed and the maintenance that will be required, the installation will not be of much use ten years hence. Although the farmers will have paid the toll to pay back the money advanced for the provision of the bulk handling scheme, I do not think any assets will remain at the end of the ten-year period. That represents one of my objections to the Bill. I realise the value of the experiment, but I regard the work simply as an experiment. Because of the experience gained, I cannot agree that such a bulk handling scheme is suitable for the producers of this State.

If it was not suitable for the producers of this State three years ago, it is not suitable for them now. What is the use of the Minister bringing down a Bill to put into operation the same scheme with a little variation? The scheme is there; the buildings are there; the main part of the system is the same as it was then. Yet the Minister is now proposing to foist a monopoly on one section of the community and is chopping the others out. The best thing to do would be to drop the Bill. Mr. Troy continued—

I ask members to imagine what the assets would be like at the expiration of ten years of a scheme built for £625,000, providing facilities for the greater portion of the State, in comparison with the assets costing £1,500,000 providing for the Fremantle zone alone. It may be that the figure of £625,000 has been inserted only as an inducement to get the Bill approved both here and in the country.

Then Mr. Troy proceeded to quote how he handled his own crop—

In order to keep down the cost of my farming operations—bulk handling may not affect my siding because it is too small, and I say, "Thank God for that"—I use horses, because I know what farm economy means to me. I use horses for harvesting, and I use them as long as I can for carting to the siding. I have hired motor trucks to do my carting when the price of wheat was good, but by using horses I can grow wheat for half the cost that tractors and trucks would entail. There is this also to be considered: In Western Australia harvesting is done easily because we have good climatic conditions. But there are occasions when, during the harvesting season, storms occur and then we are able to cart to the siding. If we are to employ trucks—

It has been said that trucks would be used for bulk handling—

If we are to employ trucks, it will mean that when harvesting is held up, the trucks will be held up. How then can the costs of the farmer be reduced? The costs will not be reduced. I know that my costs will be increased. Mr. Thomson points out that the farmer will do other work when harvesting is finished. We know, however, that the farmer does not do other work then. He has no other urgent work to do; it is the time when it is possible for him to get away for a spell from the farm. Proper farming economy provides that we must use horses. I am not going to encourage the use of motor power in Western Australia, and this House should not support anything to bring about that state of affairs.

The then Minister for Works interjected, "I am selling all my horses." Mr. Troy proceeded—

But the Minister is not far from a siding. I could go further in criticising bulk handling by asking what is going to happen to the farmer who is 15 or 20 miles from a railway. Members know what it is to have to cart from ten to 15 miles. How will farmers keep their harvesters busy and cart at the same time with limited teams? How will they get their wheat away in bulk? It will be utterly impossible. But it is not going to be impossible now. We are going to foist bulk handling on to them. It was utterly impossible three years ago, but it is not impossible now. The then Minister for Works made an interjection about cornsacks, and Mr. Troy said—

Even cornsacks will not last for three seasons, though, with exceptional care, they might last for two seasons. A farmer will use his phosphate sacks if he gets his phosphate late. If he buys it in January, the bags will not be of much use in May if they have been emptied, because the acid in the meantime will have done its deadly work. For the farmer who buys his super in March, it is all right. I know that the bags that came to me in January were of no value in May, but the bags that I purchased in March or April I was able to make use of, but only for one season. The bags containing seed wheat would not hold wheat till sowing time, though they would hold oats. The bags will not stand the wear and tear of filling and carting to the siding. Of course they may be extraordinarily strong sacks. But it has not been my pleasant experience to come across any of them. The Minister spoke of the necessity for obviating the importation of cornsacks, which he said, during the last ten years had cost the State landed here, £4,752,000. Those figures are misleading, because the bags were utilised not solely for the haggling of wheat. No fewer than 200,000 dozen bags are required in this country for superphosphate, and that number is included in the Minister's figures of expenditure. Therefore it is not fair to give those figures to the House because they do not represent the facts.

We have had evidence of how the farmers are going to use super sacks, and will not have to buy cornsacks. They are going to wash their super sacks and use them next year and continue to use them.

Mr. Moloney called attention to the state of the House.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is the Government's responsibility to keep the House. It is most extraordinary for a Government member to call for a quorum.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Mr. Troy went on to say—

Respecting Railway expenditure on the installation of a bulk handling system, curiously enough, or significantly enough, although the Minister read a letter from the General Manager of the South African railways and quoted some opinions from America, he was strangely silent about the opinion of our own Commissioner of Railways. We have it in evidence, however, what bulk handling will mean to the railway expenditure in Western Australia. We must not imagine that if we get a few pence reduction in the cost of handling that the farmer will get a reduction in costs. The expenditure on the railways that will be involved by the introduction of this principle cannot be divorced from the consideration of a bulk handling scheme. I would not be surprised to discover that the Commissioner is in agreement with the views expressed by Mr. J. J. Poynton, manager of the Midland Railway Company, and published in the "West Australian" on the 25th September. The objections raised by Mr. Poynton apply with equal force to the Government Railways in Western Australia, and perhaps to a greater extent, because the expenditure on Government railways will be higher than any expenditure that might have to be incurred by the Midland Railway Company.

Mr. Poynton, in his statement, said—

The effect on the railways of this State seems to have had little attention. Much expense would be involved in converting rolling stock, which was never intended for the carriage of bulk wheat. It is probable that the number of wagons found to be suitable for alteration would then be considerably short of requirements of wheat transport, and if so, new wagons would be necessary

The scheme which the Minister's committee condemned, and which the Minister and the Cabinet also considered unsuitable, he now takes up in this House, introducing it in this Bill. I am disinclined to believe that the Minister believes a word of the proposal. The least intelligent man in the country, the stupidest man in the country, could not consistently adopt such an attitude. What occurs to me is that some outside influence has induced the Minister to put himself in such a position with regard to this measure. I can only assume

one thing—that it was the threat made by a prominent man in this country that it was to be the Pool scheme, or nothing. In the “West Australian” of the 6th July, this very prominent gentleman, who is regarded as a political power not in this House but outside it—I contend that people who want political power should come into this House—

Then Mr. Troy went on to say, and in this I think he was perfectly right—

I do not desire that the House shall waste time over a select committee on the Bill.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Should not your colleague withdraw that statement?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I cannot discuss that now. Mr. Troy continued—

I think we are called upon to unanimously kick the Bill downstairs. I conclude by saying that though the opinions I have expressed may give annoyance outside this House and inside this House my views are in the best interests of the farmers, a class whose interests I have always considered, a class of whom I am one. And further I give my opinion and vote in the best interests of Western Australia. I definitely oppose the second reading.

Most of Mr. Troy's complaints against that Bill were due to the monopoly system. He was opposed to the people who were going to handle the wheat. He argued that he believed the company could not handle the scheme and should not be granted a monopoly. Yet we are forced to have practically the same scheme, with a few alterations, pushed on to us now. On the 6th December, 1932, Mr. Troy said—

One of the directors of the Pool has already been associated with schemes on which the Government have advanced money the repayment of which was assured within reasonable time. The Auditor General's report contains a list of the moneys advanced by the Government to assist similar enterprises. The assistance given amounts to £452,000 and that money is still owing to the Government. Yet every penny of it was borrowed on a similar assurance to that given on this occasion. Take one enterprise of which a member of the Pool was a director; the W.A. Meat Export Co. owe the State £148,000. Except that the State uses portion of the works for abattoirs and pays for a lease of the property there is no income from it and the buildings were constructed eight or ten years ago.

I should say that the Minister then inferred that the gentleman in question was not possessed of sufficient business acumen to be allowed to run a scheme of this kind, but he is going to be allowed to run it now. The same people are still the interested parties. They are going to manage and handle the whole of the bulk wheat in this State. When

Mr. Troy had reached that point, Mr. Collier interjected, “The works have never paid sinking fund or anything else.” And Mr. Troy proceeded—

Last year the Pool controlled at most 44 per cent. of the wheat. What about the growers who did not pool? We must have regard for the 60 per cent. who are not represented by the Pool. My objection is not directed against the Pool. I object to giving any one body a monopoly unless the people desire it.

The Leader of the Opposition, who speaks for the promoters of the scheme, says they do not desire a monopoly and have not asked for a monopoly. If it is possible to eliminate the monopoly without damaging the Bill, we should do it. Yet the Minister, after having made those statements three years ago, is pushing a monopoly on to people who say they do not want it. The Minister said his objection lay not against the Pool, but to giving any one body a monopoly unless the people desired it. Mr. Troy went on to say—

The Pool, in the period of greatest prosperity, never handled all the wheat and will not handle it unless there is a compulsory Pool. It is not in the interests of the people to allow one body of men to handle the whole of the product. I have the greatest respect for the members of the Pool, all of whom are honourable decent men, but they do not comprise all the brains of the community.

I agree with that statement.

The people should have representation. I would not be a party to cutting them out.

I think I have said enough for this evening.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We endorse that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We shall see whether the hon. member will vote with me. My next business is to cast my vote; and I shall cast it on this and every other occasion against a scheme which will throw out of employment so large a number of men without either compensating them or ensuring the health of workers who, continuing in the industry, are consigned to a slow death. No miner in this Chamber but will see that provision is made for safeguarding the health of the men working at bulk handling. The disease from dust in that avocation is similar to miners' disease. My father died of miners' complaint, and it is not my desire to see any of the Fremantle lumpers die of a similar complaint. I hope the third reading of the Bill will be defeated. It is not a fit and proper measure to pass in the absence of provision for safeguarding the

health of the men remaining in the industry. It gives me very great pleasure to oppose the third reading of the Bill.

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

Ayes	33
Noes	10

Majority for	23
--------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Cross	Mr. Seward
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hawke	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Hegney	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Latham	Mr. Warner
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Watts
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Doner
Mr. North	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Fox	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 3rd December.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. J. Kenneally—East Perth) [9.24]: This measure proposes to amend the State Transport Co-ordination Act. Hon. members will recollect that after lengthy debates Parliament determined to pass a measure for the regulation of transport. To that end Parliament constituted a board which in the opinion of the two Houses was calculated to extend reasonable treatment to all interests involved. Provision was made in the measure for the selection of specially qualified men. The parent Act gives to persons who had the right to run commercial vehicles on a prescribed route for 12 months or more prior to the passing of the Act,

the right of appeal to a stipendiary magistrate in the event of their applications for further licenses being refused by the Transport Board; the decision of the stipendiary magistrate to be final. Appeals were lodged by many persons, but were withdrawn upon the board undertaking to extend existing licenses for certain periods. The Bill proposes that any person who chooses to apply for a license to run a commercial vehicle, if his application is refused by the board, shall have the right of appeal to the resident magistrate in whose district the route over which the applicant wishes to run is located. I desire to draw the attention of hon. members to the effect the carrying out of such a proposal would have on the provisions of the Act. The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs), in introducing the Bill, correctly stated that the parent Act, since coming into operation, had caused railway freight rates to be considerably reduced, particularly on farm products. The question arises where hon. members desire those reduced freights to continue, whether they desire the co-ordinating measure approved by Parliament to continue to operate in the interests of farmers and of the people generally, or whether they desire, by re-introducing the old higgledy-piggledy system of transport, to compel the Commissioner of Railways again to raise freights to make the railway system pay. Hon. members will realise that we cannot have it both ways. A board of experts to control traffic was appointed, charged with considerable responsibilities. A Government officer was appointed to the board, there was a representative of rural industries, and a representative of business interests. Those members were selected on account of their expert knowledge of the subject of transport. The parent Act further provided that the members of the board should be persons who, in the opinion of the Government, were capable of assessing the financial and economical effects on the State as a whole of any transport policy. The Bill proposes to take away all those features from the Transport Board. An applicant for a license need not have had the right previously to run a vehicle for 12 months on a specified route, as required by the parent Act, before possessing the right of appeal. He need not, in fact, have run a vehicle on

any route in the State, to enjoy the proposed right of appeal from the board, not to a stipendiary magistrate, but to the magistrate through whose district the proposed route happens to run. I do not think it needs much explaining that that proposal, if agreed to, will lead to conflicting determinations in different parts of the State.

Mr. Moloney: We might as well do away with the board altogether.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; as indicated by the hon. member interjecting, we shall be making the operations of the board absolutely useless. The members of the board have been appointed, and are being paid, on account of their expert knowledge. Magistrates are not charged with the responsibility of possessing expert knowledge of transport matters. Hence, in the first place, the desire of the Legislature not to leave transport questions to the determination of magistrates, but to appoint an expert board to decide them. The members of the board have shown, by the attention they have given to transport questions, that they are prepared to extend due consideration to the interests of every section of the community in every part of the State. In point of fact, from the district of the hon. member sponsoring the Bill here, and from neighbouring districts, deputations have waited on me to ask for various alterations. As hon. members are aware, the Transport Board are independent; but on certain phases they have power to recommend. The board have gone into the questions raised. It was pointed out by them that various Governments had promised a railway to connect Boyup Brook with Cranbrook, and that because of the line not having been constructed numerous settlers located between the two railway centres were without adequate means of transporting their produce. The board gave consideration to that aspect, and instituted an entirely new system—a system which I hope the present Government and succeeding Governments will support. When it appears to the Government that it will not be profitable to construct a railway, Ministers will support the Transport Board in providing a service for the people in the districts affected. So it is that in this district the Government have made provision for an annual subsidy at the rate of £500 a year for the conveyance of produce from districts lying between the two railway centres

to the railways, either at Boyup Brook or Cranbrook. Provision was made in the tender whereby those who live at greater distances from the railway centres should receive additional and preferential treatment in the carriage of their produce. The Government also gave the contractor the right to make his own arrangements to take produce to and from those centres to the persons concerned. In effect, he could trade, if necessary, as an ordinary railway depositing and receiving station. That has been done, and therefore attention has been given to the people in the area between these two railway points. In addition, the Transport Board had given consideration to the carriage of super and wheat from Hopetoun to Ravensthorpe because they regarded that course necessary. They adopted that attitude even before the Government decision relative to closing down the Ravensthorpe-Hopetoun line was made known. It will be seen, therefore, that the Transport Board give their attention to the requirements of the people throughout the whole of the State. They are even prepared to assist settlers where such help is required. If we are to interfere with the operations of the Transport Board as suggested by the Bill, it is good-bye to co-ordinated control of our transport arrangements. It will mean reverting to the time when Parliament considered radical alterations were necessary. At that time it was pointed out that unless we had transport co-ordination, there could not be any reduction in freight rates. Since there has been co-ordination, that reduction has taken place in progressive stages, but if the Bill be agreed to, it will be good-bye to those reductions. Instead of being merely regarded as a small amendment to the principal Act, the Bill would be better named a measure to make provision for a direct route for traffic from Kojonup to Perth. The difficulties under which the people of the district labour have been placed before the Minister and the Transport Board, and adequate attention has been given to their requirements. Taking all these facts into consideration, I hope members will see the necessity for throwing the Bill out on the second reading and so indicating that the Act we passed quite recently, which has operated successfully in the interests of the people, is not to be interfered with, particularly in the manner suggested in the Bill. While the Bill proposes to provide additional advantages

for people in country districts, it also, by its wording, makes it possible for the extended provisions to apply in the metropolitan area. The operations of the Bill will not be confined to country districts. If the Bill be agreed to, it will be possible for an individual to apply to-morrow for permission to run commercial goods vehicles over roads parallel to railway lines or tramway routes. If the board refuse any such application, the individual concerned will have the right of appeal to a magistrate to upset the decision of the board. Definite provision to that end is included in the Bill. That decision will be final. I ask members not to adopt that principle, for it would mean a multiplication of varying decisions by magistrates in separate magisterial districts. If they agree to the Bill, it will mean reverting to the position in which we found ourselves before the Act was passed. I hope the Bill will be rejected.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [9.38]: I expected that the member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) would have had something to say regarding the Minister's remarks.

The Minister for Railways: If he had, he would have closed the debate.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: There is room for more co-ordination, particularly in connection with the railway traffic arrangements.

Mr. Moloney: The Bill will not affect anything in that regard.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I was one of those who voted in favour of supreme powers being delegated to the Minister to control the whole of the transport facilities both as regards goods and passenger services. I regret that the promises made then have not been fulfilled, and the Minister for Railways realises the fact.

The Minister for Railways: I do not. Many promises were fulfilled.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Most decidedly we have not received what we anticipated.

The Minister for Railways: You cannot do everything in 12 months.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It is disappointing to know that our system of transport has not improved one iota.

The Minister for Railways: You are a bad judge.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am not, because I know the position. The journey from Perth to Melbourne takes from 12 to 14 hours because of the unnecessary stops. God forbid

that I should say the railways are over-staffed, but I cannot for the life of me discover any reason why trains should stop at every siding for 10 or 12 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is well away from the Bill.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am on the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not so. The Bill seeks to amend Section 37 and that will not allow of a general discussion regarding transport matters.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill applies to the transport of passengers as well as to the whole of the operations of the service.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill does nothing of the sort.

The Minister for Employment: It deals with commercial goods vehicles.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: If it does not, then I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have trespassed on your time. I will ask the Minister why he cannot do something to improve the present position.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can do that by way of a question at some other time.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I have great sympathy for the member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) in regard to the transport difficulties of his constituents. We have built what amount to King's highways alongside our railways, and all our merchants and traders, if they had the opportunity, would avail themselves of road traffic to-morrow instead of the railways because the former is so much cheaper. That applies doubly in the district affected by the Bill and that is the crux of the whole position. If the Commissioner of Railways would only wake up to the fact that we have these splendid roads running parallel to the existing railway lines, he would alter his scale of freight charges. The people of Kojonup, if they used motor transport, could transact their business at one fourth of the cost they incur in using the railways and reach their journey's end a day earlier.

The Minister for Employment: The Bill does not deal with passenger traffic.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am confining myself to safe ground, irrespective of the interjection of the Minister. We must do something and it behoves the Minister for Railways to bring his influence to bear on the Commissioner to investigate the position from A to Z, and place the country people in a better position. The whole of our

destiny is linked up with our railways, on which we are paying, I understand, about a million pounds per annum in interest and sinking fund.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is not going to discuss the finances of the railways.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Unless we can get the sympathy of the Minister controlling the railways there is certainly something lacking. Irrespective of the Minister's remarks, I hope the House will reconsider the position and see if we cannot give something to that district in particular which has caused my friend a great deal of unnecessary worry and trouble through the obstinacy of the Transport Board. The Minister should be a little lenient with those people. I will support the Bill.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [9.47]: In supporting the second reading of the Bill I hope the House will see fit to agree with the principle contained in it.

The Minister for Employment: I hope they won't.

MR. WATTS: Probably the Minister feels that way. I seem to remember that when other Bills have been before the House this right of appeal has been properly granted against the decision of other boards. One case coming to my mind is that of the Whole Milk Board. It seems to me there should be some appeal other than from Cæsar to Cæsar. The members of the Transport Board may be experts in their business; I know that the chairman is so, but nevertheless even experts have been known to make mistakes. When it comes to deciding the question of whether or no licenses should be granted, the matter should be put before someone who is used to weighing evidence and who can bring both parties together and, after an examination of all there is to be heard on both sides, can give a final decision. But that is not the procedure with the Transport Board. The case of the Kojonup district is the one that has given rise to the Bill before us. I do not actually represent Kojonup, but I feel that since I have been in the House, so much have I heard of that case that I can sympathise with the member for Wagin when he is wearing a worried look. But although the Bill does arise from the troubles in the Kojonup district, I put it to the House that what Kojonup is suffering to-day other dis-

tricts may, probably will, be suffering in the near future. We seem to be in some difficulty as to which branch of transport we are discussing, but I suggest to the House that there is a great difference between motor transport and those trains which carry both passengers and goods. Some time ago the chairman of the Transport Board took an opportunity to go to Kojonup. He left Perth by car in the morning taking, I think, the member for Wagin with him. He reached Kojonup in the early afternoon and returned to Perth that night. Had he travelled by the train which carries goods and passengers to Kojonup, to reach Kojonup on the date he did he would have been obliged to leave Perth on the Thursday afternoon, and would not have arrived back in Perth until the following Tuesday. So the House will see that the position of Kojonup is rather more difficult than that of most cases elsewhere.

Mr Wansbrough: It is not worse than that of Denmark.

MR. WATTS: I have already said that what is Kojonup's case to-day may be some other district's case to-morrow. I am dealing with Kojonup because I happen to know that the chairman of the Transport Board went there. When the Transport Co-ordination Bill was brought before the House it was of considerable interest in country districts, and I was one of those who supported it from outside because the word "co-ordination" means the bringing together of conflicting interests with a view to harmonious results. Unfortunately I do not think the harmonious results have yet materialised. Had the sentiments expressed by the Minister on the second reading of that Bill been followed in their entirety by the Transport Board, when created, I am convinced that some true co-ordination would have resulted, and harmonious results would have been achieved between interests which undoubtedly must conflict, and the iniquities which have given rise to this Bill would never have occurred. Let me quote from the Minister's speech as reported in "Hansard" of the 14th November, 1933—

Transport is like most things in these times. Many and extensive improvements have been made. The evolution of the internal combustion engine has brought with it great convenience and great mobility, besides playing a useful part in the development of the country. No reasonable per-

son would endeavour to stop the progress or deny the advantage of motor transport. Undoubtedly there is a sphere of usefulness for trams and trains as well as for motor transport, and even transport by means of horses. So long as each of these respective spheres keeps to what it can do best in the interests of the community, no harm will be done but much good will accrue to the State. Each system of transport should be encouraged so long as it is used in the best way to supply the needs of the people.

The people of the Kojonup district contend that in view of their isolated position and their long distance by rail from more important centres, motor transport can best be used to supply their needs. The Minister went on to say—

The constantly changing forms of transport to supply the needs and to cater for the requirements of the public, show that each should be allowed its respective spheres of usefulness, with the least harm to other vital and necessary forms of transport. Wherever possible it has been the object of legislation to co-ordinate and control transport so that there will be no overlapping or detrimental opposition or competition between forms of transport that would be harmful to those sections and, incidentally, harmful to the State in its effect. There are two divergent schools of thought based, I think, mainly on self-interests. One goes almost to the extent of desiring to prohibit the introduction of motor transport, while, on the other hand, another school of thought desires to have absolute and unlimited license to do as its adherents wish, irrespective of the effect on the economic life of the community. Between these two lines of thought there is, I think, a happy medium.

I, too, thought there was a happy medium between those two schools of thought—those who want transport to be utterly unlimited, and those who want to confiscate it altogether. I looked to the Transport Board to bring it about, but now, having seen the effect of its efforts, I do not expect anything of the kind. I am not second to anyone in the desire that the State Railways should be given reasonable opportunity. They are in many respects essential and can in no circumstances be done without. I have already suggested in regard to our developmental railways that it would have been better in the first place to expend the land rents collected than to have borrowed money for the construction of those railways. Then probably we would not have needed the State Transport Co-ordination Act. I have always realised the extremely difficult position of the State Railways and of the Government in relation to the extensive amount invested in the railways and the difficult financial

problem facing those responsible. The Commissioner has had no chance in having to pay interest on capital which to-day is only partly represented by assets. In the administration of the Transport Act there seems to have been an entire absence of co-ordination. The Commissioner of Railways has been overloaded on the one hand and unable to show sympathy with outside transport because he has too much liability to carry. The Board had necessarily to work an injustice. So when one sees that there are possibilities of injustice and knows that there have been cases where in the opinion of a number of us there has been definite injustice due to a lack of realisation by the Transport Board of certain difficulties, it seems to us that there should be some right of appeal to a resident magistrate, who as members know is in country districts the equivalent of a stipendiary magistrate. Parliament should have an opportunity to go into the case and form a definite conclusion. I would not have objected to co-ordination of the proper kind as referred to by the Minister for Railways in his speech which I have just read, had there been proposals for legislation to control the working hours and wages paid by those engaged in motor transport. The objection being unfair competition, that competition should have been made fairer by regulating hours and wages. The Transport Board when appointed got the idea into their heads that it was high time to get rid of the motor transport, and although there were some attempts to compromise, and licenses were given for six months, the result was practically confiscation. Quite a number of the men concerned were placed in a very difficult financial position. The Railways have been given an opportunity for doing things to relieve the Commissioner in his finances, but the opportunity has not been accepted yet, and he now has to show an improvement, while at the same time receiving no financial relief. If in the near future those who have been harshly dealt with by the State Transport Board cannot get a fair hearing of their case, it will serve to stress the necessity for a right of appeal which I say should be adopted by the House. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [9.58]: I will support the Bill. But I will say the rail-

ways have been greatly improved during the last few months. They now go for business in a very business-like way and, as I say, they have greatly improved. But the position of Kojonup and, from the interjection by the member for Albany the position of Denmark also calls for consideration. These matters should be dealt with considerably. There is no doubt that Kojonup is suffering severely. Time and again we have heard of the difficulties these people have to contend with. The district is carrying a very severe handicap. The people are limited to railway transport and have a very great additional distance to cover.

Mr. Seward: Nearly 100 miles.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is far too heavy a handicap. Our first consideration should be for the welfare of the State in general. The burden at present imposed on the Kojonup people is too heavy. I would be wanting in my duty if I did not take this opportunity to say how much I appreciate personally the manner in which the railway service has been improved. The business with which I am connected does a fair amount with the railways. The service is very much better to-day than it was not long ago. Special attention is given to customers, and no opportunity is lost to increase the business of the department, and to see that it is efficiently and thoroughly carried out. I meant to have said this on the Railway Estimates but did not get the opportunity, so I am taking the opportunity now. I hope that on reconsideration the Minister will agree it is desirable to pass this Bill, and that the consideration asked for should be given, thereby extending to a section of the people, who greatly need it, the help the passage of this measure will provide.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [10.3]: I support the second reading. All the Bill asks for is that these people should have the right to appeal against the decision of the Transport Board. In most legislation we provide some kind of appeal. There is no doubt that the case made out by the member for Wagin and the member for Katanning demonstrates the necessity for this. When the original Bill was before us, and we supported it to a certain degree, the contention of the Minister for Railways was that there must be proper co-ordination. The

Bill was not introduced to benefit the Railways, but to see that a fair deal was given to all sections of the people.

The Minister for Railways: The people of the State generally.

HON. C. G. LATHAM: The people are the first consideration. Those at Kojonup have had very good reasons for the complaints they have made. Particularly does this matter affect Kojonup, and that area which is on the west side of the Great Southern Railway. It is not right that a man should be compelled to transport his goods at least 100 miles further by rail, and by means of a slower service too. If the service was as fast as the road transport there would not be the same reason for complaint, but that is not so. The Railway transport occupies days and days. Whilst the member for Swan may applaud the Railways for the improvements they have effected, I maintain there is still a great deal to be done.

The Minister for Railways: They are still triers.

HON. C. G. LATHAM: I believe so, but it cannot be said they are complete in their improvements.

The Minister for Railways: Oh no!

HON. C. G. LATHAM: I am glad the Minister acknowledges that. We are not here to harass the Railway Commissioner or his staff.

The Minister for Railways: No!

HON. C. G. LATHAM: I believe there is a better realisation to-day of the fact that the railways exist for the benefit of industry rather than that, being there, the people must use them whether they like it or not. This Bill does not mean that the licenses must be granted. It only says that if there is a feeling of disappointment, or there is disagreement with the decisions of the Transport Board, these people shall have the right of appeal. I do not think members on the Government side of the House would ever put up an argument against the right of appeal for any individual, or any band of individuals. I do not like the Minister to suggest that the Bill will be defeated on the second reading. This privilege of appeal has been handed down for many years. In our courts many appeals are allowed. We are not afraid of the decisions of our judges or magistrates. They are sound and sensible individuals who are selected because of their knowledge and because of their fairness. All the Bill asks

is that if the people concerned think they have not received the satisfaction to which they are entitled, and the board have not given them a fair deal, they may appeal.

Mr. Stubbs: They have not had a fair deal.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The board should not take the autocratic powers which we seem to have bestowed upon them by the Act. The request is a fair and reasonable one. I want to see the Bill given a chance. I appeal for the support of members who put up such a good fight for the men who were thrown out of employment at Fremantle. Hundreds of men were thrown out of employment when the Transport Board cancelled their licenses. It is difficult to say how many people were thrown out of employment.

Mr. Seward: And much money was lost too.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: This was so not only in the case of truck drivers, but in the case of employees of the repair shops. It represented a loss of capital. No doubt there was a great deal of confiscation. The trucks could not be sold at anything like their real value. Their greatest value was to the individuals who owned them, provided they continued their employment. I know how badly members would have felt had they been placed in a position similar to that of those men. They were men who had saved their money and who had worked long hours to get it.

Mr. Wansbrough: Some of them purchased new trucks after getting their licenses.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They saved sufficient money with which to buy trucks so that they might use them in earning a living. Surely confiscation of that sort is not acceptable to the House. I cannot believe that members would endorse it. It is all very well to say they bought new trucks after being advised that they only had six months left of their licenses. Many of the men had entered into contracts, and the law bound them to carry out those contracts until such time as the Transport Act prevented them from doing so.

Mr. Wansbrough: Contracts were entered into after notice had been given.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There may have been an odd case or two of that sort, but I have not heard of any.

Mr. Wansbrough: I know of some.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: All we are asking for is a fair deal. We are not upsetting the decisions of the Transport Board, but we wish to see that these people have the right of appeal. To an employee who has a dispute with the employer we say, "If you are dissatisfied with your treatment by the employer, go to the Arbitration Court." For the same occasions we provide boards of reference and arbitration. There is always an appeal against the employer.

Mr. Wansbrough: There is a right of appeal under the Transport Act now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: None whatever. The hon. member has not read the Act carefully. I assure the Minister who spoke on behalf of the Government that the Bill does not give any right to a license, but merely a right of appeal—in the event of an applicant feeling aggrieved—to a court that will hear evidence from both sides, the Transport Board as well as the aggrieved applicant. Therefore I hope the Minister's urging that the Bill be thrown out on second reading will not carry weight. I appeal to hon. members to give the Bill fair and full consideration.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [10.12]: In my opinion Section 37 of the Act already provides a right of appeal to stipendiary magistrates, under certain conditions. Therefore I fail to see the force of the Minister's objection to the principle of the Bill.

The Minister for Justice: That has reference to vested interests. No vested interests are in question here.

Mr. NORTH: If the Bill is to apply to goods vehicles, I do not see why it should not cover buses as well. The Minister for Public Works has mentioned that the measure includes the metropolitan area. I for one would be glad to see an amendment made in Committee—if the Bill gets so far—permitting grievances arising in the metropolitan area to be decided by resident magistrates. I do not wish to see the Act remain as it is. In the circumstances the appeal to stipendiary magistrates is not sufficient. The Bill obviously seeks to alter the policy of the existing board through appeals to magistrates. Magistrates are placed in an invidious position. Without contesting the matter as regards Kojonup, I can appreciate the awkward position in which members of the board find themselves in my own district. They are asked to do difficult

things. They made a fine decision in lifting up the tramline in Bay View-terrace and putting on buses. That decision showed breadth of outlook. On Stirling Highway, however, there is an extraordinary paradox. In fact, the thing is laughable. There we have a first-class bus service which is not permitted to pick up passengers for a long section between Bay-View-terrace and Loch-street, whereas after leaving Loch-street the buses take quite a different route to the city. Hundreds of persons desirous of going to Karrakatta or to the better parts of West Perth are denied the right to do so by bus unless they first walk a certain distance. That feature makes the position more ridiculous. If the buses were forbidden altogether to take up passengers over that stretch of road, it would be dictatorial action which I could understand. But the people are told, "You can get the bus if you walk about a mile for the sake of your health."

Mr. Moloney: But they can get the bus at the railway station.

Mr. NORTH: That means walking two miles. The buses pass the doors of these people, who still have to walk such distances. Since the regulation came into force, I have received endless complaints and protests. I have tried to avoid wearying the House with them. Let this Bill get over the first hurdle into Committee, and there be amended to include buses. I want magistrates merely to deal with the facts of the case, and not to vary the board's policy. If it is shown that there can be no possible objection on the part of the Minister for Railways or the tramways authorities to permit to persons—who now are told they must walk three-quarters of a mile before using a bus—the convenience of the bus service after walking only a third of a mile, why not let that be done? It would not interfere with either the railway or the tramway revenue. I willingly support the measure in that sense, but I agree with the Minister that it is not desirable to allow magisterial decisions to upset the policy of the Transport Board. The Government should take up the matter and investigate the acts of the board and their policy, and try to modify the situation so as to enable the board to do a better job by the road services and in future not be quite so harsh as they have had to be in the past by reason of the

provisions we have enacted for them. I support the measure in the hope that in Committee it may be made to apply to bus services in the metropolitan area.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin—in reply) [10.17]: I was pleased to hear the remarks of the Minister for Works in the first place, and then the remarks of members on this side in support of the Bill. What I am about to say may seem parochial to the majority of members, but under the State Transport Co-ordination Act only those persons who had previously operated on a prescribed route had the privilege of applying for licenses to continue their transport operations. I want hon. members, and especially the member for Claremont (Mr. North), to appreciate the point I raise by asking the House to agree to the second reading of the Bill. I believe all members of this Chamber supported the measure for restricting undue and unfair competition with the railway system from the numerous persons operating motor trucks and carrying the cream of the railway traffic, while leaving the skim-milk cargo to be carried by the department. I was one who supported that measure in the belief that it would abolish unfair competition and also render justice to districts a hundred miles or so nearer to the metropolitan area by road than by railway. If hon. members were farmers living, say, 20 miles on the Perth side of Kojonup and were forced to carry all their produce back to Kojonup and then transport it an additional 80 miles by rail above the distance from Kojonup to Perth, would they like it? All the Bill asks is that any person who feels aggrieved at a decision of the Transport Board should have the right of appeal to a resident magistrate. Under the Act he has to lodge an appeal for hearing by a Perth magistrate, and in addition to put up a deposit of £10.

The Minister for Works: Not in Perth.

Mr. STUBBS: When the Transport Board came into existence, they cut out all motor transport between Kojonup and Perth. Deputation after deputation came to the city to interview the Transport Board and the Minister, but could get no satisfaction. All the Bill seeks is the right of appeal against a decision of the Transport Board, that appeal to be heard by a magistrate con-

versant with the requirements of the district concerned. I do not think a Perth magistrate would be in a position to understand the difficulties confronting the people of Kojonup.

Mr. Wansbrough: But the farmers have the right to take their perishables to Perth.

Mr. STUBBS: The member for Albany (Mr. Wansbrough) is a fair-minded man and I think he will recognise that 90 per cent. of the farmers in the district depend entirely upon wool and sheep. They do not produce wheat or other lines and they have to send their wool away by train. It is true that the Railway Department have reduced the freight on wool by 30 per cent., and that applies to other commodities too.

The Minister for Works: Now you want that altered and a reversion to the old system.

Mr. STUBBS: If the Minister lived in the country districts, he would soon sing a different tune. He would be the first to demand an alteration. I do not want the Act thrown on the scrap heap, nor do I want the old order reverted to.

The Minister for Works: That is what the Bill will achieve.

Mr. STUBBS: The Transport Board have not given a fair deal to the people of Kojonup and surely I am within my rights in asking Parliament to assure to those people just treatment. They should have the right to appeal against the decision of the Transport Board. If the Bill is not fair, surely it would have been thrown out in the Legislative Council where it was passed by a big majority.

Mr. Fox: That is the best reason for throwing the Bill out.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	23
				—
Majority against	6
				—

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. North
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Seward
Mr. Keenan	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Warner
Mr. Latham	Mr. Watts
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Mann	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Munro
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nelsen
Mr. Cross	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Fox	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Moloney	

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the Bill defeated.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 5:—After the word "include" in line 24 of page 5 insert the following new paragraph to stand as paragraph (i):—

(i) any officer of either House of Parliament under the separate control of the President or Speaker or under their joint control; or

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: The amendment made by the Legislative Council seeks to exclude officers of either House of Parliament from the definition of "Government officer." I understand that the officers in question desire to be excluded from the provisions of the Bill. The Civil Service Association do not desire that they shall be included and we have no desire that they should be. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 5:—In the proviso to the proposed new Section 156, delete the word "employers" where it appears in lines 15 and 18 of page 17 and substitute the word "parties."

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

BILL—RESERVES.*Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of four amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. New clause:—Insert a new clause after Clause 6, as follows:—

7. The Fremantle city council may, with the approval of the Governor in Council and notwithstanding any trusts affecting such land, lease to the St. John Ambulance Association, Incorporated, for the purposes and objects of the said Association in and around Fremantle, for a term of twenty-one years and such further term not exceeding twenty-one years as the council may at the expiration of the first term deem fit, and upon such terms and conditions as the council may deem fit, and free during such term or extension of such term from the operation of any of the aforesaid trusts, that portion of land held in trust for corporation yards being all that portion of Fremantle town lot 1508 which is more particularly described, defined, and delineated in the Fourth Schedule hereto.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The amendment provides that the Fremantle City Council may, with the approval of the Governor, lease an area of land to the St. John Ambulance Association. The Association proposes to erect buildings on the land in question. The object is a very worthy one. I have seen plans of the proposed building, which will be in every way suitable.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. New clause:—Insert a further new clause, as follows:—

8. The municipality of Cottesloe is hereby authorised to sell, for such price and upon such terms and conditions as the said municipality shall deem fit, those portions of land held in trust "solely for the purposes of a Municipal Endowment," being portions of Cottesloe lots 40 and 114, containing together 3 acres

3 roods 25 perches, and being those portions of the land comprised in Certificate of Title volume 487, folio 118, not included in Warnham road, as dedicated in the "Government Gazette" dated 24th June, 1932, and may transfer to a purchaser freed and discharged from all trusts the land hereby authorised to be sold: Provided that the proceeds of such sale shall be applied by the said municipality for the purpose of forming and constructing the extension of Napier street from Broome street to Marine parade, Cottesloe, and for the improvement and embellishment of class "A" reserve 3235, which comprises Cottesloe Suburban Lots 37, 38, and 39, and for the provision of recreational facilities thereon, and for such other municipal purposes as are approved by the Minister for Lands.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—
That the amendment be agreed to.

It is proposed to utilise a strip of the Class "A" reserve for the purpose of erecting 21 houses, and to make a recreation ground of the other part of the land, which consists of sand hills. It is immediately behind Mr. de Bernales' residence.

Mr. NORTH: I support the amendment. From inquiries I have made, the Cottesloe Council raise no objection to the proposal. A number of persons in the district, however, feel some anxiety about the interference with the Class "A" reserve. The road which it is proposed to construct will obliterate the existing hill and tennis courts, while presumably the sand hills on the north side of the reserve will be utilised to fill the hollow. However, Parliament is only asked to grant permission to sell the endowment land; it is not asked to say how the council shall deal with the Class A reserve. I suggested to the residents that the matter was one which the local council could deal with, and that they should be approached thereon. I hope the council will meet with success in whatever it is decided to do with the reserve. It is quite a long time since any Government handed over to a municipality any money in that form. I do not know of any grants that have been made to municipalities for a long time past. But here a few acres are to be granted to these people, and I hope

they are to be used in the interests of the district. I warn the Minister that now he has adopted this policy which is a new policy for him, he will be inundated with requests from municipalities and possibly the University also, to permit them to sell their land.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There is a principle involved in this amendment. Many municipalities have endowment lands which were granted to them for their benefit. I am thinking also of the tremendous area of land which the University hold by way of endowment. Albany has a great deal of endowment land, and so have York, Northam, Northampton and Geraldton.

The Minister for Lands: They do nothing with it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is so. I do not know whether we are extending these endowments, but this is a means of handing them over.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Cottesloe Municipality expect to sell their land. It will cost quite a lot of money to carry out the levelling.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You gave them a lot of land a little while ago, but they have not improved it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, there are many new houses on it now. Much of the land is very steep, and I think the best thing to do with it is to sell it and use the money for the making of a recreation ground elsewhere. I have investigated this matter and have come to the conclusion that the land should be sold. But because this is done once is not to say that it may be done again.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is pretty hard to say no.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In this case I think the proposal is justified.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3. New clause:—Insert a further clause, to stand as Clause 9, as follows:—

Reserve 12905.

9. All that piece of land, being reserve 12905 (Busselton lot 311) granted to the Busselton municipal council in trust for municipal endowment may be surrendered by the said Busselton municipal council to His Majesty to the intent that the same may be granted to the

Western Australian Fire Brigades Board for the purpose of a site for a fire station.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This gives the Busselton municipality power to surrender endowment land to the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board as a site for a fire station. There is no need to explain that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is really only a transfer.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4. New Schedule:—Insert a new schedule, as follows:—

Fourth Schedule.

All that portion of Fremantle town lot 1508 bounded by lines starting from the southern corner of said lot, and extending 339 degrees 51 minutes 1 chain 27 8/10 links along Parry street; then 69 degrees 41 minutes 2 chains 70 4/10 links; thence 168 degrees 35 minutes 1 chain 24 9/10 links; and then 248 degrees 41 minutes 2 chains 55 5/10 links to the starting point, and being portion of the land comprised in Certificate of Title volume 1037, folio 625. All measurements more or less, and bearings true or thereabouts; area 0 acre 1 rood 13 2/10 perches.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

House adjourned at 10.44 p.m.