

car produce his license, seeing that the registration number was attached to every car. He favoured severe penalties for those who transgressed the law.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 15th October, 1913.

	Page
Questions : Railway employees vision and hearing tests	1722
Railway Sleeper supplies, sub-contracting	1722
State Battery, Mount Egerton	1722
Lands Department Lithos.	1722
Perth Tramway Tracks	1723
Bills : Fisheries Act Amendment, 3a.	1723
Declarations and Attestations, 3a.	1723
Leave of Absence	1723
Motions : Swine Fever	1723
Fremantle Harbour Extension, Commission to inquire	1729
Sewerage Connections and Filter Beds	1755
Food and Drugs regulations	1761
Papers : Thompson's dairy	1725
Phosphate deposits near Esperance	1756
Phosphate Deposits and Federal Bounties	1758
Mines Regulation Bill, 1906	1761
Return : Leases of Northern Reserves	1761

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY EMPLOYEES VISION AND HEARING TESTS.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many of the 113 railway employees that, according to the return laid on the Table of the House, failed to pass the official vision and hearing test have successfully passed the test imposed by the Government Medical Officer? 2, What fee is charged by the medical officer for making these tests? 3, By whom is the fee paid?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Of the 113 employees referred to eight have since passed the Railway medical officer. 2, 10s. 6d. 3, The fee is paid by the department.

QUESTION—RAILWAY SLEEPER SUPPLIES, SUB-CONTRACTING.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that the pernicious system of sub-contracting is being carried on by the Railway Department in connection with sleeper supplies? 2, Is he aware that the system has been abolished in the Works Department? 3, Seeing that two Ministers have promised to deal direct with the hewers, will he give his officers the necessary instructions?

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

QUESTION—STATE BATTERY, MOUNT EGERTON.

Mr. WISDOM asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Were tenders called for the supply and erection of a cyanide plant for the Mount Egerton State Public Battery? 2, If not, why not.

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, Because the Government has no present intention of erecting a cyanide plant in connection with the Mount Egerton battery. Full particulars concerning the treatment of tailings at that centre have been supplied to the member for the district.

QUESTION—LANDS DEPARTMENT LITHOS.

Mr. MONGER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that the lithos supplied by the Lands Department are similar to those in existence in September, 1911? 2, When is it proposed to supply something more up to date?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, In some cases this may be so, the large number of working lithos in existence (over 500) rendering it impossible to have every one up to date. 2, Drafts-

men are constantly employed on this work and lithos are revised and re-issued weekly.

QUESTION—PERTH TRAMWAY TRACKS.

Mr. ALLEN (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: Has his attention been drawn to the shocking condition of the tramway tracks in the metropolitan area?

Mr. Bolton: Recently?

Mr. ALLEN: Quite recently.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: I can say that I have not received any complaints.

Mr. ALLEN: The Minister should look at the tracks for himself, and he would then see the shocking condition they are in. We had more power over the tramway company when they owned the lines than we have at the present time.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Fisheries Act Amendment.

Returned to the Legislative Council with amendments.

2, Declarations and Attestations.

Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. UNDERWOOD leave of absence for one month granted to Mr. Dooley on account of ill-health.

MOTION—SWINE FEVER.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth) moved—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing: 1, The number of pigs detected by the officers of the Central Board of Health as suffering from swine fever in the Perth, Fremantle, and Guildford districts for the three months ended 30th September; and 2, The number reported to that Department during the same period by the pig owners and others as having died from that disease, and the districts they are reported to have died in.

He said: According to information which has been supplied recently only one pig has been found by the Stock Department suffering from swine fever, but from what I understand the disease is very prevalent. Those who were in the House some seven years ago will recollect the outbreak of swine fever in the State and the injury it did to the industry. As a matter of fact it practically ruined many of those engaged in the pig breeding industry. At the present time there is no doubt about the fact that the matter is much more serious than the information which has been supplied to the House will lead members to believe is the case, and when the return which I am asking for is laid on the Table of the House hon. members will find that in the Guildford district alone 17 pigs were recently found suffering from swine fever. In the Wanneroo and surrounding district and also at Coogee the disease is prevalent, and to permit it to remain in our midst with the lax inspection which exists is most unfair. I am sure there is no desire to see the industry suffer as it suffered a few years ago. In all other parts of the world the disease is treated seriously. The Hungarian Government deal with between 400,000 and 500,000 pigs annually by inoculation, and on this subject of inoculation I asked a question in the House a few days ago, and the information I was supplied with was not very satisfactory. The Hungarian Government subject pigs to the number I stated to inoculation each year and the results are very successful. It will be seen, therefore, that though the disease is treated very lightly in these parts it is looked upon as being serious in Hungary and is treated as such. I have a report from Mr. Melvin, the chief of the Agricultural Bureau in America, who stated in 1907 that although the treatment of pigs by inoculation had not been very effective it was worthy of attention. I think, therefore, that the matter should be given consideration in this State. I understand that some pigs have been inoculated in this State, but I do not think that sufficient care has been exercised. The member for Northam had a lot of experience in reference to swine fever;

in fact. I think I brought it under his notice one day when he was Minister, and the disease was very prevalent in the State. The old records will show that on one occasion, when the inspector said that swine fever did not exist, I saw in the yards at Robb's jetty 14 pigs suffering from swine fever, and I know of another instance of about 40 pigs being killed. To allow the fever to spread and become as bad as it was seven years ago would be simply monstrous. Only last Saturday a man came into the Perth market and said he had lost £50 worth of pigs in a week, but he did not want anything said about it. On another occasion, when swine fever broke out, I went to Mr. Buckley's place. I give the House the man's name so that hon. members can make inquiries if they doubt my statement. Dr. Cleland reported at the time that the man had lost only nine pigs, but Buckley himself told me that he had lost 50 pigs, and they had cost him 30s. per head. It is our duty to try to prevent the spread of a disease that does so much damage to the herds.

Mr. S. Stubbs: How long ago was that?

Mr. LANDER: Seven years ago. My object in referring to these things is to show that the same tactics as were adopted seven years ago are being used at the present time to hide up this sort of information. Whenever these epidemics have occurred there has always been somebody ready to try to cover them up, and I say that when there are men in the State who are trying to hide these things, it is our duty as honest men to expose them. I tell the House that swine fever exists at the present time, and we should try to deal with it. Seven years ago, when it was first said that swine fever existed in the State, the sickness amongst the pigs was generally attributed to thickness of the lungs. If I had known that this motion would come on this afternoon I could have brought to the House samples of the lungs and intestines of pigs which died at Robb's jetty, showing unmistakable symptoms of swine fever. They are sealed up, for I had intended to send them to the Royal College in London in order to get a proper bacteriological examination, but they are proof that swine

fever did exist in Western Australia when it was said that the disease did not exist here. If anybody who takes an interest in stock cares to visit the different stock yards about Perth, he will find that swine fever does exist to-day and it is our duty to see that measures are taken to eradicate it. I move the motion standing in my name.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): I have no objection to this motion, or to supplying the return asked for. I would like to point out to the hon. member that when at any time there has been a suspicion or indication of the existence of this disease, the inspectors have been active in investigating the matter and taking the necessary steps to, as far as possible, prevent its spread. We know that if the disease were allowed to get amongst the herds of our pig breeders, the result would be disastrous. A case occurred recently in the district between Perth and Fremantle, and when the matter was brought under my notice I gave instructions that the case was to be kept continually in view, in order that the department might have the latest information on the subject. I assure the member for East Perth that the officers of the department are alive to the necessity for activity in this matter.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I would like to say that I have the utmost confidence in the officers of the Stock Department. They are active men, and if this disease is as prevalent as we are led to believe by the member for East Perth, those officers must know all about it. I hope the Minister will realise that when swine fever is discovered the fact should be published, so as to prevent its spread through the herds of Western Australia. The best form of prevention is to make public the information at once and to destroy all the pigs already suffering from the disease. Some years ago we had swine fever, with the result that the pig industry to-day is not in a very flourishing condition. It is ridiculous in a State where we can grow pigs in large numbers that we should import bacon, and that the price of pork should be what it is to-day. However, I believe

the officers are fully alive to the seriousness of the position, because they are the same officers as had experience of the outbreak seven years ago.

Mr. Lander: Some of them deceived you, at any rate.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I am sure the officers are capable of handling the matter satisfactorily. I believe there was some doubt in the first place about the disease being swine fever, but as soon as the disease was identified the officers did their duty and stamped out the disease in a most satisfactory fashion. It was not confined to Fremantle but was found throughout the country, and the officers deserved the greatest credit for the prompt and efficient way in which they dealt with the outbreak. I am confident that if to-day the Minister gives them their heads and allows them to do what they want to do, they will fully protect the industry. I am sorry to hear that the disease has again made its appearance in the State, and I regret that the fact has not been made public before.

Mr. LANDER (in reply): I cannot agree with the member for Northam when he states that the officers were alive to their duty and did it. I will tell hon. members how they did their duty: they did it by allowing the pig industry to be ruined. The statistics in the *Year Book* will show that there is a smaller number of pigs in Western Australia to-day than there has ever been. The apathy of the officers was such that it was only by fighting them at the point of the bayonet, and bearding the then Minister in his office, that the officers could be made to admit the existence of swine fever and deal with it. The only way to awaken them to their duty is to give publicity to the matter through this House, and the pig owners themselves will then be on their guard.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS—THOMPSON'S DAIRY.

Mr. LANDER (Easi Perth) moved—

That the report of Inspector Weston, and Inspector Weir's comments there-

on, upon the state of the dairy and cows at Thompson's dairy, which was supplying the Children's Hospital with milk up to the time of the Government taking over that contract, and also the report of Messrs. Lovekin, Battye, and Lander on the same dairy, be laid upon the Table of the House.

He said: In asking for these reports to be laid on the Table it is my intention to subsequently ask that they be read. It is a most scandalous thing that officers should come forward and give a most incorrect and misleading report to the Minister in reference to the state of a dairy from which milk was coming which was practically murdering children. The report put in by one officer of the Stock Department and commented on by another was simply an outrage on honesty. When hon. members see the two reports on the Table and compare the returns of deaths at the Children's Hospital to-day with a similar return for the time when this milk was being supplied to the institution, they will see that the report submitted by Mr. Battye, Mr. Lovekin, and myself was a true one. I hope these papers will be put in and kept as a record of the general unreliability of officers who occupy positions in the Stock Department.

Mr. Allen: Will you take any action afterwards?

Mr. LANDER: I might take action afterwards. If I had known that I had the power, I would probably have taken action at the time.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Your insinuation is very wrong.

Mr. LANDER: Where an officer will give an untruthful report—

Mr. George: Who is the officer?

Mr. LANDER: Inspector Weston. He gave a report that was misleading and untrue. The milk coming from this dairy was practically murdering children, and, as I stated on another occasion, that officer in making such a report was nothing better than a murderer and assassin ready with his knife to stab. To pass over the condition of that dairy was a scandal to any department. The cooler was dismantled and milk was sent away at a

temperature of 102 degrees. It is generally reduced to a temperature of about 40 degrees with the object of killing any microbes in the milk. Besides being taken away without being cooled, this milk was allowed to stand in an open can on its way to the children's hospital.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora): I second the motion.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): The papers asked for in this motion will be laid upon the Table without any objection, because I am sure that the tabling of the papers will indicate that the hon. member might have modified his statements considerably if his remarks had been deferred until after the perusal of the papers. The hon. member seems to have a vendetta against the officers of the Stock Department, for what reason I do not know, and I think, in pursuance of that vendetta, he is in the habit of making extravagant statements which are not justified. All recognise the deep interest the hon. member has taken in connection with securing a pure milk supply, and the elimination, as far as possible, of tuberculous from our dairy herds, but at the same time that interest should not lead him to the extent of practically accusing officers of being acquiescent and indifferent to the supply of impure milk, which the hon. member characterises as the act of an assassin and murderer. These are statements which are certainly not justified, and I think they ought to be excluded from his remarks in supporting a motion of this kind. I am ready to lay the papers on the Table, and after a perusal of the papers I think the hon. member will modify the remarks which he has made.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): I wish to make a few remarks in connection with this matter. I think any member of the House who feels he has a charge so strong as the hon. member for East Perth (Mr. Lander) appears to think he has against these officers should take a very different action from what the hon. member has taken to-day. He practically charges these officers, not only with neglect of duty, but worse, criminal neglect, and knowledgeable neglect.

Mr. Lander: Perfectly true.

Mr. GEORGE: And assassins and murderers.

Mr. Lander: Quite right.

Mr. GEORGE: I am loath indeed to believe that there are officers in this State whose conduct in any shape or form would justify the statements made by the hon. member. If the hon. member believes, and I believe he has that idea in his head, that his statements are correct, the manly course and the course which should appeal to the hon. member to take is to impeach these officers and have an inquiry held, and if it is found that the hon. member's statements are correct, these officers should be hounded, not only out of the service, but out of the country. I would remind the hon. member that for years Western Australia has been blessed or cursed, whichever idea the hon. member may think is right, with gentlemen who have made extravagant statements in connection with every department of the State. The hon. gentleman should be rather proud that the civil service of Western Australia has within its borders men of the highest character that it is possible to get anywhere, and if there should be something in certain officers' conduct, or certain action with which the hon. member does not entirely agree, then the hon. member should not allow his zeal to run away with him and brand these officers with terms of opprobrium. There has been too much said in this State about officers who have not carried out their duties properly, and it has been found upon inquiry that there has been nothing to cause the statements to be made. However, it has been the means of obtaining cheap popularity for the persons who have made the charges, and who have thought fit to sling mud at these gentlemen, and it appears they think that is the best thing they can do for this State. I protest very strongly in connection with this matter. I could, if necessary out of my own experience, say sufficient to make the hon. member sympathise with these officers, but if there are in the service officers so callous as the hon. member would lead us to believe these officers are, then the hon. gentleman should move, as

he has the power to do. for a committee of inquiry and have the matter thoroughly thrashed out. The hon. gentleman in an excess of enthusiasm and in his evident sincerity in trying to obtain what he believes and what we all believe is right, the good health of the people, he has allowed his zeal to override his good sense. I am willing to believe that the public service of the State contains within its borders men of the highest character. As far as Western Australia is concerned, during the last 20 years this sort of accusation has been thrown against officers in all departments who have had to take any strong stand, and they have been subject to abuse and misrepresentation, but it stands to the credit of Western Australia that in very few instances where the matters have been inquired into, has there been the slightest foundation for the charges made. But what has been found? The men who have made the charges and who have shouted them from the platform, have written them in the newspapers and spoken them in the House, when it has been proved that the charges were not correct and that the statements had not been supported, these men who made the charges have not had the manliness to stand up in their places and state one iota of regret. If the hon. member gets the papers and does not carry them to the full length that he should do and allow these officers an opportunity of defending themselves, then the hon. member is unfit to be in this place and unfit to be in the society of hon. members.

Mr. S. STUBBS (Wagin) : Whilst I think the hon. member for East Perth has been actuated by pure motives, I think every hon. member other than he will agree with me when I say there should be British fair play among members of the House. To attack men in the manner in which the hon. member for East Perth has done without these men being able to defend themselves is not in my opinion in the best interests of the House or the country, and I hope and trust the hon. member will see fit to modify the language which he used because these men are not able to defend themselves. When the hon. mem-

ber has seen the papers, and the Minister for Lands has said that he will lay them on the Table, he might then have some justification for asking that the papers be laid on the Table, but the hon. member has endeavoured to condemn these officers in the minds of members of the House, which to me seems very unfair and un-British. With all due respect to the hon. member, and giving him credit for pure motives, still he has allowed himself to be carried away in a manner which on calm reflection I think he will see is not quite right. I hope the hon. member will see fit to refrain from casting reflections on the character of officers. I know both of these officers referred to, and I believe them to be honourable members of the civil service of the country, anxious to do their duty to the country and to see that the laws of the country are carried out. I shall support the motion, but I regret the tone the mover has adopted when speaking to his subject.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) : I would just like to say a word in connection with the motion, not only on behalf of the officers who have been charged by the hon. member, but on behalf of the dairymen of this State. If the hon. member will make inquiry he will find that the children's hospital was supplied with as pure milk before the supply was obtained from the Government as since. I had occasion to inquire very closely into the manner in which the dairies were carried on when I was in office and I invariably found that they were kept clean.

Mr. Lander : Of course, you fixed up an inspection.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : No such thing. The inspections were good. We are all willing to give the hon. member credit for endeavouring to do good, but he has allowed his zeal to run away with his discretion. He has made charges against the dairymen of the City time and again, and they have been unfounded. As the Minister for Lands has said the hon. member has some objection to chief inspector Weir and no doubt now he has some objection to inspector Weston,

These men have done their duty well. No men are more conscientious and desirous of doing their duty. They have nothing to gain in a neglect of duty or in failing to make others do their duty. The people of Perth are supplied with milk from clean dairies and well fed cows. It is plain to everyone that in the metropolitan area cows have to be hand fed and fed on the best possible feed to be obtained. There is no justification at all for the attack which the hon. member has made on the dairies generally and there is no justification for the statements that the dairymen have murdered children and that the inspectors' neglect has contributed to that end. It is regrettable that the hon. member should bring this matter up as he has done. If the hon. member believed there was something wrong why did he not ask for the papers or go to the Minister and see the papers.

Mr. Lander: I have seen the papers.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: And having seen them, then he could bring forward a definite charge. I believe it is the duty of Parliament to protect the people of the country who are doing right and obeying the laws of the land. The law sets up a standard and says that dairies shall be clean and cattle well fed. That is so. The laws are satisfactorily and well administered. If a special quality of milk is needed, as it is for infants, then the Government have to pay a special price. They have to pay for cooling rooms and the price is high, which the ordinary consumer could not afford to pay. In Melbourne the milk sent to hospitals is specially treated, but it is paid for at a special rate, not 1s. 1d. per gallon, and it is obtained from specially tested cows.

The Minister for Lands: The Government pay 1s. 6d., not 1s. 1d.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In Melbourne I believe the price is even more than 1s. 6d. No doubt it is a very good arrangement to pay a special price for a special article when dealing with young children. However, I did not rise to discuss

that phase of the question, but I rose to protest against the hon. member making charges in a violent manner against officers who are not here to defend themselves. These charges go forth to the public and no doubt people who have lost babies which were sent to this institution may think that the person who supplied milk to the institution is somewhat guilty. We are specially privileged here in this House in being able to say what we like, but that privilege is given to us because no doubt it was thought that members would exercise a wise discretion in making charges. But it seems that some members think they can make charges, that they need not be true, that they can make any charge they like, and that they are absolutely protected. We should remember that if we have an advantage we should use that advantage within reason because considerable harm may be done. I hope the hon. member will withdraw the remarks which he has made and will do whatever he can to have them taken from the *Hansard* report, for the records will show the statements which the hon. member has made, and these statements I believe he will find on consideration were extravagant and inadvisable.

Mr. LANDER (in reply): To listen to the two members on the Opposition side who have spoken one naturally would think that I made a charge or statement that I could not substantiate. I may tell hon. members if I had been here a few years ago when there were forgers and thieves sitting in the House—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member take his seat. The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. LANDER: I withdraw it; but if you will suspend the Standing Orders—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would not advise the hon. member to make those remarks even if the Standing Orders were suspended.

Mr. LANDER: If I were permitted to criticise I would criticise some hon. members who occupied Ministerial office in

this House when the distribution of bad milk was going on. I have seen these reports, and I do not want any chastisement from the hon. member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. George) for making charges about people. The hon. member made charges about men occupying responsible positions, but this House will not find Titus Lander closing up. When these papers are placed on the Table of the House it will be found that I will move for a select committee to enquire into the business. I will not withdraw one word of what I have said about this matter. Had the hon. member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) done his duty when he was acting Honorary Minister there would have been no necessity for me to take so much interest in this milk question as I did take. We found the most deadly milk was being served out to the public of Western Australia, and rotten cows were brought to Western Australia at the instigation of the hon. member when he was in power.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is not true.

Mr. George: Withdraw, withdraw, that is not fair!

Mr. LANDER: Things have been hurled at us on this side as to what we would do and would not do. I have said things this afternoon and I will try to prove them, and when these reports are placed on the Table of the House I hope to have them read so that they may get into *Hansard*. I hope that this motion will be carried and I will stand or fall by it. I do not want anyone in this House to carry my burdens. I will fight my own battle, and I do not want the hon. member for Murray-Wellington or the hon. member for Northam to sympathise with me. I have reached the age of maturity. What we want in this House, and ought to have had years ago, is more outspokenness when things are going on.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We will want more truth soon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Question put and passed.

MOTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR EXTENSION, COMMISSION TO INQUIRE.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle)
moved—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into and report upon proposals for extending the Fremantle harbour.

He said: It is hardly necessary for me to occupy much time in pressing upon hon. members the importance of this question. All who have taken any interest in the rapid expansion of the business of this State know that among our various State trading concerns the harbour question, not only at Fremantle but at the out-ports as well, is pressing for consideration. We have spent over £1,500,000 in the construction of the present harbour at Fremantle. We are anticipating now, according to information given by the Government some time ago, the expenditure of another £648,000, and while this will bring the expenditure on the present harbour well over the £2,000,000 mark, it is satisfactory to be able to say that so far the Fremantle harbour has proved a valuable and profitable asset to the State, and there is no reason for any doubt or anxiety as to the future success and the financing of this great concern. Possibly one reason for my assurance may lay in the fact that it is a concern against which there is no competition. The gentlemen who are charged with the control and protection of this harbour, the commissioners of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, are in the somewhat happy condition of being able to levy such charges as will give them a balance sheet on the right side at the end of any given financial year, and it is only due to the gentlemen who have occupied the position of commissioners up to the present time to say that, speaking generally, their work has been carried out with credit to themselves, and, I believe, with satisfaction to the Government, with perhaps this modification: when the present harbour works were completed, and the question of their management had to be faced,

the idea governing the Ministry of the day was that the Harbour Trust should be composed of representatives of the various interests doing business in that connection with the harbour, and so the commercial interests of the State were given a considerable representation on that Trust; but while this may have been an ideal arrangement on paper, it was found in actual practice not quite so successful or satisfactory as had been anticipated, and the result has been that, more particularly with regard to recent appointments, the Government have felt compelled to give a larger representation of Government officers upon the Harbour Trust. I think I am correct in saying that the feeling, so far as I can gauge it, is still growing in the direction of more Government control, and I shall not be surprised if in a few years' time we have here in Western Australia something similar to what they are doing in Victoria: that is, the abolition of a large body of commissioners, and the appointment of one, two, or three commissioners, who will have control much in the same way as the Commissioner of Railways has control over our railways to-day. There is now and again a considerable amount of dissatisfaction expressed at the present management by those members of the community who have business with the Trust, and in conversation with some of them I have gathered that they would prefer to deal with one responsible person, a commissioner having full control, rather than deal with a body which they assert is merely a buffer between themselves and the Minister controlling the harbour. The question of harbour extension is one that has to be faced. For the past four or five years it has been increasingly apparent that something must be done within a short time if we are to keep pace with the rapidly expanding business of the State. On the 22nd of December, 1911, I sent a letter to the Premier. I want to read it now because it contains views which are still my views as to the importance and urgency of the matter under discussion. The letter was as follows—

The Hon. the Premier. Sir,—Following our conversation on the question,

I have now the honour to ask your consideration of some proposal for the extension of the Fremantle harbour. As you are doubtless aware the trade of the Port is constantly increasing, and it is inevitable that, with the growth of our export in wheat, etc., such increase will continue in future. Last year, during an emergency, ships were compelled to lie outside the harbour awaiting berthing accommodation, and at present the normal trade during the busier days of the week, taxes to the utmost existing facilities. The final extensions of Victoria Quay and the North Wharf, now being undertaken, may relieve existing pressure, but the growing demand for greater accommodation, particularly on the south side of the river, where passengers and goods must be landed, demands that consideration be at once given to the question of further extension. In this connection I may be allowed to call special attention to the current report of the Harbour Trust Commissioners who state that they have been careful to provide only what appears, from the great general progress the State is making, to be absolutely indispensable; but they feel that further harbour extension cannot be very long delayed. Bearing in mind the fact that any further scheme of harbour extension must entail considerable work of preparation and construction, it will be admitted that the question requires immediate attention. Some difference of opinion already exists as to the direction in which such proposed extension shall be made. The decision on this matter should not be made without the fullest inquiry. Such inquiry will cover questions upon which no one opinion of either shipping, commercial, or engineering expert should be accepted as final. Each of these should be invited to express their opinions, together with any others who may be qualified to advise. For this purpose I respectfully suggest that a Royal Commission of say three members be appointed to take evidence, consider, and report upon the

question of harbour extension. A small body such as this could do its work during the coming recess, and its report would be valuable in assisting the Government to arrive at its decision on this urgent and important matter. Asking for this request your early and favourable consideration.

That letter was signed by myself and the hon. member for South Fremantle (Mr. Bolton).

Hon. J. Mitchell: What is the date of the letter?

Mr. CARPENTER: The 22nd December, 1911, shortly after the elections. On the 12th January following I received a formal acknowledgment from the Premier's office, stating in the usual way that the matter was receiving attention of the Government. We were given to understand verbally, what we all know, that the Government contemplated the introduction of a Public Works Committee Bill, and the work of that Public Works Committee, had it been established, was to consider all proposals for public works costing £20,000 or more. And in conversation with the Minister it was stated that if the Bill became law this work would be one of the works which that public works committee would consider.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The people of Fremantle must be pretty simple if they are content with that sort of excuse.

Mr. Bolton: It is much more than they used to get from the previous Administration.

Mr. CARPENTER: If the hon. member will wait until I put my case, he will see that there has been no simplicity on the part of either the people of Fremantle or its members. For the time being we had to await the fate of the Public Works Committee Bill, because as reasonable men we had to accept the statement that the public works committee could handle a question of this kind just as well as could a Royal Commission. But, as hon. members well know, the Public Works Committee Bill, introduced the following session and again in the session after, although it passed this Chamber it did not pass another place; and on our finding that

there was little prospect of this matter being dealt with by the public works committee, the question then arose as to whether some steps should not be taken without awaiting the consideration of a committee of that kind. Meanwhile I understood from the Minister for Works that they regarded this question of harbour extension as an urgent one and in spite of the fact that the Public Works Committee Bill did not become law they intended to take some steps in reference to harbour extension without waiting for any public works committee to report upon it. Finding that the Government intended to consider some proposition of harbour extension, I sent the following letter on the 15th August, 1912, to the Minister for Works:—

Sir,—In December last I wrote the hon. the Premier asking that a commission be appointed to inquire as to the best means of providing additional harbour accommodation at Fremantle. As I received no reply to my request, I can only conclude that the Government have taken other means of obtaining such information as they require. From a conversation with yourself I learn that some proposition is about to be submitted to Cabinet, and I respectfully ask that, before making any recommendation, you will give your personal consideration to the following:—In view of the increasing size of ships the most effective scheme of extension will be that which provides accommodation for steamers of increased draught, and which is located as near as possible to the ocean in order to give quickness of entry and exit. If some portion of the entrance to the existing harbour can be utilised, making profitable use of costly works now lying idle, and making valuable and convenient accommodation at once available, such a proposition will, I feel sure, receive favourable consideration from the Government and from Parliament. This, I submit, can be done by extending the north mole for a distance of, say, 1,000 feet in a southerly curve, thus giving protection to the present south mole from the prevail-

ing north-westerly winds, and making it available for wharf and jetty accommodation. As you are aware, the weather conditions of the port of Fremantle are particularly favourable. It is only on a very few days of the year—chiefly during winter months—that rough weather prevails. If, however, a mail steamer happens to arrive during the prevalence of a heavy north-westerly gale, its entrance to the present harbour is attended with danger, and the ship master prefers to lie outside until the weather moderates. With the extension of the north mole to form a breakwater, the mouth of the existing harbour will be protected and ships would enter safely during the heaviest gales. This extension, as already stated, would protect the south mole, on both sides of which wharves could be constructed, and from the end of which a jetty could also be made, at which the largest steamers that will ever come to Australia could be accommodated. As regards convenience of construction this suggestion has much to commend it, seeing that the work of wharf construction can be immediately put in hand, and can proceed simultaneously with the extension of the breakwater. The question of whether this lengthening of the north mole would cause silting is one that may be raised. But any theory or allegation of sand travel should only be accepted on proof being supplied. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no evidence of any such movement. The only alternative scheme of which I am aware, namely the extension of the harbour up the river, is one that necessitates such an enormous preliminary expenditure, entails so great an interference with existing interests public and private and will occupy so long a time in its construction, that any Government may well hesitate before committing themselves or the country to such an undertaking. To this, I feel sure, yourself and your colleagues will give the fullest consideration, so I need only to refer to it as emphasising my personal objec-

tions, and that of many others to such an enormous expenditure of public money. Efforts have been made to influence public opinion in favour of the up-river scheme by raising the cry that the present railway bridges are unsafe. "The bridges must go" is a stock cry which has been used for years past and is used to-day by many who have not the slightest knowledge as to their condition. When those responsible for the safety of the railway bridges advise us that their existence is a public danger there will be no hesitation in taking whatever action is necessary, irrespective of any effect such action may have on the question of harbour extension; but I must protest against any attempts to prejudice the latter question by unsupported rumours as to the non-safety of the existing bridges. Although not regarding this question of harbour extension as one which concerns Fremantle alone, I am justified in asking that you will give special consideration to the effects which any up-river extension will have upon its interests. The desire to open the river and take ships to Perth is one of which you are fully aware. With the removal of the bridges a strong agitation would certainly begin to bring this about, and little or no consideration will be given to the large public and private expenditure already made to provide shipping accommodation for the business of the State. The evils of centralisation and the power which can be exerted to secure it against the public interests is too well known to require further remark. In conjunction with Messrs. Bolton and Angwin, Ms.L.A., I placed this before Mr. Scaddan when in Fremantle some time ago. He gave us an assurance that he would be no party to any proposal which would divert shipping from Fremantle. This was made public and was generally accepted as an assurance that he would not agree to any scheme for taking shipping up the river. In view of the known intention of the Wilson Government to remove the bridges Mr. Scaddan's statement was highly appreciated

throughout the district, and should the present Government propose or agree to any contrary course intense disappointment will be felt.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Is this your own letter?

Mr. CARPENTER: Yes. The letter continues—

The proposal which I have briefly outlined in this letter is one which, if adopted, will meet the growing requirements of the State for the next 10 years or more. Its proximity to the sea, its convenience, both of construction and of working when constructed, its utilisation of public property at present unused, or partly used, and its lower cost as compared with any alternative scheme, makes it worthy of the fullest inquiry and consideration.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is that an expert's advice?

Mr. CARPENTER: That is my own letter to the Minister for Works when I asked him to consider a proposition for harbour extension. I also stated that last year I had the honour, in conjunction with my friend the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Bolton), to introduce to the Minister for Works, a deputation arranged by the Fremantle municipal council and other citizens. That deputation urged upon the Minister the importance of taking some early steps to extend the present harbour. They submitted to the Minister, for his consideration, a proposal that had been outlined by Mr. Lefroy, a gentleman well known to most members of the Houses, and who is an associate member of the Institute of Civil Engineers. On that occasion, I am sorry to say, the Minister for Works forgot for a time that he was a gentleman, and suggested that the deputation was there in the interests of Mr. Lefroy as an individual. I think afterwards he was convinced, or partly convinced, that we were not there in the interests of any one man. We wanted then, as we want to-day, the best possible scheme of harbour extension, and I am not aware up to the present time just what criticism has been levelled against Mr. Lefroy's proposition for an outer harbour. There has been

no reply, either to myself or to the Fremantle municipal council, as a result of that deputation.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Are you supporting the outer harbour?

Mr. CARPENTER: I am asking for a Royal Commission to inquire into any and every scheme.

Mr. Bolton: I am supporting an outer harbour.

Mr. CARPENTER: Personally I favour an extension towards the sea. But I was saying that up to the present we have no knowledge, no official reply from the Minister as to what consideration was given to the scheme laid before him by that deputation; nor was there any reply sent to myself to the proposition which I submitted in this letter. I may say that before I ever heard of Mr. Lefroy's proposition I had written and published a rough outline of a scheme for an extension of the harbour in an outward direction. However, time went on and the Minister informed me that he was about to submit, or that he had submitted, to Cabinet for its consideration a proposition for the extension of the present harbour. Last session I secured the papers dealing with this matter, and on perusing them I found that the Minister for Works had submitted to Cabinet a proposition for completing the present harbour, the proposition which I indicated in the early part of my remarks was estimated to cost £648,000. I want to say that so far as that work is concerned I am not raising the slightest objection to it. As matters are at present I think that is the best course the Government can take, that is, to make the fullest possible use of every foot of room in the existing harbour. But I want to make a protest against the attempt of the Minister for Works to tack on to that proposition something which I think he has no right to tack on to it, and which I am glad to find from the papers the Government refused to consent to. The minute of the Minister for Works to Cabinet contains the following:—

I now submit for consideration of Cabinet the recommendation of the Engineer in Chief, in which I fully

concur. It must, I consider, be recognised that the time has arrived when the next move in the direction of harbour extension will finally settle—at least for very many years—the question as to whether the extension should be inside the river or outside. The scheme which I now submit is an extension inside, which does not in itself involve the removal of the bridges, but if this general policy is endorsed then it is considered that in about five years' time the railway bridge will have to be removed a considerable distance upstream.

Mr. Wisdom: So it ought to be.

Mr. CARPENTER: As the minute is somewhat lengthy—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Go on, that is worth hearing.

Mr. CARPENTER: I have no objection to reading it.

Mr. Bolton: We will take it as read.

Mr. CARPENTER: The minute continues—

The principal item of expenditure, *i.e.*, "H" dredging, etc., at an estimated cost of £180,000 if approved, will in my opinion be taken as a declaration against an outer harbour, as by incurring this expenditure the Government are providing for the larger vessels with the increased draught which was referred to in the interesting information recently supplied by the Agent General.

Mr. George: We shall want both harbours in ten years' time.

Mr. CARPENTER: That is quite possible, and in my opinion the Minister for Works has no warrant whatever for trying to make a condition that the carrying out of the work of dredging the present harbour involves the removal of the bridges. We shall want every foot of room in the existing harbour, and some room outside of it, and while the present work of dredging may provide for boats coming here within the next five years, it certainly will not provide for those coming in the next ten or fifteen years. Hon. members who have followed the progress of shipping only need to cast their minds back about ten years, and they will

readily recognise that at that time there was no conception of the rapid increase imminent in the size of vessels doing the world's shipping trade. When boats like the "Kyarra" and "Kanowna" were built, they astonished many people as showing what a large increase had been made in the size of steamers for our coastal trade, and yet, after a lapse of about ten years, we have boats of more than twice that size coming here and running in the same trade, and the coastal steamer of to-day is larger than the oversea steamer of ten years ago.

Mr. Bolton: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARPENTER: We know that so far as the world's shipping trade is concerned, whereas ten years ago a boat of 15,000 tons was considered a big one, we have to-day boats of 30,000, 40,000, and up to 50,000 tons on the water already, and Lord Pirie, one of the shipbuilders of Belfast, has expressed the opinion that in the next few years we may have steamers of 80,000 tons on the water. When the Minister for Works comes to the conclusion that the dredging of the present harbour to 36 feet is going to give all the accommodation which will be required for several years ahead I think that, with all due respect to his opinion, he is not looking at the matter in as broad a light as he should. The minute proceeds—

Within the 36 feet area there will be a wharfage accommodation of 1,973 feet, or three berths. The total expenditure is estimated at £648,000; this will give increased depth, an improved entrance and additional 2,663 lineal feet, or a total wharfage of 10,701 feet as compared with 8,038 at present—1,973 feet at 36 feet depth, and the balance of 8,728 feet at 33 feet, as compared with a depth of 31 feet at present. To deal with some of the items as outlined in the Engineer in Chief's minute—A. £10,500 widening existing wharf by 8 feet for distance of 700 feet to provide accommodation for the larger vessels at Victoria Quay. D. The work outlined in "D" is now in hand? E. E1, F, and K. These have been approved and are now practically in hand. J. This is an item

which is not urgently required, but would improve the entrance to the harbour. With regard to the one definite scheme that has been urged by Mr. G. A. Lefroy—I have had this matter reported on by the Chief Harbour Master, who absolutely condemns it from a navigation point of view, I also had the cost run out and it is estimated to be at least £6,800,000, so really speaking the only alternative that exists to-day to the scheme I now recommend is a combination of the commercial harbour and the naval base.

May I say here that I consider Mr. Lefroy has been unjustly treated in regard to his proposal. When he first published his proposal, it was, through the influence and efforts of some of the citizens of Fremantle, given publicity in the columns of the *West Australian*, and after we had submitted his scheme to the Minister for Works it appears from this minute that the scheme outlined by Mr. Lefroy was submitted to the departmental officers. They were invited to express their opinion upon it, and I want to say I think it a ridiculous estimate to put such a figure as £6,800,000 as the cost of that scheme. But the injustice to Mr. Lefroy arises here: the Press was given these figures which I am now quoting, apparently by the Minister for Works, and when they were published, Mr. Lefroy endeavoured to rebut them by writing an article in reply to them to the *West Australian*, but very much to his surprise and disappointment the *West Australian* refused to publish his reply to this criticism. I understand that he has taken the only course left open to him, namely, he has written to the Premier pointing out the absurdity of this estimate of his work as given by another engineer and submitting a definite practical offer to the Premier for his consideration. However, as I have indicated, I am not here as a champion of Mr. Lefroy. There are, I believe, many good points about his scheme, and I am only anxious that his scheme, with any others that may be made, should be submitted for the consideration of a Royal Commission, who may have the opportu-

nity of learning from the proposers of any scheme the merits and details of their proposals. To proceed with the minute—

I think it would be desirable to get the concurrence of those interested in the harbour before actually incurring any expenditure in the removal of the bridges, and with this object in view I consider the scheme should be submitted to the Working Railways for their views as to the present extension, the ultimate removal of the bridges and the extension of the harbour upstream. It would also be necessary to submit the matter to the Harbour Trust. With the endorsement from these two bodies I think the Government are safe in assuming that the correct thing is being done, and so far as the Government are concerned it can become a definite policy. W. D. Johnson, Minister for Works.

I am very glad that Cabinet, while approving of the proposal as far as the extension of the present harbour is concerned, did not endorse the Minister's opinion that it involved the removing of the bridges and the adoption of the policy of an up-river extension. The minute of the Premier is very brief and to the point—

Cabinet approve recommendations.

The question raised in the final paragraph to remain in abeyance.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Did Cabinet in that minute approve of the expenditure of £640,000.

Mr. CARPENTER: That is purely for deepening and wharf construction within the present harbour.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Is that what they are expending now?

Mr. CARPENTER: I suppose part of the work being done now is included in that, but I understand they are awaiting the construction of a special dredge to dredge out the hard stone at the entrance to the harbour; that is to give a depth of 36 feet up to Victoria Quay. In my opinion to get at the inwardness of this proposition, and to give the House and the country the information which

they ought to have before embarking upon any extensive scheme of this kind, can only be done by the appointment of a Royal Commission. Personally, I think it would have been very much wiser if the Government, before sanctioning the expenditure of the £648,000, had adopted my suggestion of nearly two years ago, and appointed a Royal Commission then. It is unfair, and I use that word advisedly, for any Minister of any Government to submit a proposition to Cabinet and endeavour to get not only that proposition itself endorsed, but to get Cabinet, while endorsing that proposition, to also commit the country to the adoption of a scheme which might involve the expenditure of millions more. I say that is not a fair way of proceeding. It is not fair to this House or to the country.

Mr. George: You are on the wrong side.

Mr. CARPENTER: I do not care which side it comes from. I only regret that the question appearing on to-day's Notice Paper was not answered. The absence of the Minister for Works may possibly account for this. I understand that he is in the country, but knowing that I intended to bring this question forward, it would have been fair to me if he had sent along the information which I was desirous of ascertaining, namely, the cost of the proposal which the Minister for Works says would be involved in the adoption of this proposition, some particulars of which I have just given.

Mr. George: You ought to move a motion of censure against him.

Mr. CARPENTER: The questions which I gave notice of yesterday and as they appear on to-day's Notice Paper are as follows:—"1, Has any estimate been made of the cost of extending the Fremantle Harbour to Rocky Bay, including cost of removal of existing bridges, diversion of roads and railways, resumption of private properties, erection of new bridges, dredging, wharf construction and equipment? 2, If so, what is the amount of such estimate?" I do not know whether the Minister has that information in his office. I can only hope

that he has, but I can hardly believe that he would ask Cabinet to endorse a proposition involving the carrying out of this work without giving some idea of what the work would cost.

Mr. George: That was done years ago.

Mr. CARPENTER: If the information is available then I repeat I have not been fairly treated in not being supplied with it.

Mr. George: Mr. Dillon Bell made a most comprehensive report some years ago.

Mr. CARPENTER: It does not necessarily follow that the Government of the day would endorse an estimate or accept an estimate made years ago. What I am more concerned about is as to whether the present Government or the officers of the present Government have made an estimate which is up to date. We are in the dark on this question in that we do not know what the Minister proposes to do. Whether the Minister proposes that this work shall be a step towards the up river scheme, we do not know, and neither do we know what such a scheme would land us in. We have no means of judging whether it is a fair thing to sanction the expenditure of this money, knowing that it will involve an outlay of one or two millions. We know nothing about it. We have not been able to consider the matter because it has not been submitted to us. I would like to quote a few words from the speech made by the Minister for Works when introducing the Public Works Committee Bill on the 29th October last year. He said this—

It is desirable that we should have, not a committee composed of experts who report to Cabinet, but rather that the Committee should be able to cross-examine these experts so that we can get an opportunity of hearing from them the details of the proposition, instead of getting merely a general outline as we get to-day.

Then he went on to say—

With the system of the Public Works Committee, we will have the advantage of cross-examining the experts. To get the best possible advice

from an expert, it is necessary to cross-examine him. It does not do to allow him to make a statement which may be based on a wrong conclusion. There is only one way to avoid that, namely, to bring the expert before a committee and see exactly how he has arrived at his conclusions. The details can be conveyed to Parliament instead of, as under existing conditions, merely conveyed to Cabinet.

I think we who are here to conserve the interests of the public can endorse every word of that, and if we put the word "Commission" in the place of the word "committee" the quotations which I have read are the strongest that I can get in support of my proposal for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into this big project which we shall have to face during the next two or three years.

The Minister for Lands: Those remarks apply to new works.

Mr. CARPENTER: And the extension of the harbour will be a new work.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. CARPENTER: I think so.

The Minister for Lands: We are committed to expenditure there.

Mr. CARPENTER: We have expended a definite sum on a definite work, and the question now is the extension of the present harbour in one direction or another, and it will require new plans, new estimates, a new loan, and it will be in every sense of the word, a new work entirely.

The Minister for Lands: All part of the existing work.

Mr. CARPENTER: What is the Minister for Lands trying to make us believe? If he extended one of the existing railways from its present terminus, a distance of 100 miles further on, would not that extension be submitted to the Public Works Committee. Of course. It would be regarded as a new work entirely and the same thing applies to the proposal for the harbour extension. That would be a new work in the same sense, and would require the fullest consideration of the commission or the committee, if that committee existed. I do not wish to say one word in depreciation of the

present departmental officers. I have reason to believe that we have good men in our Engineer-in-Chief and his assistants, and in the nautical men who now control and manage the affairs of the port, but I want to point out that experts differ, and very often, the accident—I think we may call it such—of having Brown instead of Jones as the expert, makes all the difference in the proposal which is submitted to Cabinet or to Parliament.

Mr. Wisdom: Especially if you do not like Brown's proposal.

Mr. CARPENTER: Yes, there is something in that interjection. We all know the jealousies to which our professional men are subject, but while I quite agree that the present Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Thompson, believes in doing the best thing in submitting to the Minister a proposal for an extension up river, I also want to point out that if it had been Mr. Palmer and not Mr. Thompson, we might and probably should have had a different proposition.

Mr. Wisdom: We would.

Mr. CARPENTER: I have here an extract from the report of a discussion by the Institute of Civil Engineers in January, 1911. It is a condensed report, and Mr. Palmer at that conference said this—

There was no doubt that with the aid of wise counsel, Fremantle could be made a great and cheap port, but in order to obtain this with benefit to the State as well as the interested localities, the question of providing a ship-channel to Perth and of making Fremantle a large *entrepôt* must be kept separate. It was easy to do this, for they were not, and never had been conflicting questions. When they were kept separate it would, in Mr. Palmer's opinion, be realised clearly that the extension of the Fremantle Harbour should be to the south-west and not inside the river; the works already constructed lent themselves to such an extension and from conversations with the late Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Palmer judged that such had been his opinion also.

That extract supports my statement that the particular proposition coming before the Minister will depend very largely upon whom the expert officer happens to be for the time being. Seeing then that we have an authority like Mr. Palmer advocating one proposition, and Mr. Thompson advocating another, it is a reasonable request to make that we should have somebody, such as that suggested in my motion, to get the best evidence available from any and every man who is qualified to speak, and not to lend ourselves to expenditure first and find out afterwards that we have taken the wrong course and wasted public money. I am aware, of course, that the Fremantle Harbour Trust with Mr. Thompson at their head, have also given their sanction to what is known as the up river proposal. In their last report the following statement appears:—

To another proposal that a Royal Commission should be appointed to consider the question of harbour extension at Fremantle, the commissioners have informed the Government that in their opinion there already exist in the service nautical and engineering expert officers fully competent to advise on the subject.

I do not want to throw ridicule upon any body of public men, but I do think that the secretary of the Harbour Trust and his officers somewhat exceeded their duties in making that report. I question first of all their right as an administrative body to criticise or comment upon the action of members of this House. If they were asked to express an opinion by the Minister that should be done in the ordinary way by official minute. They have no right in their public report to express an opinion for or against any matter which is likely to come before this House, and in this particular case, they are throwing bouquets at themselves by saying "We do not want a royal commission, we consider ourselves as nautical and engineering experts fully qualified to advise the Minister and Parliament upon this work." I say in doing that they have exceeded their duty, and I am somewhat pleased that the Premier, on a recent occasion, administered a rebuke to them for

having made such a reference to this question in their last report. I have no wish to talk over the tea hour. I have given sufficient evidence to prove on a question of such importance and magnitude as this, that the House and the country are entitled to the fullest information before taking any further step involving as it will, a huge expenditure and the disturbance of existing interests. I am quite willing to allow this body, having taken what evidence they can, to decide the question, and I think I can speak for the people of Fremantle and say that when the evidence of both sides has been fairly given and fully considered, they, too, will accept what would be regarded as the best scheme, and for that reason I submit this motion to the House with every confidence.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. P. Collier): I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion negatived.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): The member for Fremantle will perhaps be rather astonished when I tell the House that I intend to support his motion, but before I sit down I propose to move an amendment so as to include other harbours in the State. The question of harbour accommodation is one which is becoming of more importance day by day; and it goes without saying that we should lose no time in giving this very important matter the most serious consideration. I see that the member for Fremantle stated in an interview in the *Daily News* that he found Parliament exceptionally dull, that there was not much opposition, and there was no scope for private members on the Government side of the House. I do not intend to give him any opposition tonight. I hope he will give me none on my amendment, but I think he has had a very fair innings, and a very considerable scope in dealing with the matter of the Fremantle harbour. I want, however, to take some little exception to his statement that it was well known that the Wilson Government had decided to remove the bridges. Whereas that might have been,

and no doubt is, the opinion of individual members of the late Government, I have yet to learn that it was ever stated as a public policy.

Mr. Carpenter: It was announced.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not think it was announced officially by any member of the Ministry, and I can say this much that the Wilson Government never discussed the proposal. We did discuss very urgently the extension of the wharves at North Fremantle, and the erection of sheds which are now utilised for the shipment of wheat. As hon. members will remember, we authorised the expenditure of some £80,000 odd, anticipating parliamentary authority, and we were taken to task in due course for having done so. Nevertheless, the expenditure was urgent, facilities were required, and we did not hesitate to take the responsibility of expending money on what was necessary work. The work has proved to have been effectual and the facilities then given have been of great benefit to the State. I am surprised to learn from the hon. member that the present Government have definitely and as far back as August of last year put it on record as a Cabinet minute, which the hon. member read out to us, that they have decided to expend £648,000 on harbour works at Fremantle. I have no recollection of any public announcement of that policy. I do not think any hon. member of this Chamber has full information as to how that money is to be expended or on what work. Now I here protest once more against this hiding-up policy. If any Government have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to expend a sum of money verging on three-quarters of a million, I think it is certainly the duty of that Government to put plans and details of their proposals before Parliament. The Loan Estimates were put through last year in record time; a sum between five million and six million pounds was voted at one sitting of the House, and although I was not present on that occasion, I do not remember any information being then afforded the Chamber as to the proposal which the hon. member has referred to this evening. It may be, possibly is, a fact that the papers

have been on the Table, as the hon. member said he was quoting from papers which have been made public in that way, but I go beyond that and say that it is not only necessary to place papers on the Table of the House—I presume in pursuance of a motion which the hon. member moved; it was the duty of the Treasurer, when introducing his Loan Estimates, or at any rate the Minister for Works as head of the department concerned, to have explained fully that the Government had adopted a fixed policy which would necessitate the expenditure of such a large sum of money. It seems to me that it is a continuation of the policy of keeping the public and the House in the dark. We do not seem to be able to learn anything definite as to the proposals of the Government.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It is not in the dark when the papers are put on the Table.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Oh, yes it is. An hon. member moves for papers in order that he may personally obtain some information which those papers contain so that perhaps he might at some future date take further action in connection with some particular subject supposed to be contained in those papers, but other hon. members are not supposed to take any notice of the papers unless they also have some particular object in doing so. The whole of the papers placed on the Table are seldom perused by other hon. members.

Mr. Taylor: Unless to make use of them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is so. The hon. member for Fremantle wished to get information in regard to harbour matters, and he obtained the information that the country is pledged to the expenditure of £648,000 in continuation of a fixed policy which has been adopted by Cabinet, and the approval of the Treasurer as representing Cabinet is shown on the file. I say again that the House ought to be in possession of the fullest information as to what this work is to be, how far it is to be carried out, and within what time, how much money was to have been expended during the past

twelve months, and how soon the balance will be required to be expended in order to complete these works. There has been no opportunity for public comment and criticism, and there has been no opportunity for criticism in this House on the part of either members of the Opposition or members on the Government benches, of proposals which evidently have become a fixed part of the policy of the Government of the day. With regard to this motion, I welcome it all the more for the reason that we have this astounding statement that a large sum of money is to be expended without knowing how it is to be expended, and I think it is very desirable that we should have the fullest inquiry. I have thought for some time that the question of extending the harbours was one of such vital importance that it was time we had full inquiry as to the requirements to-day and in years to come. Not only does this apply to Fremantle, but it applies to other ports, more especially Geraldton, Bunbury, and Albany.

Mr. Taylor: And Busselton.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And Busselton also. In visiting these centres during the last twelve months I have on several occasions been asked what the intention of the Government was with regard to shipping facilities. At Geraldton there is great need for further facilities. The out-back country having been opened up by railway construction and land having been settled, to a large extent owing to the admirable policy of the late Minister for Lands (the member for Northam), railways having been constructed owing to the confidence and energy of the previous Administration in their desire to provide means for absorbing that tide of immigration which we had the honour of inaugurating in this State—all these things are now beginning to bear fruit, and the result is that with the blessing of Providence and the good season which is almost assured, there is going to be a very large export of wheat from our northern port of Geraldton. We know that the facilities are very meagre indeed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not know how far the hon. member is going with this discussion, but I hope he is going to bring his remarks to bear on the motion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am going to move an amendment before I sit down to include those other ports, and I am just pointing out as I go along that the necessity seems to me to be just as great for inquiry regarding those other ports as it is for inquiry regarding the harbour at Fremantle. The facilities at the northern port are such as demand very prompt attention at the hands of the Government.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): They are being attended to.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, they are not. The trouble is we have nothing but promises from members on the Treasury benches.

Mr. Taylor: They will keep, will they not?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They will keep, it is true.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: They are being kept, too, which yours were not.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Is the hon. member often taken that away? I think he is one of the first to complain. He is always complaining that he cannot get promises kept, but like any young pup he is always ready to fight if his sire is attacked.

Mr. Taylor: He will be like us if he lives long enough.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I think it is most urgent so far as Geraldton is concerned that this matter should be thoroughly inquired into, because we know that there are many difficulties to overcome at that port. Those who are interested in commerce, business, and the export trade of Geraldton are complaining bitterly that nothing has ever been done, and notwithstanding the promises which the hon. member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) declares are always being kept, and notwithstanding the fact that the present Government have held office for two years, we do not know that anything definite yet has been brought out in the shape of a

policy for providing the necessary ship-facilities at that port.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You will get something shortly.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am tired of hearing that we will get something shortly. It is just about time a move was made. I am satisfied that if the Government are as indefinite in their proposal with regard to harbour improvements in Western Australia as they have been with regard to railway construction, and other important works, to say nothing of the finances, we will wait many a long year, if they remain in office, before we get anything carried out. What do we find in regard to Albany? Promise after promise, but nothing done. Many schemes have been projected and some have been talked about and are being talked about at that port to-day, but there is nothing definite before the country as to a policy, and I can assure hon. members that if we wait until next year at this time Albany will be in exactly the same position as she is in to-day so far as these harbour improvements are concerned. Bunbury has congestion and is crying out for increased facilities. The inner harbour scheme was promised to be inquired into immediately, and money was to be provided in the Estimates. The hon. member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) was very urgent in his appeals to the Government and very strong in his criticisms at one time, but he has been gagged; his mouth is closed and he has nothing but good to say to-day for the present Administration, and Bunbury goes wanting in shipping facilities to-day.

Mr. Green: The hon. member for Bunbury makes you squirm sometimes.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not know what the hon. member means. If I did as much squirming as he has done since he occupied a seat in this House I would feel particularly uneasy. I can assure him I do not feel uneasy on this occasion. I want to insist on this point, that these important matters go much further than the actual requirements of the harbours themselves. They do not only affect Geraldton, Bunbury, Fremantle, or Albany, but the whole State,

and if we have not proper harbour facilities we very soon feel the effect in the railway revenue, in the trade of the country, in the population which ought to be coming in increased numbers day after day to our shores, and in our land settlement; and in every other avenue of activity will we feel the necessity and want of these facilities. It is the outlets of a country which build up the country's prosperity, providing it has the commodities to export, and Western Australia is becoming a very important factor in the export of the Commonwealth. I think the neglect of the present Administration can be classed as most reprehensible, inasmuch as they sat back and thought all they need do was to sign a Cabinet minute in regard to Fremantle, to say nothing of the other ports. But nothing has been done, and if anything has been decided this House is kept absolutely in the dark as to what their intentions are. The hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) gave us a long recitation before tea in connection with his motion for a Royal Commission to inquire into the requirements and proposals for extending the Fremantle harbour. The hon. member started by eulogising to some extent the present Harbour Trust. He said the Government had been compelled to place their officers on that Harbour Trust, and very shortly it would become more and more controlled by the Government of the day.

Mr. Carpenter: I said the tendency was that way.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I venture to think it would be a very sorry policy indeed to carry out to the full effect. It may be desirable to have certain Government officers on the Harbour Trust, but I certainly think, so far as Fremantle is concerned, and so far as the State is concerned, that it is highly undesirable that such an important officer as the Engineer-in-Chief should be chairman of that Trust; he has much more important duties to perform; and, whereas he is necessarily a professional man who can give solid advice to the Trust, and also to the Government with regard to proposed extensions and requirements of that har-

bour, his duty ought not to be, and his time ought not to be taken up in presiding for hours over a body of men, the bulk of whose time is taken up in considering matters of commerce and business detail with which he is not familiar.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): He gets fully conversant with the requirements in that way.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We do not want to pay £1,200 a year, or perhaps more, for him to sit and get a full knowledge of the disputes between ship-owners and shipping masters, or the lumpers' society and the Harbour Trust; or questions of terms, fees, and charges, and all matters which are applicable to a business, rather than to the work of an engineer, and, therefore, I think the Government are going the wrong way about controlling this harbour. The immense strides made with regard to the Fremantle harbour in the earlier years were due almost entirely to the fact that the operations of that huge concern were controlled by business men who were then members of that Trust, notably Captain Laurie, an ex-member of the Legislative Council. Those are the men who built up the Fremantle harbour to its present position, and it is idle for any Minister to say to-day that, in view of the success which has attended their efforts, we must replace them with civil servants who are paid to carry out other work. If the Government reverted more to the system of appointing business men on this Harbour Trust, they would do much better and the results would be of greater advantage to the State than the proposal to make this merely an appendage to a Government department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): There are not as many complaints as previously.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I would not dispute that, but—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not think it is desirable that hon. members should enter into a discussion concerning the control of the Fremantle harbour. The motion does not provide for such discussion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member for Fremantle in moving his motion dealt upon this aspect at some length.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have pointed out on previous occasions, the fact that an hon. member has referred to a matter does not make that matter one for discussion. The motion before hon. members is what is to be discussed. I do not think the hon. member for Sussex should enter into these other details.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am quoting the remarks of the hon. member for Fremantle concerning the position of Trust.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not pursue that discussion beyond what is permissible. I do not want to limit the hon. member to any extent, but I do not want a discussion to be entered into upon the control of the harbour, as that is not provided for in the motion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I recognise that fully, Mr. Speaker, and will try to follow out your wishes in that respect, but I respectfully claim the right to reply, or touch upon the comments of the hon. member for Fremantle.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must accept my advice and suggestion in regard to this motion. I merely ask him to keep to the terms of the motion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In that case the hon. member for Fremantle should have been stopped—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That is a reflection on the Chair. I cannot allow the hon. member to make such observations. I shall give the hon. member the same fair play as I have given to other hon. members. The hon. member must not make references of any other hon. member a subject for discussion, if the motion does not provide for it. But so far as I can I will allow him the same latitude as I allowed the hon. member for Fremantle.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I object in toto to any suggestion that the Harbour Trust should become a mere appendage of a Government department. I want

to see that harbour controlled by business men, as it was, which control has brought it to its present state of prosperity.

Mr. Carpenter interjected.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member for Fremantle must not interject or he will be getting me into trouble with Mr. Speaker. We were told by the hon. member in the letter which he read at considerable length, giving Carpenter upon Carpenter, and quoting Carpenter, that in December, 1911, he took steps with a view to getting increased facilities for Fremantle, but at that time all he could get out of the Government was that he must await the advent of the Public Works Committee Bill, and this would be a matter for that committee's consideration. I must confess the hon. member has shown great patience. He has waited for almost two years, and to-night he has made up his mind, I suppose, that he can wait no longer for a public works committee to be appointed, and, therefore, he feels justified in moving for a Royal Commission. I agree with him that he has exercised too much patience altogether, and he ought to have moved in this direction very much earlier. If he waits for a public works committee to be appointed I am very much afraid he will not get a report on this great work from such a body during the life of the present Government. He said we want the best harbour. I can go further and say we want the best harbours that are procurable in Western Australia.

Mr. Taylor: What about Esperance?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We want those harbours that tap the sources of our supply. It is useless to open up harbours when we have nothing to ship from those harbours. Open up the harbours we have got and give the increased facilities that are demanded by the shipping that is visiting our shores every month, and which is certainly increasing in size year by year. It is recognised that we must provide better accommodation in Fremantle. We must have deeper water there; and this applies not only to Fremantle, but also to the other harbours which I propose

to ask to have included in this resolution namely, Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany, and Busselton.

Mr. Taylor: What about Esperance?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not propose to include Esperance. The hon. member can suggest Esperance if he likes, but I think it will be time enough to suggest Esperance when Esperance shows that she has something to export which she has not got at the present time.

Mr. Taylor: She has already shown that, years ago.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It seems to me the two members more interested in this motion perhaps than any others, namely, the members for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) and for South Fremantle (Mr. Bolton) have, the one by his remarks and the other by interjection, already come to a conclusion notwithstanding that they are asking to have this royal commission appointed. They have come to the conclusion, for instance, that Mr. Lefroy's scheme of an outer harbour is the one that ought to be adopted. I think if these two members have made up their minds that we are to have an outer harbour, possibly a motion in that direction would be more to the purpose than the one which the hon. member has moved. Be that as it may, I want to claim for every member the right of his own individual opinion. Whilst these two members have pledged themselves evidently to support an outer harbour scheme I do not see that they can find fault with any hon. member who thinks in his judgment that the better course is to extend the harbour up the river as the trade requirements warrant.

Mr. Carpenter: We want the fullest inquiry into both schemes.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I quite agree with that. The thing is to get the fullest impartial inquiry and to have proper evidence taken before the commission as to which is the better scheme to adopt. In connection with that I think we ought also to inquire as to railway facilities which must be provided, more especially with the construction of the Trans-Australian railway. We shall

have, I believe, this year something like a quarter of a million tons of wheat to export, and we know that our export of timber alone equals about another quarter of a million tons, to say nothing of wool, and other articles of produce sent away from our shores. So the tonnage amounts to a pretty respectable figure, and it is a question which requires proper consideration. I think that the sooner we can get a commission appointed to go into this matter thoroughly the better for the country and for the people residing in it. I know that down at Albany they have almost given up all hope of getting anything in the shape of harbour extension.

Mr. Price : It has been revived during the past couple of years.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : It was as dead as Julius Caesar when I was down there about a fortnight ago, but I hope it has been revived during the last two or three days, possibly owing to the fact that I myself had some conversation with the Premier on the subject. At all events I hope the conversation which I had will bear some fruit, and that at any rate the Government, without being satisfied with a mere revival of the subject in a conversational way, will take the practical step of inquiring thoroughly into the requirements, the best means of giving these increased facilities and the most expeditious manner of providing a greater depth of water to meet the ever-increasing size of vessels which are likely to visit our ports. The matter of dredging at Fremantle, for instance, is one that can be proceeded with and be carried on continuously. Thirty-two feet or thirty-three feet to-day possibly is all that is required, but in a few years' time we may require forty feet. It is a work that must go on year after year. We cannot afford to have any cessation. The same thing applies to other ports. In the old land ports are being continually reconstructed. We do not improve a port for 50 or 100 years; we should be improving it every year, continuously improving it. At the present time we have visiting Australia a representative of the port of London, the commercial manager, I think he is

called. He tells me they are going to spend 14 million pounds next year on the port of London, merely to meet the increased demands of those who use the port. He is travelling the world to find out what the requirements are likely to be, and we must be up and doing in the same way. We cannot afford to sit down and think we have reached finality. Finality will never be reached. It will go on continuously, no matter what Government may be in power. With a view of urging the Government to proceed expeditiously, and to get the right scheme, and to stop any hole and corner decisions of policy which are not made public and certainly have never been disclosed in detail to the House, I intend to support the motion and to ask the hon. member who moved it to support my amendment that a royal commission be appointed to inquire into this matter with regard to Fremantle and also the other harbours of the State. We want a comprehensive scheme.

Mr. McDowall: "Other harbours" will include Esperance.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Well I do not mind if Esperance is included. I have not the slightest objection to including all the harbours; but that will be a lengthy subject and I prefer to put them in their order, namely, Fremantle, Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany, and Busselton; and then you can take on Esperance if you wish. But certainly we ought to get busy on this work in order that we may have a comprehensive policy before us to be carried out continuously year after year to meet the growing requirements of the State. Bunbury wants increased facilities in regard to coaling. The trade there ought to be built up enormously, and will be as the years go by. She wants increased facilities for wool export, and I suppose she will be tapping fruit centres and be exporting fruit in the near future. All these matters want inquiring into.

Mr. Thomas: How was it it never occurred to you?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It did occur to me, and we always met the occasion. We carried out wide extensions in Bun-

bury and further extensions in Fremantle. We built and extended the jetty at Geraldton, and constructed the jetty at Busselton, which many hon. members have treated with scorn and contempt, but which, according to the Minister for Works, has proved itself to be a good proposition even at the present time.

Mr. Price: What did you do at Albany?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: At Albany we did likewise.

Mr. Price: You did nothing.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. We dredged incessantly. We have always been dredging at Albany. The continuous work has gone on at Albany, and increased shipping facilities were outlined by me in a policy speech at Albany and at Busselton in 1911, and they were very much better facilities than anything talked about since. If we had been in power instead of having been relegated to the Opposition benches, those works would have been pretty well half completed at the present date. So Albany did badly when it threw over a Liberal Government for a Labour Government represented by my hon. friend opposite. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"and the other harbours of the State, namely, Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany, and Busselton."

Resolved: That motions be continued.

Mr. THOMAS (Bunbury): I do not know that I would have taken any part in this debate had it not been for certain remarks made in connection with Bunbury by the leader of the Opposition. I listened with a considerable amount of interest and pleasure to the member for Fremantle when pleading his cause, and I must say that he put forward some very sound arguments, and put up a very effective plea for the appointment of a royal commission. I must say that I was very much impressed by his remarks, reserving my final decision as to how I shall vote on the question until I hear the reply of the Minister. It is just possible in connection with Fremantle as with Bunbury, that the Minister for Works

has done and is doing all that is possible under the circumstances. The leader of the Opposition was good enough, in that kindly and graceful manner which he always has, in referring to the Bunbury harbour to say—I am told; I did not hear it—that the member for Bunbury has been gagged, and that nothing had been done. A very graceful expression for the hon. member to throw across the floor of the House. I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that I have not been gagged in the matter, and that something has been done for Bunbury in the last two years which had not been done by the hon. member and others of his political persuasion in the previous 25 years.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The whole harbour was built in the previous 25 years.

Mr. THOMAS: What sort of harbour did the Liberal Governments build? Instead of taking up the question seriously as they should have done and providing a proper scheme and carrying out the work as they should have done, they put up a temporary, miserable breakwater that has hampered the development of Bunbury ever since it was a town.

Mr. George: Who put that up?

Mr. THOMAS: Your crowd.

Mr. George: Sir John Forrest?

Mr. THOMAS: Yes.

Mr. George: He put up what he had the means for.

Mr. THOMAS: However, I do not wish to be drawn off the track by any consideration of Sir John Forrest and his works. Year in and year out Liberal Governments have had their representatives in Bunbury—generally Premiers until I came along.

Member: There will be another Premier there yet.

Mr. THOMAS: No doubt they will have another Premier for Bunbury. Like the soldiers in Napoleon's army all the members in the political Labour party carry each a marshal's baton in his knapsack.

Mr. Taylor: Some of them are getting round-shouldered with carrying it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Make someone else carry it now.

Mr. THOMAS: It has interested me immensely after knowing the manner in

which the hon. member when Premier and a member of other Ministries has dealt with the question of harbour facilities in all other places except Bunbury, knowing that he did nothing in the matter except to make vague and extravagant promises, which I doubt if he ever intended to fulfil, and after he has been relegated to the position he now adorns he constantly develops a very serious desire to see that everything is done for all the ports of Western Australia. He is quite ready and willing to suggest all sorts of schemes and the expenditure of fabulous sums so long as the Labour Government have to do it. If the hon. member is in earnest, why on earth did he not do these things when he had the opportunity?

Hon. J. Mitchell: We made the harbour necessary.

Hon. Frank Wilson: We spent £100,000 on Bunbury, you know.

Mr. THOMAS: Yes, and the hon. member built a jetty in Busselton upon which I was politically crucified. The price of the hon. member's election was the jetty. Without that I should have been the member for that district, and with the gift of the harbour the hon. member only got his nose in front of me by 70 votes. It is positively entertaining to find the newly developed enthusiasm of the hon. gentleman for these particular ports. I claim that for many years past Bunbury has had undoubted claims to proper harbour facilities. It is probable that most hon. members know little, if anything about the actual requirements or conditions of the port of Bunbury. As a matter of fact, as has often been repeated, Bunbury in the matter of export tonnage is the fourth port of Australia. It beats Fremantle and all the other ports of Western Australia put together. This is a fact that hon. members might remember, that in the matter of export tonnage Bunbury beats Fremantle by about 100,000 tons per annum, and all the ports of Western Australia put together. Of all the out-ports of Western Australia, the ones that the hon. member mentioned, Bunbury collects in railway revenue from the jetty

something like £38,000, £28,000 from harbour dues, and leaving Fremantle out of the question, the next biggest port in Western Australia collects only £9,000. As regards the railways, speaking from memory, I think in Perth something like £128,000 per annum is collected, and in Bunbury we get within £10,000 of that figure, that is within £10,000 of what is collected in the biggest centre of Western Australia. This is not the growth of to-day or yesterday but it has been obvious for years. And yet Liberal Government after Liberal Government have come along and what have they done towards developing that port?—absolutely nothing. Our shipping charges are approximately the same as those at Fremantle, and I do not anticipate that the Government will permit of any great difference, but there is not the slightest doubt that the development of the metropolis of the South-West has been retarded by the want of activity and the earnestness of members of the Opposition who are to-day making complaints against the present Government.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are quite satisfied then with your present facilities.

Mr. THOMAS: I want to say that the Labour party who were in power when I was fighting my election for Bunbury, made me certain promises with regard to the construction of the harbour.

Hon. Frank Wilson: And you are satisfied that they have been kept?

Mr. THOMAS: And every promise has been kept to the letter.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Your electors do not say so.

Mr. THOMAS: My electors are the best judges of that.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They will be next October.

Mr. THOMAS: I would not like to be standing so near the brink as the hon. member, the brink that means political destruction. Every promise that has been made in connection with the Bunbury harbour has been fulfilled to this extent—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Ah! a qualification.

Mr. THOMAS: An expert, as promised, has been sent to Bunbury, has had all the facilities possible at his disposal, has inquired thoroughly into the matter in every detail—and in my humble opinion he was the best expert West Australia has—he has enquired into every detail and has carefully prepared a complete scheme for a new harbour for Bunbury. Those plans are now in the hands of the Minister for Works. I am not sure whether they have yet been before Cabinet, but if not I anticipate that in the near future they will be. I am also promised by the Minister for Works—and as he has never broken a promise to me in the past I do not anticipate that he will break any in future—he has promised that within a week or two that scheme will be laid before Parliament and hon. members will have an opportunity of deciding whether it is a suitable proposition or not. In the face of a statement such as that, where is the necessity for the Leader of the Opposition to move that a Royal Commission should inquire into the question of harbour facilities at Bunbury, Albany, Geraldton, and in that little fishing village, Busselton?

Hon. Frank Wilson: You were going to sell up in Bunbury and go to Busselton.

Mr. THOMAS: My political ambitions were such that I would have taken up my residence there and served the people. What the hon. member and his colleagues and Liberal friends for the last 20 years have failed to do for Bunbury, the Labour Government have done in two years.

Hon. J. Mitchell: A paper harbour.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What have they done?

Mr. THOMAS: They have gone to the trouble and prepared a thorough scheme for harbour facilities for Bunbury which will supply the wants of that port for the next 50 years to come.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Mr. Lefroy has prepared a scheme for Fremantle too.

Mr. THOMAS: They have prepared a scheme of shipping facilities which will enable the district to develop as it should. The scheme will provide for its wheat

export, its fruit export, its timber export and its coal export, and everything necessary from that district.

Mr. George interjected.

Mr. THOMAS: The people of Bunbury think a good deal of me. They are particularly sensible people; that is why I am representing them. I do not think I need go any further. I merely rose to indignantly repudiate the assertions made by the hon. member that I had been lax in my duty in fighting the battle of my port. I am as prepared as any hon. member in this House, if the need arises, to fight either the present Government or any other Government in the legitimate interests of my constituents.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have not a fight in you. What is the good of talking?

Mr. THOMAS: I am prepared to have a go at the hon. gentleman at every conceivable opportunity. One of the delights of my existence is when I have a chance to cross swords with the hon. member.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why didn't you fight your chemists' Bill through?

Mr. THOMAS: The hon. member has asked rather a difficult question, but that Bill is not lost; it is only postponed. So far as the harbour at Bunbury is concerned, and the same remark applies to the hon. members for Albany and Geraldton, a scheme has been prepared, the matter has been thoroughly investigated and the work is on the eve of being undertaken. But if the hon. member's proposal were carried out it would mean months, and possibly years, of further delay.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

Mr. THOMAS: And further schemes, and nothing done, which doubtless would meet with the hon. gentleman's approval. I am satisfied; I have the promise of the Minister for Works and the Premier that this work will be done, and done at a very early date. I have never had any reason to question any promise made to me before; every one of them has been faithfully kept, and I fully anticipate and honestly believe that the promise

with regard to the Bunbury harbour will be carried into effect, and when it is I anticipate that an enormous development will take place in those parts, and under the influence of a Labour Government, probably we will at last get in reality what has been dangled before us for the last 25 years by insincere Liberal Governments.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You were not in the State 25 years ago.

Mr. THOMAS: I have been in the State longer than the hon. member. It is my intention to oppose the amendment, because I am perfectly satisfied that at last we in Bunbury are going to get justice from a Labour Government.

Mr. NANSON (Greenough): I entirely agree with the contention of the leader of the Opposition that there are other harbours than Fremantle whose requirements need immediate attention. I am, however, somewhat doubtful as to whether a Royal Commission such as is proposed by the hon. member will do all that is required in regard to some of these harbours. Speaking as a member of one of the northern constituencies, I may say that the farmers in the Victoria district and the residents of Geraldton, regard the harbour scheme for Geraldton as a matter of the utmost urgency, and I do not believe that they would favour the appointment of a Royal Commission if they thought that that commission's instructions covered so wide a ground as must necessarily be embraced in an inquiry into the need for harbour facilities practically throughout the whole of the South-West division of the State. A commission that had to inquire into not only the needs of Fremantle, but of Albany, Geraldton, Busselton, and Bunbury, might be sitting for well over 12 months. And what is to be the personnel of this commission? Is it to be a commission of amateurs, or a commission of capable engineers who have had experience in harbour construction?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Experts, certainly.

Mr. NANSON: If, as the leader of the Opposition suggests, it is to be a commission of experts, the appointment of that commission will in itself take up a

considerable amount of time. As I have said, I am mainly interested in regard to harbour facilities at Geraldton, and I understand that there is in the Public Works Department a scheme already prepared or practically prepared for harbour additions. I understand it is a comprehensive scheme for additions at that port. Before I should be prepared to support what possibly may be an amendment which may have the effect of delaying work at Geraldton, I should like to know what that scheme is. I believe that there has been a promise made by the Minister for Works that he will inform the public at an early date what that scheme is. We in the Victoria district, are in the fortunate position in one way, but an unfortunate position in another way, that the wheat production of the district is increasing very much more rapidly than the harbour facilities for coping with that production. This year I suppose in Western Australia we may expect a wheat yield of something like 15 million bushels as against something over nine million bushels last season, and in that wheat yield the Victoria district will play a very important part. Now no one who is familiar with Geraldton will deny that the harbour facilities there are of a most meagre description. It is not an easy matter to perhaps make an adequate harbour at Geraldton, but there is a great deal of anxiety both amongst the farmers and amongst the business people in Geraldton as to the intentions of the Government in regard to the handling of the very large amount of wheat, which will arrive at Geraldton for shipment after the coming harvest, and there would be a great amount of dismay and dissatisfaction in that part of the State if it were thought that the effect of appointing a royal commission would be to delay this manifestly urgent work. The facilities at Geraldton at the present time are such that they might almost be described as non-existent. The jetty is incapable of carrying a crane sufficient to do the work required, as is done at Fremantle, and Geraldton is in the unfortunate position of fearing that a great deal of the trade

that should naturally come to that port will be diverted to Fremantle, not because ships would not be perfectly willing to go there, but because if they did go there, they would not be able to obtain reasonable facilities in regard to shipment of their cargoes. I do not wish to say anything that may seem to decry the claims of other harbours, but one cannot look at the position of Geraldton without seeing that in no harbour in the south-west division is there so little provision made, as is the case at Geraldton, for the large wheat shipments that may be expected from there after the next harvest. I hope whatever may be the result of this discussion, it will at least have the effect of impressing on the Government this very urgent matter so far as the port of Geraldton is concerned. The trade of the port will receive a great set back if it should not be possible during the coming season to cope with the wheat which will find its way into Geraldton. The farmers are doing their part splendidly, Providence has helped them with a magnificent season, and I venture to submit that it is the duty of the Government to recognise the very great responsibility that rests upon its shoulders, and to see that the wheat coming forward during the next and the succeeding seasons shall be placed in the ships at Geraldton at a cost which will return to the farmer a reasonable profit for his work and his enterprise.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie): I desire to move an amendment on the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. It is—

That after the word "Albany" the word "Esperance" be added.

The effect of my amendment will be to bring the harbour of Esperance within the scope of the royal commission. It is unnecessary to point out to the House that the Esperance harbour must take precedence over the Busselton harbour. We know that, with the exception of Albany, unfortunately for this State, Esperance is the only natural port in the southern portion of this continent. As we are now on the eve of the construction of 60 miles

of the Esperance railway, it will be for the Government to consider the question of the expenditure of the small amount which will be necessary, in order to improve the harbour facilities at Esperance, and this is what should be taken into consideration by the Royal Commission. It would also have the further effect of perhaps making some members of this House, who may be nominated for seats on that royal commission more familiar with the harbour at Esperance. There are few members of this Chamber who have had an opportunity of making a personal inspection of Esperance, and I am satisfied that when the royal commission visits Esperance, their report will be such a glowing one that the prejudices which have existed in this Chamber in the past in regard to that harbour will be immediately swept away. It is a natural harbour and that fact has been supported by no less an authority than Sir John Forrest, whose word will probably be accepted by members of the Opposition, and it has also been described as such by one of our late Governors, the late Sir Frederick Bedford. Eighteen years ago vessels of the tramp class drawing 18 feet of water entered Esperance harbour without a pilot, and Surveyor Middleton in his report which was presented to the House last year, pointed out that it would only be necessary to expend £44,000 on this harbour in order to provide a depth of 26 feet below low water mark. We know that the great trouble in Australia has been the centralisation policy which has existed. In regard to our own harbours if we take Albany we must admit that it is undoubtedly a fine harbour, Bunbury we know is a made harbour, but Busselton we have never seriously taken into consideration.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have you been there?

Mr. GREEN: I have been there. Busselton is a town that stands by itself. It is one of the old sleepy remnants of the past which exist in Western Australia even in spite of the representation of the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have you turned up the records of the revenue derived from that harbour?

Mr. GREEN: The matter I was proceeding to refer to before the unseemly interruption of the leader of the Opposition was that the distance from Albany to Esperance is 280 miles. It is a great distance away from the other harbours and opening it up will add to the chain of harbours between this State and the sister State of South Australia. I trust that the sympathy of hon. members will be enlisted in support of a harbour which is such a great distance from Perth. We have to admit that in the past State legislation throughout Australia has been very unsatisfactory, regarded from the point of view of those places which are unfortunate enough to be a great distance from the seat of Government. I trust that hon. members will to-night overlook the idea of vested interests that seems to obtrude itself into the consideration of a question such as this, and that they will vote for my amendment.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth): I second the further amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The proposal of the member for Kalgoorlie to amend the amendment will bring about a fresh discussion and I propose to take the amendment to the amendment separately, allowing the original motion to stand aside until such time as the amendments have been disposed of. The question, therefore, is that the word proposed to be inserted in the proposed amendment be inserted.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): The question of the appointment of a royal commission, as the hon. member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) has pointed out, demands the serious consideration of the House, especially as we have heard from the member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) that so far as the port of Bunbury is concerned, the Government have taken into full consideration the desirability of and necessity for extending the harbour accommodation there. An apparently similar course has been taken in regard to other harbours. So far as the Fremantle harbour is concerned, I would like to say that there have been

prepared a number of schemes for its improvement, and these have been gone into during the past ten or twelve years. I know that Mr. Dillon Bell, who was considered one of the leading engineers in the Works Department, and who was a man whose career and experience carried weight and still carries weight throughout Australia and New Zealand, gave this matter of the alteration and improvement of the Fremantle harbour some 18 months' or more attention. I had the opportunity during my term of office as Commissioner for Railways, of seeing his plans and carefully perusing his report, and I know that in that report every point of necessity appeared to have been given full consideration. I am free to confess that as years go by reports of that kind require modification or expansion and it is evident that the member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) is of the same opinion. I do not want it to be forgotten that there has been good work done and serious consideration given to these important matters by all Governments in the past, whether Liberal or Labour. So far as Bunbury harbour was concerned, Sir John Forrest in his time laid before the Chamber two schemes. One of these schemes, which was carried into effect, cost £100,000 and the other one, the opening of the Leschenault Estuary would have involved an expenditure of £350,000. The House at that time took into consideration, perhaps very carefully, the state of Western Australia's finances, and the due proportion in regard to population. I do not think there was any petty jealousy or that the ports of Fremantle or Albany were taken into consideration at all, but at that time Bunbury did not show evidence of the great trade it is doing to-day. There were none of the great timber stations established. The only one that was established was that managed by M. C. Davies and Company, who had their own port of Hamelin, and at the time when Sir John Forrest brought forward this scheme there was not contemplated at all, other than perhaps as a vision for the future, the immense spread and increase of the timber

trade which has made Bunbury to-day the fourth port of the Commonwealth. I am glad, as one representing a constituency close to Bunbury and also as one who has a great portion of his interests established in the South-West, to hear from the member for Bunbury—and I am sure his constituents and the people in the South-West will also be glad to hear—that the Government have done something in connection with the question of improving the harbour there. In a matter of this sort it is really not a question of taking into consideration any particular shades of politics. The fact that something has been done or is being done for Western Australia is of more importance than the question of whether the Liberal party were asleep or not. However, so far as the importance of Bunbury harbour is concerned, that was part of the Liberal policy for years. Sir Newton Moore's policy was to give to each port in Western Australia the traffic which its geographical position entitled it to; his Ministry, and also the Wilson Ministry, who followed, carried out that same policy, and when they return to power, which will be shortly, that is the policy they will endeavour to carry out again. Western Australia is too big a State for it to be supposed for one moment that we can make any one single port carry traffic that does not geographically belong to it. Geraldton, the only northern port—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that his speech could be more properly applied to the amendment by the leader of the Opposition when the other amendment is disposed of. The amendment moved by the member for Kalgoorlie deals only with the port of Esperance.

Mr. GEORGE: I did not understand that. I thought we were discussing the whole amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will be entitled to discuss the main amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition after the other is disposed of.

Mr. GEORGE: Well, so far as the small child to which the member for Kal-

goorlie has given birth is concerned, I have no objection whatever to offer to it. It is one of those things which I suppose will have to be dealt with by the House, and perhaps it may be best dealt with by our votes.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Mr. GEORGE: Continuing my remarks, I desire to say that my object in speaking as I did was to deprecate very strongly the idea of bringing into a debate on what is really a national question any consideration as to whether it is the policy of this party or the other party, or whether any particular party may or may not have seen their way to do things which the member for Bunbury thinks fit. I think we should all be satisfied that the present Government are profiting by the work done in this direction by the previous Government, in the same way as the succeeding Government must naturally profit by the work done by the present Government, and it is idle for the member for Bunbury to be throwing these taunts at the Liberal Administration, when those who have followed political matters for years know perfectly well that Sir Newton Moore's policy was to give to each particular port the traffic that belonged to it geographically. Take, for instance, Bunbury. The different railways that are connecting up the Great Southern are to-day bringing produce to that port which could not have been brought there otherwise; had these railways not been built the wheat which belongs to Bunbury and which it is receiving would have had to go to Fremantle or Albany, but Albany had sufficient of its own trading from the Great Southern railway to satisfy it, and from the railways to the east of the Great Southern so soon as the development there begins to be felt without having to feel that it is suffering through the loss of the traffic that really belongs to Bunbury. The extension of the wheat-growing areas is so great, both to the east and west of the Great Southern, that there is sufficient to-day to fill those ports, and to fill Bunbury also. The condition of the harbour at Bunbury is a matter

of serious moment. I was down there the other day and I heard that vessels which formerly could come alongside the jetty are no longer able to come alongside, and have to load on the extreme end of the jetty. This has been caused by the silt which the late C. Y. O'Connor took so much care about, and it is a matter in regard to which the Government must be supported by all members, or else the trade of this port will be absolutely very seriously damaged. If the news once gets about that it is unsafe for vessels drawing a certain depth to come to the port for the traffic that is undoubtedly there, the reputation of the port will be damaged beyond recall, and this is a matter that affects not only the people just about Bunbury but the whole of Western Australia. There is more timber exported from Bunbury than from any other part of the State. There are large quantities of coal being sent away, and I venture to say that the bunkering trade could be practically doubled if the Bunbury harbour were in fit trim to take the ships that would call there. Then there is a very considerable quantity of wool. Every year there is a ship calling, and this year, I believe, there are two boats calling for wool. Then there is the fruit industry, and I am satisfied that there will be more apples exported from Bunbury within the course of the next five or six years than are exported from Albany at the present time. The district is well suited for fruit growing, and the people are planting orchards very rapidly. I am pleased, therefore, to hear from the member for Bunbury that he has this assurance from the Minister for Works. I have not the same amount of faith as the hon. member has in the Minister's assurance, but at the same time I shall be quite willing to admit that his faith is deserved when I see this thing put right through. I am desirous, however, that it shall be distinctly understood so far as Sir John Forrest was concerned that he, when Premier, looked after Bunbury well, and the reason why he went into that particular harbour scheme was that those who were members of the House at that time were people who be-

lieved in the good old adage of cutting one's coat according to one's cloth, and the expenditure of £100,000 on Bunbury harbour at that date was a bigger thing than any proposal to spend a million at Fremantle to-day. Therefore, I say, however desirous we may be of making a point, do not let us be unmindful of those who worked hard and well in pushing forward this country in years gone by.

Mr. PRICE (Albany) : I do not intend to take up much time in discussing either the motion or the amendment. In fact, I should not have taken any part in the discussion were it not that the leader of the Opposition, as usual, endeavoured to raise differences between the various ports of the State, and I certainly could not allow the hon. member's statement to go unchallenged when he alleged that during his term of Ministerial office in this State any action what ever was taken towards providing proper harbour facilities at the port which I have the honour to represent. I say unhesitatingly that the hon. member at all times neglected to do that which he should have done towards providing for the shipping calling at the port of Albany.

Hon. J. Mitchell : He developed the back country, for you, which is better still.

Mr. PRICE : The hon. member did not open up the back country for us. He took care that the opening up of the back country only extended so far as it might redound to the benefit of Bunbury or Fremantle, and the opening up of the back country which has benefited Albany has been carried out by the present Government.

Hon. Frank Wilson : What rot ! What about the railway to Shannon's Soak ? The present Government did not put one mile of railway in for you.

Mr. PRICE : I thought I would get in a few home truths which hon. members on the Opposition side would not like. When the leader of the Opposition was so anxious to let the people of Albany know what he proposed to do, at an expense to the country of £200 he made a special trip to Albany, and told them

that he was going to improve the harbour by the expenditure of something like a quarter of a million pounds, and on top of that he said he was going to open up another harbour distant some 70 miles at a cost of £300,000.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You have a very vivid imagination. Just as vivid in that particular as in regard to the cost of my trip to Albany.

Mr. PRICE : I will give the exact figures. The cost to the country of the hon. member's trip to Albany was £160 3s. 4d.

Hon. Frank Wilson : It was not.

Mr. PRICE : That was the actual cost of the hon. member's trip to tell the people what he proposed to do after having been in office for several years. As a matter of fact nothing definite was done in regard to harbour facilities at that port until a few months ago when the present Government took action and provided plans.

Hon. J. Mitchell : It is all plans and no harbours.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Even the plan is not finished.

Mr. PRICE : The hon. member went down and told the people that plans were being prepared, but he knows that nothing of the kind had been done. The hon. member may deny it, but the facts are well known. However, since the present Government have been in power we have had plans submitted to us.

Hon. Frank Wilson : To whom ?

Mr. PRICE : To the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the municipal council of Albany, and those plans have met with their approval. That is something definite.

Hon. Frank Wilson : They objected to them strongly.

Mr. PRICE : The leader of the Opposition submitted certain proposals and they turned them down very emphatically at the last election, as they will do again if the need arises.

Hon. Frank Wilson : They are just waiting to fire you out.

Mr. PRICE : The proposed amendment is one which, if adopted, will undoubtedly delay the carrying out of the

works that are contemplated by the present Government. If the amendment is carried it would simply mean a further delay in carrying out these harbour improvements. I will admit that every action of the past administration, the Liberal Administration, lends colour to the idea held by the people of Albany that the object of that Government was to prevent any trade going to that port.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Nonsense.

Mr. PRICE : Certainly the carrying of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition would have that effect at the present time. We do not want a Royal Commission. The people of Albany know what is proposed by the Government and they are satisfied with it. They are also satisfied that the present Government will keep their promise.

Hon. Frank Wilson : They told me something very different.

Mr. PRICE : Probably they did over a glass of wine around at the club, but the hon. member did not meet the people, only a few of them.

Hon. Frank Wilson : I was not in the club.

Mr. PRICE : I believe the hon. member was in the town about 18 hours. He certainly did not receive such information, that the people there were not satisfied with what the Government are doing.

Mr. George : Why should we not know what it is ?

Mr. PRICE : I admit that some hon. members opposite consider they are infallible.

Mr. George : We do not claim that.

Mr. PRICE : I have heard two of the hon. members opposite claim to know the opinions of the people of every port in this State. These members are the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Murray-Wellington. When the leader of the Opposition asserts that the proposals of the Government do not meet with the approval of the people of Albany, he asserts something that is wrong.

Hon. Frank Wilson : In your opinion.

Mr. PRICE : I voice the opinion of the majority of the people whom I represent. I have no intention whatever

of supporting the amendment, which would only tend to cause delay in the Government's proposals. That can be the only object of the hon. member who moved the amendment. What object he can have in desiring to delay the Government's proposals I do not know. I sincerely hope that the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition will be defeated.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I hope the amendment will be carried, as I believe it is more necessary to inquire into the facilities at our out-ports than to inquire with regard to Fremantle. During the last few years the face of the country has changed, thanks to what was done by the past Administration. The hon. member for Albany (Mr. Price) said that nothing was done for that end of the country by the past Administration. As a matter of fact wheat lands were opened up and export becomes an important matter in connection with their harbour work, and the activity is entirely the result of the past Administration, whereas nothing has been done since. At Albany, in consequence of the new country that was opened up, additional facilities are now needed; bigger vessels will go in there, and the jetty needs to be strengthened at once, as otherwise a decent-sized boat will some day push it over.

Mr. Price: Why move to delay what is needed?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There is no intention to delay it; but there is need for close inquiry at the hands of a Royal Commission of gentlemen who know their work. Members of Parliament are unfamiliar for the most part with the needs of harbours; but we can appoint a Royal Commission of gentlemen who are not in the House, but who know just what is wanted. In regard to the exportation of wheat, these places want more attention. At Albany it should be as easy to handle wheat almost as it is at Fremantle. We realise that wheat is selling at a fairly low price, and therefore the cost of handling it at harbours is all-important. At Geraldton the same applies; there they have altogether inadequate harbour facilities, and where it

is difficult to load a boat the cost is high. Wheat ought to be worth just as much on the wharf at Albany or Geraldton as it is at Fremantle. No matter what confidence hon. members opposite may have in the Ministry, we have not sufficient confidence in them to think they know all about this subject. It is quite true that the Government have engineers, and that they have engineers who satisfy the hon. member for Albany; but I want to be satisfied that the best that can be done is done at once. I want the Ministry to have the advice of a Royal Commission, composed of men who do know, and whose business it is to arrange to ship and export, not only wheat, but timber and other things. In addition to shippers we can have engineers and Government officials. I think the very best thing that could happen would be the appointment of this Royal Commission, and that we should get its report as early as possible. Hon. members opposite say they are perfectly satisfied with the Ministry, and the hon. member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) says there is a plan which is going to cost a million. I want to know where the Government are going to get that million. The hon. member for Albany (Mr. Price) said the people there are perfectly satisfied because they have a plan; but something should be done speedily so that the out-ports may be developed. I want to see Albany doing the trade that belongs to it, and Geraldton doing the same thing.

Member: And Esperance.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: They do not want a port yet. Seed has to be taken there from Northam. I want to see all these out-ports get the trade that belongs to them. I believe we cannot extend our production unless we do it by giving them the necessary facilities in this direction. The export meat trade will never be developed until we have the necessary facilities. It is no good for people trying to produce ahead of the facilities. I want the harbour facilities to be complete, and in addition to the handling of timber and wheat. I want the question of the export of meat considered. This country is capable of producing meat for

export. I endeavoured to have abattoirs and freezing works at North Fremantle, and I am pleased now to hear that the Minister for Lands has attempted at any rate some portion of the scheme which was in progress when he took office. We passed the money for these works and now after two years they are going to make a start in regard to them.

The Minister for Lands: You talked about it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We got the vote through this House and wanted to give effect to it, as these works are a proper part of harbour equipment. In regard to harbour facilities there was never so much need for close inquiry and speedy action as there is at the present time. We are approaching the wheat harvest, and the equipment at Geraldton is just about as inadequate as it is possible to be. The hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) is generally easily satisfied and takes the word of a Minister at any time; but in regard to this question he showed that he is not satisfied with the present Government. We hear from the hon. member that the Government had decided to spend nearly three quarters of a million; but we have been in the dark in regard to this matter and we want to know. The only way we can know is by the appointment of this Royal Commission, and if it is appointed I hope it will report. I am glad indeed that the question has been brought up by hon. members sitting opposite, as we will be able in this case to insist upon something being done. I warn the Ministry that the wheat crop is going to be a big one, and there is going to be trouble and loss to the producer unless the Government act properly. I hope something will be done at once. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment, as I desire to see the country developed, and I believe that the trade belonging to these outports should go from them. There is no need for the trade to be centralised.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

I would like to ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of

the debate, to make a short explanation. The Minister for Works when dealing with this question will have an opportunity of referring to the matter raised by the member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) as well as other hon. members who have dealt with the outer ports, in addition to the port mentioned by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) in the original motion.

Motion passed; the debate adjourned.

MOTION—SEWERAGE CONNECTIONS AND FILTER BEDS.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth) moved—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the cost of the house connections, as now carried out by the officers and men of the Water and Sewerage Department, and other contractors, and also the unsatisfactory workings of the filter beds at the East Perth treatment depot.

He said: For a considerable time there have been unfavourable comments with reference to the house connections and also the sanitary service in the metropolitan district. If we take these complaints, we find that some of them deal with the excessive charges which have been made for house connections, and the unnecessary delays which have taken place. There was one instance quoted here a fortnight ago where it cost about £80 to connect a cottage with the sewerage system. Having such instances as this before us, I think it is our duty to take steps to fathom these matters. We have also had numerous complaints and I am sure they are justified, with reference to the disgraceful state of the filter beds at East Perth. Any person has only to go along there by day or by night and he will be disgusted at the smell which arises from these beds. Some years ago when the work of erecting the Bunbury railway bridge was put in hand, it was found necessary to drive the piles down 90 feet into slush, but close by we find that the Government experts are trying to put these filter beds in six feet of slush. The result is that these beds have been practically rising and falling with

the slight tide there is in the Swan river. Some time ago in this House the faulty construction of these filter beds was brought under notice, and this was before they were put to any use. Since then we have had the medical and health officers of the various authorities visiting the filter beds and practically on every occasion they have found fault with them. These beds are a menace to health, and I say without hesitation and without fear of contradiction that it is up to the House to take steps to appoint a select committee to investigate the matter. We have been told that the house connections cost too much, that the men engaged on these connections are in the habit of loafing, and that they have been kept in want of material by their officers through the maladministration of their department. If we have the inquiry we shall no doubt find out who is to blame; to allow this thing to continue on present lines will not reflect credit upon the department or the Government. With these few remarks I have great pleasure in commending the motion to the consideration of members.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin): I second the motion.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. P. Collier): I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	10
				—
Majority for	14
				—

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullaney
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Foley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lander	Mr. Heilmann
Mr. McDonald	(Teller.)
Mr. McDowall	

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mouger
Mr. Broun	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. George	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller.)
Mr. Mitchell	

Motion thus passed; the debate adjourned.

PAPERS.—PHOSPHATE DEPOSITS NEAR ESPERANCE.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) moved—

That the report made by Mr. H. P. Woodward, Government Geologist, on the deposits of phosphatic rock existing on the islands near Esperance, be laid on the Table of the House.

He said: When I was in Esperance some time ago, I heard on every hand that the deposits of phosphatic rock on the islands near Esperance were of fine quality, but I found it a very difficult matter to get reliable information on the subject. In an issue of a weekly paper I noticed an interview with Mr. Woodward, in which that officer referred to the fact that there was a small amount of phosphatic rock of high value on these islands, but that the bulk of the rock, he expected, was of low value. Every hon. member will realise that our farmers want all the artificial manures they can get as cheaply as it is possible to supply them. We know that Mr. Woodward is a geologist with a high reputation in this State, and in the circumstances, I think it would be a matter of public interest if Mr. Woodward's report, written in an official capacity, were made available to the public, so that the value of the phosphatic rock he inspected on these islands might be made known. I am not sure, in the absence of the reports whether Mr. Woodward went to all the islands or not, but I do say that if he did not make a complete examination of these islands, and if there is room to believe that further investigations on these islands would reveal the presence of deposits of rock phosphates of value, it is the duty of the Government to send another geologist to make a complete examination of the islands.

Mr. Underwood: There is more phosphatic rock at Bedout Island.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I can recall a couple of deplorable days spent on Bedout Island and I question that statement very much. If, however, it should be true, it is the duty of the Government to work these deposits. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood), who I think has a little knowledge of farming, knows that there is nothing more necessary for farmers at the present time, especially those in the poorer districts, than cheap artificial manures. I hope that if the researches already made on the islands near Esperance are not of a complete nature, further examination will be made by the Government, and that if there are phosphatic rock deposits there of any value, the Government will work them themselves as cheaply as possible and do what they can to supply our producers with cheaper artificial manures.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie): I second the motion.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I would suggest that all papers in connection with investigations relating to these islands be included in the motion. A good deal of work was done, but the phosphatic rock which was discovered was not of great commercial value. Samples were taken and the question was inquired into. There is nothing new in the suggestion. This rock has been found, but it is not of commercial value. We need rock containing 80 per cent. of phosphatic matter to be useful, because the freight from these islands will be nearly as much as it is from Ocean Island where most of this rock comes from. I fear that only disappointment would follow further inquiry because if my memory serves me rightly, fairly close investigation was made some time back.

Mr. Hudson: Which islands are you speaking of?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The islands on the south coast.

Mr. Hudson: Which one?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: All the islands. I venture to say that if those islands are worked as the member for Williams-

Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) suggests we shall not get cheap phosphates. I believe that if investigation proves that we have deposits of phosphates of any value there they should be worked, but I hope they will be worked far more cheaply than can be done by any day labour system under the Government. However, when we get these papers we will have the history of a socialistic enterprise at Namban Creek which I carried out some years ago. When that comes to light we will see something that will interest hon. members and show the country what has been the result of attempting to work these deposits at anything like a reasonable rate. I move an amendment—

That after "geologist," in line 3 of the motion, the words "and all papers" be inserted.

Mr. HUDSON (Yilgarn): I support the amendment and also the motion. I think it is highly desirable that inquiries should be made in the direction indicated, and that those inquiries should be of a thorough character. I regret exceedingly that this has not been done previously. An effort was made some time ago to form a company to work these islands, and that company was assisted by the late Government to the extent of some £1,500.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Not to anything like that extent.

Mr. HUDSON: It is not within my actual knowledge what the amount was. The hon. member can check me, and can even assist me by supplying the correct figures. At any rate the work was not properly carried out, and the whole of the islands were not examined, but only those in regard to which cursory reports have been made. I would like to draw attention to the fact that, although this phosphatic rock would have to be carted some distance, yet in the Ravensthorpe district there is a supply of sulphuric acid and other commodities used in connection with the manufacture of superphosphates. These might all be worked together, and an industry established in the neighbourhood which would be of considerable advantage, not only to the

South-East, but to every part of Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. P. Collier): I may say the Government have no objection to the laying on the Table of the report made by Mr. Woodward, or any other papers in connection with these deposits of phosphates. I understand inquiries have been made by private individuals, and perhaps a good deal of information has been gathered in that respect which will not be available to the department, gathered by persons who had in mind the establishment of works there for the manufacture of superphosphates. But, so far as the Government are concerned, any reports and papers will be made available for the information of hon. members.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (in reply): I welcome the amendment moved by the member for Northam, because naturally my desire is to get all information possible in regard to these deposits.

Amendment put and passed.

Question as amended agreed to.

PAPERS—PHOSPHATE DEPOSITS AND FEDERAL BOUNTIES.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams Narrogin) moved—

That all official reports on deposits of phosphates at Nambam, Dandaragan, or elsewhere in this State, be laid on the Table of the House.

He said: I would like to say that my reason in desiring to have all the official information in regard to deposits of phosphates in this State made available to the public is because the Federal Government have offered some considerable inducement to people to work deposits of phosphates. But, as you are aware, so far very little has been done in this direction in this State. The Federal Government passed an Act at the end of 1912 under which, spread over a period of some years, £75,000 was apportioned as money for bounties on the production of rock phosphates and wood pulp in Australia. Under the provisions of that Act a reward of £1,000 will be given for the discovery of any deposits of rock

phosphates of sufficient quality to justify the working of 10,000 tons of that rock. And it is also provided—and perhaps this is an unfortunate proviso for Western Australia—that the deposits worked have a value which has been fixed by regulation at 25 per cent. phosphoric acid. In addition to the reward of £1,000 the Federal Government are offering a bounty of 10 per cent. on the actual value of the manure produced. If only deposits of suitable value could be discovered in Western Australia, I am sure that reward and bounty would be of great assistance to any person, or to the State Government if they decided to work such deposits themselves. It is provided that not more than £5,000 a year shall be paid in such bounties. The great problem that is facing our wheat growers at the present time is how to increase the production on their farms and to decrease the cost of their cropping and production. Nothing would help the settler more than cheaper artificial manures, and more of them. Both those things could be guaranteed by local supplies, particularly if those local supplies of fertilisers were undertaken by the State Government, and not by private companies. To-day we have the fact that for superphosphate our settlers have to pay no less than £4 7s. 6d. per ton. It is a most unjustifiable rate, and a correspondent in the *West Australian* has lately proved beyond doubt that in the Eastern States superphosphate of a similar quality is being supplied to the settlers at £4 2s. 6d. per ton.

[Mr. McDowall took the Chair.]

Hon. J. Mitchell: The Government steamer took it over from here that it might be supplied there.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I do not think so. I do not think the member for Northam is fair in saying that, and I do not think he believes it for one minute. I have been assured by people interested in this business—I am not an agricultural chemist myself, and have no technical knowledge on the point, but I have been told on reliable authority that at

this rate of £4 7s. 6d. per ton the companies are making something like £2 a ton profit.

Mr. Underwood : What is superphosphate used for?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : It is used, as you know, for fertilising our wheat lands. It has given a productive value to tens of thousands of acres of land in Australia which, prior to the use of superphosphate could not be profitably cropped. I would like to say, too, that in addition to the very high price charged for the superphosphate, the companies operating—last session I read a schedule of their prices, and it is remarkable that for every item of manure those two companies, acting in combination, charge exactly the same rate per ton—charge interest at the rate of 1s. per ton per month on this sum of £4 7s. 6d., which they charge for their artificial manure. That is to say, they charge the unfortunate settler who has to go to them interest at the rate of 14 per cent. per annum.

Mr. Green : About 28 per cent. on the productive cost.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : I hope the Government will accept this motion, and will lay on the Table all the reports they have on deposits of phosphates in Western Australia, so that any person who desires to go into this industry to try to earn the Commonwealth bounty and award will be able to get without any trouble all the official information we have on the subject. It is absolutely necessary for the cropping of our poorer lands that we should have the superphosphate, and I am sure that every hon. member will recognise the very great advantage that would accrue to the wheat growers if they could be supplied with local artificial manures, instead of being dependent on supplies imported at great expense from Ocean Island, Christmas Island and Japan. In speaking on the previous motion the member for Northam referred to the socialistic experiment which he undertook at Namban Creek, and I compliment the hon. gentleman on the fact that he did make an effort to

have those deposits at Namban Creek worked by the State. I believe the effort was not successful, but the hon. member did show that when it came to a question of helping the farmers in that respect he was prepared to allow the State to do the work. He went so far as to buy a State ship—

Hon. J. Mitchell : A poor old ship.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Yes, it was, and I think the country lost a lot of money when it was resold. It was a pretty bad bargain that the hon. member made.

The Minister for Mines : Why single out that one. They are all bad bargains.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Yes, I believe we got better value for the money we spent on boats than the member for Northam did for the money he spent on that ship. However, I do not propose to criticise the member for Northam on this occasion, because even though a loss was made in working the deposits at Namban Creek, it was made with the good intention of supplying the farmers with manure at cheaper rates than they are getting it to-day. I hope that when the papers are laid on the Table the Government will try to find deposits of good phosphatic rock, and that if they are successful they will work them by the State with much better results than accrued from the experiments at Namban Creek. In fact I hope the State Government will go to any extent they can outside the scope of this motion in endeavouring to stimulate prospecting for phosphatic rock, and I am certain that if good phosphatic rock of high value can be found in Western Australia the discovery will be more valuable to this country than a new gold mine would be, and very much more valuable to the country than the Bullfinch mine has been up to date. In conclusion, I would like to ask the Government to consider the question of sending a geologist through the State to try to find a good phosphatic rock, and if they succeed in locating one of proved value, I hope it will be worked by the State in the same way as they are now supplying State machinery, and give the

farmer the benefit of the manure he requires at cost price, which I trust will be much lower than it was at Namban Creek. It is needless to say that unless the Government can work it cheaper than the companies are doing to-day they would not be wise to undertake the experiment.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I am delighted to have for once the approval of the member for Williams-Narrogin, but I am afraid that if he went into the history of the whole scheme at Namban he would not be such a keen advocate of State socialism in this regard. At one time I had the idea that we should find phosphatic deposits in the State, and we sent out a geologist to make researches. At Namban Creek we discovered a very valuable fertiliser in the form of cave deposits, but it could hardly be said to come within the scope of this motion because it was a complete fertiliser ready to be applied to the soil without any preparation at all. It was not, however, a phosphatic rock. We endeavoured to work this fertiliser and bring it to Perth. In those days I thought that if we could do work of this kind at a reasonable price we should endeavour to deliver to the settlers, particularly the potato growers in the South-West, this fertiliser at the cheapest possible cost. We decided to buy a boat, and that vessel was a calamity. It was nearly as bad as the "Kwinana," the "Western Australia," and the other boats of the Government fleet. We put on men to bag the stuff at Namban, and we bought our boat, of course on the advice of the harbour authorities. Everything looked bright and promising, and we thought we would get a supply of fertiliser at a reasonable rate. We did manage to bring down a load or two, but then the Government stroke intervened. When the boat was ready to sail and the wind was fair it was complained that the tucker had not been supplied by the Tender Board, so the boat was delayed, and when she was ready to start again the wind had changed. Then when we did get her away we found she was a very slow craft, particularly when the fishing was good. Eventually, the cost of bringing the stuff down was

so great that we were unable to sell it at a reasonable price. We had an Irishman in charge of the bagging, and he was of an economical turn of mind, so that when the bags burst on the beach he gathered up the spilt fertiliser and put it back into the bags again, with the result that the inspector of fertilisers came down on us for selling fertiliser that was partly sand. There is no doubt that good fertiliser is to be had there, and if private people had been given the right to bring it down we would have had it for sale at a reasonable price. It cannot be worked and brought down by the Government because of the Government stroke. However, the experiment did not cost the State very much, except for the inquiry and investigation by the geologist, and the results of that work will be available for others when the right time comes. I would just like to ask those members, who are anxious for the State to buy boats, to look at that experiment of ours before they go any further. At Dandaragan there is a deposit worth looking into, but it contains iron, and on that account is difficult to work. However, analytical work was undertaken by Mr. Rowley, and I believe he succeeded in removing the iron from the phosphatic rock, and so making the fertiliser of value.

Mr. Green: Was it at Namban Creek that Goezel was?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Yes. If the iron could be removed from this Dandaragan rock we should get a cheaper phosphate. In regard to the price paid to the local manufacturer, £4 7s. 6d., the farmer pays according to the unit value, and the value of the local phosphate is a little bit higher than the value of the imported article, but it is possible to get phosphate at £4 per ton notwithstanding that £4 7s. 6d. is charged for the local article. I mention this because it is well to realise that we are not compelled to pay £4 7s. 6d., inasmuch as we have the imported article competing with the local manufacture. There can be no denying that the cheaper the phosphate the better it is for the country, and that all our lands, whether rich or poor, demand the use of phosphate in order to grow wheat satisfactorily.

I do not see that the motion can do very much good, but it certainly cannot do any harm. To use the words that the Minister for Railways is so fond of uttering, "If it will not do any harm we might pass it."

The Minister for Mines: I never used those words in my life.

Mr. Underwood: That is a "Mitchellism."

Hon. J. MITCHELL: At any rate I think the House might agree to have these papers tabled, and when we get them we might discuss the advisableness of allowing some private individual to work these deposits if the State cannot undertake the work at a reasonable price.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie): I move an amendment—

That after the word "House" the following words be added, "together with all papers respecting the working of same."

I believe we would be able to see from those papers the reason for the failure of the previous Government in attempting to work the deposits at Namban Creek. I remember reading in the Press at the time a glowing account of these deposits by Mr. Goetzl, and I think it is the duty of the House to inquire into the value of the phosphates in that district. I am sure that the amendment will fall in with the wishes of the mover of the motion.

Amendment put and passed; the question as amended agreed to.

PAPERS — MINES REGULATION BILL, 1906.

On motion by Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) ordered: That all papers bearing on the Mines Regulation Bill, introduced in 1906, be laid on the Table of the House.

RETURN—LEASES OF NORTHERN RESERVES.

On motion by Mr. McDONALD (Gascayne) ordered: That a return be laid on the Table of the House showing, 1. the number of reserves leased north of Murchison River; 2. the names of the lessees.

MOTION — FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATIONS.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue) moved—

That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor praying that Executive Minute No. 14102, C.S.O., laid on the Table of the House on Wednesday, 24th September, 1913, rescinding Subsections (6), (7), and (8) of Regulation 16, and the whole of Regulation 62 of the Foods and Drugs Regulations, made on 25th June, 1913, be cancelled.

He said: I welcome the opportunity of once more saying a few words on an old pet subject of mine, although I am sorry the opportunity comes so late in the evening. The motion deals with the regulations under the Health Act in regard to infants' food and patent medicines. I want first of all to trace the history of those regulations for a few minutes in order that members may understand fully my position, and in order that I may explain why I take what may appear to be a somewhat extraordinary action. Hon. members will remember that for some years past members in this Chamber have spoken of the necessity for some regulation or censorship in regard to what are known as patent and proprietary medicines. Mr. Bath, when leader of the Opposition five or six years ago, spoke on one phase of this trade during the discussion on the Health Bill, a very comprehensive measure, which was fully discussed by members on both sides of the House, and he moved an amendment to the Bill to deal with this phase of the question—the publication of certain statements in regard to patent medicines. So convinced were hon. members of the justice of the amendment that without further discussion they decided to include it in the Bill. During the last two or three years we have had an amendment to the Health Act before the Chamber, and in that measure power was given to make certain regulations. At that time the question of patent and proprietary medicines was discussed on all sides, and there appeared to be a genuine desire on the part of members, and, I believe there is a genuine desire on

the part of the people of the country who understand this subject, that this trade must be regulated if we are to keep from the people certain nostrums. It is with a desire to protect the people themselves, even possibly against their own wishes, that the Labour party have endeavoured to regulate this trade. It was stated during the passage of the Bill that it was the intention of the Government to demand that manufacturers of proprietary and patent medicines and of children's and invalids' food should deposit their formulæ with the Health Department of the State. Regulations have since been drawn up in conformity with the intentions of the Government and of the House at that time, and in harmony with the measure which was then passed giving power to make regulations. These regulations have been brought forward to control this particular traffic. They were laid on the Table of the House for the statutory time of 30 days, and no objection was taken in this Chamber. In another place, I believe exception was taken to these regulations, but for some reason, unforeseen at the time, an opportunity was not given to another place to discuss them within the statutory time, with the result that the regulations became law in fact and prosecutions were made under them. An hon. member of that House and other people in the City took strong exception to the regulations, as was expected by all people who take an interest in the question. The same vested interests which have protested in all parts of the world when an endeavour has been made to regulate this trade got to work and followed the same lines as were followed in America, and it is most interesting to read the report of the united action of the manufacturers in America during the passage of certain Bills through various State legislatures in the United States. At times when they failed to influence the lower Chamber they called to their aid the Press of the State with whom for the greater part they had contracts for advertising, and hon. members can look up the book written by Mr. Adams, of *Collier's Weekly*, containing reprints of the articles which appeared in that periodical

a few years ago. It seems that almost the same methods have been adopted here. I was amused and interested to read a copy of a telegram sent by certain proprietors of some of these nostrums to the owner of a paper in one of the States. The wire stated—

House Bill 829 discriminating against proprietary medicines passed Lower House, up in Senate Monday; quick work necessary; use your influence.

One need not be very keen to understand what that means. The president of the association in America in the course of one of his addresses stated, "I am tired of fighting our opponents; I am tired of this uncertain position. We never know when any of the States will legislate against us, and it is too strenuous for me to fight as I have been doing, so in future I intend that the newspapers will come to my aid and fight for me, and I have in my contracts with the newspapers for advertising—these contracts meant millions of dollars every year throughout the United States—what is known as the red clause, which states that if any law is passed in a certain State discriminating against a particular medicine the contract is to be void." Instead of fighting and calling to his aid those in the same business, the newspapers fought for him. I am inclined to think that the same methods were adopted here, because not long after the Government contemplated bringing in these regulations, the whole of the newspapers in this State were circularised to show the mutual disadvantage it would be if the regulations were allowed to pass. The manufacturers evidently failed with the newspapers, and as was suggested in the telegram I quoted, they went to the second Chamber. I confess that I am surprised at one hon. gentleman in particular taking an active part against these regulations. I have always understood that that hon. gentleman was high-minded and public spirited. I remember the many efforts he has made to protect the fauna in this State. I remember the great interest he has taken in the protection of native animals. I remember the strenuous fight he put up to protect

the kangaroos, much to the disgust of the hon. member for Pilbara.

Mr. Underwood: They did not give the kangaroos patent medicines.

Mr. HEITMANN: If they had done so the animals would probably have been exterminated. Now we find the same individual saying practically that while we will protect the animal life of this State little consideration is to be given to the human being. The result was that he took what I admit was a perfectly legitimate course in protesting in the Legislative Council against the regulations. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman who at one time was head of the Health Department, and who has a full knowledge of the harm which is done by these nostrums, should have taken this action. The regulations had become law, and this hon. gentleman objected because he had not had an opportunity to protest against them, and he asked the Government to give effect to a motion adverse to the regulations if that motion was carried in another place.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think I am allowing the hon. member very considerable latitude. No hon. member is allowed to reflect on an hon. member in another place.

Mr. HEITMANN: I am grateful for the latitude which has been shown to me. I have no desire to reflect on the hon. gentleman in any way. At the same time I suggest that it is somewhat difficult to deal with a regulation which has been so much before another place and which is so closely related to another place without referring to another place, and if I am permitted to briefly refer to what took place there, solely with the desire to explain my position, I will be glad. The Government consented to the proposal that if a motion adverse to the regulations was carried they would give effect to it. Such a motion was carried and the Government, in fulfilment of their promise, rescinded certain regulations mentioned in my motion. It may be said that I am not acting fairly in moving that an Executive minute, which has been published in the *Government Gazette*, and which was laid on the Table of the House

on the 24th September, should be cancelled. It may be said that, as a member on the Government side of the House, I am in duty bound to respect a promise made by the Government. While that may be so, and though my action may appear to be unfair, I am prepared to take almost any action if I can obtain a regulation of this particular trade. Extraordinary diseases require extraordinary remedies—that is the only explanation I desire to make in connection with my action. It is well known that in regard to fertilisers, a matter which has just been dealt with by the hon. member for Williams-Narrogin, the purchaser who takes a certain quantity is entitled to know exactly what he is getting.

Mr. Lander: He is entitled to an analysis.

Mr. HEITMANN: That is so. It seems to me to be extraordinary that while that provision is made in regard to fertilisers, the moment we say that the Health Department of the State must know what patent medicines, foods, etcetera, consumed by the people, and affecting human life contain, we have vested interests rising up at once and telling us it is not fair. Objections are raised by the big commercial firms dealing with these medicines. For years there has been a demand in Australia for these so-called patent medicines, but I am not prepared to admit that that fact indicates that these medicines are necessarily good for the people because, as I have indicated and as is well known to the people interested in this business, it is possible by the expenditure of huge sums of money in advertising to create a demand for almost anything, no matter how valueless or injurious it may be for the purpose. Because of this demand on the part of the people a demand created by the expenditure of huge amounts in advertising the virtues of particular medicines, the opponents of the regulations say—and one gentleman in particular is strenuous in his opposition—that we should leave it to the people themselves to say what is good or bad for them, and in fact that we have no right to interfere in any way. I will draw attention back to a discussion which took

place in this House during last session, also dealing with drugs. I endeavoured on that occasion to expose a trade which I believed to be immoral and there was no doubt at that time a demand, and there is even at the present time a demand, decreasing I believe, for certain goods. Certain drugs are immoral, to say the least, and using the very mildest term. Would the same gentleman who said we should allow the people to judge for themselves take the same attitude in regard to this question? I am inclined to think he would not. For my part, I believe the great demand for patent medicines is on account of the ignorance of the people through being misled by exaggerated statements and advertisements in newspapers concerning these patent medicines. While it might perhaps be easier for the present Government and any individual member to sit back and say, "Let the people go, let them have what they like; we know a majority of them are using certain standard remedies and we will leave it to them," I will do all I can to prevent the people from getting certain patent medicines, because I believe they are injurious. I know some people will protest against my action. While the active opponents of this regulation tell us it is the people they are endeavouring to protect, it is well known to all who take an interest in this matter that the manufacturers have no consideration for the people, but only for the amount of money involved in the sale of these particular medicines. It has been stated by a public citizen that he is pleading in behalf of the people in regard to certain standard remedies—that, I believe, is what he called them—to the number of 10 or 12, which he mentioned. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Adams of *Collier's Weekly* when he stated, in reply to certain requests that he should endeavour to separate the good from the bad, "I started out with that intention, I am still endeavouring to do it, but in looking for the good among the bad, I have practically failed to find any genuine articles among those I have criticised." While there are certain so-called standard patent medicines used in this State and

practically all over the world, I venture to say that on analysis the claims of the manufacturers of them cannot by any means be substantiated. Outside a certain few remedies, which are merely used as aperients and laxatives, there is not one single patent medicine, so far as I have learnt, at all events, which is of any material value to the people. On the other hand there are quite a number of patent medicines on the market to-day, and have been for years, which are not only valueless from a medicinal standpoint, but are positively injurious. Particularly have I in mind those patent medicines which are very often given to infants. In the list mentioned by the public spirited gentleman to whom I have referred, we have, of course, Beecham's pills. It is recognised by many people in this State, and recognised even by medical men, that for certain purposes these pills have a value.

Mr. Green: Worth a guinea a box!

Mr. HEITMANN: That is an exaggerated statement made by the proprietor. Beecham's pills are, however, looked upon by most people as perfectly legitimate, and in regard to them, comparatively speaking, no very exaggerated statements are made. The hon. member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) no doubt had Beecham's pills in mind when he said that some of his constituents would cease to live unless they could daily get this patent medicine. Beecham's pills are easy to analyse, and what they contain is well known. Of course the reply given to the analyses made by chemists, health authorities, and others is that they are wrong. However, I am prepared to accept the analyses of Mr. Mann, the analytical chemist in the employ of this State, against a good many analysts in other parts of the world. Mr. Mann has come in for severe criticism by interested parties, and particularly I notice by a publication known as the *Australian Chemist and Druggist*, but whatever Mr. Mann may have done in regard to the analysis of patent medicines, he certainly deserves to receive credit, and has received it, for the work he did on behalf

of a previous Government in connection with gases in the mines. I have seen letters which this gentleman has received from authorities in London to the effect that he has undoubted priority in relation to certain work. Mr. Mann is at the present time backing his reputation to do a certain thing in regard to a standard whisky.

Mr. Taylor: I could take that job on.

Mr. HEITMANN: The character of the individual himself is sufficient for me to believe that he has made fair and honest deductions from his investigations, and I am prepared to take his analyses so far as these patent medicines are concerned. After all, when the proprietors of patent medicines ask for such accuracy, one would imagine that they put into their work in the manufacture of these medicines the same accuracy. As a matter of fact it has been found by different authorities that one can take a bottle of pills and find that while some contain 5 or 6 grs. of a certain ingredient, others in the same bottle go up to 10 or 12 grs., yet a certain number of these pills is prescribed as a dose. The people who are so careless in making up medicines themselves say it is not possible for Mr. Mann to give an absolutely accurate analysis. Beecham's pills, the formula for which has been frequently quoted, and may be found in *Secret Remedies* and in Mr. Beale's report, have been quoted as being composed of aloes, ginger, and soap.

Mr. Underwood: Soap?

Mr. HEITMANN: Yes, but I understand the hon. member does not believe in soap. It should not be very hard for a trained man to discover what are the ingredients of Beecham's pills. Let us have a look at the morality of the individual who proclaims to the world that the analysis of this particular pill cannot be discovered, and proclaims that he is endeavouring to do such a vast amount of good by placing his wares on the market. This individual has, I believe for his commercial capacity, been knighted and is in a very large way of business indeed. Sir Joseph Beecham, in giving evidence before a select committee

appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into this particular matter, made the following admissions in regard to his "cough pills":—

That for many years they contained a proportion of morphia; that when an amendment of the Poisons Act made it necessary to label the pills "poison," the morphia was dropped out, so as to avoid this necessity; that the morphia was a desirable and useful ingredient of the "cough pills"; that the trading aspect of his business weighed with him more than the fact that he was, by taking out the morphia, reducing the value of his pills from a medicinal point of view; that of recent years he had been informed that a minute proportion of morphia might be inserted in the pills without declaration as "poison," and that thereupon a minute proportion of the drug was re-instated.

The Minister for Lands: Most accommodating.

Mr. HEITMANN: Most accommodating, as they all are. Here is this gentleman so public spirited that he has been knighted for the good he has done in the world, telling us he has no consideration for the value of his pills from the medicinal standpoint, but it is purely as well all know, a commercial point of view that he adopts every time. He says if the law will not permit him to make a certain kind of pill without proclaiming his formula, he will make up another which is equally as good as the last. On the same point I would like to quote the *Australian Chemist and Druggist*. This publication made a strong attack upon Mr. Mann, upon Dr. Atkinson (then Acting Commissioner of Public Health) and upon the Government of Western Australia. In the course of its remarks in an article headed "The proprietors' way of escape," this publication stated—

Rumour has it that the West Australian regulation has been adopted for recommendation to all the States by the Interstate Conference held during May. That is to say, that no proprietary medicine will be allowed to be sold in Australia unless the formula is either published or lodged with the

health authorities. Moreover, it looks as if it will be necessary to lodge the formula with the health authorities in each State.

The article goes on to say that if some plan could be devised whereby lodgment with one State would be sufficient for all the others on a certificate, say, that the formula had been lodged, they would have no very great objections. The point I wish to refer to is this: they point out that it is needless for the people to think that the bringing in of these regulations will lessen the sale of these goods. They go on—

To mention one device only, nothing will prevent a British proprietor from preparing a special pill for the Australian market and lodging this special formula in Australia. This will not disclose his formula in any other part of the world. The advertisement might then read, "Heatem's Australian pills, worth a guinea a box. Specially prepared in accordance with our long experience of the Australian constitution." This will immediately get over the difficulty of British and other proprietors that publication in Australia will mean disclosure of their formula for the whole world. They will simply prepare a special pill, with special labels for the Australian market, and the rest of the world will be left to the established order of things. Nor will the sale of their goods suffer one iota.

I would refer this to the member for Williams-Narrogin. Here we have the value of his pet medicine, the makers of which say "If you bring in your regulation, which will make us supply the formula, we will simply alter the ingredients and change the labels and the box, and send it out to Australia, and our sales will not decrease."

Mr. E. B. Johnston: None of this argument has a bearing on your motion. The point is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEITMANN: The hon. member considers it unfair on my part to move this motion, which, if carried, will have the effect, so far as I can learn, of allow-

ing things to remain as they were before a certain minute was passed by Executive Council. The motion in another place had nothing whatever to do with the validity or otherwise of these regulations, but I have pointed out, perhaps in the absence of the hon. member, that extraordinary diseases require extraordinary remedies, and I am prepared to take the blame for my extraordinary action.

Hon. Frank Wilson: This is a no-confidence motion against the Government.

Mr. HEITMANN: I would tell the hon. member and the Government, and in fact every member in the House, that if I could rid the world of the curse of these patent medicines, I would gladly do so. Another medicine mentioned is a household remedy made by an individual in another part of the world and known as Elinan's embrocation. I would say that this does not come within the terms of the regulation at all. Collis Brown's chlorodyne is a medicine quite a number of people claim to be the original makers of. I recognise that this is used extensively, but I would inform hon. members that any chemist in this town can make up chlorodyne. In the British Pharmacopœia there is a formula for chlorodyne, and the people in this State will not be placed in a position of inconvenience if they are prohibited from purchasing that of Collis Brown. The idea that people will be deprived of the use of certain remedies, if we compel the makers to lodge the formula and they refuse to do so, is all hush. There have been about 1,000 formulae deposited with the department and, as I have mentioned, there is in the British Pharmacopœia the formula for making chlorodyne, and the member for Bunbury will correct me if I am wrong when I say that any chemist in this State can make it up for whoever desires it.

Mr. Thomas: That is quite right.

Mr. HEITMANN: There is a dispute between a man called Freeman and the original Collis Brown over this medicine.

Mr. George: And there has been a big lawsuit over it.

Mr. HEITMANN: At all events I will say that any chemist can make it up.

Mr. Taylor: Make up something like it.

Mr. HEITMANN: I would like to point out in reply to that good old stock argument that they can make up something nearly as good, that hon. members might read the articles on the American frauds published by Samuel Hopkins Adams, in *Collier's Weekly*, or the "Secret Drug Cures and Foods," by Mr. Beale, and it will be discovered that a majority of these medicines have been made up by men who do not pretend to have the slightest knowledge of chemistry. Fulford, the great discoverer of bile beans, is the man who, in his pamphlets, declared that he travelled into the interior of Australia and there discovered a race of aborigines of extraordinary physique, who lived to a great age, and that after long years of studying and watching these natives, they pointed out to him the identical plant which gave them their long life and physique. This very man who had advertised this nostrum, however, when himself stricken with an incurable disease, did not worry about his own medicines—he knew too much about them—but went to the ablest physician in Australia to obtain treatment. Eventually, I believe, he died from the disease on which his own medicine had no effect.

Mr. Foley: Why did he not go back to the niggers to see what they could do for him?

Mr. HEITMANN: I am positive that if any hon. member will read the publications I have referred to, they will come to the conclusion, without a shadow of doubt, that the majority of these nostrums are made up by men who have not the slightest knowledge of chemistry. I would say to the members for Mount Margaret and Williams-Narrogin that among the formulæ deposited with the Health Department there are those of many medicines which are made up by chemists in this State, and, as the member for Bunbury knows, there is the opportunity of observing which are the prescriptions mostly ordered by medical men for certain diseases. I believe we

can get better medicines in those made up locally and there is also the assurance that they are under greater control than those which are imported.

Mr. George: And you foster native industry.

Mr. HEITMANN: Quite so. The next of the valuable remedies mentioned by our friend in a distant place is Kaye's Essence of Linseed. A label for this line was submitted from England, which label would comply with the regulation, as it disclosed the ingredients used in the mixture. The firm is evidently willing to comply with the regulation. Then there is this gentleman's favourite medicine, sanatogen. This line would be thrown off the market. But it might be pointed out that the position which it at present occupies is entirely due to the extremely skilful, expensive, and costly advertising campaign, which from a business point of view certainly redounds to the credit of the manufacturers. The market has been energetically worked up. Members of the medical profession only were first canvassed extensively for a considerable period. As a matter of fact the food and medicinal value of sanatogen is very much less than that of a number of recognised articles of the daily dietary. Because some medicos have believed the claims put forward by the manufacturers, and prescribe it, it by no means follows that its presence on the local market is essential. The price, 5s. 6d. for a small tin, is abnormally high, and makes the article almost prohibitive to the general public. and, I may add, the general public does not suffer thereby.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What about the Colonial Secretary's promise? Tell us about that.

Mr. HEITMANN: This is my business at present, and I am not very much worried about the Colonial Secretary. Now we come to antiphlogistine. This is a plaster for external application and does not really come within the terms of the regulation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You might tell hon. members that

sanatogen is only the ordinary cottage cheese.

Mr. HEITMANN: I did not mention it, because I thought the fact was so well known.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Antiphlogistine is a good thing.

Mr. HEITMANN: As it is not a medicine, we do not require to take any action in respect to it. The next thing on the list is St. Jacob's Oil, a very old and well-known remedy, claimed to be a cure for everything. This mixture, according to the report of Beale, as a Commonwealth Royal Commissioner, 1907, is composed as follows:—gum camphor, hydrated chloral, chloroform and sulphuric ether, of each one ounce; tincture of opium, oil of origanum, and oil of sassafras, of each half ounce. Then comes the principal ingredient, alcohol. After all, if hon. members will look at these works which I have mentioned they will find that one class of patent medicine, to deceive the patient, relies upon alcohol, while in another class it is opium. In this St. Jacob's oil there is only 92 per cent. of alcohol. In other words, 92 per cent. of St. Jacob's oil is alcohol. The oil is applied externally. A small bottle containing only about two ounces costs 1s. 3d., and it claims to be a cure for rheumatics, neuralgia, colds in the joints and all bodily aches and pains. One cannot imagine a patent medicine proprietary seriously putting up this as a cure for all cases of rheumatism. The directions include the application of the oil by massage, and also the application of the oil after hot fomentations. Obviously the massage and the fomentations have the greater effect towards any improvement rather than the oil, which may, to a certain extent render the superficial nerves temporarily insensible to pain. As a cure for rheumatism this is a fraud. We now come to Seigel's Syrup, another popular remedy for some people. It has a very simple formula. This mixture as a tonic laxative has no advantage over numerous others on the market, and therefore should be given no special value. On the subject of Bonnington's Irish Moss, Beale states that

the stuff contains chloroform and morphine. No formula has been deposited. If Beale's information is correct then this substance is dangerous when given to children. The morphine relieves the symptoms but does not touch the cause, and consequently on each return of the cough more is given.

Mr. Thomas: It has an injurious effect on the parts.

Mr. HEITMANN: As morphia should on no account be given to young children such a mixture, left to the discretion of a mother, is possibly dangerous. There are other lines of Irish Moss put up by local chemists against which these allegations cannot be made. Although on carefully reading the literature it is seen that Bonnington does not claim to be a cure for consumption, yet it sails very close to the wind, and refers to this disease and states that it can cure other conditions which are often mistaken for consumption but are not really consumption at all. There is quite a number of others which I would like to touch upon, quite a number of nostrums on the market to which I take the greatest possible exception. Almost all nostrums put up by these quacks for coughs and colds claim to be good for consumption. I will show before I finish that a prominent medicine man in Australia prescribes a full course for consumption. Any man that proclaims to the world that these things can cure, alleviate or help the consumptive patient in any way is a liar, a rogue, a scoundrel, a rascal of the worst possible type and a man deserving of no possible consideration on the part of this or any other public institution. Now we come to Cackle's pills.

Hon. Frank Wilson: A very good pill, too.

Mr. HEITMANN: Seeing the variety of patent medicines which the leader of the Opposition has taken I am positively surprised that he should be alive. According to Beale's report, Cackle's pills consist of aloes, colocynth, and rhubarb. These pills differ in no wise from numerous other purgative pills. Then there is Eno's Fruit Salts. The formula for this is fairly well known, and as given by

Beale, is as follows:—bi-carbonate of soda, tartaric acid and citric acid. There are numerous similar lines on the market, and it is no uncommon thing to find housewives who themselves put up fruit salts very little different from Eno's. Eno's claims to be a cure for indigestion and certain other maladies, and therefore comes under the heading of a patent medicine. If it is to be kept off the market there are plenty of others which can be had in substitution. Powell's Balsam of Aniseed is stated by Beale to contain opium. Then there is Singleton's Eye Ointment. This is an ordinary prescription for eye treatment, and has no special value over others. It contains ingredients known to almost any chemist making up these remedies. Scott's Emulsion is an emulsion of milk and cod liver oil, and is not in any way a secret preparation, as the ingredients are known. It is more properly styled a food. In regard to Pain-killer, the hon. member has undoubtedly had a large experience with Pain-killer. I can remember Pain-killer since childhood and it was used very extensively in my young days.

Mr. Thomas: In place of whisky sometimes.

Mr. HEITMANN: When I read the ingredients I can quite understand why the demand has been so great in the past, particularly in no-license districts. Beale in his report quotes the formula of this line as tincture of capsicum, spirits of camphor, gnaicum resin, tincture of myrrh and one or two other things, but the principal ingredient is alcohol. According to its own label it confesses to 91 per cent. of proof spirit and to $\frac{1}{4}$ grain of opium to the dram. According to the dosage recommended on the label, a child of four may easily be given half a grain of opium in the day, which is positively dangerous. It is recommended either for internal or external application. In regard to external application it claims to be good for bites, stings of poisonous insects, scalds, burns, etcetera. In case of any trouble with the breast women are recommended to bathe the parts with Pain-killer. For coughs and colds the mixture is recommended for internal ap-

plication, and for colds it is also recommended to bathe the feet in hot water to which a few teaspoonfuls of Pain-killer have been added. Diarrhoea and dysentery may be treated both by internal and external applications of Pain-killer. For the treatment of influenza a few drops of Pain-killer every few hours are recommended, also external application, and foot baths to which Pain-killer has been added. The motto appears to be "apply it anywhere for anything." It is a well known fact that when alcohol cannot be obtained, this "medicine" is taken as a substitute, so that not only is alcohol often being taken in a dangerous form, but considerable doses of opium are also consumed. An hon. gentleman in another place mentioned Horlick's Malted Milk and Benger's Food. In both these cases the information as required by the regulations has been deposited, and the articles are available for sale. In regard to infants' food the opponents of these regulations say that they are not opposed to certain reasonable regulations. Of course none of them are ever opposed to reasonable regulations, but the definition of the word "reasonable" must be always left to them. In the course of remarks made to the people of Western Australia by a certain gentleman, he stated that the Colonial Secretary's office had misled the public when they stated they had the formulae of certain patent foods deposited with the department, and to support his contention he read a letter which was published in the *West Australian* over the names of, I believe, seven manufacturers of these particular foods, denying that they had deposited the information required by the department. In reply to that the Colonial Secretary stated to the public that the department had received a communication from four of those firms assuring him that if their names appeared under that letter which was published in the *West Australian*, they were not placed there with their authority and they protested strongly against the letter. They were prepared to place the information required at the disposal of the department, and so far as we are concerned, that is all that is re-

quired. Had I the opportunity of referring to the remarks made by this gentleman I would deal paragraph by paragraph with them, but as I am informed by you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am not allowed to refer to the discussion in another place, I am at present unable to do so. I wish to refer, however, to some medicines which are well known in Australia, just as well known as those mentioned by the hon. member of another place and by those representatives of vested interests opposed to the regulations. They have mentioned 10 or a dozen. I could mention offhand 10 or a dozen, and if I were to take the trouble to read to hon. members I could tell them of almost 100 proprietary medicines which are on the market, and which are almost as prominent as Beecham's pills; and I could prove that even if we would like to have some consideration for the bona fide patent medicine men, they are so very few that it is impossible to legislate for their particular cases, and it is necessary, therefore, that the regulations should apply to the whole of them. After Mr. Kingsmill had mentioned the good medicines I might mention at least some bad ones. I have already mentioned about Pulford, the gentleman who, in order to place his drug on the English market, spent something like a quarter of a million of money before offering for sale one box of pills, and if any one requires any further information as to this gentleman or desires to express himself after acquiring that information, I would refer him again to Mr. Beale's statement or to the judgment of the Scottish court, which, I understand, is equivalent to a Supreme Court in this State. The judge there in almost plain language called him a liar. He called him a fraud, a quack, a scoundrel, and a rascal, and he used words which might possibly mean that the man was a murderer. This gentleman died of a disease uncurable. I might mention for an hour the advertisements of this particular gentleman in regard to bile beans.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What is the matter with bile beans?

Mr. HEITMANN: Absolutely only a very poor laxative. The beans are not a

curative at all. Let us go on now to Vitadatio. Vitadatio, of which thousands of bottles are sold in this country, is according to the analysis chiefly made up of a very poor quality of gin. I have the analysis before me—bad gin. Regarding Dr. Williams' pink pills, there was never a man of that name connected with this medicine, which necessarily detracts from the value of the pills. There is proof beyond doubt that this is a fraud.

Mr. George: Are they pink?

The Minister for Mines: Yes they are true in colour and that is all.

Mr. HEITMANN: Another remedy used very much in the village where I was reared is Warner's safe cure. This is the same as is declared by the German official analysis and warning to contain not a single ingredient to remedy the ailments set down in the list. Mr. Adams showed that Warner's safe cure and all the Warner remedies are leased, managed and controlled by the New York and Kentucky Distillery Company, manufacturers of standard whiskies, which do not pretend to remedy anything but thirst.

The Minister for Lands: It is a bi-product of a whisky mill.

Mr. HEITMANN: Yes. Let us now consider the so-called drink cures, which every day are advertised in our own paper the morals of which paper are of a very high standard. Drink cures are really worse than the liquor which makes it necessary for a man's wife or children to purchase one of these so-called cures for him.

Mr. George: I would knock them out.

Mr. HEITMANN: A score of these so-called cures are positively more dangerous than whisky itself.

The Minister for Lands: One of them is salt and water.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is not dangerous.

Mr. George: Salt and water would make a man thirsty.

Mr. HEITMANN: Ayer's sarsaparilla can be set down as a positive humbug. I want to refer to the number of soothing syrups and medicines used by mothers merely to keep their children quiet. There are scores of them on the market.

and it is well known that the effect of the medicine is that for the time being it deadens the senses of the child, but according to authorities, these remedies have bred many drug fiends, and no one in this House would say nay if we prevented entirely medicines of this description from coming into the country. I am sorry that I have not time to read some of them out. It is simply damnable; one can say nothing less.

Mr. George: Hear, hear, that is a good old word.

Mr. HEITMANN: Deaths innumerable can be traced to the taking of these particular nostrums.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What, Eno's fruit salt?

Mr. HEITMANN: No, soothing powders for infants.

Mr. George: I would like to have given some to the Attorney General the other night.

Mr. Thomas: Some soothing powders would be good for the hon. member.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The hon. member for Bunbury sells them.

Mr. HEITMANN: There is a list dealing with quite a number of them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Take it as read.

Mr. HEITMANN: Perhaps the hon. member has taken them himself.

Mr. Thomas: In his infancy.

Mr. HEITMANN: The hon. member was never an infant. I want to warn the hon. member against these nostrums.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I have survived them.

Mr. HEITMANN: The report of the Royal Commission on page 186 states—

There are a few proprietary articles which are so well known to contain poisons that there has not been any necessity for analysis, such as chlorodyne, containing chloroform and opium; Atkinson's royal infant preservative, containing opium; rough on rats, being arsenic; various phosphorous pastes; Easton's syrup, containing strychnine; Boschee's German syrup.

I used to take a lot of that myself.

In the publication called the *Chemist and Druggist* long lists are given of

deaths through infants' preservatives and soothing syrup, both of which enjoy an enormous sale in Australia. Hundreds of grosses are sold annually, and the sole active principle in these drugs is poison, and poison only. Certainly thousands of infantile lives are annually destroyed by these two preparations.

Then it goes on to deal similarly with soothing powders. I will read a list of prominent so-called patent medicines which are before the public, some of which are just as prominent as those mentioned by the champion of the patent medicine fiends in Perth. Perry Davis's pain killer, which contains opium—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Who is the gentleman?

Mr. HEITMANN: A gentleman by the name of Garner, and another who was at one time ministerial head of the Public Health Department in this State. The exhibit No. 133 of the Royal Commission, which I was quoting states—

Perry Davis's painkiller, result opium; Kay's essence of linseed, chloroform and morphine; Jayne's expectorant, opium and strychnine; Fellow's compound syrup, strychnine; Wood's peppermint cure, chloroform and morphine—

In connection with this there is a foot note stating that since two years, Mr. Wood has ceased to put these two articles into his preparation, and the medicine is, therefore, now harmless.

Bonington's Irish moss, chloroform and morphine; Steedman's soothing powder, opium; Powell's balsam of aniseed, opium; Mrs. Winslow's soothing syrup, opium alkaloids; Godfrey's cordial, opium; Ayer's cherry pectoral, morphine; Chamberlain's cough remedy, opium; Chamberlain's diarrhoea mixture, chloroform and opium; Ayer's sarsaparilla mixture, opium.

I hardly think it is necessary to go much further to show the hon. members of this Chamber, and, if possible I would show it to the public, that the claims put forward by the Health Department of this State, the members of which view health

matters entirely from the standpoint of the public, that it is necessary to have some regulation and some control over these patent medicines, are well substantiated. None, I think, will contend that we are doing an injustice to anybody by saying "In regard to what you intend for sale in this State, and what you intend the public to consume, we, the guardians of the health of this community, desire to know the contents." That is all the Health Department of this State are asking.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What about breaking the Colonial Secretary's promise to the Legislative Council?

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. HEITMANN: As I have told the hon. member before, I would break every thing if I could stop these murderers. It seems that the hon. gentleman is not yet convinced that we should have some control. No doubt he has received a letter or two from some outback constituent saying, "We are not near a chemist or a doctor and if we cannot get Bonnington's Irish Moss, Wood's Great Peppermint Cure, and Mother Seigel's syrup, we will suffer." As I have told the hon. member to-night, there is nothing for him to feel alarmed about in that regard. The public officers of this State are well aware that there has been a demand for certain patent medicines and they hope some day by replacing the present ignorance with knowledge, to do away altogether with the present demand for these nostrums. They know this demand exists and that if they stop certain well known remedies, the public will not suffer, as they will get a better article made up from the prescription of medical men, and it would not be, like the imported article, absolutely outside of control, so far as the manufacture is concerned, of the State department. I cannot understand any man who is public spirited in any degree asking consideration for the general body of these patent medicine manufacturers. Speaking of them as a body I say there is no class of man lower morally than the manufacturer of these patent medicines. They are not only prepared to trade upon the gullibility

of the people, but I will refer hon. members again to Mr. Beale's report, and they will find certain of these individuals trading on the ignorance of mankind advertising in the papers that they have a certain and particular remedy for what are known as the private diseases of men and women, and in strict confidence they invite correspondence from sufferers. I could not imagine, until I read this report, and several others since, that these men, who say that they will observe the strictest confidence in regard to the communications they receive, would dispose later on of these very letters to other nostrum vendors equally immoral as themselves. I am carrying out a promise I made to myself, if ever a time should come that I could regulate this trade, if I could crush these individuals out of existence, I would be very happy indeed to do it. A case will be found quoted in Mr. Beale's report where two or three individuals advertised a certain remedy and then sold the letters they received from people they corresponded with. The result was that communications were sent to young women stating, "If you do not give us two guineas we will publish this communication we received from you." When the police stepped in it was not long before they intercepted no fewer than 600 letters enclosing two guineas. Yet we have men coming forward and proclaiming the virtues of patent medicines generally, and saying we should not deal too harshly with these particular individuals, as they have built up by business acumen huge businesses which we should not destroy. Human life is not to be considered. I say again that the medicinal qualities of what they sell do not concern these traders in the least, but by advertising through the medium of the newspapers they have created a demand for these medicines and have made millions thereby. I ask, what consideration is due to men who will invite confidential correspondence and say they will treat it secretly, but by-and-bye, after receiving these communications, from young girls and women, they sell them to a wholesale depot? Among these letters

were found thousands upon thousands dealing with consumption and thousands upon thousands dealing with cancer. They claimed that they could cure cancer in the first place, and after bleaching white financially the unfortunate individual, they sell his or her letter so that afterwards a fresh individual may come along and go through the same performance. I say that no sympathy should be extended to such individuals. I want in conclusion to deal with a few remedies that are on the market in Western Australia. I would like to refer to the power that was really behind the throne. From the information I have given to this House, and from what is in the hands of public men, hon. members will see that it is surprising that a business of this kind can be continued. One asks why, and, as Mr. Beale emphatically states, the whole business has been created by the public Press throughout the world. One can hardly comprehend that the public Press, from the highest to the lowest journals, almost every one of them, is prepared to take from these advertisers huge amounts of money in order that they in turn may do business with people in regard to these nostrums, in many cases useless patent medicines and in many more cases harmful patent medicines. The whole question is in the hands of the public Press. We are led to believe the Press is there to protect the public. We are told that many men would do evil but for the fact that they think the Press may get hold of it. What then is the position so far as the public is concerned, when we find this guardian of the public, the public Press, ready to advertise, and in many cases recommend, as some newspapers do, nostrums, cheap, nasty, valueless, and in many cases most harmful? It was stated by an hon. member when speaking to a resolution in another place recently that he would not believe that the better class of journalists would stoop to publish such advertisements. As a matter of fact he said that he denied that even the average journalist would go out of his way in order to publish the advertisements of these nos-

trums. That gentleman owns two or three newspapers in the Great Southern districts. I have looked at the newspapers that he controls and I must say that they are a credit to him.

Mr. Thomas: Their circulation is so small that it would not attract these advertisements.

Mr. HEITMANN: I decline to believe that. I look upon it in quite another way. This gentleman declared that he had given it out that he would not publish these advertisements. I did, however, find one advertisement which referred to Doan's backache pills, and I am inclined to think that it must have found its way into that newspaper by mistake. After all, I might mention that journalists themselves have nothing to do with the publication of these advertisements. It is the proprietors of the newspapers who are responsible. Some of the newspapers almost live on the advertisements which they receive from these nostrum mongers. I would like to refer to a newspaper which is well known to the people of Western Australia, the *Sunday Times*, a paper which claims to be the largest in the Empire. In one issue of recent date there were thirteen columns in the aggregate of advertisements dealing with patent medicines of various kinds, and mostly quack medicines. It appears to me extraordinarily pitiful to find a paper with the influence of the *Sunday Times* stooping to accept these medical advertisements—a paper which ought to be in a position to expose the evils which result from the use of these medicines, a paper too which never hesitates to expose other abuses, such as the one which they exposed only the other day, a mythical sweep on a mythical race to be run in Calcutta or some other part of the world. I have also noticed that this newspaper exposes frauds which are perpetrated by letter on unsuspecting people, and viewing these circumstances, it is surprising indeed to find the proprietors willing to accept advertisements relating to patent medicines. If the editor or the proprietor of that newspaper only thought what power for good he could exercise by refraining from publishing these advertise-

ments, I am sure he would not hesitate to decline to insert them in his columns. I would like to see that newspaper adopt the course followed by the *Australasian Traveller*, published in Melbourne, and the *Producers' Review* published in Western Australia—journals which declare boldly in their own columns that they will not accept advertisements relating to certain medicines which claim to cure stated diseases. More power to those newspapers which have the courage to take this stand, and I shall always take off my hat to them. The *Sunday Times* could well afford to take up that attitude, and if it did it would be one of the first of the large newspapers in Australia to do so. I feel sure, with its big circulation, which extends over such a large area of country, if they were to follow this course, in a few years we would find that these nostrums would be almost unknown in Western Australia. Mr. Cullen, the newspaper proprietor in the Upper House to whom I have referred, said he did not think that any journalist or proprietor of a newspaper would publish anything which he believed was not good for the community. But right throughout the same opinion ought to exist. It was pointed out by Mr. Adams in *Collier's Weekly*, when he took up the work of attacking the proprietors of these nostrums, that in twelve months he dealt with 250—I speak from memory—patent medicines, individuals, and institutions, and he declared that he expected quite a number of law suits when he set out on this crusade. The number of lawyer's letters which were received in the office of *Collier's Weekly*, he declared, became quite a joke. Every day bundles of letters came in demanding that a withdrawal be made of what had been written, but four months after the last article had appeared Mr. Adams, in summing up, stated that although he waited for the threatened suits there only remained two in the courts and one demand for a withdrawal. This demand was from Dr. Blosser, who denied the allegation that he had disclosed confidential correspondence. In reply Mr. Adams stated that he had simply gone to a broker in New York and there discov-

ered that he could obtain 113,000 letters that had been written in confidence to Dr. Blosser. As for the suits, they were before the court for a considerable time, but for some reason known only to the offended parties they had not up to then been definitely dealt with. Occasionally a move would be made on the part of the plaintiffs and there would appear in the Press throughout the State of New York paragraphs making some mention of these cases which would lead the non-intelligent readers to believe that Dr. So-and-so, the inventor of some great remedy, had gained a verdict of many thousands of dollars against *Collier's Weekly*. I regret very deeply that I have to refer to the advertising columns of the *West Australian*.

Mr. Lander: They ought to know better.

Mr. HEITMANN: It does surprise me that a paper of the standing of the *West Australian* should lower itself to the extent of accepting a few pounds—and after all it cannot be much more that they receive from these advertisements—for the publication of these announcements, which appear in two columns and which may be seen in this newspaper on any day of the week. I have cut out of one issue something like 15 inches of advertisements of the same nature as these which I will quote. Only to-day you will find that about a foot of cures for almost every disease, every ailment is advertised. There is "deafness, head noises, gathered ears, catarrh of middle ear treated by latest scientific treatment, mechano-therapy, no drugs, no operations." That is advertised by two different firms, so it must be a good treatment. The cost is only 5s. Here is another, "drunkenness positively cured by Dr. Shaw's anti-alcohol." To Shaw or his representative I will say here, and I will repeat on the public platform, that he is an absolute liar and a scoundrel. Then we have different diseases of women treated. We have *Homo Cura*, a new cure for hydatids. Then we have nasal catarrh, and catarrh of the stomach causing acute indigestion. Then we come to Pang Chong Fe, a Chinese herbalist. Then we have another individual, who in my opinion, should be in a different place from that

in which he is, in which case the public morals would not suffer to any great extent. I refer to an advertisement which appears in the *Daily News* from day to day. This individual advertises proprietary medicines "for skin and other diseases without the use of drugs that permanently injure the system." There is to be no delay, no humbug, the stuff is to be forwarded free of observation and strictly confidential. Dr. Scott's female pills, we are told in this advertisement, are safe, certain and reliable, 5s. per post. This gentleman has taken the place of one who used to keep the Red Cross Pharmacy, a gentleman who once expressed to me the highest possible sentiments in regard to this trade, a gentleman who read a copy of Beale's report borrowed from me, and who expressed horror of a trade of this description. Yet in the *Daily News* from day to day will be found his advertisements attractively written up, and always leading to the same thing. He is prepared to treat what are commonly known as private diseases. Gentleman who will treat these diseases should be placed within the four walls of a gaol. I appeal to the Press of Western Australia to rise above a trade of this description. I feel sure that if one newspaper was to begin in Western Australia others would soon follow. It only requires one leading newspaper in this State to start out on a campaign against these nostrums, and before very long, as has happened in America, hundreds of other newspapers would come to its assistance, and to a very great extent, the trade would disappear.

Mr. Lander: We will put the Labour paper on to them.

Mr. HEITMANN: Labour papers in various parts of the world, I am sorry to say, seem to have no greater appreciation of the importance of this question than have some other newspapers. It is said that certain standard remedies mentioned by me to-night are good, and for that reason we have no right to interfere with those medicines. I have stated in reply that there are certain exaggerations made which cannot be substantiated, and that some of these medicines are injurious and most of them are

positive frauds. I have also stated that there are certain advertised specifics, claiming to cure certain diseases, which scientific investigation and the medical profession have not yet discovered means of doing. Strange as it may be, the ignorance of the public generally allows them to be gulled by these advertisements. I have secured some of these patent medicines, and I desire to exhibit them to the House. I regret that I have not time to dilate on each of these medicines. One could go one for an hour on headache cures alone. In Beale's report the analyses of headache cures to the number of 29 are given, and in each of these the drug known as acetanilide is prominent. As a matter of fact it is a cheap drug. Acetanilide is something which is very rarely prescribed by the medical profession. It has a depressing effect on the heart. That is why some people believe it to be a cure for headaches and other ailments. Possibly for the time being, it does relieve the pain, but reports I have claim that there have been numerous deaths from the use of these headache cures, some of which contain about 10 grains of acetanilide to the pill. Some have been known to contain as much as 16 and 18 grains. I do not think there is any medical man in Perth who would prescribe more than three or four, or at the most five or six grains for an adult. It has cured headache, but it has a depressing effect, and in cases where death occurs it is as the result of the depressing effect of this particular drug on the heart. This is one of the greatest frauds ever put on the market, yet it is one of the most prominent on the market, and is known to almost every individual in the community. It is just as well known as those mentioned by another gentleman, and by reason of the danger in this as well as others, I say they should be thrown out.

Mr. Green: What about Burroughs Welcome's phenacetin?

Mr. HEITMANN: It is not good to be taken by every one indiscriminately, but phenacetin is not a patent medicine. You get the formula on the bottle, and I can show the hon. member quite a num-

ber of other medicines of Burroughs Welcome's which are not patent medicines, but simply proprietary lines, and which show the ingredients plainly to the public. That is the difference between secret remedies and the remedies of these reputable firms. Here is another line, which costs only 6s. 6d., and the 50 or 60 pillules are supposed to reduce fat. I would suggest that they try to get a testimonial from the member for Northam. Here is still another line to which I particularly wish to draw attention. They are small tabloids in some kind of a gelatine cover. I suppose it is the dynamite inside the glycerine, or in this case gelatine, and the directions are as follows:—

Adults should take two, or in very severe cases, three capsuloids before eating or with the first part of each meal, three times daily. The dose for younger persons is one or two with each meal. Capsuloids never cause constipation or indigestion, nor do they in any way upset the stomach or any part of the system.

From the directions one would be naturally led to the conclusion that this was an indigestion cure, but members will be pleased to hear that this is the latest invention for preventing hair from falling out or turning prematurely grey, and it is claimed to have the special virtue that it will not cause indigestion or constipation. Here is a medicine mentioned by another gentleman to the public of Western Australia, and he ridiculed the idea that the framers of these regulations should mention this medicine in support of the regulations. The hon. gentleman said that from inquiries he had made he found that Radam's Microbe Killer was not to be found in the State, but here is a bottle purchased only recently, and the agent is a very business-like man who is supposed to be doing a very fair business. This was put up by Radam some few years ago, when it was discovered that certain diseases were the result of micro-organisms, and he proclaimed to the world that every disease was the result of a micro-organism and said, "I have a medicine that will cure every known

disease." At the time when an outbreak of yellow fever occurred in America some few years ago, he made an offer to the Government to put up a guarantee of 10,000 dollars that he would kill every germ in his State. Of course the Government replied that they had no power to accept his deposit, and although he never cured a single case he received a good deal of kudos for his pluck and a tremendous advertisement, and that individual is now a very wealthy man. The medicine will kill nothing. It might kill germs if one were able to catch them and apply it to them, but I would advise members not to take this medicine because its principal ingredient is prussic acid. Wood's Great Peppermint Cure—This is a nostrum that proclaims to the world that it cures consumption. If only for that reason this medicine should be on the black list, and so far as I am concerned, it is on the black list. Here is a "pain paint"; it apparently imitates pain killer, and they claim also for it that it will cure everything—Asthma, burns, scalds, coughs and colds, colic and cramps, dyspepsia, diarrhoea, dysentery, deafness—the relation between dysentery and deafness is easily understood—earache, fever and ague, nervous headache, neuralgia, pleurisy, piles, rheumatism, sprains, bruises and toothache. I have two lines here which I would recommend to the notice of hon. members. They are put up by the well known firm of Towle—Pennyroyal and steel pills; one lot is just of the ordinary common or garden variety, and then there is another preparation put up by the same firm and labelled "special and extra strong." It is well known what these special pills for ladies are used for. Here is a catarrh cure, "Raffan's Catarrh Remedy." We find that almost every medicine is a cure for catarrh, whereas, as a matter of fact, catarrh is only a sign of some other disease. It is possible that certain of these medicines might alleviate catarrh in some of its forms, but it is not getting down to the root of the evil, and anyone who takes any particular medicine dealing with catarrh is misled and should not

build up hopes of recovery from the real cause of the trouble. Next I come to Chamberlain's cough remedy, a preparation that claims to cure incipient consumption, amongst a number of other diseases. The man who puts that up and says that he can cure consumption in any stage is a liar and a scoundrel, and his medicine should be banned from this State. Bonnington's Irish Moss is claimed to be a safe and reliable remedy for coughs, colds, asthma, whooping cough, bronchitis, influenza and all affections of the throat and lungs. There are not too many affections of the lungs that are not consumption; therefore, this gentleman also proclaims that he can cure consumption. Another preparation is Chamberlain's colic and diarrhoea remedy. A case was brought under my notice recently, the second in the last couple of years, of the drug habit having been created by the use of this particular remedy. These two cases came from Kalgoorlie. At the present time one of them, a young woman and the mother of two or three children, is the most pitiful case I have ever seen. Commencing in the first place to use this remedy in small doses, she has reached such a stage that in the near future she must either go to a lunatic asylum, or, if she is lucky and carefully treated in a good hospital, she may make a slow recovery. She had got to the stage that she would drink two or three bottles of this particular colic medicine per day, inventing all sorts of excuses to get the drug, and as a matter of fact she has become a confirmed user of this drug. This contains 108 parts per cent. of proof spirit; also two $\frac{3}{8}$ minims of chloroform, five $\frac{1}{8}$ minims of ether, $\frac{1}{64}$ grain of capsicine, and $\frac{3}{4}$ grain of opium in each teaspoonful. Hon. members will imagine what anyone would take in drinking two or three bottles a day: because 108 parts per cent. of proof spirit in reality means in the volume 54 per cent. of proof spirit. Another medicine I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to is Weston's Wizard Oil, and the outside cover is, I think, the champion advertising medium of

anything of this nature I have ever seen. The package on all four sides is almost wholly taken up with the names of diseases which it is supposed to cure. On the face of it, it is an absolute fraud and should be kept out of the State. Another innocent looking medicine is Congreve's Mixture, which claims to be a cure for consumption—another lie. I hold in my hand another medicine put up in a form known as Clarke's B41 pills. The number is intended to indicate what particular complaint it is claimed these pills will cure. About the worst thing that can overtake anyone suffering from disease is to get into the hands of a quack, or to use such nostrums as these. Anyone who endeavours to deal with the plague which the greatest scientists of the day are investigating with a view to eradicating and preventing it, should be exterminated. I come to the last of these remedies. The hon. gentleman who is the champion of the nostrum-mongers gave us the names of quite a number of patent medicines which are well known, and which he described as household remedies largely used, not only in places where people are beyond the reach of medical men and chemists, but in almost every home in the State. The hon. member said that owing to this fact we ought not to interfere with them. I want to bring under the notice of hon. members and the public the preparation under the well known name of Hearne. This man's productions are almost as well known in Australia as Beecham's pills. This large package of Hearne's remedies, which I hold in my hand, was purchased from one of the firms, the representative of which stated in the public Press a few months ago, "I know there are certain illicit dealings in these drugs, I know there are certain patent medicines which are frauds, but firms of the standing of the one I represent would not think of entering into this business." This package was purchased from a wholesale firm and the label states—

Hearne's course of medicine for consumption, consisting of one bottle each bronchitis cure 1A small, bron-

chitis cure 1b large, liniment A, No. 6 medicine, No. 21 medicine, and No. 34 medicine.

Hearne evidently goes to the extent of having medicines up to the number of 34, thus trying to lead people to believe that there is such a fineness of distinction in their preparation. This man claims that he can cure consumption. Would anyone say that this man should be allowed to indiscriminately dose the public with these nostrums? He states that full instructions are given and among other things the instructions say "Continue the medicine until you are getting stronger, until the night sweats disappear, until your appetite improves, until the expectoration ceases," when, I presume, the sufferer is to discontinue. Poor, unfortunate patients, and I have seen scores of them, suffering from this terrible disease, who would be only too ready to grasp at any straw. I know of one individual in the Coolgardie sanatorium who told the doctor that he wanted a certain advertised remedy. It was one of the alleged recent discoveries and this man actually left the hospital because his friends had purchased some of this tuberculine and because the doctor, knowing that it was valueless, refused to administer it. This demonstrates the extraordinary readiness on the part of patients to grasp at any straw.

The Minister for Mines: In despair.

Mr. HEITMANN: Yes; one can imagine the wife and children of a patient, running across a line like Hearne's supposed cures, even foregoing the necessities of life in order to get husband or father cured. Yet this man Hearne, I suppose, is an honoured citizen of one of the suburbs of Melbourne. I suppose he is looked upon as a keen business man, a clever individual, going to church every Sunday, and a good man. I cannot find words to express my opinion of a scoundrel of this kind. I believe that a man who would trade upon the feelings of one suffering from this and other diseases, who would put up medicine of this description knowing that it has no curative value, and who would receive the money of the stricken, the

poor and the dying, such an individual, I say, would sell his own wife or daughter.

Mr. Lander: He is worse than that.

Mr. HEITMANN: The man is not fit to live who would trade upon people in this way. I have finished with this matter for the time being. I hope that members of this Chamber, in spite of any promise that has been given, and in spite of any motion carried in another place, will remember the statements I have made that the majority of the people dealing in this trade are scoundrels and have been designated by Mr. Adams in *Collier's Weekly* as liars, rogues, scoundrels, adulterators, abortionists, and murderers.

Mr. Lander: So they are.

Mr. HEITMANN: I ask that in consideration of the people themselves, in consideration of the people who have made these things popular, who have purchased them and who have used them, that we should carry the motion and retain the regulation which insists upon the Health Department knowing what is being sold to the people.

12 o'clock midnight.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	9
				—
Majority for				9
				—

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Foley	Mr. Muusse
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Gill	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Lander	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDonald	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Heitmann
	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Collier	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

House adjourned at 12.5 a.m. (Thursday).