

fence in the schedule up to that of an exempted fence, the amendment of the schedule, to provide for a fence 78 inches above ground, is necessary. It will be noted that the overhang is not now specified. That provision is not included as some of the road boards objected to the fence overhanging roads, and there was a possibility of owners being liable for damages if any person suffered injury through coming in contact with it. Before concluding, I desire to inform hon. members of the state of the fund to which the special tax for the destruction of wild dogs, foxes and eagle-hawks, is paid. As hon. members are aware, the maximum rate of tax permissible is 1d. in the £ on pastoral holdings and ½d. in the £ on farm lands. The maximum amount that can be obtained on that rate of tax is £47,000. Against that amount, the annual expenditure for the three years during which bonuses have been paid, is as follows:—

1927-28	..	..	£35,141
1928-29	..	..	£40,151
1929-30	..	..	£51,175

It will thus be seen that the maximum rate only provides sufficient for the annual expenditure. Admittedly there has been a considerable surplus at the Treasury since the fund was first collected. That surplus was due to the fact that the first year's rating overlapped the rating by the local vermin boards for the same purpose, and, in consequence, practically no expenditure was incurred from the fund for the first year. Because of that, the credit balance arose. To adjust the position, the rate of tax was reduced last year to ½d. in the £ on pastoral holdings and ¼d. in the £ on farm lands, and the amount collected was £23,500. The revised rate of tax resulted in the surplus being reduced by £27,675 and on the 30th June, 1930, there was a credit balance of £28,607 at the Treasury. This year it is intended again to levy the lower rate of tax, namely 50 per cent. of the maximum rate, and it is estimated that the amount collected, together with the credit balance, will provide only sufficient for the year's requirements. In fact, unless collections are well maintained, it is quite possible the assistance of the Treasury may be required before the end of the year. During the 12 months ended 30th June, 1930, the following vermin were paid for:—

Wild dogs	..	14,815, decrease of 2,135
Foxes	..	11,039, increase of 7,370
Eagles	..	10,859, increase of 5,924

Since the Act was amended to provide for increased bonuses, the number of dingoes paid for each year has shown a decrease, whilst foxes have not only increased in numbers, but appeared in fresh districts each year. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 1st October, 1930.*

	PAGE
Question: Railway freights	789
Bills: Supply (No. 2) £470,000, all stages	790
Anatomy, 3R.	790
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 3R.	790
Main Roads, report	790
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	803
Egg Marketing, 2R.	812
Motion: Kangaroo and other marsupial skins, to discontinue royalties	790

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

### QUESTION—RAILWAY FREIGHTS.

Mr. WANSBROUGH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it a fact that railway freights on small consignments of perishable goods, such as fruit and vegetables, have been increased 15 per cent. plus 9d. additional loading charges, as from the 22nd September? 2, If so, is it considered that this is in the best interests of the producer, consumer and State in general?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Freights on certain classes of goods have been increased by 15 per cent., and the loading charge by 3d. per ton, but the flat rate of 1s. 6d. per case on single cases of fruit by any train has not been altered. Other small consignments would come under the 15 per cent. increase, but the amount involved in such cases is not considerable.

2, The increases were necessary owing to the financial position of the Railway Department.

### **BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £970,000.**

#### *Standing Orders Suspension.*

**THE PREMIER AND TREASURER**  
(Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam)  
[4.37]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Question put and passed.

#### *Message.*

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

#### *Committee of Supply.*

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Richardson in the Chair,

The PREMIER: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the service for the year ending 30th June, 1931, a sum not exceeding £970,000.

The balance remaining from the previous Supply, with this amount, will be sufficient for two months. That is why the amount is so small. The Leader of the Opposition will notice that it is very small, and that no provision is made for any expenditure of loan money.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

#### *Committee of Ways and Means.*

The House having resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Richardson in the Chair,

The PREMIER: I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty to the service of the year ending 30th June, 1931, a sum not exceeding £950,000 be granted out of the Con-

solidated Revenue Fund and £20,000 from the Government Property Sales Fund.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

#### *Bill Introduced, etc.*

Pursuant to the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, passed through all stages without debate, and transmitted to the Council.

### **BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.**

1, Anatomy.

2, Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

### **BILL—MAIN ROADS.**

Report of Committee adopted.

### **MOTION—KANGAROO AND OTHER MARSUPIAL SKINS.**

#### *To discontinue royalties.*

Debate resumed from the 17th September on the motion by Mr. Piesse—

That in the opinion of this House the royalties paid to the State upon kangaroo and other marsupial skins should be discontinued.

**MR. DONEY** (Williams - Narrogin) [4.53]: Because of my personal knowledge of the destructive habits of the kangaroo, and because I have received numerous letters seeking the abolition of the royalty on kangaroo skins, I am prompted to support briefly the motion of the member for Katanning (Mr. Piesse). I feel obliged to the hon. member for having submitted to the House data essential to the consideration of this important question. He has left us in absolutely no doubt that the kangaroo is a proven pest, and by no means a desirable member of the Western Australian fauna such as we have been in the habit of considering the animal for many years. I suppose we have a right to expect something like 50,000,000 bushels from the forthcoming crop. It may be regarded as a fair computation that two per cent. of

that crop is likely to be destroyed by kangaroos, tamar and brush. If that is a fair proportion, it means a million bushels, which quantity, at 2s. 6d. per bushel, represents £125,000—a great deal of money to lose from this one cause. If it should be contended that two per cent. is too high a proportion, surely it will be admitted that one per cent. is not estimating it too liberally. One per cent. represents £62,500, and that is too great an amount to lose, especially when it comes wholly from profit. To compute accurately the losses from the pest is difficult, but for many years we have been in the habit of calculating the pecuniary injury from this source as between £50,000 and £100,000. I am sure that the Treasurer, despite his keenness to keep the £5,000 he now gets by way of royalty, would prefer to see the huge sums I have quoted in circulation through the State rather than see it eaten or destroyed by the pest, for we know full well that when the corn is ripe, a kangaroo destroys a great deal more than he eats. It is not so much a question whether the Treasury can afford to lose the £5,000 of royalty. The point is that our one big legislative duty is to preserve the continuity and the prosperity of the agricultural industry, and that we should endeavour to save as much as possible of the £100,000 or thereabouts to which I have referred. By relinquishing the £5,000 of royalty we shall not, naturally, save all the £100,000 now being lost through the pest. I am well aware of that. Manifestly we cannot in one year destroy all the kangaroos that attack our crops. We can, however, do something towards it. But, putting that on one side, it is fair to suggest that the Treasury would more than recoup itself from additions to the earnings of various departments, for instance in the form of increased railway freights and increased collections by way of taxation, interest and rent. I am quite ready to admit—the point has been raised two or three times during the debate—that the kangaroo is probably the most interesting of all the members of the Western Australian fauna, and that it does seem a pity to pursue the animal relentlessly. Indeed, many people seem to think that we run a risk of bringing about the extinction of the kangaroo by removing the royalty and other protective measures. But that is absolute nonsense. I am sure that never before has

the kangaroo led so right royal an existence as at present. Prior to the coming of the white man kangaroos suffered death by tens of thousands every year from hunger and thirst. But nowadays we look after them with unstinted generosity. We feed them first with nice green crops, and later with nice ripe corn topped off with an ample supply of clean water. The kangaroo is showing his appreciation of the improved times by breeding now—according to men who have knowledge of the facts—at double the rate of olden times.

Hon. P. Collier: Who was here in olden times to know?

Mr. DONEY: We can no longer afford to keep the kangaroo in these luxuries. Present times are altogether too hard. It has become perfectly plain that the kangaroo is an undoubted menace. There can be no two opinions about that matter. I now suggest to the Chief Secretary—as recently I did by way of question, without obtaining any satisfaction—that it is a perfectly fair proposition to abolish the royalty of 2d. per lb. on kangaroo skins, with the object of replacing it by a bonus of the same amount. The kangaroo is taking altogether too heavy a toll of the farmer's profits. With some authority I can say that the animal, by the destruction it achieves, has forced quite a number of farmers into bankruptcy. Of course, we like the kangaroo, but in economic self-defence we are compelled to kill the animal. I appeal to the Chief Secretary to take the broadest view of the matter. The hon. gentleman realises, as I am sure does every hon. member, that the agricultural industry is now in a most precarious condition, and that it is the duty of the Treasury, as of every other department, to shoulder its share of the sacrifice. I can quite understand the Government's keenness to secure the £5,000.

The Minister for Railways: Not so keen as about some other amounts we would like to get hold of.

Mr. DONEY: I am convinced that if the Government were to forego the royalty, it would be in the interests of farmers. I appreciate the fact that the £5,000 represents complete profit, as I understand not a penny piece is incurred in expense in collecting the royalty. I quite appreciate the view of the Government that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." At the

same time, I hope the Premier is not behindhand in appreciating the benefits that would accrue to farmers if the royalty were abolished. If he were prepared to adopt the step I suggest, he would be in line with what I believe to be the desire of every farmer in Western Australia. On two or three occasions, the Chief Secretary has expressed his reluctance to abolish the royalty in its entirety, but I suggest to him that he might be prepared to abolish it so far as it is applicable to the agricultural areas. That is a reasonable proposition to put to him. It is bad to retard production by seeking to make a profit out of the pest in the way the Chief Secretary is desirous of doing. I hope sincerely that the motion will secure all the success it deserves.

**MR. J. H. SMITH** (Nelson) [5.3]: I support the motion moved by the member for Katanning (Mr. Piesse). Although my district is not affected by the ravages of the kangaroo to the extent evident in other parts of the State, I am aware of the fact that the royalty imposed on kangaroo and marsupial skins has proved a deterrent to men desirous of destroying the pests. I know of four young men in my district who went North some time ago for the purpose of kangaroo hunting, but returned as they found they were unable to make it pay. Their experience was that the good season on the Murchison had provided so much feed that the kangaroos were plentiful, but, in view of the royalty that had to be paid, the game was not worth following up. It must be remembered that the royalty applies also to opossum skins. Last year, the Labour Government, acting perhaps on the advice of myself and other South-West members, declared an open season for opossums in order to provide work for men who were unemployed. The royalty on opossum skins is 18s. per dozen. Hundreds of men took advantage of the action of the Government. They equipped themselves with tents and feed, but when they came to tot up the results of their venture, they found they had to pay a royalty of 18s. per dozen on the skins when they were valued at from 23s. to 25s. per dozen. Some of the men had small bank balances and were able to pay the royalty. I know of three instances in particular. One man, who had been working, paid royalty on a hundred odd dozen. To-day the skins are not worth more than

22s. 6d., royalty paid. In such cases, the Government should forego the royalty. I admit that the Fisheries Department held on to the skins for some time in expectation of an increased price being obtainable, but no such fortunate sequel can be recorded. If the motion be carried, it will represent the loss of a small amount, perhaps between £4,000 and £5,000. The member for Narrogin (Mr. Doney) and the member for Katanning (Mr. Piesse) have indicated the experiences of those who are suffering from the ravages of the pest, and if the royalty be foregone, there will be an incentive for men to go out and secure skins.

**MR. WITHERS** (Bunbury) [5.5]: I have an open mind as to whether or not kangaroos should be destroyed. The motion does not seem to be in accord with the general trend of the debate. Every member who has spoken so far has dealt wholly and solely with the question of the kangaroo and, as one member said, "his cousins." They have left the opossum out of their consideration altogether. The object of the motion arises from the fact that the kangaroo has been destructive, but the opossum has been left out of that category. The Chief Secretary informed the House that £5,000 represented a considerable sum of money for the Government to forego. It has not been indicated how much of that amount represents royalty on opossum skins.

Mr. Marshall: They are not included; the amount applies to kangaroo skins only.

Mr. WITHERS: The motion would be made more acceptable if it were amended so that opossums could be dealt with. I move an amendment—

That after "skins" the words "exclusive of opossums" be inserted.

**HON. M. F. TROY** (Mt. Magnet) [5.8]: I support the motion because I live in an area that is devastated by kangaroos. Anyone who has had experience of the ravages of the pest appreciates the damage that is done, particularly in the pastoral areas. It has been said that there are more kangaroos than sheep in the State, and there is no doubt that in many parts there are more kangaroos to be seen than sheep. In a bad season what feed is available is eaten out by the kangaroos, and the sheep starve. Should there be a thunder-storm or a fall of rain in one part of a pastoral

area, it is there that the kangaroos get their feed, and the sheep and lambs suffer accordingly.

The Minister for Railways: But that has not been the position for the last few months only!

Hon. M. F. TROY: No, that position has existed for the last seven or eight years. I do not see any point in the Minister's remarks, unless it be a suggestion that nothing was done in the past to abolish the royalty.

The Minister for Railways: That would be a reflection upon a previous Government.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister need not bother about that. A Government supposed to represent the primary producers, should consider it their duty to take action now that attention has been drawn to the menace. I should think that Ministers representing largely the primary industries, as the present Government are supposed to do, would realise the position. The amount imposed as a royalty is small, and I think the Chief Secretary stated it was twopence for reds and ninepence for greys. The effect of that is that the hunters look for the greys and leave the reds. The reds require as much feed as the greys, and so the evil continues.

The Minister for Works: The reds will turn grey as they grow older.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is exceedingly funny, and coming from a man who has become a Minister, must have our respect! Ministers are entitled to be jocular and if a Minister is humorous, he should demonstrate it when he is in the House. We would be sorry if Ministers did not show their brilliancy in being humorous, so the remark of the Minister for Works naturally must be expected! The royalty on 100 skins of the red kangaroo amounts to 16s. 8d., and that is the cost of ammunition. In former days a number of men, both young and old, resorted to kangaroo hunting for a living. They were backed up by the storekeepers and, as I have already indicated, the amount of royalty represented to them the cost of their ammunition. A little while ago, I saw a number of young fellows in the back country, and one of them told me he had been an apiculturist. He had been in the Swan Valley but could not make a living there, and therefore took to kangaroo hunting. He did not have a turn-out, sulky or horse, or even a bicycle. He had

a bag of flour and some bacon at one well, and similar supplies at another well five miles away. One day he hunted in the vicinity of one well and the next day at the other well. He said, "If I had a bicycle, I could get a good living." I said to him, "You are certainly having a hard life," to which he replied, "It is better than knocking about the country looking for work. There is a living in it for me." There are a number of such men who are not prepared to go to Blackboy but have remained in the back country where they are earning a living. The payment of 16s. 8d. per hundred skins is a matter of importance to them. Irrespective of what Governments in the past may or may not have done, the conditions to-day are such that a number of men, who have been dismissed from stations owing to present-day conditions, have not come to town but have remained outback. They are the type of men essential for the back country, and Western Australia should do what is possible to keep them there, for they will then be available for work on stations when necessary. Those men are hunting foxes, kangaroos and dingoes, and should be encouraged. They are making tucker and are better employed there than at Blackboy, waiting for a job. I commend that phase of the question to the Minister for Railways. The devastating work of the kangaroo is nothing new, and the economic position to-day suggests that men who are willing to remain in the back country, endeavouring to cope with the pest, should receive every encouragement from the country. The Government would do a far greater service to the State if they kept those men employed on that job and so enable them to keep away from Blackboy.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—on amendment) [5.15]: I desire to support the amendment. Members have been debating a motion for the removal of the royalties on kangaroo skins, while the motion itself contains such phraseology as would involve the removal of the royalty from opossum skins also. And that would be grabbed by the Government as an excuse for modifying in small measure the original intentions of the mover of the motion. If we allowed the motion to be submitted to the Chamber in its original form, we would be voting more or less in the dark, because we do not know exactly what amount of royalty the Government receive for opossum skins; and prob-

ably it would be fatal to the motion if we permitted opossum skins impliedly to remain in it. Therefore I will support the amendment. I think the Chamber will be satisfied if we can induce the Government to remove the royalty on skins of kangaroos and marsupials other than opossums.

**MR. BROWN** (Pingelly—on amendment) [5.17]: I have already spoken to the motion, and I wish to oppose the amendment. In my previous remarks I favoured the abolition of the royalty on opossum skins, for the reason that hundreds of men would then be able to earn a crust. Opossums are very numerous in Western Australia and there is not the slightest fear of their extermination. We cannot wipe them out altogether because, whenever they become scarce, the trappers refuse to waste time trapping them. It is for the purpose of finding work for the unemployed that I favour the removal of the royalty from opossum skins.

**Mr. H. W. Mann**: But there is no sale for opossum skins.

**Amendment put and passed.**

**HON. W. D. JOHNSON** (Guildford-Midland) [5.18]: I desire to oppose the motion as amended, because I believe we are approaching this subject in too limited a fashion. We are dealing with a matter of some moment to the State; we are dealing with an income to the State running into many thousands of pounds. While the royalty charge is certainly an impost on those that market the skins, still the amount is so small as compared with the actual value of the commodity—which, after all, the State produces—that I am not prepared to say the State is getting sufficient out of it. At the same time I am satisfied that the kangaroo shooter, the man who really produces the skins, is not getting anything like reasonable value for the commodity he is producing.

**Mr. Doney**: You are in favour of still further reducing it?

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON**: I am in favour of dealing with this matter in a broader way than is proposed by the motion. If we remove the royalty charges we shall be penalising the State still further—and the State is already being over-penalised in regard to this matter generally. For the year

ended the 30th June last 185,000 red skins were produced. I am dealing with the red skin first, because that is the most valuable.

**Mr. Doney**: Oh, no.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON**: Yes, the red skin is the most valuable skin. That is the North-West skin. To-day the grey skin of the South-West is not altogether marketable, certainly is not saleable to the extent that the red skin is. For instance, the grey skin is worth a little less than 2s. 6d. per lb. and in weight it averages a little more than a pound. The red skin weighs on an average one pound, and is readily marketable. Over 185,000 red skins were marketed last year, up to the 30th June. Putting their value at 2s. 6d. per lb.—really they are worth a little more than that—and with each skin averaging a pound in weight, their value to the State was £23,125. And there were over 98,000 grey skins marketed. Putting their weight at 1½ lbs. and their value at 2s. 6d. per lb.—they are not worth quite that to-day—we get a total value of £15,312, or an aggregate value of kangaroo skins of £38,437. Those are figures that should make the House seriously consider whether we are dealing with the subject in the manner that the State requires when we simply limit our consideration to the question whether or not there should be a royalty charge upon the skins. People argue—and it sounds all right until we investigate it—that we declare kangaroos to be vermin, and then turn round and ask men to pay a royalty for the privilege of destroying them; in other words, we ask men to pay a royalty for the skins they get as the result of destroying vermin. As I say, it sounds all right, but when we come to appreciate the value of the skins, and the value those skins might be to this country, one might properly ask whether we are dealing with this matter in the manner in which it should be dealt with. I think we have to come to the conclusion that the State is not getting sufficient in the royalty it is receiving to-day.

**Mr. McLarty** interjected.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON**: Well, it is questionable. I am speaking from the north-western point of view. I was in the Gascoyne district during the elections, and I found that the great burning political question in Gascoyne at that time was the dual question of the marketing of kangaroo skins,

and the royalty charges. At all political meetings of all parties the kangaroo shooters were very persistent in eliciting candidates' opinions as to the royalty on kangaroo skins.

The Minister for Railways: Did they limit their questions to that?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: As a matter of fact they did, until I thought it would be a good idea to get all those chaps together and secure from them further information than it is possible to gather while listening to speeches on a vote of thanks at a political meeting. My object in getting them together was that I might further understand the question so that I might use the information here and in other places, and possibly influence the kangaroo shooters as to the best course to adopt with a view to getting a remedy for their disabilities. On going further into the question I found that the royalty represented but a small expense as compared with the enormous amount of marketing charges imposed upon the kangaroo skins. After I had analysed the information gained from the kangaroo shooters—who, after all, knew very little about the marketing side of the question, and I do not say that I know too much about it to-day—I very soon ascertained that their grievance was, not against the Government because of the royalty charge, but rather against the Government and those in authority for not protecting them from the exploitation of those people using kangaroo skins in various ways for personal profit. It is interesting to follow the kangaroo skin in the process of marketing. Most kangaroos are killed by rifle bullets, but to an extent, unfortunately, in the North-West they are poisoned. I think it a crime to poison kangaroos. There should be some better method than poisoning what is undoubtedly a marketable product. When a kangaroo is poisoned, the skin, unless it is immediately removed while the flesh is still warm, is of considerably less market value than if the rifle had been used. In the South-West, when the skin is produced by the shooter it is in most instances taken to the local storekeeper, who buys it and then sends it to one of the selling brokers. These are Messrs. Goldsbrough, Mort, Messrs. Elder Smith, Messrs. Dalgety's, and the Westralian Farmers. They are all purely middlemen. Not often do we find

a co-operative organisation operating with other middlemen, for it is a function of the co-operative movement to cut out middlemen. But unfortunately the Westralian Farmers Ltd. operate with other brokers regarded as skin brokers and dealing in skins and hides generally. Those brokers take delivery of skins from the storekeeper, or even direct from the shooter. For instance, in Carnarvon the skins are taken by the kangaroo shooter to either of the skin brokers—and the three firms operating up there are Goldsbrough Mort, Elders, and Dalgety's—who advance a certain amount against the skins, or buy them outright. Those skins are then sent to Fremantle, where there are three firms operating. Those firms prepare the skins for sale to another set of middlemen. They are then passed on to H. E. Mofflin & Co., Chas. Horman, or Wilcox, Mofflin, Ltd., commission brokers. No one else is in competition with them. They deal directly with the brokers who receive the skins from the kangaroo shooters. They do not always receive skins direct from the first buying brokers, because in many cases the local storekeeper also gets a commission. Three firms in Fremantle obtain possession of the skins and, I understand, do a certain amount of work to them, though what it is I do not know exactly. The skins are then sent to the firm of Booth & Co. in Sydney, and that company also obtain a certain percentage of the proceeds for what they do. We followed the skins from the local storekeeper to the receiving brokers, or the first brokers. The skins are then sent to another set of brokers in Fremantle, who pass them on to Booth & Co. in Sydney. I understand that the Sydney firm send them direct to America. The number of skins that go to London is very limited.

The Minister for Railways: America is the real market for them.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: America has the monopoly over them. When the skins go to America they are handled by three firms. These are known as the Surplus Leather Co. of New York, Richard Young & Co. of New York, and Zeigelezman of New York. I promised, when in Carnarvon, to endeavour to get to the bottom of the marketing difficulty, to ascertain if there was not some direct means of disposing of the skins without passing them through all the channels.

each of which exacts some toll upon them. My object is to endeavour to avoid all unnecessary commission, and to enable direct communication to be established between the shooter at Carnarvon and the user in any part of the world where skins of this kind find a market. It is quite a simple matter, after some investigation, to follow the skins until they reach America, but I tried in vain to find out what becomes of the leather and what its relative value is compared with other leather. It is most remarkable, but it seems impossible to find out anything about that side of the business. Everyone I have gone to has passed me on to somebody else, and I have now exhausted all possible means to discover anything to assist me in this direction. I have got into touch with Messrs. Pearce Bros. at Fremantle. Mr. Ken Pearce became quite interested. He told me that at one time the firm were buyers of kangaroo skins, and had tanned them quite successfully. He said they had great difficulty in selling the leather in Australia, that it was too expensive and too valuable for the Australian market. Whatever the causes were, they were unable to market the skins, and they gave up trying to handle them. They also told me they could not assist me to ascertain the real value of the leather. They pointed out, what I had discovered before, that practically all the skins went to America, but that what happened to them when they arrived there they did not know. They could not help me to ascertain the actual value of the prepared article. I also found that a couple of skins that had been tanned and dressed had been sent back to Fremantle by one of the American firms to demonstrate the difference between the skin that is properly dried and that which is improperly dried. For a long time the shooter in the North-West dried his skins in the sun. A sun-dried skin is much inferior to a shade-dried skin. The shooters are now taking special pains to dry the skins properly, because it has been demonstrated to them that a skin depreciates very much when sun-dried. This firm sent the skins to show how the drying affected the quality, after the tanning had been completed. I was informed by those who had seen the skins that there might be about a foot square of decent leather in the sun-dried hide, but that the rest had all depreciated because the skin

had not been properly dried after being removed from the animal. On the other hand the shade-dried skin was a complete piece of leather which was all useful. I was told there was a remarkable difference between the two kinds of skins. I understood from Mr. Ken Pearce that he had either seen the skins or had some knowledge of them. He told me he knew that the skins which his firm had treated at North Fremantle were equal to if not superior to those which had been sent back from America. He conveyed to me the impression that the firm at North Fremantle had no trouble in tanning and dressing the skins, and that they compared favourably with the tanning and dressing that were done in America. What I have endeavoured to find out is the relative value of the tanned or dressed skin, compared with ordinary leather, so that I can ascertain what our skins were worth to us in Western Australia, and what the skins dressed and tanned were worth in America. The answer, however, is not forthcoming, and there seems to be no way of getting it. We require someone to take a keen interest in the marketing side of this product. The kangaroo skin industry is likely to prove of great value. It is certainly probable that it will last a great number of years, because the kangaroos are increasing despite all the shooting that takes place.

Mr. Lamond: They are increasing very fast.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have been told that the kangaroos are fast becoming more valuable than the sheep whose pastures they eat. The way things are going now we may arrive at a stage when we can profitably handle and market the skins, and when they may be more valuable than sheep. Of course I would rather see a return to the days when the wool and sheep were of greater value. I would like some authority to go into the question and see whether we cannot prevent the export of kangaroo skins. We should exploit the world's markets for the purpose of selling kangaroo leather. I have met people who have been in America, and who had the opportunity to gain some information on the subject. They have told me that kangaroo leather is used for the uppers or tops of ladies' shoes, for the manufacture of ladies' handbags, and for a special kind of boot that is used extensively



by the lumber men employed in the lumber works in America. The climatic conditions are very severe on ordinary leather boots, and the lumber men therefore find it more profitable to buy kangaroo leather. The kangaroo leather has a longer life, and I am informed that boots made of it fetch between £4 and £5 a pair.

Mr. Lamond: I understand that in the manufacture of aeroplanes, where a special quality leather is required, the kangaroo product is used.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The statement I have made about boots is more or less common knowledge. There seems to be no way of getting hold of any literature or reports to enable me to arrive at a correct estimate of how the leather is used, what the world's consumption is, and what the value of the skins that are produced in Australia really represents. In the circumstances I claim we are producing a valuable article for the United States. Manufacturers there seem to be using it very successfully, and to have a monopoly of it. This monopoly is due to the fact that we have been foolish enough to send away the skins. What we ought to do is to organise this activity so that the skins shall not be exported, but that when they have been properly tanned and dressed then only should they be exported. No one, however, is interested in the market. That is one of the great problems with nearly all our commodities.

The Minister for Railways: What is wrong with another pool?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I would not mind that. It is quite a practicable proposition. Unless some organisation is established to attend to the marketing of these products, we shall go on losing money and the exploitation of them will continue. If we had a complete marketing organisation we could test out the markets of the world. To-day we send our kangaroo skins to America and that country makes the profit. I do not know whether we could sell kangaroo hides or leather in France. That country, I am assured, uses a large quantity of kangaroo leather. This information only comes from the man in the street, but, if it is so, America is getting commission on the sales which ought to be coming to Australia. The money represented by those profits would help this State in the way of increased royalty and a more fitting reward to the kangaroo shooter. Other nations may

also be interested in this type of leather. Czecho-Slovakia is becoming a big producer of boots. I read an article recently outlining the wonderful development of the bootmaking industry in that country. The article explained that many of the citizens of that part of Europe had gone to America, and were being employed extensively in the making of boots in the factories there, and after they became proficient some of them drifted back to their country. We know that after the war Czecho-Slovakia became a nation; they established factories and the men who had their training in America were brought back to carry out their work in their own country, and so to-day Czecho-Slovakia is competing against America. I am of the opinion that a great deal of the raw material that is used in different parts of the world to-day could be sent direct from this country if we had the marketing side of the business properly organised. I have no desire to labour the question but I know from experience in respect of other commodities that we shall never get a proper idea of the consumption of given articles from Australia until we get some central organisation instituted for the purpose of securing maximum results. It can be understood that the Westralian Farmers Ltd. get their 5 per cent. commission for handling the skin between the kangaroo shooter and the merchant.

Mr. H. W. Mann: They make an advance against it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know they get 5 per cent. commission for what they do. Moffin & Co. get another 5 per cent. commission and so much for services rendered; the firm of Charles Horman also get something and then Wilcox & Moffin get their commission as well. In America there is further commission to be paid and America distributes the skins throughout the world. It can be realised what an enormous amount would be saved in comparison to the full value of the skin if we could cut out some of the commissions. It ought to be quite a simple matter to organise this industry. We could say that the skins would not be sent to America for treatment, but that we would treat them ourselves. Let me quote the export of wheat. This was done by wheat firms for generations, and the wheat producers did not know the amount of toll they were paying. It was all unnecessary,

but they were not interested in the matter of investigating any of the details of the handling of wheat in Italy and other parts of the world. All they were concerned about was the securing of markets for the wheat and they got into touch with agents in France, Italy and Germany, sold the wheat and paid the agents their commission. As to whether the imposts were unfair and were capable of being removed, the farmers were not interested and no one bothered about investigating the subject. I remember attending one of the first meetings of the wheat pool and when we got our balance sheet it was found that there were commissions for this, brokerage for that, and other brokerages and other commissions. I went through them all, totalled them up and asked Mr. Monger, the chairman, to explain why we had to pay all these commissions. Mr. Monger said, "Why we pay them we do not know, but we have to pay." I said, "Surely to goodness you can explain something about the services rendered," and the reply I got was that it would be very difficult to explain the position, but it was necessary to put the wheat through ordinary channels and there was so much handling. All that is changed to-day by the pooling of the wheat. We got the producer himself interested in the marketing. The producer became critical of the various items of expenditure. We went to the expense of sending a producer to London to investigate matters, to see where it would be possible to cut out a lot of the commissions paid to the agents and the brokerage charges, and to arrange that we should deal more directly with the consumers. We found that certain possibilities were there, provided we took certain action, and we reduced the cost of marketing considerably by cutting out certain penalties that were imposed on the products, all through want of attention on the part of those who previously did the marketing. We also sent the same man to Italy to investigate a lot of the disabilities we were suffering from in that country. We found that the out-turns in Italy were very difficult to get, but without going into details I need only inform hon. members that we created an organisation in Italy to protect the producers' interests, with the result that we removed a lot of the disabilities and saved many hundreds of thousands of pounds to the producer. All that became

possible because we had an interested organisation. That organisation does not work on commission and the wheat pool is there to give service to the producers and to fulfil their obligation of looking after the producers' interests. The pool investigates details and removes faults, with the result that the producers get far better returns. The kangaroo shooter might be said to be in the same position as the wheat farmers were before they organised. Therefore, just as it was good that the farmers organised to market their wheat, so it should be good to establish an organisation to prevent the exploitation of the kangaroo shooter by the middleman. If some method is adopted by which we can prevent the exploitation of the activities of the shooter who to-day is earning very little but is producing a very valuable article, we shall do some good. I intend to oppose the motion and to urge those who desire to assist the shooters that they should investigate the marketing question and try to influence public opinion and members of Parliament in the direction I have suggested. The only way to do it is to have the skins tanned and treated in Australia. Kangaroo leather is a unique article; it is really the best leather in the world, so I am assured by an authority. Consequently where we have the best, we can do something that would be of advantage to the kangaroo shooter and the industry. To-day there are too many exploiting the industry, and I venture the opinion that as a result of this discussion something will be done and the shooter will awaken to the fact that it is not the royalty that is keeping him poor, but the middleman's charges and that he is paying too much to the middleman and getting too little for his labour.

#### THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS

(Hon. J. Scaddan—Maylands) [5.55]: The desire of the mover of the motion is that some action should be taken to reduce the number of kangaroos that are apparently doing damage to the crops and are a menace to the pastoralists in the North-West. I would like to ask members whether the kangaroo shooter is likely to go out and destroy an additional number of kangaroos if the royalty is removed, and if he gets 2d. per skin more than he is receiving to-day. Do members not realise the fact that if the

kaugaroo shooter kills more he will probably reduce the market value of the skin, not by 2d., but by perhaps 6d. or 1s. Thus instead of getting more out of the destruction of kangaroos we shall probably find that fewer men will be out shooting.

Mr. Doney: That is assumption.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is not assumption; it is proved by past experience in regard to marsupial skins. Recently in Victoria there was declared an open season for the very purpose suggested by some hon. members in this House, namely, to find work for unemployed in the trapping of opossums. It was thought that this would be a profitable business, and so it was for a period, but only a short period. As soon as it was discovered that a greater number of opossums was coming forward, the price immediately fell. Those who really got the advantage were the agents referred to by the member for Guildford. Exactly the same people handle opossum skins and kangaroo skins, and as soon as they know that the royalty has been taken off and that a greater number of men will engage in shooting, the same thing will happen here as happened in Victoria. The underlying purpose of the motion is to get an additional number of kangaroos killed, but they will not be killed unless the skins can be marketed. If we get additional men out we shall have additional skins, and notwithstanding that there will not be a royalty, the result, as I have pointed out, will be of no advantage to anybody. If hon. members are serious about marsupials being a menace, let those marsupials be treated as such, but members should not ask the State to do something in the way of losing revenue and losing trade. The royalty does not affect the question of the kangaroos if regarded as vermin. What I am trying to explain is that the remedy suggested will not be effective; the marsupials that are a menace will not be destroyed. If they are vermin what is proposed will have no effect at all.

- Member: Why will it not be effective?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There would have to be a great number of skins put on the market. Suppose we doubled the number of men engaged in hunting kangaroos.

Mr. Willecock: Would not your argument apply to production costs in every industry?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Not at all, because there is a limited market.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Who said there is a limited market?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The member for Guildford-Midland said so.

Hon. M. F. Troy: How do you know?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is what I expected. The hon. member will not take the word of the member for Guildford-Midland on a subject he has investigated. The member for Mt. Magnet has not investigated the question of marketing. Quite the reverse. The member for Guildford-Midland went to Carnarvon and, during the election campaign, heard some comments about the vermin known as kangaroos. He investigated the matter and discovered that the important question was one not of royalty, but of marketing.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The same is said about wheat and wool to-day.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There is no analogy between those commodities and kangaroo skins. We are cultivating wheat for marketing purposes, and we are producing wool for marketing purposes. If we over-produce, the market will be affected. I do not think the production of wheat in Western Australia or in Australia affects the world's market to any extent. The member for Guildford-Midland said that, as a result of his investigation, he was satisfied that the marketing of marsupial skins was controlled by three firms in New York, and that as soon as great quantities of skins were put on the market, those firms would reduce the price to the producers in this State. If we removed the 2d. royalty and sent out twice the number of men to destroy what has been described as vermin, they would have to depend upon the marketing of the skins.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is pure pessimism.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am not at all pessimistic. The member for Katanning who submitted the motion does not want us to lose what we are receiving for royalty. He wants removed what he considers is a bar to the destruction of vermin, and the only way in which he suggests that bar can be removed is by taking off the 2d. per skin. I declare definitely that if we increased the price to the extent suggested by

the member for Mt. Magnet and secured additional skins and destroyed the vermin, we would affect the market value of the skins to a greater extent than would the royalty, and would not attain the result desired by the member for Katanning. The member for Guildford-Midland has stated the case fairly. According to his figures, which I believe are correct, the export value of marsupial skins was over £33,000 last year, but the State received only a little over £5,000 by way of royalty.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Is not that a fair percentage?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I take the view that, for whatever we produce for use overseas, we should demand by all means in our power the highest possible price.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Kangaroo skins are listed on somewhat similar lines as was sandalwood some years ago.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is right, and the buyer is not so sleepy as some members would have us believe. The removal of the royalty would not ease the position from the standpoint of destroying vermin. It could not possibly have that effect. Who actually pays the royalty? Is it the shooter or the man who captures or poisons the kangaroo? He does not pay the royalty.

Mr. Doney: But he would get the higher price.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not admit that at all. I believe that if the royalty were doubled, the price placed on the kangaroo skins exported would be raised to that extent. The member for Guildford-Midland instanced how we overcame some of the difficulties presented by the overseas market for sandalwood. There was a time when sandalwood paid only 5s. per ton royalty, and it was vigorously claimed in this Chamber that if we attempted to increase the royalty, the market overseas would be destroyed. That was merely an assertion, but there was nobody in a position to deny it at the time. It was said that if we imposed a royalty of £2 or £3 a ton, the getter would be the loser. We have had seven years' experience of a royalty, not of 5s. per ton but of £9 per ton, and the getter is receiving more to-day than when sandalwood carried a royalty of 5s. per ton. That resulted from our organising the market.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is so: it is due to organisation.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If the member for Katanning investigated the question, he would discover that there is a serious monopoly handling these valuable skins. They are valuable skins for leather manufacture. The remarkable thing is that we produce not only the kangaroo skins and export them in the raw, but we also produce the tannin and export that overseas, in order that the skins may be converted into leather. Then the leather is sent back here for local use.

Mr. Sleeman: It is as bad as the agricultural machinery position.

Mr. Doney: Do you consider that the demand is fully supplied?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not think it is.

Mr. Doney: You think there is room for marketing more skins.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, but quite a number of commodities produced in different parts of the world are so controlled by market operations that the price is kept up to a certain point, whereas if there was a free market available, the whole industry would probably be killed. Some time ago we were advised of the price of a certain mineral. Someone in the North-West wrote down inquiring whether the published statement regarding the market price of the mineral was correct. If so, he asked us to get into touch with the Agent General and ascertain what quantity the market would take. We did so. We found that the price quoted was correct, but we could not sell a ton of it. It was estimated by the writer that 100 tons a month could be produced. The market was held by certain individuals who had a world monopoly, and they kept the price up for their own benefit, because the amount they received on a percentage basis for marketing the commodity was greater by virtue of the higher world price maintained by their control. If we had sent 100 tons of the commodity, it would have killed the market.

Mr. Lamond: That is a different proposition. There was only one firm dealing with that mineral.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: And practically only one firm is handling this leather. I am advised that the three firms in New York operate side by side, that they limit the quantity placed on the market, that they have a definite understanding

as to the quantity they will take, the quantity they will deliver and where they will deliver.

Mr. Willcock: An honourable understanding.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Call it what we like, that is the position.

Mr. Munsie: In years gone by kangaroo skins were tanned in Australia.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is so and they are still being tanned, but only a relatively small number. The point I wish to emphasise is that the member for Katanning is seeking to attain something that will not be achieved by his method. If it can be shown that marsupials should be treated as vermin, let them be declared vermin, and let us find ways and means to destroy them. His proposal, however, will not give that result. It is impossible. The amount of the royalty is so slight that, if we removed it, there would be no advantage unless there was a tremendous increase in the number of kangaroos killed and skins marketed, and that would have the effect of reducing the market value by much more than the amount represented by the royalty.

Mr. Piesse: Would you rebate the royalty?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Will the hon. member say that a rebate of the royalty to the men employed in killing kangaroos would be sufficient inducement for hunters to go out, without marketing the skins? He knows that no one would go out killing kangaroos in numbers, and thus remove this so-called menace, unless he was paid something in addition to what would be available as a result of rebating the royalty. The hunter must get the market value for the skins.

Mr. Willcock: The ammunition would cost him as much as the royalty.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Of course it would. It is possible to get the kangaroos killed only by having a market available for the skins. The prices on the market must be sufficient to encourage men to go out and earn a livelihood in that way. A greater number of kangaroos will not be killed merely by our taking off the royalty. It is necessary also to introduce some method by which the market value of the skins will be increased.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Or find a new market for the skins.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. Why not direct our attention to the question of securing a better price for the skins? To accomplish that would be of value from the point of view of the State, as well as from the point of view of destroying vermin. We should obtain the last possible penny for every commodity we export. Having shown that marsupials are a menace, we should endeavour to secure a better export value for the skins, and if we can succeed in that, it should lead to a reduction in the number of kangaroos that are doing damage in the country districts.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

MR. PIESSE (Katanning—in reply) [7.30]: When I moved this motion the outstanding object I had in view was to assist farmers and settlers who were suffering as the result of the depredations of marsupials, particularly kangaroos in the wheat areas. The debate has brought out certain information that was new to me. Although I understood that the kangaroo was very destructive in the North-West, I had no idea there were so many of them in that part of the State. The matter resolves itself into whether it is more important for Parliament to give greater consideration to the kangaroo industry, or to the pastoral and farming industries. If it is the intention of the Government to foster the kangaroo industry, we might at least expect some protection through Government departments. This is a very serious matter. Whilst I agree that the Treasurer may be loth to forego any of the revenue he derives from the royalty, which amounts to about £5,000 a year, I cannot refrain from pointing out that on a moderate estimate the wheatgrowers must be suffering to the extent of £45,000 to £50,000 a year. It is hard to estimate the loss in exact figures, but I think that would be a moderate computation. Apart from that loss there is all the worry, anxiety and expense sustained by the settlers, more particularly in the early stages of their operations. I have no desire to deprive the Treasury of money at these times, because all available revenues are required to carry on the services of the country. In the course of his remarks the Minister might have given us some assurance

that an effort would be made to alleviate the sufferings, distress and loss sustained by the settlers. They might have suggested that whilst they were not in favour of foregoing the royalty from the killing of kangaroos, they were prepared to declare certain areas as vermin districts, and either forego the royalty there or offer a bonus for the destruction of the vermin. Kangaroos are increasing greatly in number, and are likely to go on increasing if something is not done to prevent it. The point I have tried to make is that the royalty has deterred the destruction of these marsupials. The Minister was hardly logical when he said that the royalty did not affect the position. According to his line of argument, if the royalty were increased the price of kangaroo skins would automatically increase. If the royalty were taken off, however, the kangaroo shooters would have a better chance of making a living, and more kangaroos would be destroyed. The House is indebted to the member for Guildford-Midland for his remarks. It is interesting to know that this industry is likely to develop into one of considerable value. For many years past the kangaroo has been of great assistance not only to those who have been engaged in killing them for a livelihood, but because they have furnished food for the settlers. In the early days the pioneers depended a great deal upon that source of food supply. The hon. member illustrated the value of the industry, but he did not enlighten the House as to how we were going to relieve the sufferings of those who were affected by the damage that was being done to their crops. The object of my motion is to endeavour to secure for the people immediate relief. Are we going to wait until the kangaroo industry is further developed, during which time our settlers will continue to suffer heavy losses? Surely we should treat this as an urgent matter. I should be quite prepared to accept an assurance from the Minister that immediate steps will be taken to remedy the position. I want to know how the Government stand in this matter. I would not have cared if the motion had been postponed for a month or two until inquiries could have been made. It would not have cost very much to appoint one or two responsible officers to make investigations

into the damage that has been done. The member for Guildford-Midland showed that the skins were valuable, and suggested that the Government should encourage the production of the kangaroo. That would be all right so long as damage was not being caused to our primary industries. I have proved, and other members have proved, that an enormous amount of damage is being done. The hon. member might equally well have argued that it would be profitable to increase the production of foxes. A fox's skin is quite valuable, and is becoming more valuable as times goes on. Nothing is more destructive to sheep or lambs than a fox, and few things do greater damage to crops than kangaroos. The marsupials range over very wide areas, and are occupying pastures that could be better employed in the feeding of sheep and lambs. Kangaroos eat all the dainty bits of the feed and deprive the sheep of their means of sustenance. I have no wish to ridicule the Government, but I cannot help saying that they should look after their kangaroos. If kangaroos were looked upon as stock in the ordinary sense, they could be prosecuted for trespass. If it is wise in the interests of the State to set about increasing the production of kangaroos, it would be equally wise for the Government to segregate them in one part of the State, upon unoccupied land, keep them off the private holdings, and render assistance to the farmers to enable them to do it. I do not wish this motion to be the means of depriving the Government of any revenue. I thought that possibly some proposal would be advanced by the Minister to the end that the abolition of the royalty might be made to apply to that portion of the State which is most seriously affected, namely, the special areas within the South-West. I hope the motion will be carried so that the Government may be directed at the earliest possible moment to deal with these harmful marsupials.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	20
Noes	..	..	..	15
				—
Majority for	..			5
				—

## AIDS.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Doney	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Raphael
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wells
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. H. W. Mann
Mr. Ferguson	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Keenan	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. North
Mr. Lindsay	

(Teller.)

Question as amended thus passed.

## BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th September.

**MR. H. W. MANN** (Perth) [7.49]: I shall support the second reading of the Bill, with a view to moving amendments in Committee. The subject matter of the measure might well be left to the bank authorities. In Committee I shall move an amendment giving those authorities discretion to refuse advances to persons who do not purchase implements or machinery made in this State.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the law now.

**MR. H. W. MANN**: There is no law on the question at present, I understand. There was a law at one time, but after it had operated for a period it was amended at the instance of the present Premier. The whole State is agitating for the consumption and utilisation of local products.

Hon. P. Collier: Agitating and instructing are different things.

**MR. H. W. MANN**: If a person is borrowing money, the lender has the right to say on what conditions it shall be advanced. We must do something to build up our secondary industries as well as primary production. Many implements made in Western Australian factories and foundries are used throughout our agricultural and dairy-ing districts. If a person approaches the

Agricultural Bank for an advance with which to purchase machinery, and if that machinery is made here of equal value to the imported article, the bank authorities should have the right to say, "We will let you have the advance on condition that you purchase a locally-made article."

The Minister for Agriculture: Why should not the farmer be the judge, and not the banker?

**MR. DONEY**: The banker is lending the farmer his own money.

**MR. H. W. MANN**: In point of fact he is lending the money of the State Savings Bank, which is the workers' money.

**MR. DONEY**: It is everybody's money.

**MR. H. W. MANN**: It includes deposits by workers and deposits by operatives in factories and foundries. It is no more the farmers' money than that of the rest of the population. I see no sound argument against vesting the proposed discretion in the trustees, who are entrusted with millions of money to lend for the development of Western Australia. Surely, if those gentlemen have sufficient administrative knowledge for that important work—and undoubtedly they have shown that to be the case over a number of years—it is not asking too much that they should be granted this discretion as regards, say, a set of harrows. I am positive that they would not ask a client to take a machine which they knew to be unsuitable. Their one desire is that farms should be developed on sound lines, and they would not ask the farmer to purchase machinery which would be a hindrance to him in the working of his farm. They would only ask him to take a local article that was equal to the imported article.

The Minister for Lands: The farmer is the judge of that.

**MR. H. W. MANN**: The farmer may be even a better judge, but the bank authorities would not force him to take an article which was not equal to the imported article.

The Minister for Lands: Why not let him use his own judgment?

**MR. MARSHALL**: Yes, if he is using his own cash.

**MR. H. W. MANN**: Apart from the State Implement Works, with which I am not particularly concerned, there are in this State several manufacturers of agricultural machinery. My desire is to increase the

production of our secondary industries. Every boy is not suitable for the land, and even if he has the desire for it he may not have the necessary means, in which case he becomes just a farm labourer, working from farm to farm. If we are sincere in the desire to increase our local production, let the secondary industries advance side by side with the primary. Several local firms make implements that are being purchased and used by agriculturists and dairy farmers of independent means. Without mentioning the names of firms, I may say that I got in touch with a works established in the Guildford electorate, and I find that those works are making stump-jump harrows, T-bar rollers, farm wagons, small drills, and other articles which are being used with satisfaction. Another firm specialises in cultivators, fertiliser distributors, and chaffcutters. One amendment I intend to move in Committee is to include within the scope of the Bill dairying implements as well as agricultural machinery. Our dairying industry will expand, and at present most of the dairying implements used here are imported from the Eastern States. Like other members, I have urged here many times the greater use of our own butter, our own bacon, and other primary productions of Western Australian origin, with a view to obviating importations of these commodities from the East. Our dairy farmers now import scores of cream cans of Eastern States manufacture. I took the opportunity to-day of requesting your permission, Mr. Speaker, to exhibit in the hall an article made by a local firm that is quite equal to the imported article, and, if anything, cheaper. The factory which made it employs 32 men and boys. If its sales can be increased, it will probably in a few years' time have 52 employees, and this without injury being done to anyone. A milk or cream can can be made here quite equal to one brought from the Eastern States. If the Government are to be called upon to establish dairy farmers in the South-West, it is not too much that the Agricultural Bank should say that if these dairy farmers require milk cans, they must buy the local article. If that is, in fact, the law to-day, my amendment will do no harm. Indeed, I consider that such an amendment should appeal to both sides of the House, its object being to increase the output of our secondary industries and thus

tend to create more employment for our growing lads. Members representing city electorates have many appeals made to them by parents to find employment for their boys. Day after day I have interviews with parents who are desirous of finding avenues for placing their sons. At present it is hardly possible to find any employment for boys leaving school. It is not possible for all lads to be placed on farms nor can we find places for them in other avenues of primary production. I suggest that no harm can follow to the interests of the farming community if the whole matter be left to the discretion of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank as to whether clients of that institution should buy locally made implements. I support the second reading of the Bill.

**MR. BROWN** (Pingelly) [8.1]: I do not like the Bill because it savours of compulsion, and I have no regard for anything of a compulsory nature. There must be some reason why the farmers of the State do not patronise locally made agricultural machinery turned out at the State Implement Works, which is the largest manufacturing institution of that description in Western Australia. I have conducted exhaustive inquiries, and I find that the works are making certain types of agricultural implements that are giving general satisfaction. I am told that their ploughs are quite equal to the imported article. Their drills have given great satisfaction, and we know that their harrows and windmills, which are minor articles that can be made by an ordinary blacksmith, are also giving satisfaction. That makes one wonder why the locally-made implements are not patronised and why farmers procure their requirements from the Eastern States. There must be some explanation, and I can tell hon. members what it is. There are certain parts of the machinery that have given greater satisfaction than have similar parts made in Western Australia. I will mention some of the most prominent makes of harvesters—McKay's, the Big E and the Horwood-Bagshaw. The farmers of this State consider those harvesters much better for general use than the harvester made by the State Implement Works. Again there must be some reason why the patent used by the State Implement Works in their harvesters has not given satisfaction throughout the agricultural area. We all know the standard set by the McKay



harvester, as well as by those turned out by the other Eastern States firms. By virtue of work that has extended year after year, their machines have been brought practically to a stage of perfection. Those machines are imported into Western Australia and are bought at a greater price than the farmers would have to pay if they bought a harvester made by the State Implement Works. That being so, it is evident that there is something radically wrong. Should the Bill be agreed to, it means that if a farmer is under an obligation to the Agricultural Bank he will be forced to buy the locally manufactured article, whereas a farmer not in that position will not be forced to do so and will not have to buy a machine that will not give him satisfaction. It is not in the interests of the farming community to provide such power in our legislation.

The Premier: And suppose the machine could not be bought in the State at all, seeing that it could not be made here?

Mr. BROWN: That is so. It is quite possible that the machine a man desired could not be turned out here. If a man desires to buy a machine, he should be allowed to buy what he requires at the price he is willing to pay. If the Bill provided for the abolition of the State Implement Works, I would perhaps be speaking in a different manner.

Mr. Panton: How would you speak then?

Mr. BROWN: I believe it is in the interests of the farmers to retain the State Implement Works. I have given this matter serious consideration and various phases brought under my notice indicate that the works are a check on the imported lines by keeping prices down.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are not a check.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Of course they are.

Mr. BROWN: I will give hon. members an indication of how the check has operated. A large number of plough shares are imported and are sold at about £2 10s. a dozen. An article quite equal to the imported share is turned out by the State Implement Works at £2 per dozen. Thus a saving of anything from 7s. to 10s. a dozen must be in the interests of the farmers themselves. Seeing that that position obtains, surely it can be admitted that the State Implement Works act as a check.

Mr. Marshall: What would have been the charge for the imported article had it not been for the State Implement Works?

Mr. BROWN: That is the point I make. If the price is kept down owing to the State Implement Works turning out an equally good plough share, resulting in a saving of 10s. on the imported article, it is worth while. As members of Parliament, we would like to see articles made in Western Australia used by our own people, because it would be in the interests of all concerned to have factories in this State. I have not the details, but it would be interesting to know the value of the agricultural implements imported into Western Australia. That would demonstrate to us what it would mean to the State if we were able to manufacture satisfactory lines locally.

The Minister for Lands: You know that the local manufacturers have a natural protection.

Mr. BROWN: And that is represented by the freight paid on machines imported from the Eastern States. That is the only natural protection that I know of. That represents about £12 per machine. The Bill goes further than that, and we are asked to agree to it being made compulsory for farmers throughout the State to buy agricultural machinery made in Western Australia. For that reason I am not in favour of the Bill. There are a lot of minor articles required in Western Australia, and I fail to see why they cannot be made just as well here as in the Eastern States. Most of the raw material has to be imported into the Eastern States and we could use the same material here, so that our manufacturers should be able to turn out an article equal to that made in the East. At the same time we have to admit that competition is so keen that we must have mass production before the manufacture of agricultural machinery can be made to pay. It is obvious that in Western Australia, with our small population, mass production would not be possible. I do not know that the wages paid in Western Australia are any more than those paid to the workers in the Eastern States. I presume the wages paid are in accordance with Arbitration Court awards. The crux of the position is that we must manufacture an article that will conform to the requirements of those who desire to purchase it. Apparently that has not been done in the past, and those concerned must realise that until they are able to turn out an article that will prove suitable to the purchasers, they cannot expect to make a

success of the business. If the Bill is agreed to, and people are forced to buy machinery that is not suitable to them, and which will cause a lot of expense for repairs and so forth, it will give rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction. We are told that we send £10,000,000 to the Eastern States for the purchase of our requirements. Why do we do that? It is because the public of Western Australia require the articles. Is it not better to send the money to the Eastern States than to Canada or America? That is what the freetrader desires, to a certain extent. That gentleman would sooner see our money sent to China or Japan than to the Eastern States where we would patronise our own people.

Mr. Marshall: Why not patronise our own people in Western Australia?

Mr. BROWN: It is up to our manufacturers to produce an article that will meet with the approval of the public. Something must be radically wrong with the local article, seeing that the people are not willing to purchase it. I shall not stress this matter at any greater length. It would not be in the interests of the people to agree to a Bill that means compulsion. The member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) has indicated that he intends to move an amendment, but I do not think that will represent an improvement, merely because the question of the purchase will be left to the discretion of certain people at the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It is at their discretion whether a loan shall be granted.

Mr. Doney: And the farmer applying for the loan offers ample security.

Mr. BROWN: Does the member for Perth suggest that it is right to say that a farmer applying to the Agricultural Bank for assistance must be compelled to purchase a locally-made machine that may cost a lot for repairs, that may cause tremendous wastage with the crop, and give rise to other difficulties? Is that the consideration that an Agricultural Bank client must expect? Certainly not. It should be our desire to be loyal to the State, and we should give every encouragement to our own people to produce what we require, but I do not think the Bill will achieve that objective. The desire of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) is laudable in so far as he would like to see agricultural machinery manu-

factured in Western Australia. I think he had the State Implement Works in mind when he drafted the Bill.

Mr. Marshall: Those works are not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. BROWN: No, but I know he had the works in mind. It is up to the State to get the mechanics and the men of inventive genius to produce articles to the satisfaction of the public. When that is done, I have not the slightest doubt that the people will be loyal and will patronise the locally made article.

**MR. DONEY** (Williams - Narrogin) [8.12]: I desire briefly to indicate my dissatisfaction with the method proposed by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) to achieve an objective, which in itself is no doubt highly laudable. At the same time I feel an utter dislike of the methods to be employed. What a beautiful, simple, handy and mischievous instrument Parliament could be if that institution could be put to the destructive use the hon. member has in mind. I do not think it matters much, however, because, in my judgment, the hon. member's Bill has not a one per cent. chance of success. Apparently it does not matter what may be the price, the strength, the structure, or the suitability of the agricultural implement! Apparently it does not matter how shoddy it may be, what delays may arise, or what troubles may be caused at the works, the farmer is to be compelled by legislation to use the locally manufactured agricultural implements, turned out by the State Implement Works.

Mr. Sleeman: The Bill does not say that!

Mr. DONEY: I admit the works are not specifically mentioned in the Bill, but hon. members know that if the Bill is accepted in its present form, on the day following it becoming the law of the land, farmers will be thrown on the tender mercies of the State Implement Works.

Mr. Sleeman: The member for Perth told you that agricultural implements were being made near Guildford.

Mr. DONEY: The member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) knows very well that for all practical purposes we may regard the manufacture of agricultural implements in this State as confined to one concern—the State Implement Works.

Mr. H. W. Mann: That is not so.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Of course not.

Mr. Thorn: We know what are turned out.

Mr. DONEY: Of course we do.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You do not know your own State.

Mr. DONEY: I know all the makers who turn out agricultural implements in any quantity or of any value.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We must show you round your own State.

Mr. DONEY: I do not think the hon. member could show me much about agricultural machinery in this State, that I do not know already. However, the point is that a monopoly of the kind the hon. member has in mind is of no use whatever to the farmers of this State. Surely the farmer has plenty of annoyance to put up with already. I hope to goodness there is no chance of coercive legislation of this kind being imposed upon him. I am not questioning the integrity of the member for Fremantle, but I am questioning his judgment on this occasion. I cannot think that even he expects any chance of success from hampering legislation of this kind at a time when we should be doing all that we can to assist the farmer to produce a little more cheaply than he is doing now. The farmer, surely, should know what is best for himself. If he is not an expert in respect of the articles he is using every day, it is time he was. We should not by legislation hamper his choice. The need for protection has been spoken of by several members. I put it to the member for Fremantle that the only protection the State Implement Works need is the very ample protection they would afford themselves by turning out a normally good article at a reasonable price. No protection should be needed beyond that. Still, there is the further protection that comes to them by reason of their not having to pay the very high overseas freights that have to be paid by competing manufacturers in the Eastern States, and the still further protection that comes from the natural preference of all our people for the locally-made article. Just as in the case of all other traders, the State Implement Works must be prepared to trade and sell on their merits, or go to the wall. The fact that apparently they cannot carry on without the assistance of

coercive legislation of this kind is an admission, and indeed proof, of failure. It would be very nice indeed, all other things being equal, to see the State Implement Works a hive of industry; but as it happens, other things are not by any means equal. It is the duty of the Government, particularly at a time like this, to examine very carefully all proposals laid before them, with the object of seeing whether those proposals can assist them in their economy campaign or in their keen desire to assist agriculture by cheapening it. No member can assert that the Bill would do any good in either of those directions. Nor do I think the hon. member would claim that, when framing this Bill in his mind, he looked upon it from the point of view of the people most concerned, namely the farmers. I am sure he is not going to claim that this Bill would do the farmer any good.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Yet he happens to be a farmer himself.

Mr. DONEY: Yes, and because of that I am the more surprised to find he could go against his own interests.

Mr. Marshall: Certainly he would not be led by considerations of expediency, as are some members representing the farmers.

Mr. DONEY: No, I agree that he would not. I admit that. Then there is this point that should be readily agreed to, namely that if the Bill were to become law the State Implement Works would certainly not be in a position to supply the ever-growing needs in the way of machinery of the farmers of the State.

Mr. Withers: There is in the Bill no mention of the State Implement Works.

Mr. DONEY: I am aware of that.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They why do you keep reading it into the Bill?

Mr. DONEY: Because nothing else was thought of when the Bill was being framed.

Mr. Marshall: McKay wants to come here, and if he were given this guarantee he might come.

Mr. DONEY: If the hon. member had brought down his Bill when other manufacturers of farming implements were operating here, or seeking to operate here, the Bill might not have had so strong an opposition to face. In common with every other member of the Chamber, I am eager for the time to arrive when this State shall make all its own machinery. But I want to

see the factories come and grow and trade entirely on their own merits.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Are you prepared to help them do that?

Mr. DONEY: I am prepared to assist the establishment of anything here, provided it is on a competitive basis.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I see. You, like others, represent the farmer up to a given point and then you drop him.

Mr. DONEY: I represent the farmer just to the extent his interests go, and no further.

Mr. Marshall: And then you turn to the St. Georges-terrace farmer.

Mr. DONEY: I do not think the interjection has anything at all to do with the Bill.

Mr. Marshall: Nor has much of your speech, either.

Mr. DONEY: Had I not been talking to the Bill, I imagine I would have been called to order by the Speaker. The member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) pointed out that this was a matter for discretion. Surely he cannot bring discretion into the Bill. Had the Bill been based on discretion instead of on compulsion, there would have been very little objection to it.

Mr. H. W. Mann: I said I intended when in Committee to move an amendment that would leave it to the discretion of the Managing Trustee of the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. DONEY: Then apparently you discussed your amendment without waiting until you had moved it. The Bill deals wholly with compulsion, and makes no mention of discretion. I shall be very much surprised indeed, and deeply disappointed, if members having the true interests of the farmer at heart can bring themselves to support the Bill.

**MR. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle—in reply) [8.22]: I am not disappointed at the reception accorded to the Bill. I set out expecting that it would meet with a lot of opposition, and I have not been disappointed. When we have a House comprised as this is, comprised, as the "West Australian" says, of a lot of country members, we cannot expect much sympathy for a Bill such as this. The Premier said he could not see the object of the Bill. I say the object of the Bill is exactly the same as the present Premier had when in 1909 he put a similar clause into the Bill of that session. I want

to congratulate the Premier on the speech he made on that occasion; a fine loyal speech. As a big Western Australian he pointed out—

The Minister for Lands: The Premier has not spoken to this Bill.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Oh yes, he has. He said he could not see the object of the Bill. I say the object of this Bill is the same as the Premier had in 1909, namely, to keep the work in this State, to reserve Western Australian work for Western Australian men; and also Western Australian boys, who are leaving school with nothing to do and nowhere to go, walking the streets looking for work. If for nothing else, the Bill warrants the support of every member in that it will serve to build up an industry affording our boys a few places in which to learn trades. As I pointed out when moving the second reading, there are quite a number of trades related to implement making. The Premier in 1909 remarked that if the people of the East wanted our trade, they should come over here and get it, that the work had to be kept within the State. During the last few days there has been something in the nature of an agitation in the newspapers over the fact that there is nothing for the lads to do after leaving school. Mr. Thomas Chandler, headmaster of the James-street school, has taken up the matter, and a number of leading citizens have contributed to the discussion in the newspapers. What better can we do for our boys than help to establish an industry that will afford those boys a good many openings? The Premier, when he talks of butter and then turns to the subject of machinery, seems to me to somersault altogether. He goes out and tells the people that he wants them to buy Western Australian butter, and says that instead of importing butter from the Eastern States it is much better to import the cow and make the butter here. Might I be allowed to compare the making of machinery to the making of butter.

The Minister for Lands: The Premier has not somersaulted.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Premier has said, and said frequently, that it is better to import the cow and make the butter in this State. In the same strain, I say it is much better to make our own machinery than to import it.

Mr. Sampson: The State Implement Works do not make cream separators.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, but they make good farming machinery. If the hon. member would copy that and keep more printers employed in the printing industry instead of dealing abroad, it would be better for the State.

The Premier: Do not say anything about the hon. member's make of motor car.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not wish to discuss the hon. member's motor car, but certainly a little while ago it was not an English one.

The Premier: What is your own?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Mine is not an English one, either. Unfortunately it is the only one I can afford.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are not discussing motor cars.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Premier in 1909 said that if the Easterners wanted our trade they could come over here and get it. Recently he took up another attitude when he said that if the Easterners were to come over here looking for work, they would get no work. "Let them stay in the East," he added. He might have gone further and said that if they stayed in Victoria he would not mind sending money from the taxpayer here over there to keep them in Victoria. Names of people coming West are being taken on the railway trains now and sent forward to the Government authorities in Western Australia. I say it would be ten thousand times better to let them come here if we had the industries to absorb them than to send money to keep them in the Eastern States. The Premier the other night said that if I could show him that the machinery could be made here, it would be a different matter. In February of 1909 the Premier said that all the machinery needed by the farmer, with the exception perhaps of the reaper and binder, could be made in this State.

Mr. Doney: Of course it can, but it is not.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The other night the Premier said that if I could show him that it could be made in this State, he would agree with me. In 1909 he said that everything needed by the farmer, except the reaper and binder, could be made in this State. They were his own words in 1909. If all the machinery could be made in this State in 1909, how much easier and better

can it be made here in 1930? The Premier also said—

Since the idea of advancing £100 was mentioned, there have been inquiries from Eastern manufacturers desiring to come over here.

If they would come over here for the little trade we had to offer in 1909, how much more readily would they come over for the larger trade now offering? The member for Williams-Narrogin said that if the Bill were to become law twenty State Implement Works could not supply anything like the mass of machinery required in the State. If that is so, is not that an inducement for Eastern States manufacturers to come here and participate in that trade? It is the very thing that would help the industry in this country. The Premier the other night said this—

When I introduced the Bill in 1909, those were the days of small things.

If we take up the attitude the Premier has adopted to-day, this State will always be a State of small things. If we are not going to do anything to advance the State, the State is not going to get very far.

The Premier: This will not advance the State.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I think it will advance it considerably by opening up the industry. I do not wish to weary the House by reading the whole of the speech the Premier made in 1909. It was a splendid speech and I congratulate him on it. I only wish he would put up a similar speech to-day. The hon. member thought it would be an inducement for manufacturers to come here at that time, but he says it would not be an inducement for them to come here now. The Minister for Lands spoke on the Bill, and I am hopeful of getting a little support from him. His reception of the measure was not too bad. He evidently believed in the object of the Bill, but he went on to say that we could not compel the Agricultural Bank to do this and that and the other thing. He said the Associated Banks would not do such a thing. The Associated Banks often do dictate terms to their clients when they go to borrow money.

The Minister for Lands: Oh, no.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister must know of many instances in which the Associated Banks and other institutions have dictated their terms. I might include building societies amongst the other institutions.

The Minister for Lands has evidently been fortunate in that he has not found himself in the clutches of big firms that handle wheat and wool. If he had been in their clutches, he would know that they do dictate terms. Private enterprise, of which the Minister is so fond of talking, does dictate terms. Let any wool grower get into the clutches of one of the big firms, and he will find that he has to put his wool through that firm. Perhaps I have been unfortunate in getting into the clutches of such firms whereas the Minister has been more fortunate. There is no doubt that the big firms do this sort of thing, and most members know that once a farmer gets into their clutches, they dictate their terms and tell him that the man who pays the piper calls the tune. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) was a little antagonistic, but I think there is a chance of getting his support. However, there were one or two things he said he did not like. He said he supported the principle of the Bill, and then he asked what was the underlying motive of the Bill. The only motive is to assist the men and boys who are out of work—some of the men and boys for whom the hon. member on the hustings promised to find work. After the member for Nelson's promising to find work for those people in his district, surely he will not turn me down when I am trying to devise means to find work for them.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Do you think a depot would be established in the Nelson district?

Mr. SLEEMAN: In the Eastern States there are factories in most of the agricultural districts. Only to-day I heard that there is an implement being made in Greenbushes, which is very close to the hon. member's district. On the hustings he said he would provide opportunity for all. This is a chance to assist to provide work for a few and opportunity for a lot. I am sorry that the member for Nelson, in the course of his remarks, could not resist having a dig at the State Implement Works. Though the State Implement Works are not mentioned in the Bill, many members on the Government side harped about what the works would do if the Bill were passed, and what the Bill would do for the works. I am not concerned about State Implement Works, Mitchell works or Nelson works. I want to get works established in this country. The member for Nelson said it was owing to

State implements that thousands of pounds had been lost on the group settlements. I am surprised at his making that statement.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Which is quite correct.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No one knows better than the hon. member why so much money was lost on the group settlements. He can not tell me that the State Implement Works were responsible for the loss of so much money on the groups. There were other causes. Now I come to the Minister for Works. I am sorry he is not in his seat, because I would have liked him to hear what I have to say. He said I made a personal attack on him. I have yet to learn that when one member criticises the statement of another it constitutes a personal attack. I criticised statements he had made in this House, and in reply I was told that I had not any State-made machinery on my farm, which is getting pretty close to personalities. As a result I had to reply to the Minister for Works. There was no personal attack until the Minister made one. The Minister said he had bought more State machinery than I had. To prove what I said that the Minister was always a great opponent of the State Implement Works, I am going to quote him and show that what I said at the time was perfectly correct.

The Premier: Under what Bill does this occur?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister for Works said that farmers had lost hundreds of pounds through using locally-made implements. Later on he added that he could speak from experience. What experience of State implements has the Minister had? He admits that he has not a harvester, and that is generally the bone of contention with everybody. He admits that the ploughs and windmills made by the State Implement Works are good. Practically everything on his farm is good, and yet he sets out to condemn the State Implement Works. In another portion of his speech he said—

Although I shall be attacked by the member for Fremantle, I can say positively that I have spent more money on State implements than anyone else in this House. I have several of the machines; I have used them and scrapped a lot of them.

That is where I join issue with the Minister. When he made that statement I did not interject or contradict him. Now that he has attacked me, I want to say that I do not be-

lieve he has been the largest purchaser in this House of State implements. I am prepared to challenge him on these lines if he will accept the challenge. If he has spent more on State implements than has any other member of this House, I will donate £10 to the Wyalkatchem hospital; if he has not spent more money on State implements than has any other member of this House, he will donate £10 to the Fremantle Hospital.

The Minister for Lands: You cannot do that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am doing it. If the Speaker prevents me, well and good. The Minister has not the power to prevent a member from making his speech. The Minister may appeal to the Speaker if he likes. I am satisfied that the Minister for Works has not spent more money on State-made machinery than has any other member of this House. If the Minister is prepared to accept the challenge, he has a chance of making £10 for the Wyalkatchem Hospital. The Minister produced a file, which I have since perused. I could not find some of the statements said by the Minister to be contained in the file. If he says they are in the file, I shall let it go at that, but I could not find them there. I am sorry that the Minister set out to parade his hospitality. There was no need for him to do that; his hospitality is well known throughout the State. He is noted for his hospitality and for his use of the capital letter "I," and he has used that frequently on every occasion on which I have heard him speak in this House. He went on to say—

The member for Fremantle got a block and, on getting it, he came to me for assistance and advice, which I gave him, as I have given many a member on the other side of the House. I invited him to go to my farm, and showed him all over the farm.

I want to give the Minister a chance to withdraw that statement, which is totally and absolutely untrue. The fact is that, at the latter end of 1924, the present Minister for Works came to me and said that the memorial wing of the Wyalkatchem Hospital was being opened, and would I accompany him there as the Minister could not go and most other members could not be present. At that time I had no block of land, and was not interested in farming. I was not invited to go up and see his farm. I was invited to accompany him to Wyalkatchem at the opening of the hospital wing. That proves

the statement of the Minister untrue. I admit that while in Wyalkatchem he invited me to drive to his farm, and I do not think we were on the farm more than a couple of hours. I did not see too much of it. As regards inspecting the machinery, I think I did more poison-pulling than machinery-inspecting. The manager of the farm spoke about a few sheep that had died.

The Minister for Lands: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It has something to do with the statement of the Minister that I went to him for assistance. I had not a block of land at the time and was not interested in farming. If the Minister for Lands wishes to take sides with the Minister for Works, he can test my statement to ascertain whether it is true. I have a perfect right to answer the statements made by the Minister for Works. The Minister mentioned the expenses of the trip. He would have the House believe that I was his guest, that I travelled with him, and that I stayed with him. All the expense he met was that of my riding in his motor car from Perth to Wyalkatchem. While we were in Wyalkatchem I paid my hotel expenses, and I returned to Perth by train. That is the extent of the hospitality to which the Minister for Works referred. If I am indebted to him for three or four gallons of petrol for the trip to Wyalkatchem, I shall oblige him by handing over the amount when the House rises. The member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) received the Bill somewhat sympathetically. He said he was in accord with the object of the Bill. I thank him for having brought along the exhibits displayed in the corridor to-day. They reveal very good work done in this State, of which we might be proud. I understand that most of such work has previously been done for us in South Australia. If the hon. member proposes the amendment he indicated, of which I do not altogether approve, I shall give it consideration. If I cannot get the whole Bill as I should like it, I shall be prepared to take something which will be a step in the right direction. If the Bill passes the second reading, I shall consider the hon. member's amendment and endeavour to make the Bill more to the liking of members opposite. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) apparently intends to vote against the second reading. I do not know that we shall get very far with the hon. member. Perhaps, in view of

the amendment proposed by the member for Perth, he may think it advisable to support the second reading, so that the Bill may be dealt with in Committee. The only object I had in bringing down this measure was to do something for the people of the State who are particularly interested. Even if members are not prepared to go as far as I would desire, they will perhaps assist me part of the way along the road I wish to travel. I am prepared to meet them to the utmost extent possible, for I believe that half a loaf is perhaps better than no bread. I commend the Bill to the House and hope it will pass the second reading.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	19
Noes	..	..	..	18

Majority for	..	..	1
--------------	----	----	---

#### AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lamond	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Millington	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Doney	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
	(Teller.)

#### PATRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Angelo
Mr. Walker	Mr. Davy
Mr. Kennedally	Mr. Parker
Mr. Coverley	Mr. J. M. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Troy	Mr. Thorn

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; Mr. Sleeman in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

#### Clause 2—Amendment of Section 28:

Mr. H. W. MANN: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "further," in line 3, be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"That the trustees shall have discretion to refuse an advance to a settler for the purchase of any agricultural or dairying implement or machinery which has not been manufactured in Western Australia."

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have not had time to study this amendment. It does not seem that it would take us very far.

Mr. H. W. Mann: You had better take half the loaf or you will get nothing at all.

Mr. Panton: You are not allowed to use threats here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am most anxious to do the right thing. I think we can improve on this amendment, and I should like to see something better than this brought forward. If time were given, possibly something better could be drafted.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for Fremantle thinks we might be able to do something with the amendment if we had time in which to consider it. It should not be discussed until it has been properly analysed. It would be better to report progress.

Progress reported.

#### BILL—EGG MARKETING.

##### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th September.

#### THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. P. D. Ferguson—Irwin-Moore [8.57]: The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson), in introducing this Bill, has lived up to the reputation he has built for himself over a long period of years, the reputation of taking a keen interest in the marketing of all primary products. He has devoted a great deal of time and thought to the question of the marketing of wheat and other products, and we have heard to-night that he has taken a great interest in the marketing of kangaroo skins. I take second place to no one in my interest for the welfare of our primary producers. The results of my inquiries into the marketing question, however, have not satisfied me that compulsory control is in their best in-



terests. Owing to the cost of control, and the disadvantages due to the lack of competition because of the cutting out of private firms that would be brought about by actual compulsion, it would do more harm than anything else to the persons who are vitally concerned. Apart from the fact that control is objectionable and irksome, the Bill contains many undesirable features which absolutely preclude this House from passing it. The hon. member said his first idea was to endeavour to bring about control in the marketing of eggs within the metropolitan area. The Bill provides for control in districts or areas. This kind of local option, if I may call it so, does not appeal to me. It is fraught with very great danger, and would not achieve the object in view. The hon. member's main concern seems to be for the egg producer in the suburban areas, just outside the metropolis. My concern is just as much, if not more, for the egg producer in the country. I fear that the latter's interests are not likely to receive, under the Bill, that consideration to which in my opinion they are entitled. Most of our poultry industry now is located outside the metropolitan area. There are approximately 912,000 head of poultry in the State. Within a 40-mile radius of the Perth Town Hall 306,000 are kept, and outside that radius 606,000. It will be seen that if control is to be of any service to our egg producers as a whole, the control must be general. It will not achieve anything of real service to the egg producers if it is done in a piecemeal fashion. The eggs outside any particular controlled area would be free; and as Perth is the wholesale marketing centre for the State, a limited area around Perth which might in the first instance be constituted a controlled area would be absolutely futile as regards bringing about any beneficial results to the producers.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Give us that amount of control, and we will be content for the time being.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is the bone of contention between the hon. member and myself. I am fairly convinced that such control would be useless to the country producer, and would not be materially beneficial to the suburban producer.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The producer needs to be educated first.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What would be the position of the producers outside the area, supposing one was proclaimed in the vicinity of Perth, who sent their eggs to Perth, which to-day is the only outlet they have? I take it those producers would have to conform with any regulations which might be detrimental to their interests, even with regulations directed against the country egg producer by a board constituted largely or almost wholly of metropolitan egg producers.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That could not be, of course.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If there happened to be two controlled areas in districts not adjoining, they might make regulations directed absolutely to the detriment of each other. Such a position would be absurd, but under the Bill it might be created. In the course of his remarks the hon. member referred to the fact that the local price for eggs is less than export parity. Primary producers are notoriously slow in coming to a decision as to the export of their products, even though export might be, and often is, in their own interests. They generally prefer to take, say, a shilling a dozen for eggs in Perth, and be sure of that amount, rather than seek to get 1s. 1d. by exporting to the Old Country. In every instance that I know of, particularly as regards wheat, fruit and meat, the Western Australian primary producer has refused to take on the export of his product until the price in the local market has fallen to an almost unremunerative level. As one who in years gone by had a good deal to do with the marketing of wheat, the member for Guildford will realise that. He must admit that he and others absolutely refused to export a bushel of wheat until the local price had become so low as to compel them to export. In the realm of wheat an organisation with which the hon. member is personally associated has done marvellously well in a purely voluntary capacity. I think I am safe in saying that the wheat growers of Western Australia would not have a compulsory pool at any price. The voluntary pool has been an unqualified success, and what has been achieved by the wheat growers—

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They were first educated by compulsion.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They were educated by the fact that the Western Australian price fell so much as to be well below the London parity.

Mr. Corboy: There had to be compulsion in the first place, then.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The same thing will happen in connection with eggs.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We shall have to educate the producers by compulsion first.

The Chief Secretary: How long?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am quite satisfied that when the egg producers who market locally are bitten to such an extent as to be very much hurt, they will be induced to turn their attention to overseas markets. The hon. member tells us that to-day they are selling their eggs locally for less than they can sell them at abroad. They have some business instincts, and they will not let that go on too long. To-day the lamb producers of this State are in much the same plight. I personally have been trying for some time to induce them to be prepared to export their lambs when the local price falls below London parity.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Did you try to organise those producers?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have tried very hard to organise them. I have tried to induce them to export a percentage of their lambs early, so that a crash may not occur in the lambs sold here. The lamb producers who have agreed to that course can almost be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Mr. Corboy: In other words, compulsion is necessary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is far better to be compelled by prices than to be compelled by a law of which the producers generally do not approve.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is quite wrong.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Everything I say will be wrong in the hon. member's eyes.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You are misrepresenting the Bill. The Bill does not ask for compulsion.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If I said anything that appealed

to the hon. member, it would not appeal to other members, and certainly it would be foreign to my own views on this subject.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But you should not misrepresent.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Reference has been made to the fact that compulsion did much for the dried fruits industry. I am quite prepared to admit that. It is the only compulsion known to me that has been beneficial to the primary producers of this State. The position as to dried fruits is entirely different from the position regarding eggs. For 40 years one particular district of Western Australia, the Swan district, has been noted for the productive nature of its vines. For a great many years, further back than I can remember, a few vinegrowers on the Swan have been accustomed to market a percentage of dried vine fruits. It was well established that that district was wonderfully suited for the production of raisins. At the close of the war, when many of our soldiers were being repatriated, the Government of the day—incidentally, I think it was led by the present Premier—decided that viticulture would be a suitable avenue of employment for returned men. A great many of them were put on growing vine fruits on the Swan.

Mr. Sampson: They starved until they got the dried fruits marketing law.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I will show the absolute absurdity of that statement. For some years those soldier settlers reaped a rich harvest as the result of their operations. The hon. member, in his ignorance, says they starved. To my knowledge, the price of dried fruits soared to about £90 per ton, and the growers did remarkably well. As the result of the reconstruction of affairs on the shores of the Mediterranean after the war, and as an effect of increased production in California, the price of dried fruits slumped badly. In Australia a system of compulsion was brought into operation. But it is not due to that policy that the success of dried fruits production has to a certain extent been sustained. It is due to the decision of the Australian people, the Australian consumers, that in the interests of the returned soldiers it was not advisable to allow the industry to languish. Therefore Australian consumers said, "We are prepared to pay more for the fruit than it is

worth, so that our returned men can remain on the land and the industry be saved to Western Australia." To-day dried vine fruits are being sold in Western Australia at a much higher price than in London. To-day currants are bringing in London approximately £37 per ton, while the local consumers are paying, and are prepared to pay, at the rate of £63.

Mr. Corboy: Protection is all right sometimes, then.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Protection has nothing to do with compulsion. The price of sultanas is £45 in London, and £70 in Western Australia. I am of opinion that Western Australian consumers are not prepared to adopt a similar course to save the egg industry or the poultry industry. I am firmly convinced also that nothing that compulsion can achieve cannot be achieved under a voluntary pool. The Australian people generally do not like compulsion, do not care to have it foisted on them. They regard it as irksome. As an instance of what can be achieved by voluntary effort, let me inform the House that the voluntary pool in South Australia, as recently as last month, was selling in Adelaide eggs, guaranteed new and infertile, at 1s. 3d. per dozen. At that time the price in Western Australia was 10½d. per dozen. New South Wales has a system of control which the sponsor of this Bill wants to introduce here. New South Wales tried to boost up the price of eggs, and failed dismally. While eggs were selling in Adelaide for 1s. 3d. and in Perth for 10½d., the New South Wales pool sought to fix a price of 1s. 2d. per dozen; but owing to the dumping of Queensland eggs the New South Wales board had to reduce the price. So much for compulsion. Voluntary efforts are evidently far more effective. For some considerable time, an effort has been made to export eggs from Western Australia and I would like to inform the House what has been achieved in that direction during the last six years. In 1924 we exported 18,045 dozen eggs, and in 1925, 38,006 dozen. We had built up quite a decent little export trade by that time, and in 1926 we sent away 196,980 dozen. In the following year, 1927, when the Commonwealth Act and the regulations under it were first brought into operation, our exports slumped to 62,520 dozen. That was due to the fact that our poultry farmers did not produce a standard of egg that, according

to the Commonwealth regulations came up to export quality. Thousands of eggs intended for export were accordingly rejected. Profiting by the experience gained that year, in 1928 we started to build up the export trade again, and sent away 111,885 dozen eggs, and in 1929, 174,720 dozen. For 1930, on the basis of the exports that are taking place, it is estimated that something like 240,000 dozen eggs will be sent away. I cannot help thinking that if the Bill becomes law, it will be necessary to set up some organisation to control the business. Those who have been attempting to conduct a voluntary pool in Western Australia and have not met with the success they deserved or desired, would probably be at least some of those who would control the compulsory pool and handle our eggs. I want to say at once that that will not be acceptable to the country producers of eggs in Western Australia. In fact, I doubt whether it will be acceptable to the egg producers in the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Those who will control will have to be elected.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If any proof were needed in support of my contention, we have it in the figures available, which go to show what eggs are being handled by the poultry committee and what eggs are dealt with through the ordinary channels of trade. The private traders are getting most of the business, and the voluntary pool has not done as well as I desire, or as the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) would wish.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You know that the private traders are merchants buying eggs and making a profit themselves. I want that profit to go to the producers.

The Minister for Railways: You can make a return to the producers now if you desire.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Some time ago representatives of the poultry organisations in the metropolitan area waited upon me and asked that the Government should introduce a measure similar to that now before the House. The Government gave the matter serious consideration, but decided that they would not father the Bill, the policy of the Government being that it would be better, in the interests of the producers and of all concerned, to allow the natural channels of trade to carry on rather than to interfere with them and bring in a measure of compulsion. I am perfectly

satisfied that voluntary effort can and will achieve all that can be claimed for compulsion. In fact, I think the advocates of compulsion have altogether over-estimated the advantages of it and under-estimated the advantages of voluntary effort. If, like the wheat growers, they have private firms operating and a voluntary pool as well, then if the voluntary pool gives service to the producers such as the voluntary wheat pool has given, I am satisfied that, as time goes on, the voluntary pool will easily collar the bulk of the trade being done, and that the producers will be quite satisfied with their efforts. Recently the Department of Agriculture, in endeavouring to assist the egg producers of the State, attempted to get a concession from the Federal Government. Our producers have demonstrated that they are exporting eggs of a higher quality than those despatched from any other State in Australia. Because of that, we have been trying to induce the Federal Minister for Markets to approve of our eggs being branded as Western Australian. Unfortunately we have not been successful in our effort so far, but we are following the matter up still further in the hope that the Minister will accede to our request and allow us to brand our eggs as "Western Australian eggs" instead of as "Australian eggs." If our efforts prove successful, it will assist materially in the further expansion of the export trade of this State. I wish to read to the House a few lines from a report in a South Australian newspaper, which has just come to hand, and which has reference to the operations of the voluntary egg pool in that State. The report contains the following:—

From a small beginning of five members pooling about 200 dozen eggs a week, the Association is now more than 400 strong, pooling 40,000 dozen eggs in springtime and supplying 60 per cent. of the South Australian exports to the United Kingdom.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Now go on and read the lot.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In conclusion, I wish to issue a note of warning to members of Parliament who represent country constituencies. I warn them that this effort of compulsion is an effort by the suburban poultry raisers and some suburban politicians, and will not be in the best interests of the egg producers throughout the country districts. I suggest to them that they would be wise in the

interests of their constituents not to allow the Bill to become law.

Mr. Corboy: Read the whole clipping.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not the slightest use for any member of Parliament to try to interrupt me while I am speaking. It is absolutely impossible for me to hear interjections that have fallen from hon. members. That is not my fault, but my misfortune. I have not heard one interjection.

The Minister for Railways: You have not missed anything.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I may not have missed anything, although members of Parliament may say that they have not heard much. I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill, and I hope it will not be agreed to.

*[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]*

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [9.24]: I support the Bill.

Mr. McCallum. You are one of the suburban politicians!

Mr. SAMPSON: I am disappointed that the Minister did not read the whole of the newspaper clipping to which he referred. Had he done so he would have disclosed to the House that the South Australian egg producers are desirous of an egg control board being established in their State. I realise, as everyone who has given the slightest consideration to the subject must appreciate that this problem bristles with difficulties. There is one object only in connection with the Bill and that is to give to those who are engaged in the poultry industry an opportunity to make a living. The position to-day is that, in a marketing sense, we are living in a by-gone age.

Mr. Panton: I hope the eggs are not in the same state.

Mr. SAMPSON: We have failed to keep pace with the forward movement in other countries. I shall endeavour to show by references to what is done elsewhere and to statements by various authorities, that the Bill now before hon. members is in the interests of the producers, the consumers, and the State generally.

The Chief Secretary: And in the interests of those outside Australia, too!

Mr. SAMPSON: Outside Australia the principle is recognised, as I hope to demonstrate.

The Minister for Railways: And you are in favour of a monopoly!

Mr. SAMPSON: I applaud the action of the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) in introducing the Bill. I am sorry the Government could not see their way clear to introduce it. It would have been a great pleasure to me to have supported a Government measure, not that I desire to imply disrespect for the Bill now before the House. As the member for Guildford-Midland himself explained, a Bill introduced by a private member is accompanied by grave difficulties from a Constitutional standpoint. I would like to read a few remarks issued by the Federal Minister for Markets, in connection with Empire marketing—

Everywhere we have been losing ground while the traders of the United States, better informed and equipped, keener perhaps in the study of local requirements and with greater driving power behind them, have gone rapidly ahead. The moral of all this is plain. It means, as Mr. Lennox B. Lee, the retiring president of the Federation of British Industries, recently pointed out, that we must discard old ideas of organisation and methods of distribution, adopt mass production, work more efficiently, rationalise our machinery and our labour, and unify interest and aim, with the co-operation of capital and labour as the essential preliminary condition. Our whole outlook involves the application of scientific control to industry in its entirety.

The first argument brought forward against the Bill to establish an egg control board is that a voluntary effort could be made by the producers, and thus the difficulty would be overcome. That method has been tried over and over again, and always the result has been failure. For a time it appeared that a measure of success would attend the voluntary efforts made. On the argument that half a loaf is better than no bread, so long as a considerable proportion of those engaged in the industry participated in the voluntary pool, something was achieved, but as time went on the number of producers supporting the effort lessened, and so it is realised that a voluntary effort in connection with egg marketing is hopeless. The argument used that the wheat pool is a success, is answered by the fact that education along the lines of compulsion has made that voluntary effort possible. I hope that hon. members will give those engaged in the poultry industry an opportunity to test out real organisation along compulsory lines.

If that is done, even for a period of a few years, I am satisfied that thereafter there will be no return to the present chaotic position. It is always realised that the local market is the best market, but that export is essential. Naturally endeavours are made to secure the local market, but unless export is maintained a glut soon occurs. Organisation, therefore, is necessary, and all producers should participate. The marketing difficulties that face this primary industry, as well as others, are world-wide. The worst feature is that the efforts of those who endeavour to market efficiently are injured by a section which does not realise the value of organisation. Those people claim something termed liberty or freedom, and as a result they remain chained to out-of-date methods which really hold them as slaves or serfs. It is admitted that some Australian products figure very badly in the world's markets. Australia does not stand up as well as does New Zealand. In London Mr. H. E. Stevens, a member of the New Zealand Export Control Board, has made the marketing of New Zealand products very much more successful than it was prior to the appointment of that officer under the New Zealand Export Control Act. Under that Act Mr. Stevens has absolute power. Some evidence was given in the Perth "Daily News" of the 31st June last which I think is of sufficient interest to read. In that issue Mr. T. M. Wilford, the New Zealand High Commissioner, quoting the Empire Marketing Board as an authority, claimed that New Zealand producers of meat, butter, cheese, honey, and other products were absolutely up to date in comparison with their world competitors. Mr. Wilford therefore believed that he was entitled to congratulate not only New Zealand's producers, but also its trade representatives. It is a matter for regret that we have not the same justification for congratulation. We are lacking in those efforts of organisation which in the Dominion have been made possible by statute. The position is that we are really out of step with modern marketing methods. In California great progress has been made. That State has gone further than most other countries, and to-day spares no effort in placing her products on the markets of the world. Californian trade commissioners are sent out, and carefully-devised standardisation laws are enforced. As a matter of

fact California is so well organised, and her products are distributed to such an extent, that even in countries adjacent to Australia California holds the market for citrus fruits, bananas, etc., which New Zealand cannot produce. For New Zealand those fruits are provided, not by Australia, but by other countries, principally by California. Yet in point of location to the New Zealand market Australia has a very great advantage indeed over California. But California has shown by her methods of marketing that she is able to lead the world in these matters. As I was observing, from California trade commissioners are sent out to go through different parts of the world making arrangements for the reception of Californian products. In this way real assistance by the State Government of California is rendered. Here in Western Australia we have organisation in most things; organisation in regard to finance, in regard to shipping, in regard to trade workers, and in many other regards.

The Minister for Lands: We have certain pools.

Mr. SAMPSON: There are in operation what might be termed pools, because of the existence of definite honourable understandings which have the effect of stabilising rates of interest, shipping rates, and other charges. I realise that the poultry industry is a particularly difficult one to organise. There are in it a majority of small producers. It is well recognised that the bigger the concern, the more easily can organisation be brought about. The organisations to which I referred, bankers, shipping, trade workers, and so on, try to stabilise, and actually are successful in stabilising, their services to industry. We claim that if the egg producers desire organisation it should be in their power to get it. But even the Minister for Agriculture himself acknowledges that the efforts he made proved, if not futile, at least so discouraging that it was impossible to hope for success. It is desired that our poultry farmers who compete overseas should have the assistance which is given by other countries. It is asked that a measure, really on the lines of the New South Wales Marketing of Primary Products Act, on the broad lines on which the measure now before the House has been framed by the member

for Guildford, shall be approved. Some of the reasons for control are as follows:—

Because grower-controlled marketing is infinitely superior to agent-controlled marketing. Grower-controlled marketing means orderly marketing. The pooling system has proved itself; it is far beyond the experimental stage. Under the protection of a pool the uplift of an industry generally is possible; the pool would specialise in the marketing of eggs, and the board would give this matter its sole attention. The elected representatives of the growers, being growers themselves would have interests identical with those of other growers. The board's determination would be to see that returns to growers covered the cost of production plus a fair margin of profit to which the grower is entitled, and which all other classes in the business community claim as their moral right. The pool board could hold store the surplus on behalf of the growers. The pool would be in a position to supply intelligently the demands of the local market by realising just what the market can absorb.

The lack of a system means gluts and consequent ruinous prices to all concerned. On Monday evening last a public meeting was held in Keough's Hall, Stirling-street, Perth. That meeting had been called by advertisement in the weekly and daily Press, and it was open to all concerned in the poultry industry. It was a very large meeting, there being insufficient seating accommodation for all who attended, the number being about 300. The matter of pooling was discussed at length, and questions were asked and answered. Subsequently a vote was taken, and with the exception of two or three persons, the meeting was unanimously in favour of the passing of the measure brought down by the member for Guildford. The growers themselves are satisfied that their salvation lies in organisation. Unquestionably improvement will be brought about in that way. Back in 1924 I visited Queensland in company with Mr. H. J. Yelland, M.L.C., and while there I specially inquired into the operations of the Egg Control Board. Recently I wired to the Premier of Queensland to ascertain the position to-day. I am glad to say I now have the privilege of giving the House the latest information, for the Premier of Queensland has been good enough to send me a reply as follows:—

Queensland egg pool was created in 1923 and now applies to all persons with 50 fowls or over in the populous south-eastern portion of Queensland. Since the pool was estab-

lished, production in Queensland has practically doubled, and without the pool it is difficult to conceive how the local market could have been maintained in view of the vast quantity of eggs that have had to be exported.

If nothing further than that was submitted to the House it would be, I think, sufficient evidence to show justification for what is being done. I have referred to organisation in New Zealand and California. In addition there is a measure of control in South Africa and also in Canada. In Canada it is a very real measure. I refer particularly to the province of British Columbia, where control on the lines of committee-of-direction methods has been in existence for the past three or four years. Only a few weeks ago I received a letter from the chairman of the board, who says that although they have plenty of trouble, the position is better because of the organisation they now have. Nobody expects that the operation of this Bill will eliminate all trouble. That would be too much altogether to expect. There will always be difficulties. Difficulties are not objected to, so long as it is possible to export a sufficient number of eggs in order to give to those engaged in the industry the advantage of the big London and Old World markets. It is a fact that Western Australia offers wonderful inducements for poultry raising. I need not dwell on that, for it is well known. Our climate is wonderfully adapted to egg production, but experience has proved that progress in marketing is only possible when the producers have the advantage of control of sales and distribution. This statement, I claim is supported by the experience of other countries to which I have referred. The Bill aims to give control, but only if and when three-fifths of the commercial producers desire it. Under control the price of eggs is stabilised. We learned when in Queensland that prior to the establishment of the egg pool prices fluctuated very greatly indeed, and that in a few days they went from 1s. 3d. to 2s. 6d., and from 2s. 6d. back to 1s. 3d. Such things could not happen under the operations of the control board, for if there is one thing the board would do, it would be to stabilise prices, and so protect the producers, protect the consumers, and generally improve the industry.

Mr. Panton: Will it protect the fowls at all?

Mr. SAMPSON: All the Bill seeks to do is to provide machinery for organisation; in other words, it is an enabling Bill designed to make possible without further recourse to Parliament the control of the marketing of eggs. The Bill provides that a majority of three-fifths of the producers in certain areas may secure control subject to a vote being taken. The assumption of control by egg producers does not follow as a matter of course on the passing of the Bill. A vote must be taken, and thus there are adequate safeguards for those who may oppose the measure. A board of five is provided for, two to be nominated by the Government, and the other three to be elected by the producers. It is surely reasonable to ask that those who produce the eggs should have control of them, that if three-fifths of those engaged in the industry in a certain area vote for it, they should have the power of control. An effective majority is therefore essential before anything can be done. It is no mere statement to say that our poultry producers have their backs to the wall. It is an absolute truth. The poultry industry has been hard hit lately, and the reason for it is largely the absence of organisation. It is no one's business to see that eggs are exported. This is left to anyone, and consequently it is not properly done. Not many weeks ago I was in Perenjori. I mention this to show how poorly eggs are distributed and the ineffectual methods that obtain in our own State. At Perenjori, with a friend, I went to a refreshment room and ordered ham and eggs, and the surprising fact is there were no eggs in the town.

Mr. Panton: There were plenty at Perenjori the other day.

Mr. SAMPSON: Perhaps so. It is a remarkable thing that where there is no organisation, one day there is a glut and another day there is a famine. On the day following my arrival at Perenjori, eggs arrived.

Mr. Panton: Had there been an election meeting the night before?

Mr. SAMPSON: If there is one thing control would ensure, it is a supply of eggs to all centres. We have an army of unemployed in Western Australia.

The Minister for Railways: I have heard that before.

Mr. SAMPSON: Many of those people would find profitable employment if this industry were organised. There is an al-

most unlimited market overseas to which eggs could be exported.

Mr. Marshall: You never appreciate the solution of your troubles.

Mr. SAMPSON: Other countries have developed organisation to an extraordinary pitch of perfection. We realise that it can be done here, but only on the lines of organisation set forth in the Bill. The success that has attended the operation of the Dried Fruits Act is a complete answer to those who claim that compulsion would be a mistake. Again, we have the Sandalwood Act passed in the concluding session of the last Parliament. Members will recall that the measure was passed without a single protest, even from the most conservative of members. That measure was one of compulsion. In addition to wiring the Premier of Queensland, I wired the Minister for Agriculture in New South Wales, Mr. Thorby. He replied—

Marketing eggs under organised control allows advances to be made farmers, also provides surplus be exported. Any loss resulting from export distributed over whole industry and not borne by limited number. Interstate price cutting has involved board in considerable difficulty.

That is realised, but it is hoped, since Queensland and New South Wales have already organised, that a Bill is before the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, and that South Australian producers are striving to obtain control, it will not be long before we have control boards in the poultry industry just as we have in the dried fruits industry. There is co-operation in the fullest degree in regard to dried fruits, each State being protected. If this Bill be passed, it will only remain for South Australia to adopt similar legislation, and then we shall have the same control in the egg industry as we have in the dried fruits industry. Under the measure there will be ample opportunity definitely to ensure that good fresh eggs will be available for the public. That will be a good thing. If there is anything calculated to encourage the consumption of eggs, it is the definite knowledge that they are of good quality. "Eat more eggs!"

Member: Give the fowls more ginger.

Mr. SAMPSON: The trouble is that at existing prices a producer could not afford to give them green grass. Organisa-

tion is necessary; otherwise we shall get nowhere.

Mr. Marshall: The Minister for Railways will get all the eggs he wants at the next election.

Mr. SAMPSON: Let me give a few details regarding the New South Wales Egg Marketing Board. On the 30th June, 1930, the chairman issued the first annual report, which stated—

The majority of the egg producers within the controlled area loyally support the board. The areas concerned are the counties of Cumberland and Northumberland, and the shires of Nattai and Wollondilly. Some 14 authorised agents in Sydney, Newcastle, and Maitland handle the board's eggs.

It has been claimed that when there is control, the small producer has his business taken from him and that he is no longer able to supply the needs of a small round which he has hitherto carried on.

The Minister for Lands: He will not be able to do so under this measure.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Bill makes provision for exemptions, and exemptions also operate under the New South Wales Act. In that State a large number of exemptions are granted to producers, thus permitting them to sell privately the whole or any part of their products. Altogether 37 per cent. of the product is sold by exempted producers, and 63 per cent. through authorised agents. It is proposed that the Western Australian board should have similar power. The board's work is sometimes not clearly understood and criticism, much of it very unfair, has been levelled against the New South Wales pool. Criticism will be levelled against every effort made by the producers to place their industry on a proper basis. Success always brings criticism, but the fact is indisputable that the New South Wales Act is proving advantageous to the producers of that State. The same applies in Queensland; the same will apply here. The object of levelling criticism is to create dissension, to break down the confidence of producers. The New South Wales board has received much support. The Minister for Agriculture, the Colonial Treasurer, and I dare say the whole of the Government of New South Wales stand behind it. Sometimes it is considered that Labour Governments alone support methods of organisation. That is not so.

Mr. Marshall: They do initiate intelligent legislation.



regulations have been tabled which have passed by unnoticed. Indeed, I am not sure whether it may not truly be said that we have somewhat abused the trust which has been reposed in us by having extended privileges and concessions to ourselves, to say nothing of having increased our own salaries on two or three occasions. The article in the "West Australian" sets out an appalling state of affairs, and its publication has rendered the public a great service. Let me traverse what is pointed out. Firstly we are told that each member of Parliament is supplied with a free gold pass. This entitles the holder to travel not only upon the State Railways, but upon State steamers and over all the lines of the Eastern States, including the Commonwealth railways.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is that correct about the State steamers?

Hon. J. M. Drew: No; it is not correct.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am told that members do travel on State steamers, merely paying for their meals; that the passage is as free as on the State railways.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I think it applies only to members for the North-West.

Hon. J. M. Drew: That is so.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And they pay the victualling allowance.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am giving hon. members what appears in the article I have here, and what I have learnt on making inquiries. I may add that my inquiries have not been made from men in the street. No complaint can well be advanced against the practice in general, because it is essential that members of Parliament should be able to travel freely, and this they do not do if they had to pay for each journey out of their salaries.

Hon. E. H. Harris: In those circumstances many members would be compelled to live in the city.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: They would be compelled to live in the city, or on the other hand they would not be able to do their duty to their constituents as they ought to do by being present within the constituencies. But the privilege does not stop there. It carries with it the right of the holder to take his wife and children under 16 years of age over the railways twice a year without charge. There can be no possible justification for this, and in these times the conces-

sion ought to be cut out. Then there are holders of life passes which are provided (a) for Premiers who have held office for one year or more, (b) for Presidents and Speakers who have served for three years, (c) for Cabinet Ministers who, in the aggregate, have held office for three years, (d) Leaders of Opposition on completion of six years' service in the aggregate, (e) persons who have served 25 years as members of the Federal Parliament. Why members of the Federal Parliament and not members of the State Parliament does not appear, but in not one of the instances set out can the issue of life passes be justified from my point of view. These passes carry with them free journeys and free sleeping berths for wives and families twice in every year. There is no warrant for such privileges at the expense of the taxpayer. The privileges should attach to the member, and not to his wife or family. Next come Presidents and Speakers who have served for three years. What justification is there for this on top of an additional salary of £400 a year, making £1,000 in all, besides other smaller privileges? Here again not only is the life pass for themselves, but it carries wife and family privileges. Next we have the heads of departments, each of whom is entitled to free railway travel. Why, I do not know. If an officer is called upon to travel in connection with any work he is engaged upon, his expenses ought to be debited to the work and confined to such. Certainly there is no justification for the free use of the railways, whether the occasion be for work or for joy riding. Since looking at the matter I have received a note from a prominent gentleman in this community. I will not mention his name, but I will show the note to any hon. member who desires to see it. The gentleman writes—

Regarding railway passes, it is interesting to know that quite a number of highly placed civil servants have railway or tramway passes, or both, from their homes to their offices; also a good number have the telephone installed and annual payment is made by the Government, the excuse being that the duties of office might require them to be called at night or on Sundays. Even the president and secretary of the Trotting Club have free passes on the trams, on the ground that their trotting meetings bring much revenue to the tramways. Railway employees and their families, of course, are almost unlimited.

A most grave position exists in connection with the permanent employees of the Railway Department. It is usual in the case of all railways, including private companies, to grant travelling concessions to their employees. But the conditions prevailing here are somewhat different from those which operate in connection with some other railways and private companies. Here we have not only annual leave but long service leave. During these occasions not only are the employees permitted to travel free, but they may take their wives, unmarried daughters of any age, and sons up to 18 years of age, to and from any places within the limits of the railway system. I have verified these facts from the proper channel. In addition to this they and their families are entitled to two destination passes annually. This means that the place of travel is specified, whereas in the case of the annual leave privileges there is no limitation. In addition to this an unlimited number of privilege tickets is obtainable at half the single fare for the return journey. Thus the employees are practically the owners of the railways for the time being, going where they please and when they please. I am advised that in the good old days it was quite a common practice for heads of departments to find some urgent work to be done at, say, Kalgoolie when the racing carnival was on. I do not think the present heads continue the practice. At the same time, there is no justification whatever for heads of departments having the free use of the railways, either to take them to their homes, or to participate in a holiday jaunt if they so require. Still further, season tickets at half fare are available for the employees to travel to and from work. Again, those employed in isolated places are entitled to medical passes whenever required. Moreover, market passes to the nearest market town are issued once a month, and are available for the employee, his wife, or housekeeper, or his children between 5 years and 14 years. An employee's wife or housekeeper may also on application obtain a fortnightly pass, if desired, for marketing purposes. Then, notwithstanding district allowances, free freight from the nearest market town up to two cwt. per fortnight is provided, in addition to which meat, bread, vegetables and dairy produce are carried free as and whenever required. Except, say, in the case of the annual holiday

and the free journeys for marketing purposes, not one of these privileges is warranted. Employees of the railways have sheltered jobs, good pay and district allowances. Members may not appreciate what these concessions mean. If they will turn to the Revenue Estimates they will find on page 24, Premier's Department, the following items: 1, Travelling concessions to members of Parliament and life pass holders, £3,000. That was for last year. 2, Payment to Railway Department to cover all charges for free passes, special trains, cars, etc., £1,500. 3, Railway and tramway passes for disabled returned soldiers, £500. The first item, £3,000, is used to provide £150 per annum for each life pass holder. This £150 is paid into a pool covering all the State and Commonwealth railways, out of which each contributor draws its share on the basis of the number of its life pass holders. The next two items, £1,500 and £500, go together, and involve the State Railway Department in a very heavy annual loss. If members will turn to Appendix O, page 91 of the Railway Commissioner's report, they will find a statement showing that the items covered by this £2,000 have involved the department in a cost of £36,057, or a loss of £34,057. The statement reads as follows:—

Plus value of Parliamentary and other services, etc., performed under instructions from the Government, exclusive of £2,000 paid by the Treasury—£34,057.

In other words the Railway Department has been instructed to perform services at a cost of £36,057, against which the Department has received £2,000. An ordinary station to station pass in this State, that is an all lines pass, costs £158, and this added to the £150 paid into the pool makes it £308 as the value of a life pass to a Premier who was for one year in office. So he receives the equivalent of a pension of £308 per annum indirectly through the life pass to which he has become entitled. The Budget provision and the actual cost show how members and the public are deluded into thinking that £2,000 is the cost, whereas actually it is £36,057. Let me point to another fact. All railway employees are entitled to annual leave and long service leave. During those periods the railways are freely used by the men and their families. Some time ago there were 1,800 men employed at the Midland Workshops. I do not know

Mr. SAMPSON: Both the Queensland and the New South Wales Governments are Nationalist-Country Party Governments. Those interested in the welfare of the producers, regardless of party, have come together and done everything in their power to assist the industry. By passing measures of control, those engaged in the industry have been able to operate on a proper basis. Let me refer to the result that followed the first year's operations in New South Wales. From the 12th August to the 11th November, 1929, 55,000 cases, each of 30 dozen, were exported overseas from the controlled area. The net realisation was 1s. 1½d. per dozen. In the aggregate 14,232,310 dozen eggs were controlled, the gross value being £1,087,190. The cost of doing this amounted to one-tenth of a penny per dozen. That wonderful result was achieved after 12 months' control in New South Wales. Members have heard the telegram forwarded by the Premier of Queensland and of the wonderful success that has followed control there. The Minister for Agriculture in New South Wales recently made the following remarks:—

I am satisfied that the State Marketing Bureau will soon come to play an important part in the extension of production in New South Wales. The scientific problems of production already receive the attention of the department over which I have the honour to preside, and we now propose to embark seriously on a continuous study of the economic problems of primary industry, with particular attention to the questions of markets and marketing.

In face of those statements, can anyone doubt that in that State there will be prosperity and progress in primary industries?

The Minister for Lands: Do not you know what happened to the compulsory wheat pool?

Mr. SAMPSON: I should very much like to have a few words to say on that subject, but to do so at this stage would be out of order. Mr. Thorby continues—

The significance of this development it would be difficult to over-estimate. To replace assumption with knowledge, and to substitute a plan of campaign for haphazard action, may be said to be the functions of the State Marketing Bureau, and, with the probable adoption of the principle of collective marketing by many branches of primary industry, the need for such an organisation becomes apparent. In any circumstances, the need for it remains, and it is encouraging to report that at a recent conference in Perth of Ministers of Agriculture it was agreed that

all the States should establish bureaux on similar lines for the study of agricultural economics, and should co-operate in developing the work of the bureau for the common good. . . . Only one word more. Study will show that the interests of the community at large are conserved in the Act, and that the powers of a marketing board, so essential to effective marketing, are associated with provisions in the public interest. The Marketing of Primary Products Act will not operate to the disadvantage of the consumer.

I was very disappointed to hear the opposition voiced by the Minister for Agriculture to-night. I had hoped he would take the same view that was taken by his predecessor in office. In August, 1927, a deputation consisting of representatives of the egg producing industry, and including Messrs. S. Dolman, M. Love, R. Knight, J. T. Roberts, J. Russell, and S. Cunningham was introduced by me to the then Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Millington), and we discussed the matter very fully with him. I am glad to say the Minister was very sympathetic. In his concluding remarks he said—

For some time I have taken a keen interest in the extension of the industry, and I do not know of any industry which might expand so rapidly were a reasonable price assured. It is the absence of that which has kept the industry back. I cannot speak for the Government, but I am in entire sympathy with your desire, and if you will furnish me with the information I seek, I would be prepared to recommend that your request be given consideration by the Government.

The Minister for Railways: Who was that?

Mr. SAMPSON: The then Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Millington).

The Minister for Railways: What decision did he arrive at?

Mr. SAMPSON: The present Minister says that the natural channels of trade will do what is necessary in respect to organising the industry.

Mr. Munsie: They will go on bleeding the primary producers as they have done in years past.

The Minister for Railways: What did you do during your six years of office?

Mr. SAMPSON: I claim that the natural channels of trade will not do what is necessary. It is left to those in the industry, supported by the Parliamentary representatives, to obtain statutory power, otherwise they will get nowhere. Many of these

producers have striven hard. Much honorary work has been put into an effort to organise the industry, but the result has always been the same—failure. The Minister referred to the efforts made by those in primary industries. I venture the opinion that it is impossible for anyone to give a single example where efficient marketing organisation along the lines of voluntary effort has ever been successful. There is no instance of it. That experience is by no means restricted to Western Australia. In this State we are in a marketing sense living in a by-gone age. This statement has no party significance. Everyone in the House is animated by a desire to assist those on the land. It is generally agreed that our wealth comes from the land. If we look after those who are engaged in primary production, we look after all, and success to the State must follow. From the standpoint of marketing we are a long way behind our competitors.

Mr. Withers: You have a lot of primary producers behind you on the cross benches.

Mr. SAMPSON: I foresee great difficulties in the finding of markets for our produce. It is only by thorough organisation, standardisation, and control that efficiency can be secured. I hope the Bill will pass, and that those engaged in the industry will be given the consideration they both need and deserve.

On motion by Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 2nd October, 1930.*

	Page
Standing Orders ... ..	822
Temporary Chairmen of Committees ... ..	822
Motions: Railway free passes, to restrict ... ..	822
Coal industry, to inquire by Royal Commission ... ..	830
Bills: Supply (No. 2) £970,000, all stages ... ..	825
Main Roads, 1R. ... ..	830

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

### STANDING ORDERS.

The PRESIDENT: I desire to announce that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a message approving of the amendments to the Standing Orders that were adopted by the Legislative Council on the 23rd September, 1930.

### TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the power given to the President under the Standing Orders as amended, I nominate for the present session the following members to act as temporary Chairmen of Committees:—Hon. J. Nicholson, Hon. H. Stewart, and Hon. W. H. Kitson.

### MOTION—RAILWAY FREE PASSES, TO RESTRICT.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan)  
[4.35]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when the practice of issuing life and free passes on State railways and tramways should cease, except in the following cases:—(a) to members of Parliament during their tenure of office; (b) to railway employees in remote districts for the purpose of marketing and for one journey each year for themselves, their wives and families when on annual holiday; (c) to maimed soldiers.

An article which appeared in the "West Australian" on Wednesday last has impelled me to table this motion. Although I have been in this State for 48 years, I was never before aware that the system of privileges had grown to such an extent as to become a public scandal. We members of Parliament cannot well exonerate ourselves from blame, for, from time to time,