

ment for £1,500. Additions will entail a further expenditure of £850. From the supply in bulk through the council to the Melville Road Board we received about £173 per annum. From the direct supply we should receive £700—an increase of £527 per annum. To put the whole thing in a nutshell: The Bill proposes an exchange of territory between the Government and the Perth City Council. The Government are undertaking not to supply retail current in any portion of the Bayswater Road District in consideration of the Perth City Council surrendering the right to supply retail current in the Applecross area, which is under the control of the Melville Road Board. The exchange of rights is satisfactory to both parties. The Government do not desire to supply the few retail consumers outside the five-mile radius at Bayswater, and so have arranged for the Perth City Council to take them over. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.2]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 11th September.

I would be glad indeed if hon. members would place on the Notice Paper any amendments they propose to move in connection with the Education Bill. I trust they will do that as early as possible. It is a very important measure and any amendments proposed will require careful and serious consideration.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 5th September, 1928.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	570
Bills: Kulja Eastward Railway, 1s.	570
Dog Act Amendment, 2s.	580
Motions: Fremantle Harbour Development, to inquire by Select Committee	570
Physical well being	592

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Panton, leave of absence for one month granted to Hon. W. D. Johnson (Guildford) on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—KULJA EASTWARD RAILWAY.

Introduced by the Minister for Works and read a first time.

MOTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT.

To inquire by Select Committee.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [4.35]: I move—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the scheme proposed by the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Stileman, for the development of Fremantle Harbour, and that in the opinion of this House no further expenditure should be incurred on the Leighton-Robb's Jetty railway, including the bridge over the Swan River, until such time as this House shall have an opportunity of discussing the report of such Committee.

I sincerely hope the House will discuss this matter purely from a national point of view. I am not approaching it from any party point of view or with any desire to obtain a party advantage. We are now dealing with a matter of vital importance to the future of the State. I am making this request for a select committee because I think, in view of the diversity of opinions expressed upon this very important subject, the House should have fuller information before it is asked to come to a decision. Speaking as a representative of the pri-

mary producers' section, I say it is absolutely essential to the well-being of the primary producers that we should be sure of what we are doing, for the present and the future development of this State are entirely bound up in primary production. It is the development that has taken place in our primary industries that has made it essential that the House should consider the future expansion of the Fremantle Harbour. The Engineer-in-Chief in his report stated that 95 per cent. of the State's imports come through the port of Fremantle, and that 75 per cent. of the State's exports go out through the port of Fremantle. That important statement by the Engineer-in-Chief is in itself a justification for asking that further examination of the scheme adopted by the Government should be given by the House. In examining the report made by the Engineer-in-Chief, I fail to find any provision whatever for bulk handling. I am not going to say we should immediately proceed to instal bulk handling in Western Australia. But we know that the members for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) and for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) have spent considerable time in preparing a report on bulk handling. Also we know that the Government have appointed a committee to inquire into the practicability of installing bulk handling. Then, if we may judge by the cabled reports of the utterances of the Minister for Works when he was visiting Canada, he also was greatly impressed with the advantage of the bulk handling facilities provided in that Dominion. So even from that point of view one might safely ask that we should have a further examination of the harbour scheme by the Engineer-in-Chief. I want the Minister for Works and his Engineer-in-Chief to realise that I am not bringing forward this motion with a desire to criticise or to uphold the proposal of one engineer against that of another. It is rather that I am convinced we should have a close analysis of the various proposals. As Parliament will be called upon to vote the money with which to pay for the future extensions of the harbour, members should be absolutely sure that any scheme adopted will be the best for the State. But above all we should be sure that the scheme submitted is one that will give us economical and efficient working facilities, particularly for our exports and our imports. If we are to compete on the world's market with our products, it is the duty of the Gov-

ernment and of everybody connected with the business to see whether we cannot reduce the cost of sending our products overseas. We are creating our products under what may be termed most costly methods, the highest costs in the world. Therefore it is essential that we should entirely eliminate all unnecessary handling. So I maintain this scheme of harbour extension should have further consideration by the House. I recognise the position the Government are placed in regarding their Engineer-in-Chief. When the Fremantle railway bridge was washed away, it brought home to the Government and to the people the absolute necessity for making some provision for the extension of the harbour. But the most important thing was to decide where the new railway bridge should go. The Minister for Works, last session, when moving the second reading of the Bill for the Leighton-Robb's Jetty railway, clearly indicated that in deciding the position where that bridge was to go the Government were accepting the scheme laid down by the Engineer-in-Chief for the extension of the harbour—or, rather, for its limitation within the Swan River. The Government are in a somewhat delicate position regarding the Engineer-in-Chief. In Mr. Stileman we have secured a highly qualified engineer, and we are paying him a substantial salary to advise the Government on matters of engineering importance. The Government have practically no option but to accept the scheme submitted to them by their responsible officers. If a public works committee had been constituted, as I have so often advocated in this House, an important matter like this could be referred to it for further examination.

Hon. W. J. George : So it should have been years ago.

Mr. THOMSON : But no such committee is in existence. I can with confidence appeal to the Government to give the House an opportunity to collect evidence so that members may be able to arrive at an impartial opinion upon the subject. If the consensus of the opinions of witnesses is contrary to the views of the Engineer-in-Chief, we shall have done this State a great service, and may save it from a serious blunder. The Minister is morally bound to accept the advice of his responsible officers on such an important matter as this. It has been stated that a layman has no right to criticise a scheme put forward by experts. I do not presume to criticise the qualifications of the Engineer-in-Chief, or his designs or plans and specifica-

tions for the construction of any bridge, but I will quote instances to show that engineers are not infallible. It is stated that science is nothing more nor less than the application of common sense. If we leave out the technical part of an engineering scheme we find it is nothing more nor less than the application of common sense by practical men, who has a knowledge of their subject. I propose to show that engineering schemes have been accepted by responsible Ministers and have cost this country a considerable sum of money. I will first deal with the Peel Estate drainage. The Leader of the Opposition was then Premier and Minister for Lands. He accepted the Ministerial responsibility for the acts of his officers in that regard, just as the present occupants of those positions must accept their full responsibility.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is the value of that responsibility in the end?

Mr. THOMSON: It is of no value. I am not criticising the administrative ability or engineering capacity of any individual in past or present Government employ, but am putting forward reasons which should influence the House in appointing a select committee to inquire into the extension of the Fremantle harbour. Something like 2¼ million pounds has been expended on the Peel Estate.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That was not spent on drainage. You ought to know that.

Mr. THOMSON: I am trying, as far as possible—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You always try, but you always fail.

Mr. THOMSON: The Peel Estate has cost this State approximately 2¼ million pounds. The hon. member was responsible for the inauguration of that scheme, and accepted the report of his engineers on the subject of drainage.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is wrong with the drainage? That is what you should show.

Mr. Marshall: A lot is wrong with it.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not criticising the hon. member.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not mind your criticism.

Mr. THOMSON: Then why is the hon. member so touchy?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Say what is wrong with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The Minister for Mines: It is a very United Party!

Mr. THOMSON: I intend to deal with the matter in my own way. The expenditure was incurred under the direction of the engineers, and it was on their report that the hon. member proceeded to have certain work carried out on the estate, involving a considerable sum of money in drainage alone. From statements made in this House this session, it is estimated that, to make the drainage efficient, a further expenditure of £150,000 will be required. If the scheme had been properly examined at its inception, we should not have had the appalling spectacle afforded by this huge expenditure, which admittedly has been foolish.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What did the drainage cost?

Mr. THOMSON: I leave that to the hon. member. More than six years after the scheme was launched we find that an additional £150,000 will have to be spent on drainage alone.

Hon. W. J. George: You want to show that engineers, like other men, are fallible.

Mr. THOMSON: Precisely!

Hon. W. J. George: Then do not use so many words to show it.

Mr. THOMSON: If people were not so thin-skinned I should be able to make better progress.

Hon. W. J. George: I object to being called thin-skinned. Any man who can sit in this House for 30 years and have any skin left is very fortunate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMSON: I am sorry if I have offended the hon. member. The Herdsman's Lake drainage scheme was carried out on the advice of departmental engineers. The estimated cost was originally £25,000, but ultimately the expenditure was over £100,000. These two instances show that engineers are not infallible.

Hon. W. J. George: You know that the engineers took every possible precaution open to them.

Mr. THOMSON: I want to deal with what happened in the North. A concrete jetty was erected at Beadon Point. I understand that, contrary to the advice of those who had had a long experience of the North, the engineers persisted in putting the jetty there, although they were told it would blow away, as it actually did.

The Minister for Works: It is there yet.

Mr. Mann: The Point Sampson jetty blew away.

Mr. THOMSON: The Point Sampson jetty, which was erected contrary to the advice of local residents, was blown away.

Mr. Marshall: The Beadon Point jetty was erected contrary to local advice, and it is still there.

Mr. THOMSON: That bears out my statement that engineers are not infallible. Long before I became a member of Parliament the Great Southern inter-district conference was held. This meeting agitated for improvements to the Albany harbour. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) was then Minister for Works. The engineer (Mr. Ramsbotham) submitted a scheme for a "T" jetty to come out from the old deep water jetty. We laymen, with no practical experience but with some common sense, organised one of the biggest deputations that has ever waited upon a Minister in the Great Southern districts. We pointed out that it would be better to spend the £65,000 which it was proposed to spend on a wooden jetty, in putting in sheet piling in concrete or timber and in reclaiming that area. We were told it was a piece of gross impertinence for laymen to dare to criticise a proposal put up by the Minister. When we received Sir George Buchanan's report on the harbours of Western Australia, we found that the very scheme we ignorant laymen had advocated years before had been placed by that expert before the Government for consideration, as being that which would best serve the requirements of that part of the State.

Hon. W. J. George: You never know the effect that financial stringency may have had upon the report.

Mr. THOMSON: I would next refer hon. members to the finding of the select committee which inquired into the operations of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department. I do not propose to deal with all the findings of that committee.

Hon. W. J. George: I should think not. That report ought to have been printed in blood, for a self-murder was committed through it.

Mr. THOMSON: It is foolish for the hon. member to make such an interjection. We all regret the unfortunate happening to which he refers. There is no doubt, however, that the criticism was richly deserved. The hon. member's administration does not come out quite as satisfactorily as he would

like, as may be seen from the proceedings associated with the inquiry.

Hon. W. J. George: If they had called me, I would have blown them to atoms in five minutes. The members of the committee ought to be in gaol.

The Minister for Works: They would not give you a chance.

Hon. W. J. George: They set out to prove a case, and did not call the witnesses who could have given them the evidence.

The Minister for Works: They did not want evidence.

Hon. W. J. George: A more lying report and a more scandalous committee was never seen in the land. The report should be printed in blood. The sign of Cain is on the brow of one of the members.

Mr. THOMSON: I do like these heroics! On a question of national importance, I have no desire to introduce such a phase; nor will I be side-tracked by the hon. member who persists in interjecting. Let me quote two paragraphs—

That the Churchman's Brook scheme be completed as early as possible in order to cessate the further supply of Osborne bore water. (Your committee would have recommended the abandonment of this project and urged Mundaring as the source of supply for 2,000,000 gallons of water per day with safety to the goldfields and the agricultural areas, except for the fact that the work at Churchman's Brook is too far advanced, and the expenditure already incurred is so large that stoppage at the present time would be neither practical nor economical.)

If it had been possible to avoid the expenditure at Churchman's Brook, the select committee of another place would have recommended the abandonment of the scheme. The final recommendation reads—

That henceforth every work proposed to be undertaken from loan funds shall be reported upon by at least three members of the professional branch of the service and three persons skilled in finance and accountancy, and that their report be presented to Parliament before any expenditure other than preliminary for the purpose of investigation is incurred.

It is safe to say that if such a course had been adopted in connection with various State undertakings, large amounts could have been saved. I have on my notes that something like £520,000 has been spent on the drainage of the Peel Estate, and that an estimated annual expenditure of £25,000 is required for the maintenance of the drains. Surely the facts prove the necessity for close scrutiny.

Hon. W. J. George: What you are quoting is an engineer's estimate.

Mr. THOMSON: Just so. Here, however, we have a scheme which has cost over half a million sterling and now requires an estimated annual expenditure of £25,000 for maintenance. I feel sure that if the scheme in question had been referred for such advice as the select committee of another place recommended, the hon. gentleman who accepted the scheme, in all good faith, on the advice of his engineers, would have hesitated to embark on it. The same remarks apply to Herdsman's Lake drainage. The engineers estimated the cost of that work at from £35,000 to £40,000, and the ultimate cost was £105,000 or £110,000. I give these illustrations as reasons why the House should be granted an opportunity further to examine the Fremantle harbour scheme accepted by the Government, including the construction of a bridge across the Swan River, which would limit the progress of the harbour.

Hon. G. Taylor: Canning-road is another instance.

Mr. THOMSON: Quite so. There about £130,000 was spent on eight miles of road. The Minister accepts his Ministerial responsibility in that respect, but it is a poor satisfaction to know that the engineer responsible has been dismissed. The taxpayers have to bear the burden of the underestimate of cost furnished to the Minister. I venture to say that any Minister who was informed by one of his engineers that the construction of eight miles of road would cost £130,000, would order the engineer out of his office pretty quickly and tell him to look for another job. When the Minister for Works introduced the Bill for a railway from Leighton to Robb's Jetty and stated that it involved acceptance of the Engineer-in-Chief's plan relative to the Fremantle harbour, it came as a shock to quite a number of the public and to quite a number of members of this House. Speaking from memory, it is about 25 years ago that the Government of the day proceeded to purchase land at Cottesloe, behind Buckland Hill, at Blackwall Reach, and across on the other side of the river. These purchases show that 25 years ago the Government accepted the principle of extending the harbour to Blackwall Reach. I may add, as further evidence, that the Government went so far as to test the river for suitable foundations for a bridge. The casing stands

there to-day as proof of the Government's intention to proceed with the construction of a railway across from Cottesloe to Blackwall Reach, connecting with the existing railway system. In discussing the Fremantle harbour scheme, I am not setting one engineer against another. I only want the House to have an opportunity of obtaining evidence and thus being enabled to arrive at a conclusion as to what is best for the State in the development of the Fremantle harbour. I propose to refer briefly to various matters mentioned in the report of the Engineer-in-Chief. I shall not read the whole of that document, and in case the Minister eventually should consider that because of any omission I place the Engineer-in-Chief at slight disadvantage, I state now that it is not in any way my intention to do so. The Engineer-in-Chief give the following reason:—

The heavy floods of July, 1926, which caused the collapse of the north abutment of the railway bridge, emphasised the need for early consideration of this whole question, to the study of which my attention had earlier been directed. While it was clear that both the existing bridges were approaching, if they had not already reached, the limit of their economical life, and that heavy annual expenditure must be incurred in their maintenance, it seemed desirable not to hurry unduly a report on the subject until time permitted of a proper perspective being obtained

The Engineer-in-Chief then deals with the scope of the report —

Wrapped up with that of the Swan River crossings are the following questions, all of which constitute what may be regarded as major problems—(a) The extent and direction of future harbour development. (b) The route or routes by which future railways may approach the harbour. (c) The provision necessary in order to ensure that adequate space is available for any probable future developments, and for the rail and road access, as well as the storage, which such developments will require.

As far as one can see from reading the report, no provision has been made for the possible utilisation of bulk handling for the export of our wheat. That is so far as the report goes. We have only the Engineer-in-Chief's sketch plan.

The Minister for Works: Bulk handling will fit in with this scheme.

Mr. THOMSON: I am only dealing with the report which we are discussing.

The Minister for Works: Nothing special is needed for bulk handling.

Mr. THOMSON: With all due respect to the Minister, I would point out that this report states one-fourth of the cargo handled in the Fremantle harbour to be wheat. That is a very important factor, which has apparently been overlooked by the Engineer-in-Chief in the preparation of the report for his Minister's information. It is a very full report, and I wish to congratulate the Engineer-in-Chief on providing members of this Chamber with so important a document. He states that as regards export cargo it may be assumed that shippers will seek the nearest port for shipment, but this will not invariably be the case. I was taken to task for stating in this Chamber that it might be more economical to incur extra haulage by rail than to transfer a vessel from one port to another. As I mentioned earlier, the Engineer-in-Chief states that 95 per cent. of the State's imports are handled at Fremantle and that 75 per cent. of its exports are also made from there, showing, of course, that this very important question is a national one, and should not be dealt with from a party point of view. I am sure the Minister will agree with that statement. Dealing with the relation of wheat export to the total cargo tonnage, the Engineer-in-Chief states in his report—

In no single year since the opening of the harbour has the total quantity of wheat shipped represented more than one-quarter of the total cargo tonnage handled, and generally the proportion has been very much less

He also said—

On the lowest figure of past years, it is clear that every additional ton of wheat exported has meant at least three tons of other cargo handled.

That discloses a very important phase of the question.

Hon. G. Taylor: Will that help us on the question whether there should be an inner or an outer harbour?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not know how it can.

Mr. THOMSON: If we refer this matter to a select committee, evidence will be taken and it may be shown, as the result of testimony of men who are experienced in bulk handling, that it will be beneficial to the State to erect silos in Rocky Bay, from which the wheat can be sent down chutes by gravitation direct into the ships' holds. That would obviate the necessity for instal-

ling expensive conveyor belts and other appliances that are necessary in other ports. I do not say that that is the position, but it is quite possible that those experienced in bulk handling may tender that advice regarding the site at Rocky Bay.

Hon. G. Taylor: The bulk handling of wheat will not constitute the only justification for an inner harbour?

Mr. THOMSON: Certainly not. Later on I will quote various authorities to show where, in their opinion, the harbour should be. I want the member for Mount Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) to approach this question—

Hon. G. Taylor: With an open mind, like you are doing.

Mr. THOMSON: We are asking for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the best scheme to be adopted of the three that are before us.

Hon. G. Taylor: A select committee comprising members of this House.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes. They will take evidence.

Hon. G. Taylor: Such a select committee will say where the harbour should be all right! They know!

Mr. THOMSON: After hearing evidence, the select committee will be in a position to make a recommendation to Parliament as to which of the schemes should be adopted. While I may have my own opinion on that point, I am merely stressing why I think the question should be referred to a select committee.

Hon. G. Taylor: I would like to help you, but I do not know how I can.

Mr. THOMSON: Dealing with the wharfage accommodation required, the Engineer-in-Chief has the following to say in his report—

In order to deal ten years hence with the total cargo traffic, amounting to 3,000,000 tons, it is obvious that harbour extensions on a bold scale will be necessary. It is also obvious that the existing railway approach to Fremantle from Perth will not be adequate, and that a second main line entrance to the port will be required. Full equipment of marshalling, sorting and storage sidings, laid out so as to afford ample room for future extension, must be provided. An adequate area, with easy access to the wharves, should also be left for construction of warehouses and other developments, which, whether constructed by the harbour authority, private enterprise or any other body, will result from increased activity at the port and for which provision must therefore be made.

The Engineer-in-Chief then deals with the larger vessels that are engaged in the shipping trade now, and he proceeds—

Increases in draft are, however, to a very great extent, controlled by the depth of water available in port, and the full economic draft has not for this reason been obtained in some of the larger cargo vessels of recent date. In Fremantle, where 36 feet of water exists, and provision has been made for an increase, when necessary, to 40 feet, limitation of draft does not apply. The position is therefore unusually favourable for the use at Fremantle of the heaviest drafted and largest available vessels. The programme of dredging recently decided upon for the Suez Canal, provides for vessels 904 feet in length and 90 feet beam with a draft of 35 feet.

He then goes on to deal with the position at the North Wharf where operations are principally confined to the loading of wheat and the discharge of bulk cargoes. When he comes to the scheme of Sir George Buchanan, Mr. Stileman has this say—

In his recent report Sir George Buchanan recommended extension of the harbour in an up-river direction, and he divided this extension into four sections.

As I shall deal with this matter later on, I do not propose to quote the whole of the statement at this stage. The Engineer-in-Chief proceeds to give his objections to a bridge being constructed across the present harbour. He says—

Sir George, later in his report, however, adds:—"If it is decided that there must be road communication between North and South Fremantle, then a new road bridge should be provided with two equal spans giving clear openings of 90 feet each." Such a bridge, in order to serve the purpose for which it is intended, could only be built on approximately the site of the existing bridge.

Dealing with his objections to the bridge across navigable waters, the Engineer-in-Chief says—

Briefly stated the objections to a bridge, having an opening span for the passage of ships, are—

As affects navigation interests—

- (a) Restriction of navigation to periods when traffic across the bridge can be suspended, and also probably to daylight hours.
- (b) Necessity for attendance of tugs on all vessels making the passage.
- (c) Charges and risks are increased while delays are incurred.

As affecting other interests—

- (d) Considerable increase in capital cost, working expenses and maintenance.
- (e) Necessity for dolphin and fender protection to bridge.

(f) Interruption to road traffic while vessels are passing.

(g) Maintenance of staff and watchmen for operation of the opening span.

I am therefore fully in accordance with the desire to avoid the necessity for an opening bridge. At the same time, in my opinion, a harbour having a total length of nearly three miles, with no communication between the wharves on the two sides, other than by a bridge at one end, is very seriously handicapped. Efficient and economical control is difficult, the essential despatch which shipping requires cannot be given, and the necessity must frequently arise of moving a vessel across the harbour to complete operations. Up to the present time it has been the aim of the Fremantle Harbour Trustees to complete all operations to a vessel in the berth originally taken up. This aim is one which must recommend itself as leading to the most economical and fullest use of quay space and, so far as possible, its attainment should be facilitated.

The Engineer-in-Chief agrees with Sir George Buchanan, but he states that in every instance the alternative is the South-Swan railway which will leave the main line at Guildford and run along the south side of the river. Mr. Stileman proceeds to give reasons why that line should be built to relieve the traffic on the present main line and, in the course of his remarks, he says—

This railway would do nothing to relieve the existing line from Spencer's Brook, nor would it avoid the existing heavy 1 in 40 gradient through the hills. A line from Brookton to Armadale and thence direct to Fremantle would, on the other hand, relieve the existing line of the whole of the wheat traffic which at present passes through Brookton.

I am sure hon. members sitting behind me must be pleased to hear that statement from the Engineer-in-Chief.

The Minister for Works: Do you want the select committee to deal with that question, too?

Mr. THOMSON: I am merely dealing with the harbour at the present stage.

The Minister for Works: You must realise that that will affect your railways.

Mr. THOMSON: The Engineer-in-Chief next deals with the effect of harbour extensions on the river above Blackwall Reach and he says—

Over its full length, between the existing railway bridge and the Blackwall Reach, the Swan River is at present much restricted either in width or depth, often in both, and this restriction at present exercises a marked control on the level of the water surface above the existing bridges. There is no indication in any previous report that consideration has

been given as to what the probable effect of widening and deepening the river would be on the surface water levels higher up. The importance of the point is, however, obvious. River level records at Guildford and Claishbrook as well as at Fremantle, have been obtained for several years by means of automatic records. Recently the machine from Claishbrook has been removed to Mill-street to give further information, and synchronous water level readings have from time to time been made at intermediate points so that the Fremantle tidal effect could be traced up the river. From these observations it is found that water level in Perth water does not materially differ from that recorded below the Narrows, that is, the effect of the Narrows in controlling water level above or below it is negligible. Between water level recorded at Mill-street and water level at Fremantle there is, however, a marked difference. Though the tidal effect is clearly seen at Mill-street, it is not felt there until two or three hours after being recorded at Fremantle: that is to say, it takes this period for the tidal wave to travel between Fremantle and Mill-street. As is to be expected, therefore, the full effect of the Fremantle tide is not felt in Melville or Perth waters, and high water there is consequently lower than at Fremantle. For the same reason low water at Fremantle is lower than in Melville water.

Usual water level conditions are affected during heavy rainfall periods when large quantities of fresh water are coming down the river, but generally it is the case that when high water level at Fremantle is between 2 and 3 feet above zero, the corresponding water level in Melville and Perth waters is from 3 inches to 6 inches lower. When, however, water level at Fremantle exceeds 4 feet, the difference between this and water level in Melville water becomes much more marked, reaching from 12 inches to 18 inches . . .

It is clear that the main factor in controlling these differences in water level is the restriction to flow in the river over the length between the railway bridge and the Blackwall Reach. It follows, therefore, that the removal of this restriction will have the effect of making the full Fremantle tidal effect felt as far up the river as Perth water. Low water level in the latter would then be lowered from 6 inches to 12 inches, and the high water raised about 12 inches on moderate high waters, and more on the higher tides.

When I came to this State 30 years ago there was a bar across the mouth of the river. I do not know that the removal of the bar has had any appreciable effect upon the high water levels in the Swan River. I have been told that it has not had any effect.

Mr. Corboy: There is still what is practically a bar across the river.

The Minister for Works: There is the bar to which the Engineer-in-Chief refers in his speech.

Mr. THOMSON: That is not a bar in the sense that I refer to it. There are some who

say that if the harbour is extended it will not have the effect I indicate.

Mr. Corboy: No.

Mr. THOMSON: I am drawing attention to the fact that there is a divergence of opinion between experts and laymen who have resided here for some considerable time. Regarding the bridge approaches, the Engineer-in-Chief states—

The railway will approach the bridge on a line parallel to Bruce-street, leaving the existing line at a point about half a mile north of North Fremantle station, and crossing the main Perth-Fremantle-road by means of a bridge. Road approach will be by Bruce-street, the necessary widening of which presents no difficulty, and on which a good site for a new station exists. The existing railway through North Fremantle will be retained for access to the North Quay wharves and alongside this railway, where both adequate length and area can be obtained, the main railway marshalling yard and storage sidings will be situated. Traffic arriving at Fremantle by the railway from Armadale will cross the bridge and go direct to the marshalling yard, with which the present Fremantle station and yard will be connected through a junction on the south side of the river. The future South Swan railway will pass under the above lines, and go direct to Fremantle station. In all cases it is intended that level crossings should be avoided, and that all roads should cross the railways by bridge, either over or under, as the levels decide.

If hon. members will turn to the plan attached by the Engineer-in-Chief to his report, they will find that that railway will cross 28 streets!

The Minister for Works: Which railway?

Mr. THOMSON: The railway the Engineer-in-Chief proposes. From the point where it will cross the river until it again strikes the existing railway at Robb's Jetty, it will cross 28 streets. Of course, I have made that calculation from the plan submitted; I do not want to exaggerate. The Engineer-in-Chief says that there will be no level crossings, but unless we are going to close a large number of streets and interfere with the carriage-way that people have enjoyed for many years, his proposed railway will cross 28 streets.

Mr. Corboy: If bridges were provided at every fifth street, surely it would be sufficient.

Mr. THOMSON: Is it necessary to adopt the route recommended by the Engineer-in-Chief? This shows the necessity for further examining the proposals. If the railway crossed 28 streets, there would be considerable expense for bridges, even allowing one bridge to every five streets, and traffic would

be dislocated. Some people maintain that it would be preferable if the railway followed the present route along the foreshore. I am not prepared to condemn the scheme at this stage.

The Minister for Works: The people of Fremantle have been objecting to that railway for the last 25 years.

Mr. THOMSON: That being so, what will they say to the new railway proposed by the Engineer-in-Chief?

The Minister for Works: See the country, and you will understand it better.

Mr. THOMSON: I lived at Fremantle for a number of years and am conversant with the district as a whole, though I may not be familiar with every street. I can only deal with the plan submitted by the Engineer-in-Chief, which shows that the new railway will cross 28 streets. I suggest that it might be preferable to improve the present route rather than adopt the new one. The Engineer-in-Chief in his report proceeded to deal with the question of initial harbour extensions. He said—

The initial extension of the harbour will be up-river as far as the bridge. This will permit of extending the existing wharves by a length of 5,750 feet In my opinion there should be no extension of the harbour above the site now recommended for the combined road and railway bridge. The reasons on which this opinion is based have already been set out, but in addition I would add that the most extensive proposal for an up-river harbour yet put forward, namely, that recommended by Sir George Buchanan, provided only for a total length of quay of little more than half the length already existing at Sydney. In my opinion, such a provision is not adequate to deal with the cargo tonnage to which Fremantle must look forward in future, and expansion in another direction must therefore eventually be faced.

There we have the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief, a qualified engineer, that there should be no extension of the harbour above the site recommended for the new bridge. On the other hand, another engineer, just as eminent a harbour authority as is our Engineer-in-Chief, states that the extension should be made up-stream. Later I shall quote to the House from letters that have passed between the Chief Secretary, the Harbour Trust Commissioners and the pilots of Fremantle, all of which go to show that in their view the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief is at fault. On the evidence submitted, I for one am prepared to question whether the Engineer-in-Chief's opinion is right, and I wish to be satisfied that it is right before

this country embarks upon the expenditure of such a large sum of money. Dealing with later extensions, the Engineer-in-Chief stated—

As expansion of the inner harbour to the extent necessary to meet full future requirements cannot be obtained, new construction outside the present harbour will be necessary. Various proposals for extension either to the north or to the south of the existing entrance have been made in the past. All proposals on the south must contemplate the construction of a new harbour entirely separated from that already existing, of no portion of which could any advantage be taken.

There has been a good deal of correspondence in the Press to the effect that any later extension of the harbour should be constructed on the south side. The Engineer-in-Chief proceeded—

Extensions to the north, on the other hand, permit of full advantage being taken of the existing entrance channel, and ensure that measure of centralisation necessary to co-ordination of control and economy of working.

If the recommendation of the Engineer-in-Chief is adopted, we want to be satisfied that his scheme will be effective.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: South Fremantle is sheltered and North Fremantle is an open roadstead.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the merits of the various schemes. On page 12 of his report Mr. Stileman gives the approximate costs. He estimates the cost of the bridge, the railway from North Fremantle through to Robb's Jetty and the connection into the present Fremantle yards, together with the road approaches to the bridge on each side of the river, and other contingent works, at £1,200,000. The estimate provides for a double line of way on each railway, for the construction of bridges at all road crossings—I direct the attention of the member for Yilgarn specially to that—and includes provision for land resumption. His estimate for the extension of the harbour up to the site of the proposed new bridge is £2,000,000, or a total of £3,200,000 in all. Mr. Stileman mentions that the present width of the harbour is 1,400 feet and the depth 36 feet below low water. Over the extension a depth of 32 feet is intended, and a gradual reduction in width to 800 feet at the upper end. That is a point on which the men charged with the administration of the harbour, namely, the Harbour Trust Commissioners, and the men who work

the harbour, namely, the pilots, do not approve of the Engineer-in-Chief's proposal. Mr. Stileman certainly gives his reason why the width should be narrowed to 800 feet, but that is a matter on which Parliament should seek further information before arriving at a decision. Now I wish to refer to the scheme of Sir George Buchanan. On page 50 of the second volume of his report, presented to the Commonwealth Government, he deals with the Fremantle harbour.

Hon. W. J. George: From whom do you propose we should seek information?

Mr. THOMSON: I think a suitable person to give advice is the hon. member himself, who has had considerable experience of engineering works. The question submitted by the Minister for Works to Sir George Buchanan on the 31st August, 1925, were stated as follows:—

It is the desire of the Government that it be favoured with advice from you in regard to the ports of Fremantle, Bunbury, Geraldton and Albany, as set out in the accompanying statement of "Matters for Reference." Having visited these ports and inquired into the various proposals that have been submitted, it is hoped that you may now be in a position to accede to that desire, and to furnish us with as much detailed information as possible under the headings set out. It is understood that all information necessary for an assimilation of the conditions attaching to the various ports has been made available to you, but should you find anything further in this connection desirable, I shall be happy to have it supplied.

The matters for reference were stated thus—

1. Should harbour expansion be continued up-river?
2. Should new bridge for railway connection between north and south sides of river (after removal of existing bridge to provide for expansion up-river) be placed:—(a) near existing road bridge, or (b) at Rocky Bay,
3. Opinion as to opening spans in railway bridges, and, if recommended for our conditions, what is the best type?
4. Opinion as to necessity and advisability of providing either floating or graving dock.

Sir George Buchanan reported—

Fremantle will continue to be the principal port of Western Australia, but, in order to enable it to keep that position and provide for the great trade which those who have studied the prospects of Western Australia must foresee, a great deal of work is necessary. There are good natural facilities available for creating a first-class port up the river in prolongation of the existing wharves. The layout

requires careful consideration, and should be on a generous scale.

The history of the development of Fremantle harbour is of considerable interest, owing to the controversies that arose as to the best method of procedure. Between the years 1837 and 1875 numerous schemes were propounded, some for opening up the river estuary and others for constructing works outside the river.

In 1875 the whole matter was submitted to Sir John Coode, who in 1877 submitted two designs, and expressed the opinion that with the small rise and fall of the tide it would be impossible to have sufficient scour to retain an efficient depth of water in a sandy harbour at the mouth of the river. Furthermore, that any solid projection from the coastline would, in his opinion, by stopping the littoral sand drift, eventually silt up. He therefore proposed in the first instance a viaduct and breakwater projecting in a north-westerly direction from Rous Head, with berthing arrangements under the lee of the breakwater.

In 1887 Sir John Coode furnished a further report, in which he stated that after personally examining the site, and studying further details, his views expressed in 1877 were confirmed, namely, that the conditions were so adverse that it was quite impracticable to treat the existing entrance to the Swan River with a view to the formation and maintenance of a deep-water approach from the sea with any degree of success, and that any operations of this character, except to a limited extent, would be attended with failure and disappointment.

In 1891 Mr. O'Connor, the chief engineer of the State, reported adversely to Sir John Coode's scheme, and expressed the opinion that a harbour could be provided in the estuary of the Swan, and he had come to the conclusion that the amount of littoral sand drift, if any, could only be of insignificant character owing to the small rise and fall of the tide and diminished wave action. The principal features in Mr. O'Connor's scheme were the following:—

- (a) The throwing out of two ocean moles from the north and south heads, respectively, of the river estuary to protect the entrance.
- (b) The blasting and dredging of a channel 450 feet wide, and having a depth of 30 feet at low water, through the rock bar which formerly crossed the whole width of the estuary, and which, when the works were commenced, was mostly awash at low water.
- (c) The dredging out, to a depth of 30 feet at low water, of an inner basin, about three-quarters of a mile in length and 800 feet in width, between timber quays constructed along both sides.
- (d) The reclamation of about 48 acres of quay and warehouse space on the south side of the river, and of about 86 acres on the north side, making about 134 acres in all.

The works were carried out with complete success, and have been considerably enlarged from time to time since the completion of the original scheme. In this connection it should be mentioned that Mr. O'Connor always held the opinion that had Sir John Coode been in possession of the same knowledge and data of the surroundings of Fremantle as he himself had, Sir John would have come to the same conclusion.

The time has now arrived for an immediate programme of harbour expansion, and again the question has arisen:—Should expansion take place up-river or outside the Swan entrance.

Various schemes have been put forward, both for inner harbour and outer harbour works, and in 1913 Mr. J. F. Ramsbotham was asked to report on the whole subject. He summed up the advantages and disadvantages of the various proposals and finally decided, for stated reasons, that there should be no harbour development above the railway bridge, and that the future needs of the port could best be met by the construction of a large basin or dock, constructed in the open sea to the north of the existing harbour.

In view of the fact that good natural facilities are available for creating a first-class port up river in prolongation of the existing wharves, it is difficult to understand why a scheme for erecting a port in the open roadstead of the ocean should be seriously proposed, and certainly it does not commend itself to my judgment. The river above the present wharves up to and including Rocky Bay lends itself admirably to the expansion of the wharves and the creation of a first-class port by easy stages, thus permitting development to keep up with the demands of shipping. After careful consideration, my views on port development at Fremantle are as follows:—In the matter of bridges and railway connection at the present time, there is a railway bridge across the Swan at the eastern end of the existing harbour, and 1,500 feet away there is a road bridge across the Swan which unites North Fremantle with Plympton and Fremantle. These bridges are very old and require renewal, and there is no doubt that both interfere with harbour development. In my opinion a new bridge for railway connection should not be near the existing road bridge, but should be either in the vicinity of Roe Point in the Blackwall Reach or above Freshwater Bay between Point Walter and Point Resolution.

That bears out the proposals that were entertained 25 years ago by the then Government, who resumed land for the purpose of constructing a bridge at that particular locality. Sir George Buchanan expressed the opinion that the bridge should be at Roe Point, with provision for an opening span in the event of a floating dock being established in Freshwater Bay. I do not propose to deal with the various schemes, except to say that he suggests that the harbour should

go as far as Rocky Bay. So we have the opinion of two eminent engineers. We know also that in the Fremantle Press there has been a considerable amount of discussion as to the direction in which the harbour should be extended, and we find on the authority of Mr. Stevens, who addressed the Rotary Club on the 10th August, that Mr. O'Connor urged that the whole question should be considered as being narrowed down to two distinct schemes—(1) dredging a channel through Success Bank and through shoal at Owen Anchorage, with railway from thence to Fremantle, and (2) the attainment of an entrance into the river estuary. So it is argued that Fremantle is desirous of having the harbour extended up on the river. Thus we have four different schemes. We have also the suggestion that for the handling of bulk cargoes, future extensions should be at Owen Anchorage. We have the suggestion that the extension should be south of the Moles; we have the Engineer-in-Chief's report supported by Mr. Ramsbotham that there should be an outer harbour, and we have Sir George Buchanan's report backed up by every member of the Harbour Trust and the pilots that the extension should be up-river as far as Rocky Bay. We have a diversity of opinion as to what is best for the State. In the report of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners for the year ended 30th June, 1927, the proposals of the present Engineer-in-Chief are dealt with. I will quote portions of the report dealing with the depth of water and also increased accommodation. The Commissioners say—

The Commissioners have decided that in designs for extensions to Fremantle harbour the full 36ft. depth of water already stated to the shipowners of the world must be maintained as well as the full 1,400ft. clear water width between quays as at present.

Subsequent to that the Commissioners wrote—

Since the above was written the Engineer-in-Chief has placed his report and recommendations in the hands of the Government. He concurs that the time has been reached in the development of the State when additions to Fremantle harbour must be seriously considered, and recommends that the first extension should be made up the river to a point he has selected for a combined road and railway bridge, but in constructing this extension provision be made for a gradually lessening width till 800 feet is reached at the bridge, and that the depth of water shall be 32 feet in place of 36 feet. The site chosen is about 1,000 feet above the present road bridge.

As was indicated by the statement of Ministers at a Fremantle function, there is just a possibility that Fremantle may become what many people have long looked for—a terminal port. In my opinion, if the coal owners of Australia are able to achieve what they are indicating, that duty shall be paid on imported coal, Fremantle will become the terminal port, because shipping companies using coal will find it more profitable to have their cargoes transhipped at Fremantle in the same way as is done at Bombay. Thus we should exercise extra special care before arriving at a decision with regard to the harbour. The report of the Harbour Trust Commissioners goes on—

Fremantle is essentially a port for large overseas ships and the Commissioners are anxious lest in the endeavour to save some cost at the commencement, a still far greater cost will have to be met later on when the decreased width and depth recommended by the Engineer-in-Chief will have to be increased.

The Premier: What do they know about it?

Mr. THOMSON: They are the men who are in charge, and they write from experience. I maintain that the opinion of the Commissioners must be treated with respect. This is what the Commissioners have to say in regard to the bridge—

The Engineer-in-Chief recommends that no extension of the harbour up river shall be made above the site of his bridge, but that the future expansion should be in the form of an outer harbour. In this the Commissioners do not agree, and they desire to save the country the much heavier expense of building de novo an opening bridge in the future by the forethought of providing at the commencement for an opening when such is required.

I wish briefly to refer to the correspondence that has taken place between the Commissioners and the Engineer-in-Chief. On the 18th November the Commissioners wrote to the Chief Secretary—

I am directed by the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners to approach you again on the subject of the extensions to the Fremantle harbour. You will recall that this subject has been kept before you for some years, and although the disturbance of trade generally owing to the war was taken advantage of by the Commissioners, to not continuously press for extensions with costly work to be undertaken by the Government, the Commissioners have watched the matter very closely and have been fully alive to the rapid development which the country is enjoying.

It may be here mentioned that by direction I said that in coming to this decision the

Commissioners, while wishing to give every respect possible to the feelings of yourself, felt that they had done their duty for the moment by making it quite clear to the Government that it was their opinion that the time had now been reached in the development of the port and the State when the question of extensions to the harbour should be seriously considered. The report of the Engineer-in-Chief was then promised quite early, say, during the following month. This correspondence is recorded in your C.S.O. 1271/19, and therefore need not be repeated in any detail. The report of the Engineer-in-Chief was duly completed, and the first and only intimation that the Commissioners had of it was the publication of excerpts in the Press in October. I was directed at once to obtain copies for the use of the Commissioners, and these were kindly sent by the Under Secretary with his memo. of the 31st October.

Fancy the position! Here are a body of men appointed to conserve the interests of Fremantle Harbour, to advise the Government as to the best means to be adopted for handling commodities coming through that port. For years past the Commissioners have been advocating the desirability of preparing a scheme for the future expansion of the harbour. After having urged this on the Minister in charge, the Commissioners are not supplied with a copy of the Engineer-in-Chief's report. That seems to me to have been gross discourtesy shown by the Government to the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners. Mr. Stevens goes on to say—

The Commissioners have studied the report very carefully and, while they have not been asked for any opinions regarding the practical working of the harbour extensions recommended by the Engineer-in-Chief, consider it is their duty as custodians of the port of Fremantle to concur or otherwise in the recommendations made by Mr. Stileman, as their knowledge and experience of the working of the port dictates.

The Commissioners were appointed to administer the port. Several millions of pounds are involved in the port. Yet when it comes to a question of future harbour extensions, the men so vitally interested in the administration of the harbour are not supplied with a copy of the Engineer-in-Chief's report, and are not asked for their opinions thereon. In my view the Engineer-in-Chief and the Government were very discourteous to the Harbour Trust Commissioners, and moreover, showed a lack of business acumen and a lack of appreciation of the responsibilities of their position when they did not give

the Commissioners an opportunity to discuss the Engineer-in-Chief's report. Mr. Stevens continues—

The Commissioners do not think the Government would desire that they should at this stage enter into the details of the Engineer-in-Chief's recommendations, so they will content themselves with dealing very briefly with the two main essentials of the report so far as it deals with the port. The various figures used by the Engineer-in-Chief to show the necessity for the enlargement of the port are largely what the Commissioners are aware of as they come mostly from the statistics of the State, and the Commissioners desire to congratulate Mr. Stileman on the able manner in which he has marshalled the facts, all pointing the direction of the necessity for taking earnestly the repeated requests of the Commissioners that work in extending the port should be seriously considered and undertaken. The Commissioners entirely agree with Mr. Stileman in the conclusions he draws from the obvious advance the State is making, and again ask the Government to take in hand the enlargement they consider so necessary, or will be so by the time any real progress is made in the work. The Commissioners, for the sake of simplicity, have divided the report insofar as it relates to Fremantle harbour into two parts—(1) The immediate extensions up river, and (2) the outer harbour scheme proposed to be considered later. In regard to No. 1, the Commissioners agree that the enlargement should be commenced with as little delay as possible, but they cannot agree that in the extension to the point chosen by Mr. Stileman for his new combined road and railway bridge, the width of waterway shall be lessened, nor can they agree to any decrease in depth of water. The Commissioners hold, without any equivocation whatever, that the 1,400 feet clear width between quays now existing at Fremantle shall be continued, and they must warn the Government that, if they embark in a work which gradually lessens this width to the 800 feet now recommended, and a decrease in depth from the 36 feet now provided in the existing harbour to the recommended 32 feet, the day will arrive when this will prove inefficient, and it will then be obtainable only at a much greater cost than if provided originally.

They would have been lacking in their duty had they not warned the Government.

The Premier: Personally I do not take the slightest notice of them.

Mr. THOMSON: But you should take notice of them.

The Premier: I will listen to qualified men, but not to those men.

Mr. THOMSON: I have quoted various State reports in which qualified men have recommended schemes on which large sums of money have been expended on the advice of those qualified men, and those schemes have proved unsatisfactory and

against the interests of the State. I maintain that the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, backed up by the opinion of their own responsible professional men; should be treated with every respect.

The Premier: Do you suggest that the representative of the P.P.A. and the representative of the Labour Party on that Trust are experts? What do they know?

Mr. THOMSON: I suggest they have a practical knowledge of the working of the Fremantle Harbour, and that they have the advice of their professional officers.

The Premier: I am informed that some of them attend a board meeting for an hour, and that that is all they ever see of the harbour.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not dealing with that phase. I say the opinion of the Commissioners, supported by their expert officers, should be received with consideration.

The Minister for Works: Mr. Stileman is their expert officer.

Mr. THOMSON: Is it not possible that even Mr. Stileman, when laying down a scheme, may inadvertently—

The Minister for Works: You spoke of their expert officers, and I say that Mr. Stileman is their expert officer.

Mr. THOMSON: Mr. Stileman did not consult the Commissioners, even if he is their expert officer. In that he showed a gross lack of courtesy. If he is the expert adviser of the Commissioners, he should have submitted his report to them.

The Minister for Works: This is entirely outside the function of the Harbour Trust Commissioners. We know who is responsible to the Commissioners.

Mr. THOMSON: Well, I do not. I want the Minister to approach this from an un-biassed point of view. I want it to be dealt with in a manner that will satisfy the House it is not a question whether Mr. Stileman's report or Sir George Buchanan's report is right or wrong, but that it is a matter simply of what is best for the State in the development of the Fremantle harbour. That is the angle from which the House should approach this very important question. Mr. Stevens continued—

The Commissioners do not make this statement idly. The width and depth is what they have always held to be necessary, and their experience of handling modern ships teaches them, without any question, that these two most essential features must be provided if the country is to be protected from spending

heavily in the near future in rectifying what they consider would be a blunder, and the spoiling of what is otherwise a splendid working harbour.

When the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners make such a statement, it behoves the House to see that we have fuller information than is in our possession at present. Mr. Stevens continues—

What the Commissioners strongly recommend is that the enlargement should be taken in hand without delay and that the 1,400 feet clear width be provided. As regards the depth of water, let the piles of all wharf structure be driven sufficiently deeply to permit of a depth of 40 feet (as is done at present) being obtained if required in future, but that the dredging work be finished at the outset to a depth of 36 feet. I may say the pilot staff of the Trust has represented most strongly that, from a navigational point of view, it is vitally necessary that the full width and depth shall be maintained in all new works—vide their letter of 16th inst. attached. . . .

As regards No. 2—the recommended outer harbour to be built to the northward of the North Mole—this is not concurred in by the Commissioners, but they do not wish to in any way complicate the matter by going into any details at this stage. Their recommendations at all times previously (and this has been borne out by other professional men at various times) has been that ample room exists in the Swan River for all harbour extensions the port of Fremantle will ever require. It may be mentioned, too, that the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, who designed the present harbour at Fremantle, always unquestionably favoured and was prepared to design harbour extensions in an up-river direction, even to the extent of eventually carrying shipping right up to Matilda Bay at Crawley and the stretch of beach line on the South Perth side from the Narrows to the Canning River.

In the concluding section of his letter, Mr. Stevens states—

Attached to this letter I am, by direction, sending you a copy of a letter received from the pilot officers of the port, giving their views on the recommendations of the Engineer-in-Chief as master mariners and the officers whose duty it is to handle ships at Fremantle. The Commissioners have had this letter before them and commend it to your earnest consideration as coming unanimously from a body of nautical men, all of whom have had long experience of handling big vessels at Fremantle and of course have their sea training and experience also behind them. All these pilot officers have been several years in the service and are well versed in the work they have to do. All that has been before them regarding the recommendations made by the Engineer-in-Chief is his printed report with its sketch plan attached without any details of the work he proposes but, notwithstanding what details of construction may be in the mind of the Engineer-in-Chief, the Commissioners regard the pilots' unanimous warn-

ing as being of the highest possible importance. I am instructed to say that these comments are not intended to be in any way a criticism of the report and recommendations of the Engineer-in-Chief, to whom the Commissioners wish to offer their congratulations for the masterly manner in which he has dealt with a very complex subject. They, however, as custodians of the port, and engaged in the actual work of the harbour, and so having the actual experience of this work at Fremantle, extending now over many years, consider it their duty to the Government and the country to point out where, in their opinion, and in the opinion of their practical officers, costly mistakes can be avoided in the initial work.

I do not wish to read the whole of this paper.

Hon. G. Taylor: It seems to me you might just as well read the lot.

Mr. THOMSON: We have now a memo to the secretary of the Harbour Trust, signed by H. Nicholas, the Harbour Master, and by W. R. Clack, H. V. Rivers, W. K. Saunders, E. Trivett and H. S. Steere, pilots of the port of Fremantle. These men say—

We entirely disagree with the proposal to lessen the width of water area quay to quay from what exists in the present harbour, and we take the liberty of warning the Commissioners that should this width of harbour be reduced, grave risks will be involved in handling shipping in it, which will mean at the very least not only considerable delays to shipping, but also, especially in heavy weather, of accidents and damage both to ships and quay structures.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. THOMSON: I was quoting the memo. by the Fremantle pilots to the secretary of the Harbour Trust. It continues—

In regard to the decrease in depth to 32 feet over this extended area, this also we entirely disagree in and ask that the same depth of 36 feet already existing, with provision for a still further depth of water if necessary at a future date, be continued. There are many reasons from a navigational point of view why these two first essentials shall be preserved, and while we do not wish to say that we will not take vessels into this area, we must respectfully decline to accept any responsibility for their safety under all the complex circumstances which arise in a port. . . . As regards the up-river extension, we can only say that we will do our duty when we consider it is possible, but there will always be a grave danger of accident, and times will undoubtedly arise when ships will not be able either to berth in it or to leave a berth which they happen to occupy.

The Minister for Works smiled just now at some of the opinions expressed by the prac-

tical men who have to navigate ships in and out of the harbour. The letter is signed by all the pilots in the service.

The Minister for Works: I wonder who drafted it.

Mr. THOMSON: I regret that the Minister is approaching the subject from that angle.

The Minister for Works: I know what has been going on.

Mr. THOMSON: We ought to approach the subject from the point of view of what is best for the State. The Minister might be quite satisfied in his own mind about the soundness of the Engineer-in-Chief's scheme. On one occasion he said, "If we cannot get our staff to do the work, we shall get other men." I assume he was referring to the pilots. The opinion of the practical men who are handling ships in the harbour should carry weight not only with the Minister but with the House. The pilots have only done their duty by directing attention to possible difficulties. If the width of the harbour is narrowed and a ship is berthed on each side, I suppose the actual width available would be 700 feet. The pilots were quite within their rights in pointing out the difficulty likely to arise from reducing the width.

The Premier: At whose request did the pilots make that report?

Mr. THOMSON: I take the report to be a voluntary one to the secretary of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. The report begins—

I myself as Harbour Master and Emergency Pilot, and the other members of the pilot staff of Fremantle harbour, all master mariners and with long experience of handling all classes of vessels into and out of Fremantle harbour, have been keenly interested in the recommendations of the Engineer-in-Chief for the increase of accommodation.

The Premier: I recollect it now. It is rather an unusual thing for a body of employees to make a report without being asked.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I suppose they reported to the Harbour Trust.

The Premier: I was wondering whether it was done at the request of the Harbour Trust.

Mr. THOMSON: In view of the importance of the question I think they were justified in submitting the report.

The Premier: Not unless they were asked.

Mr. THOMSON: I think they were justified, regardless of whether they were asked.

The Premier: I do not think any Government employee is entitled to report on a matter unless he is asked to do so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If he reports to the department it is all right. This report was sent to the department.

Mr. THOMSON: It should be remembered that this is a report by the pilots who have to handle the ships.

The Premier: I do not know that the Harbour Trust asked for it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think the Trust did ask for it.

Mr. THOMSON: The pilots' report continues—

As regards the proposed outer harbour to be built along the north beach to the north of the north mole, this we unhesitatingly condemn from any aspect of a nautical man, and we say without any fear of contradiction that there must arise many times when ships cannot enter or leave it, and at all times, even with a vast amount of dredging work to be done, not shown on Mr. Stileman's sketch plan, it will always be a most difficult and dangerous harbour. The term "haven" does not, in our opinion, apply to it at all. We therefore wish with the greatest possible respect un-animously to warn the Commissioners that if such a harbour is built the Trust and the Government must be prepared for great delays and the constant menace of grave danger to valuable ships. In fact, we doubt whether, especially in heavy weather, ship owners or ship masters would allow an attempt to be made to get their ships into or out of it. We realise from the sketch plan attached to the Engineer-in-Chief's report that with the outer harbour proposal the full exposure to weather is to be retained with disastrous results on a highly built-up ship, whereas we have been all along looking forward to the day when these larger types of vessels can be taken up into stiller conditions. As we have reported on several occasions, there is a marked tendency for ships to sheer badly to windward when taking the entrance channel, and we greatly fear an attempt to get them into the recommended outer harbour, with the further difficulty of knowing what to do with them if we were successful in getting them in, without incurring great danger of damage. In short, we un-animously oppose the suggested outer harbour as being quite impracticable as an exposed harbour with greatly increased risks of entering or leaving or to ships while they are therein. We beg to hope, therefore, that all extensions to Fremantle harbour will be made within the shelter of the Swan River, and that no attempt will be made to construct a harbour in the exposed Gage Roads, and we believe that this opinion, as well as the opinion we have expressed earlier in this letter, that in these extensions in the river the full width of 1,400 feet and depth of 36 to 40 feet must be maintained, will be shared by every nautical man who visits and knows the Fremantle harbour.

The report is signed by the Chief Harbour Master and all the pilots of the port of Fremantle. I contend that the opinion of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, backed up by that of the practical men who are bringing the ships into and taking them out of the harbour, should receive further consideration from the House before any Bill is introduced that would mean effectually barring all further extension of the harbour up-stream. I wish briefly to quote from Mr. Stileman's reply.

Mr. Teesdale: Mr. Symons' reply?

Mr. THOMSON: No, Mr. Stileman's reply.

Mr. Teesdale: I thought you were going to quote Jack Symons!

Mr. THOMSON: The Engineer-in-Chief wrote to the Under Secretary for Works as follows:—

My comments on criticisms by (a) the Harbour Master and pilots; (b) the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners are hereunder. The points raised (by the Harbour Master and pilots) may be briefly stated as follows: (1) Desire to maintain a width of 1,400 feet; (2) desire for 36 feet of depth throughout; (3) disagreement with outer harbour proposals.

(1) Attention was directed in my report to the extravagant water area which maintenance of a 1,400 feet width involves. The Harbour Master states that a reduction in width means grave risks and considerable delays to shipping. Not unnaturally, neither he nor the pilots are concerned with the economics of the question. They do not appear, however, to realise that the reduction in width proposed is to 800 feet minimum at the new bridge. Generally over the extension a considerably greater width will be available. Navigation of a vessel in a width considerably less than even 800 feet in itself presents no difficulties. It is regularly done by Fremantle pilots when navigating the entrance channel, which is 450 feet, in width and is, moreover, on a curve. In the sheltered water of the harbour the conditions are more favourable. It is probable, however, that what the pilots have in mind is the swinging of a vessel. . . . The view of the pilots, therefore, appears to be that what is safely and regularly done elsewhere cannot be undertaken with safety at Fremantle. I feel sure this view would not have been put forward had they been possessed of fuller knowledge as to how large vessels are handled in dock in other of the world's ports.

(2) The pilots do not advance one single reason as to why, from a navigation point of view, 36 feet depth is required. It would seem that, in their view, the same margin of depth over draft is needed in harbour as in a sea-way. No authority of any kind can be found to support such a view. Two out of every three berths in the harbour, after completion of the first extension, will have 36 feet of water. The 32 feet intended over the extension will

float, with a very adequate margin, certainly 95 per cent., probably an even larger percentage, of the vessels trading to the port. The number of berths with 36 feet available will amply accommodate all those vessels requiring a depth greater than 32 feet.

(3) On the question of the outer harbour the pilots appear to think it will be difficult to enter and will be subject to such extreme weather as to be unsafe to shipping. These criticisms are made after inspection of a small-scale drawing without knowledge of what is proposed for the future entrance. Criticism in regard to the entrance channel might properly have waited for fuller information as to exactly what is proposed in reference to this.

We as laymen have been accused of challenging the opinion of a qualified engineer in the person of the Engineer-in-Chief. May I respectfully draw the attention of the House to the reply of the Engineer-in-Chief, in which he accuses the master mariners, the pilots, of the Fremantle harbour of not knowing their job? In claiming this he tells them they are not competent to express an opinion.

The Minister for Works: He says they accused themselves.

Mr. THOMSON: That is a distinction without a difference. He said—

I feel sure this view would not have been put forward had they been possessed of fuller knowledge as to how large steamers are handled in dock in other of the world's ports.

It is possible that some of the men he is criticising have handled ships in large ports in other parts of the world.

The Minister for Works: Do you know any of them?

Mr. THOMSON: I do not know, but I say that is possible.

The Minister for Works: You should find that out first.

Mr. THOMSON: He said also—

On the question of the outer harbour, the pilots appeared to think it would be difficult to enter, and would be subject to such extreme weather as to be unsafe to shipping.

Mr. Sleeman: The pilots have replied to that.

Mr. THOMSON: I have not seen the reply. Even to-day ships entering the outer harbour have had considerable difficulty at times in getting in. There have also been occasions when ships have laid off and refused to come in on account of the high winds that have been blowing. No less than three vessels in the inner harbour crashed into the wharf and did considerable damage.

The Minister for Works: What do you deduce from that?

Mr. THOMSON: It shows that wind can be strong enough in the inner harbour to cause vessels to crash into the wharf. This indicates that it will be much more dangerous for vessels in an outer harbour. The fact that the Fremantle Harbour Trust repaired the damage on the three occasions I have referred to, without levying any impost upon the ship-owners, whose vessels brought about the damage, indicates something to my mind.

The Premier: That is not the point. The Harbour Trust had no power to make the shipowners pay.

Hon. W. J. George: It was because of the risk that the late C. Y. O'Connor put up the screen wall.

The Premier: I gave the hon. member the information on that subject in answer to a question of his.

Mr. THOMSON: I have yet to learn that if, through the negligence of the officers of a ship, damage is done, the owners may not be called upon to foot the bill.

The Premier: Not when a pilot is aboard. You had better read the Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They would not get past Mr. Stevens if there was any chance of making them pay.

The Premier: He had not the power.

Mr. THOMSON: The Premier said that with a pilot in charge no levy could be made upon the ship-owners because of the damage done. No charge of negligence has been laid against the pilots. I understand they are still in the service. If there had been any negligence on their part, they would have been dismissed, or a charge would have been levied against them.

Hon. W. J. George: You are arguing that the present harbour is unsafe, and that an outer harbour would be more unsafe.

The Premier: You are anticipating things.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not arguing that way. If it is possible in the inner harbour, with the protection that has been afforded, for ships to crash into the wharf, how much more probable is it that they will cause damage if they are manoeuvring in an outer harbour? I wish to endorse the remarks of the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Rowe). I remember the days when the deep-water jetty was used. I have seen ships drop their slings and go out to an anchorage. I would not have liked to be aboard some

of them; they were pitching and tossing to such an extent. The member for East Fremantle has been associated with the harbour for many years. He states that an outer harbour is not in the interests of the State. The pilots make the same statement, and they are practical men. I hope the Government will approach the matter from the point of view of what is in the best interests of Western Australia, although the Minister interjected, "Who was responsible for getting the pilots to sign the letter?" That is not the way in which to approach an important question like this. The Engineer-in-Chief went on to say—

Criticism in regard to the entrance channel might properly have waited for fuller information as to what exactly is proposed in reference to this. When detail drawings are being prepared, all the navigation authorities will naturally be consulted before final decisions are reached, and there can be no question that it will at that time be possible to improve both the direction of, and the sea room in the present channel. The tendency to sheer to windward, to which reference is made, may then be overcome if its cause lies in the channel; while if the fault lies with the vessel additional searoom will be available in which to correct it.

That is the attitude of the Engineer-in-Chief, and the Government have accepted his report. This House will be asked to consider the erection of a bridge across the river. That structure will prevent any further extension of the harbour up to Rocky Bay. No estimate has been given as to the cost of an outer harbour. We are asked to vote blindly on a proposal which ultimately means the construction of an outer harbour. We are, therefore, entitled to more information on the subject. The Engineer-in-Chief continues—

While raising no point not covered by the harbour master, the Commissioners indicate that they are wedded to the idea of a greater up-river extension. They entirely ignore, if they have read, the arguments which led me to reject this course and, despite the expression of their desire not to criticise the report, they suggest that provision for an opening span to the new bridge should be made to permit of further up-river extensions. Clearly they are not aware of the delays which an opening bridge involves and the many objections to it that exist. In support of their views, they bring in the name of the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, as having been in favour of carrying the harbour up to Perth water. Mr. O'Connor's successor, Mr. C. S. R. Palmer, is on record in 1911, as stating that his late chief's opinion was that future extensions should not be made inside the river, an opinion he himself held. The Commissioners put for-

ward no reason, from an operating point of view, in support of their preference for a harbour extending up-river, and if they have closely studied the history of other ports developed originally on the lines they suggest for Fremantle, they will be aware of the impossibility of making such a port economical to operate or satisfactory either to shipowners or traders. On questions of wharf lay-out, capacity of sheds and cargo-handling facilities, the opinions and experience of the Trust Commissioners will, as heretofore, naturally be of the greatest possible value, but on questions which are purely engineering the same weight cannot be given to those opinions, however strongly held.

I have clearly indicated there is a divergence of opinion as to future harbour extensions at Fremantle. I do not pose as an expert, but I maintain that I possess a considerable amount of common sense.

Hon. G. Taylor: I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that private members' time has elapsed.

Mr. THOMSON: The hon. member does endeavour to keep this House in order. Sometimes he thinks he is the Speaker, and wishes to draw attention to the fact.

Hon. G. Taylor: You have been imposing on us all night, and I am just about fed up.

Mr. THOMSON: The hon. member can go outside.

Hon. G. Taylor: I am paid to be here. Get on with it!

Mr. THOMSON: And I am not paid to accept any dictation from the hon. member. We are dealing with a very important matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for private members' motions is past. Unless I have a resolution that the hon. member may continue, I shall have to call for the Orders of the Day.

Resolved: That motions be continued.

The Premier: You have now a fresh lease of life.

Mr. THOMSON: I thank the Premier for his courtesy. I wish members would approach this subject from a national rather than a party point of view. We are considering a scheme that has been approved by the Government. We also have a scheme that has been submitted to the Federal Government and the Minister for Works, by Sir George Buchanan. We have the report and opinion of the Harbour Trust

Commissioners, and the views of pilots engaged in handling ships in and out of the port. I maintain that we should get further information, notably from the naval authorities, as to whether it is desirable that future extensions should be in the direction of an inner or an outer harbour. I have myself approached this subject from a national point of view. I wish to prevent the recurrence of some of the disasters with which this State has been associated in some of its engineering undertakings. I hope the House will agree to the appointment of a select committee, so that on the evidence taken a comprehensive report may be submitted on this important question.

HON W. J. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) [8.1]: I intend to prevent, so far as I have any power, attacks upon the officials of the department over which Mr. McCulloch now presides and over which I presided formerly. Those men in my time—and I have no reason to doubt that the same thing applies to-day—as professional men did their duty. Their duty is to propound schemes which will add to the improvement, welfare and prosperity of the State, and to submit such schemes to their chiefs, who in their turn consider the matter, arrive at a decision and then bring the proposals before Parliament for consideration. However, I am by no means blind to the fact that there are conditions associated with the Fremantle harbour of which even laymen may have knowledge and experience, and which should be well ventilated and put in such form that hon. members may be guided and helped in forming a decision. The mover showed immense industry, but unfortunately from one aspect, by the manner in which he placed the motion before the House, he has absolutely precluded the reasonableness of getting a select committee appointed. If the motion is passed and a select committee is appointed, naturally the mover of this motion must be the chairman of the committee. Now, with the bias which the hon. member has shown, many people will be doubtful whether any utility could result from the efforts of such a committee. I give the hon. member credit for all honesty of purpose, but when a member is taking an important step of this nature he should so arrange the matter of his speech as not in any way to indicate bias or feeling.

Mr. Thomson: Your whole statement shows that you are biased.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: That may be, but I am not moving for a select committee. Further, the hon. member may not be a judge. In the course of his speech he referred to the fact that during his political career he has repeatedly advocated the constitution of a public works committee. I may inform him, and the House too, that that question was not lost sight of by former Parliaments. The Legislatures of the years that have passed could, if they had seen fit, have agreed to the appointment of a public works committee. In my opinion, such a body would have been of great benefit to Western Australia in its finance and its progress, and would also have been of immense service to Ministers of the Crown, who have to bear responsibilities for matters which their life's training has not given them the opportunity to judge of technically. The country has no right, nor has the House a right, to expect Ministers practically to decide upon engineering questions. Ministers can and should exercise all business care to obtain the best possible advice from their officers. When they have got that and exhausted it, if they decide upon a scheme the details must be left to the officers. The present question, however, of appointing a select committee is difficult. Still, I would like to see a select committee appointed. Before the session closes we shall have before us the Government's proposals as to the Fremantle harbour, and the House will be expected, and rightly expected, by the country to express its opinion and render its decision. I make bold to say that no man in this House has the experience that would enable him to give a judgment which could be accepted by those who deal with a question of this nature. The most that can be expected from hon. members is that they shall use their common sense and weigh arguments and statements put before them, and that they shall gather information from the newspaper Press, and further assistance from outside people. After that they must arrive at a decision according to their judgment. To ask any member of this Chamber to decide upon an engineering question is ridiculous. Yet we are asked to do so. Perhaps I may be pardoned for pointing out that anyone called upon to do deal with this special scheme

of harbour works ought to have had training which would enable him to make the calculations necessary to show whether or not the project of the specialists is well-founded. Is there any hon. member of this Chamber with education and experience such as to qualify him to deal with a problem of that nature? We know perfectly well that the Fremantle harbour as it exists now was a matter of some controversy in the early days before its construction was decided upon. Sir John Coode came to this State two or three times, and it was with the aid of the reports he put forward that Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, the lamented Engineer-in-Chief, proceeded to evolve the scheme which Fremantle has enjoyed and profited by for so many years. Mr. O'Connor differed from Sir John Coode in some respects, but he put forward a scheme which was accepted by the Government of the day, was carried out, and has proved to be a scheme of common sense and utility and foresight. The mover of the motion, towards the conclusion of his remarks, made some reference to the Fremantle pilots, and also offered some observations upon remarks made, or supposed to have been made, by the Engineer-in-Chief. Those pilots, who know the harbour and the weather prevailing there, and the conditions under which the work has to be done, and who have never failed in their duty in any storm, are a credit to the pilot service not only of Australia but of the world; and their experience is entitled to respectful consideration from everyone who has to deal with the question. I favour the appointment of a select committee without wishing in the slightest degree to snub the dignity of the position of Engineer-in-Chief. If I were Engineer-in-Chief I would think it rather a compliment to be asked to go before a select committee of members of this House to explain my views and deal with the various aspects raised by the committee, as to which they required to be satisfied before reporting. Therefore I see no lack of appreciation of the merits of the Engineer-in-Chief in the appointment of a select committee. I see in it rather the satisfaction of a natural desire on the part of the people of the State, who have to foot the bill, that the best possible shall be given for the benefit of the best State in Australia, and that is Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do you think the select committee would be qualified to handle the situation?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: As I have said, there is no man in this House whose career or experience is such as to qualify him to deal with this matter in the same way as a trained engineer could do; but there are numbers of men in this House who, whatever problem is put before them, can bring to bear their natural acumen and common sense to elucidate points which otherwise might remain obscure.

Mr. Thomson: If we had a public works committee, this matter would be referred to them, and they would—

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: We are not dealing with a public works committee now; we are dealing with the hon. member's motion. I would like to see a committee appointed. I purposely refrain from expressing a personal opinion on the matter, because I feel that I have no right, and that in fact no member has the right, to express a dogmatic opinion until he has had an opportunity to see and study all the papers. I regret very much that the mover found it necessary to reflect upon my chief with regard to the Peel estate.

Mr. Thomson: I did nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I regret also that he thought fit to give me a backhander in reference to the water works.

Mr. Thomson: Again, I did nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: This is not the occasion when a defence of either my chief or myself is needed. The mover talked about heroics. There are no heroics in connection with what I have said regarding the water works. If I had the opportunity of doing so, the heroics would be put into practical form as quickly as possible. No doubt it is somewhat heroic for a gentleman who is supposed to be at the head of a party friendly to the party of which the member for Northam is the chief never to miss an opportunity of throwing mud at former Administrations into which he was not admitted.

Mr. Thomson: On a point of order. I object to the statement just made by the hon. member, and I ask that it be withdrawn, as it is not correct.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I withdraw anything that is not correct.

Hon. G. Taylor: You will not need to withdraw much of that, anyhow.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Let me tell the hon. member again, and let me tell the people

of the State if they want to know, that as far as our water works are concerned there never was but one single plan that was not endorsed by the Engineer-in-Chief, who advised the Government to go on with the work. The records show that. If the hon. member wants to know something more, let me tell him that the chairman of that select committee—as to whom I wish that my memory could go back 35 years, and make public what I told him privately—had not the decency or honesty or courage to ask the Minister controlling the department to appear before the select committee. He suborned one of my friends by a false promise of support, and he brought forth a report which is a disgrace to himself and a disgrace to his country. I do not know what the Government's intentions may be, but I presume and hope that the debate on the motion will be adjourned. I suggest to the Government, if I may, that they think the matter over and see whether they cannot arrange in some way for the appointment of an unbiassed committee of the House. We could not have a committee with a biased chairman, because the results would be ridiculous. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson), therefore, may rest satisfied that he will not be called upon to sit on that select committee. Should the committee be appointed—I know I am too old now to work out how it could be formed, but younger men can undertake that task—it would be a good thing for the State. Satisfaction would be expressed by the people if they knew that their representatives had had an opportunity to probe into the scheme, not with any idea of destroying it, but with a view to understanding what was being proposed, particularly in view of the expenditure of millions that will be involved in the scheme. The alteration it will make to some parts of Fremantle will be most marked. If the Engineer-in-Chief had an opportunity of going into the whole matter with a select committee, it might be possible to place before him views of the position that have not yet been stressed. No one knows better than I do that professional men who have been properly trained in their various activities have very fixed opinions on technical matters, but men who have had the experience and training that I have had and Mr. Thomson too, know their particular jobs. It has been by no means uncommon for me during my long career that now extends over 60 years, to realise that occasionally an engineer may pick up hints of value from men carrying out work under him. I could

mention one instance that occurred in Victoria some 31 years ago when the manager for a contractor drew upon his experience in other countries to point out to the Chief Engineer of the Victorian railways how certain work could be undertaken with advantage so as to save a lot of expense. His suggestion was ignored, but that man lived to see that the advice he gave in those days—it is still on record in the archives of the Victorian railways—was sound and that the project he suggested had been carried out during the last 10 or 12 years, and the old one discarded. I mention that fact to show that even professionally trained men may overlook some other point of view. Then again, ordinary laymen may advance a phase that may have escaped the notice of professional men. If we regard the position from those two aspects alone, and the Government were able to see their way clear to appoint a committee of unbiassed men to review the whole matter, I am sure the investigation would not waste time and it would give immense satisfaction to the people. I do not think there is any necessity to say more on that point.

On motion by Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [8.19] in moving the second reading said: I wish to remind hon. members that a somewhat similar Bill was discussed during the session of 1927. That Bill was amended in the Legislative Council, but we were unable to agree to certain of the amendments and the Bill was laid aside. Although the Bill now before the House is not exactly the same, it embodies the same principles. The object is to control domestic dogs. It deals with the question of licensing dangerous and destructive dogs and provides for by-laws being framed by local governing bodies. It also contains a provision that will require dogs to be kept under proper control from sunset to sunrise, and provides power for the local governing authorities to limit the number of dogs that may be kept. There are certain other clauses in the Bill that are rendered necessary because of the provisions of other Acts. One point that was discussed at length in this House formerly concerned the S.P.C.A., and I have included a clause

in the Bill that differs slightly from that contained in the Bill that failed to pass in 1927. In order to limit the number of dogs that may be kept by members of that organisation for the purpose of providing those animals with homes, my clause represents an amendment of the clause in the rejected Bill and makes it apply to depots registered by that organisation. Under the Act of 1923, it could be argued that every member of the society could keep any number of dogs without the necessity for any license so long as the animals were kept in order that a home might be provided for them. There are also clauses in the Bill that deal with the destruction of dogs by means of laying poison and setting traps on land where stock is depasturing, and they limit the liability imposed upon individuals who pursue that course. These are the main principles dealt with in the Bill, which is a short measure. To-night I intend to deal with the reasons that have actuated me in introducing the Bill. At every road board conference I have attended during the last 16 years, amendments to the Dog Act have received consideration. At the road board conference that was held recently, several amendments were discussed. As a member of the Advisory Board appointed under the Vermin Act, I attended that conference and placed before delegates the rough draft of the Bill I am now presenting to members. Of the amendments suggested at the conference, there were four that I would not agree to, and eventually conference carried a motion unanimously approving of the Bill in its present form. The Primary Producers' Association conference was held in August last, and although I was not present when this question was discussed, that conference carried a resolution, the effect of which is included in the clause in the Bill dealing with the compulsory control of dogs from sunset to sunrise. Thus it will be seen by hon. members that in introducing the Bill, I place before them a measure that has been discussed by the people most concerned and has the support of the organisations I have mentioned. There is another body that I regard as of equal importance—I refer to the Advisory Board under the Vermin Act—and I can assure the House that the Bill was drafted by that body, not altogether by myself. We have drafted the Bill because we know only too well the position as it affects the State and the destruction of stock by dogs that

run wild and are still at large. I claim the support of the Premier for the Bill because during a trip through the country areas he received a deputation at Kulin. The members of that deputation discussed this question with him and Mr. Collier was asked to direct the attention of the officials of the Vermin Department to the great loss of sheep due to the depredations of domestic dogs. In the course of his reply, the Premier said, "In reference to domestic dogs, that matter has been given some attention and it is expected that Mr. John Lindsay, M.L.A., will introduce a Bill in Parliament." The Bill I am now discussing is the one the Premier referred to. Dealing with this question from the standpoint of the destruction of stock throughout the State and with the work of the Vermin Board, it may interest members to know that during the last 12 months we have found that of the dogs for which we pay £2 per scalp, not more than 10 per cent. are pure bred dingoes. The great bulk of the dogs for which we pay that bonus are cross-breeds. They are dogs that have gone out with the dingo packs and the results are seen in half-breeds and quarter-breeds. A large number of the dogs are mongrels and many are supposed to be owned by people. Those dogs are destroyed from time to time and their scalps are brought in with the claim that the animals were dingoes and the bonus is collected accordingly. The position is a serious one from the point of view of the advisory board, particularly when we remember the large increase in the number of scalps that have to be paid for. The dogs that are running wild in the agricultural districts are a menace. I can give the House many illustrations of the damage they do, and I will ask the indulgence of members while I deal with one or two instances. I will give members particulars of my own experiences. It may be said that a member should not talk about his own experiences, but I think it is better on such an occasion as this to deal with facts that have come under my own notice, rather than to give particulars of something I have heard. About five years ago I was running sheep on a farm and I had them in a 160-acre paddock half-a-mile or more away from the homestead. The sheep were yarded nightly and within two weeks I had destroyed 12 dogs in the day time. Within that period dogs had killed 60 sheep in broad daylight, notwithstanding that two men were working

in the paddock with the sheep at the time. Of the 12 dogs that were killed, nine had some trace of a dingo in them, but three were merely tame dogs that had run wild. Another illustration I can give refers to kangaroo dogs. On that particular occasion I found that some of my stock were being destroyed, and I had an idea that the dogs concerned came from the town. I determined to find out who owned the dogs so that I could prosecute the owners. After making various inquiries, I was driving home and when about three miles out, I saw a kangaroo dog trotting home to the town from the direction of my farm. I turned about and drove back behind the animal. I knew that the man who was driving a pump in the town owned three kangaroo dogs and I knew that the dog I was following was one of them. I had to go round a bit when I got to town, but the dog struck straight across to the pump. When I got there, I saw a man leading the dog away. I said, "Who owns that dog?" The man replied, "I don't." I said I would find out, and after I had gone a little way, the man said that he owned the animal. I said, "That dog has been down at my farm killing sheep." He replied, "He has not; he was here a quarter of an hour ago." That is the usual reply that one receives. If a man makes a complaint about a dog, he is always told that the animal has not left the owner inside a quarter of an hour. Around my property I have an efficient dog-proof fence, but it does not keep out kangaroo dogs. During the last five years three kangaroo dogs jumped that fence and attacked the stock. Because of the considerable losses I sustained, I killed those dogs. I knew the owner of them, but the owners of such dogs always refuse to claim them. There is in the Act no power to prosecute men who declare they do not own the offending dogs. About a month ago in Toodyay one man lost 51 sheep to one tame dog, which has since been destroyed. We believe that in the interests of the State the Bill is very necessary. We do not want to say that people must not keep dogs, but we say that if they do keep dogs, they should keep them under control. In the early days in my district the clearers always had kangaroo dogs. In one instance three clearers had five kangaroo dogs. Such dogs require quite a lot of meat. Those men could not go out and hunt kangaroos for the dogs, so the dogs had to

do it for themselves. It is instances like these that make things so bad in the agricultural areas. I believe that if we can keep control of these dogs, since other dogs are being destroyed so rapidly, at least we shall not have dogs multiplying so fast in future. It is not necessary that I should deal with this matter at any length. From the reception the Bill got in this House last session, I believe it will be agreed to in this House. I have studied in "Hansard" the amendments moved in another place last session, and have consulted the members who moved those amendments. In consequence I believe that if the Bill passes in this Chamber, it will be passed by another place. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

MOTION—PHYSICAL WELL-BEING.

Debate resumed from the 29th August on the following motion by Mr. North (Claremont):—

That this House is of opinion—1, That the social and economic burdens arising from faulty nutrition merit the serious attention of the Government; 2, That the State system of education should embrace a curriculum in which physical well-being would assume even greater importance than reading, writing or arithmetic.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [8.33]: I cannot let this opportunity pass without at least complimenting the member for Claremont on the very able manner in which he moved his motion last week. The logical way in which he laid the matter before the Chamber was rewarded by the deep attention of members. Many who, perhaps, at the outset thought it was an idealist's motion and that the hon. member was a faddist and so on, agreed after listening to his arguments that there was far more in the subject than appeared on the surface. Although food reform is not altogether a new subject, yet it remained for the hon. member to introduce it in this House. Those members who think seriously about such things are convinced that there is a great deal in this subject. The member for Claremont suggested that the Education Department might be utilised to educate the young people regarding proper and correct feeding. He also drew some convincing arguments from the attendances at the Perth

Hospital. It was somewhat startling to hear that there were in one year 52,000 patients visiting the hospital, and 4,000 operations, fully one-third of which were due to digestive troubles. We learnt also that £80,000 per annum is the cost of maintaining the Perth Hospital, and that one-third of that expenditure is necessitated by wrong and injudicious feeding. The trials of the Health Department were pictured by the hon. member. He told us how the Minister was harassed for funds to meet the financial stringency that existed, not only in the Perth Hospital, but also in country hospitals. I myself have continually worried the Minister, urging him to relieve the straitened circumstances of country hospitals. I must give the Minister credit for the fact that his department are doing yeoman service.

Hon. G. Taylor: They always have done.

MR. GRIFFITHS: They have an enthusiastic Minister and, thus encouraged, the departmental officers are straining every nerve to do all they can for the people. The work of the Health Department is largely directed towards repairing damage that has been done. It is with the idea of prevention that the member for Claremont is mostly concerned. His desire is to get information disseminated amongst the younger generation, so that a more rational type of feeding may be adopted. As a representative of the wheat-growing industry, I am appalled when I think of what is taking place in respect of our staple food, the staff of life. It used to be said in the Old Country that immediately after the millers established roller mills, men like Holloway, Beecham, and others started erecting pill factories.

Hon. G. Taylor: Which of the two was the more successful?

MR. GRIFFITHS: The product of the roller flour mills is helping, not only the pill factories, but also the dentists and others. I should say that what is needed now is co-operation between the Health Department and the Education Department. The member for Claremont suggests, as one means of securing his objective, the use of moving pictures. We know that the moving pictures have been a wonderful factor in spreading abroad crude American slang, and that they have brought within the vision of the younger people a lot of objectionable features. Altogether they have been very effective, perhaps in a wrong direction. But pictures have had a legitimate educational effect as well, and in that respect have been

largely utilised. Our Education Department really is devoting itself to such things as household management, physical training, and medical inspection of schools. Both the Health Department and the Education Department are concerned with the well-being of the people. The collaboration of those departments would prove very useful. We have the household instruction branch, and the domestic science classes—

The Premier: Is indigestion becoming more pronounced since the establishment of those classes?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I cannot say. The member for Claremont referred to what Mr. Hoover had to say about a young man who gave certain lectures upon animal feeding. That lecturer was told he had made some most startling statements that were likely to have far-reaching effects. We have to-day in this city Sir Arnold Theiler, a great expert in veterinary science. We read in various newspapers of immense sums being spent upon prize stock. Endless study is being devoted to the proper feeding of such stock. Indeed, that is one of the popular features of this visiting lecturer's addresses, the feeding of stock. He has declared that the introduction of certain ashes and minerals into the dietary of an animal is for its well-being, and is going to bring stud stock up to their full value. We devote all this attention to our animals, while at the same time we ourselves go on in the same old, careless way. We have the idea that white bread must be good for us, because it pleases our appetite and looks pretty. Nevertheless it is robbed of all the outer husks, the part that contains the ashes and minerals that go to make up the bone and the teeth. One of the best things that has been accomplished by the Minister for Health is the medical inspection of schools. These examinations have disclosed an appalling state of affairs amongst the youngsters. On a previous occasion here I gave figures showing that of some 39,000 children drawn from 17 rural districts right in the heart of one of the most prosperous provinces of Canada, an overwhelming proportion of them was alarmingly affected. It was largely ascribed to injudicious feeding. Over 10,000 of these children had decayed teeth; 7,500 had enlarged tonsils; 2,400 had enlarged glands; 2,500 had adenoids; 1,738 had defective nasal breathing; 3,677 had goitre; 318 had defective hearing. 2,331 had

defective vision, and 351 were mentally deficient.

Hon. G. Taylor: Was it all owing to diet?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It was largely owing to diet. In a district where food was plentiful and where the people were prosperous, there were 1,743 suffering from mal-nutrition. In the Health Department report, Dr. Jones states that many children are apparently not fed properly. While they might get plenty of food, it is either of the wrong kind or not nutritious. Of the 39,362 children, only 6,632 were normal. Those are the figures for a rural district. What must be the state of affairs in the cities! If we can only instil into our young people how foolish it is to feed pigs and other stock on the best of the grain and keep the starchy or useless portion for our own food, we shall have made a decided step in advance. No wonder we suffer from defective teeth!

Hon. G. Taylor: Some of the people cannot get anything for their teeth to do.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I quite agree with the member for Claremont that it is in the instruction of the young that the hope lies. He pointed out that possibly for a lot of us it was too late to be of much practical value, but that we had to think of the young people. There is far greater interest being taken in this question than members, perhaps, imagine. I know that quite a number of business men in the town recognise its importance. Our system of feeding is wrong; we do not get the wholemeal bread that we should have. I should like to quote an analysis I obtained from Mrs. Farrelly, a lady who takes a great interest in the question. I have heard that lady, as well as the member for Claremont, called a faddist, but in my opinion the people who are striving to obtain some progress in this direction are deserving of all possible credit. The analysis gives the following results:—

	Wholemeal.	White Flour.
Potassium, essential for healthy growth and activity of the glands	7.2	1.82
Magnesium	2.80	.44
Iron, essential for bloodmaking30	.03
Phosphorus, for bones and teeth	10.90	2.80
Sulphur09	.12
Lime, for teeth and bone75	.43

I have heard it said in regard to raisin bread that one required a squad of men to find the raisins, and I am afraid it would be just as difficult to get brown bread containing the right ingredients. I appreciate what the member for Claremont has done

in moving the motion. It is a matter of far greater importance than many of the things we have been discussing and I hope the motion will be carried and that something will eventuate.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. S. W. Munsie--Hannans) [8.50]: I congratulate the member for Claremont on having introduced this subject. While I do not agree with all he has said, he certainly deserves the commendation of the House for having brought such an important matter before the public. I regret that the Press of this State did not give his speech greater publicity.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. Taylor: The Press never gives this side of the House much publicity.

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: I was not present when the hon. member delivered his speech, but I have read the "Hansard" report carefully. Having done so, I confess that I find myself in rather a dilemma, because I do not know exactly what the hon. member is seeking. He led up to certain points on two or three occasions, and then he stopped dead and said he would get the information from the Minister later on. I am sorry he adopted that attitude. Had I known exactly what he was after, I might have been able to make a more effective reply.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He made the dangers pretty clear.

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: I admit he did all that, but he drew rather a long bow when he quoted the figures of the Perth Hospital regarding operations for malnutrition. The motion is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the Health Department and the second with the Education Department. I am not in a position to say what the Minister for Education is likely to do.

Mr. Thomson: He could make instruction part of the curriculum.

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: I cannot do that, and I am not in a position to say what the Minister for Education or the Director of Education will do. What I can say is that anything that can be done by way of co-operation between the Health Department and the Education Department in the interests of the health of the children will certainly be done. Anyone reading the speech would conclude that nothing had been done by the Education Department.

Mr. North: Oh, no, there are the hygiene classes.

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: In 1907 a book was prepared and printed for the Education Department, dealing with the laws of health. That book was distributed and used in every school in the State until about 18 months ago, when it was withdrawn on account of its being out of date. There is now another book in print that deals more fully with health matters. It deals with food, food values, digestion, indigestion and health generally. That book has been brought up to date chiefly by the ex-officer of health Dr. Dale, and I believe it will be distributed throughout the schools during the next week or so. There is no doubt that that work will do an immense amount of good.

Hon. G. Taylor: Did Dr. Dale write the book while he was here?

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: Yes; he completed it before he left the service of the State.

Mr. Thomson: It is rather a pity that you lost his services.

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: No one was more sorry that I was to lose Dr. Dale's services, but he had a better offer from the East, one that was more congenial to him, and he accepted it. I congratulated him on securing the appointment. I do not think I can say much more from the education standpoint, but I wish to say something from the health point of view. The member for Claremont stated that some 4,000 people were put on the operating table of the Perth Hospital during the year 1925-26, all of which cases he attributed to digestive derangement.

Mr. North: No; one-third of the cases were classed as such by the doctors.

The **MINISTER FOR HEALTH**: To say that 4,000 people underwent operations at the Perth Hospital is rather an astounding statement, and the public, on reading the hon. member's speech, would be led to believe that every one was put on the operating table. That is not so. What happened was that 2,234 minor operations were performed on out-patients and 1,605 minor and major operations were performed upon in-patients. Of the 2,234 minor operations on out-patients, not one was performed on the operating table. They consisted principally of operations upon teeth, gums and mouth conditions.

Mr. North: They were classed as digestive.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Of the 2,234 operations, 700 are classed under the heading, "digestive system," but as I have explained, they were for the most part operations upon teeth, gums, and mouth conditions. None of those patients can be said to have been ripped open by the surgeons, as the hon. member expressed it. It is a great pity that so many people have to attend the dentists for treatment. That in itself shows there is something wrong.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If they ate wholemeal, they would be all right.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Of the 1,605 major and minor operations upon in-patients, about 540 are classed in the report under the heading "digestive system," but very few of them can be definitely attributed to food for their causation. For instance, 265 were cases of appendicitis. One cannot say that appendicitis is caused by what one eats.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is caused by what one swallows.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Operation for appendicitis is not due to malnutrition or to want of nutrition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It might be due to swallowing a whole grain of wheat.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is so. There were 105 operations for hernia and 22 for cancer. None of those can be definitely attributed to malnutrition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The whole lot might be.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: A good many of them would not be. I do not think any medical man would contend that hernia was produced by bad nutrition. From the figures quoted by the hon. member, people would be apt to believe that sickness was increasing considerably in this State. That is not so. Per head of population, sickness is decreasing. I am sorry to have to admit that cancer is increasing, both as regards the number of cases and certainly as regards the death rate.

Hon. G. Taylor: That obtains all the world over.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: All over the British-speaking world, and in any other country I know of that keeps statistics, the death rate from cancer, and

the number of people suffering from it is increasing.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That may be due to the food they eat.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That may be so. While the Government in Western Australia are not perhaps doing very much in investigating the cause of cancer, Governments elsewhere are concerned and are doing everything possible by scientific investigation to find out the cause and discover a cure for the disease. If they can ascertain the cause they may be able to find a cure. I am glad to be able to say that both T.B. and syphilis are decreasing in Western Australia. That is largely due to the publicity, in the case of T.B., and to the work done by the Health Department. In the matter of the second disease the decrease is due to the Act passed by this Parliament and to the administration of the Health Department. I claim that the Department are doing a great deal in the direction set out by the member for Claremont.

Hon. G. Taylor: We were the first State to pass those health laws.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes. The principal Medical Officer, after his travels through America, Canada, Great Britain, and a part of the Continent, expressed the opinion that in no part of the world he had visited was the legislation or its administration as up to date as was the case in Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is in venereal disease matters.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is so. Some 3½ years ago the Commonwealth Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into health matters generally throughout Australia. They have appointed at different times doctors and professors to deal with the different questions raised by that Royal Commission. One of the matters reported upon concerned the treatment of venereal disease. The expert of the Commonwealth Government visited all the States of Australia prior to coming to Western Australia. That was about three months ago, and he spent two months here. When he departed he put on record in black and white that the methods adopted in Western Australia were superior to those adopted in any other State of the Commonwealth.

This shows that our Health Department are doing something.

Mr. Thomson: It shows that we have a competent P.M.O.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, and that the department are doing their duty so far as lies in their power.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Health Act met with great opposition.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I know it did. I wish to refer briefly to the 52,000 visits by out-patients to the Perth Hospital. The actual number of out-patients was 8,754, but many of those made between 10 and 30 visits, and so the figures are multiplied to 52,000. The hon. member stated it was desirable that there should be co-operation between the Health Department and the Education Department.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They are both Government departments.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That co-operation is evident to-day.

Mr. North: That is so. You refer to the report of Dr. Jull.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I believe we could spend a mint of money in trying to educate adults on the subject, and that we would then fail.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: On food and diet?

Mr. North: Because they are past redemption, too old.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: If a certain amount of money were spent in the right direction, for the purpose of getting at the children while at school, particularly the elder ones, it is likely some good would be achieved. Only recently Professor Cameron was appointed as Professor of Education. He had not been in the State long before he interested himself in the health of the children. He put up a proposition which is to-day in actual practice. The best method of getting at the children is first of all by training the teachers. It is not of much use trying to train the children if the teachers have not been taught the essence of this business.

Mr. North: Quite true!

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The professor asked the Health Department to supply a medical officer part time, for three days in the week, to give instruction on this very subject at the Teachers' Training College, Claremont. The request was

agreed to by the Health Department, and a doctor is now there fulfilling this duty. The doctor appointed was Dr. Stang. I am pleased to say that Western Australia leads the way in the Commonwealth from the health point of view. Ours is the only Training College in Australia where this practice is followed. We have gone a little further than that. The Prime Minister wrote to every State with regard to an interchange of school medical or health officers, with health officers in the different counties of England. Western Australia was the first to accept that offer. Dr. Stang is now in London, and the doctor she went to relieve is now teaching at the Training College. Much good will be the outcome of this. If we are to have medical officers going round the schools, and they are to be in a position to advise the Government as to what is best to be done, it is necessary that some of them should see the conditions prevailing in other countries. The opportunity thus afforded is now being availed of. The hon. member also made a suggestion that the Health Department should put out films on this subject. I do not know whether he has been away lately, but I would remind him that two films are now being shown in the metropolitan area. I think they have been shown in every theatre there during the last four months.

Mr. North: What was the subject?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: This subject:

Mr. North: I did not know that.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: When Dr. Atkinson was in America he was very much struck by the films produced by the National Picture Company of New York. He brought some back with him. These have been shown in every theatre in Perth.

Mr. Thomson: I know of that.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Each picture takes about 12½ minutes to show.

Mr. North: Under what name are they shown?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: They are shown by the Health Department.

Hon. G. Taylor: There have been no Press comments on them.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have seen the comments and the pictures. They have been shown at the Prince of Wales, in the Hay-street theatres, in North Perth and Mt. Lawley, and two in Leederville.

Mr. North: That is good news.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: They have also been shown at Fremantle.

Hon. G. Taylor: I thought you were improving in health.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, and I hope the improvement continues.

Hon. G. Taylor: I hope so, too.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: We are already doing something in this direction. The Principal Medical Officer and the Director of Education have pointed out the difficulty of attempting to train adults to take an interest in this matter, or of convincing them of the necessity for doing so, and how difficult it is to teach school children. The Health Department have not been lax in the matter of literature. Tens of thousands of pamphlets have been distributed by the department on the subject of food. I have some samples here. One is headed, "Food Values. A correct diet is essential to health."

Mr. Davy: That does not carry us much further unless it says what is the correct diet.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is contained in the pamphlet.

Mr. Davy: Does it refer to wholemeal bread?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is advocated in some instances as being more wholesome and beneficial than white bread. We do not take sides on the question. Another pamphlet is headed, "School lunch, suggestions for parents." That gives an idea what children should have for their lunch.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If the husband did the cooking, the child might have a chance.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not know about the husband cooking. Most Australian wives can cook and do cook. If they cannot do so before they are married they very soon learn how to do so.

Mr. Withers: And make a success of it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Does a good cook produce a concave husband or a convex one?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Another pamphlet deals with health hints. "To ensure the maximum of success in any sphere of life," says this pamphlet, "good health is essential. Therefore treat the body with respect and obey its laws; the laws of health are simple." There are also sugges-

tions for diet suitable for children. These pamphlets have been issued throughout the schools by the school medical officers, the dentists and the teachers. The last pamphlet I have is, "A Food Dialogue." I believe we are on the right lines in the establishment of infant health centres. They are established primarily for the information and instruction that can be given to mothers in regard to care of babies. Thousands of mothers are attending those infant health centres. It was first said that the mothers would not attend them; but they are patronised more and more every week. Again, each centre that is opened puts up a record for attendance during the first three months. The very last centre to be opened was that at Bunbury, which is not a thickly populated locality; but the attendance there for the first three months beat the attendance for the first three months of any centre yet established in Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: I bet attendance is free.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: It is.

Mr. Teesdale: Women are pretty good on the free shows.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Let me again congratulate the hon. member on having brought forward this most important subject. The first part of the motion I do not oppose in any way, and I hope it will be carried. I am sorry, however, that the hon. member did not go a little further while speaking, instead of coming to a stop and saying he would get certain information by way of question later. Had he intimated exactly what he wanted to know, I would have taken this opportunity of furnishing the information. However, anything that can be done to educate our younger people, and especially our school children, from a hygienic point of view will be done by the Health Department as far as may be possible having in view the financial exigencies of the State.

On motion by Hon. G. Taylor, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.18 p.m.