

Clause 2—Sums available for purposes voted by the Legislative Assembly:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest that the Chief Secretary should consult with his colleagues as to whether the words "the Legislative Assembly" could be deleted, and the word "Parliament" inserted in lieu thereof. I merely raise this point.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.14]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next.

There is nothing on the Notice Paper to warrant my asking the House to meet to-morrow. In the case of the Education Bill, there is only one clause to consider. Besides the Permanent Reserve (King's Park) Bill, in which Mr. Lovekin is interested, there is the Navigation Act Amendment Bill, which requires further consideration and which we are not yet ready to submit.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 12th September, 1928.

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat transported	691
Fremantle Harbour development	691
Crematoria	692
Auditor General's Report	692
Leave of absence	692
Bills: Group Settlement Act Amendment, 1A.	692
Supply (No. 2), £1,250,000, all stages	692
Fertilisers, 2A.	696
City of Perth Superannuation Fund, 2A.	710
Dog Act Amendment, 2A., Com.	711
Police Offences (Drugs), 2A.	720
Supply (No. 2), £1,250,000 returned	722
Motions: Fremantle Harbour development	696
Physical well-being	716

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

QUESTION—WHEAT. TRANSPORTED.

Mr. LINDSAY asked the Minister for Railways: What quantity of wheat was transported over the railways during the year 1927-28, giving each month separately, (a) to ports, (b) to mills?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The approximate total of wheat transported for the year ended 30th June, 1928, was 10,130,000 bags. The approximate figures to port and mills were—

	Ports.	Mills.
July	500,000	270,000
August	240,000	140,000
September	120,000	25,000
October	15,000	Nil
November	100,000	12,000
December	1,029,000	123,000
January	1,651,000	220,000
February	1,110,000	150,000
March	1,029,000	220,000
April	920,000	310,000
May	780,000	190,000
June	770,000	140,000
	<hr/> 8,264,000	<hr/> 1,800,000

The difference between the total to ports and mills and that for the whole year, as per annual report, is accounted for by wheat sent from station to station, i.e., to other than ports or mills.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Works: Is it his intention to lay on the Table of the House for the information of members, the papers containing the scheme

submitted by Mr. Stevens to the Fremantle Harbour Board for extensions to the harbour, also the latest comments of the Harbour Trust Commissioners, and their reply to Mr. Stileman's scheme, and the pilots' reply to Mr. Stileman's statement?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: For the reason that the Government cannot give serious consideration to the opinions of a man who has had only a clerical training, in regard to proposals submitted by a highly qualified engineer, it is considered that no good purpose could be served by laying the papers referred to on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—CREMATORIA.

Mr. NORTH asked the Premier: Are the Government aware that crematoria are in operation in certain other States of the Commonwealth? 2, Since the need has been expressed locally, will he initiate legislation on similar lines?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Not at the present juncture.

QUESTION—AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Premier: Will he ascertain from the Auditor General whether his annual report can be placed upon the Table of the House, so that members may be in a position to give due consideration to the Estimates when submitted?

The PREMIER replied: The Auditor General anticipates that his report will not be ready before the middle of October at the earliest.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Panton, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Wilson (Collie) on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—GROUP SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

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

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,250,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER
(Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.37]: I move—

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

Question put and passed.

Message.

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

In Committee of Supply.

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

The PREMIER: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the service of the year ending 30th June, 1929, a sum not exceeding £1,250,000.

This is the usual Supply Bill brought down at this period of the year, and I am asking supply for two months—that is, for September and October—and the estimated expenditure is based on the actual expenditure for the corresponding months of last year. I am hoping that the Budget will be down next week, and then, naturally, the whole financial position will be open to discussion.

Mr. THOMSON: I shall not oppose the granting of Supply requested by the Premier, but I must own I am extremely disappointed and dissatisfied with the reply which he has given to-day regarding the presentation of the Auditor-General's report. Allegedly the House is in control of the finances of this State, and yet we are asked to vote large sums of money while knowing practically nothing of the financial position. I am not in any way blaming the present Administration for the situation, which has existed for a number of years—at all events, ever since the year in which I entered Parliament, 1914. I am more than ever convinced that for the benefit of the State we should have a public works committee and a public accounts committee. The Premier says the Budget will be presented next week, and thus we shall pro-

bably find ourselves in the position of having passed the Estimates before the Auditor-General's report, which alone gives us an opportunity to check the finances, has come into our possession. If such a state of affairs existed in a company, the directors would be severely reprimanded by the shareholders. If the Auditor-General's present staff is not such as to enable him to supply the House, whose servant he is, with his report at an earlier date than the middle of October, the financial year having ended on the 30th June, it is time there was a re-assortment, if I may use that term, in the Auditor-General's Department. That department should be informed that the House intends to see that members get that to which they are justly entitled. The Auditor-General's report affords the only means of giving close scrutiny to the finances. The Leader of the Opposition, when dealing with the previous Supply Bill, raised certain points arising out of the last report of the Auditor-General. I also raised one or two. A careful perusal of the Premier's speech on the subject has not disclosed to me his replies to those questions. This being the only opportunity of voicing my opinion in regard to the non-supply of the Auditor-General's report, I protest strongly against the position in which we are placed year after year through not having the report presented to us earlier. I believe that in other Australian Parliaments it is the custom to submit the Auditor-General's report conjointly with the Estimates, members thus being enabled to digest and scrutinise the items of expenditure in a proper manner.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There can be no reasonable opposition to the motion moved by the Premier. It is quite the usual thing. Moreover, I was indeed pleased to hear the answer given by the hon. gentleman this afternoon, that in all probability the Auditor-General's report will be presented to Parliament by the middle of next month. That being so, I shall not avail myself of the motion for the purpose of passing any strictures on the Auditor-General or his department. We have not had the report at an earlier stage of the session since I have been in Parliament. If the Auditor-General can contrive to keep that promise, the report will, in effect, be available simultaneously with the Estimates; and that will be quite satisfactory to me, as we shall

not be dealing with the finances until the Budget has been delivered by the Treasurer. Then the Auditor-General's report will be of great value to members in following the Treasurer's Budget Speech and subsequently dealing with the Estimates. The vote we are asked to pass to-day is to carry on the Government until the Estimates are through, or alternatively for as long as possible.

The PREMIER: I hope the Committee clearly understands that the complaint voiced by the member for Katanning is against the Auditor-General.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, quite.

The PREMIER: It amounts almost to a censure on the Auditor-General. Although it may be very easy to speak of what private companies do, surely the hon. member realises that there is a great difference between carrying out an audit of the whole of the public accounts of the State, and the work imposed by any private company.

Mr. Thomson: Do you not have a monthly balance, the same as any other firm?

The PREMIER: It is a very unreliable balance, that monthly balance, as probably the hon. member will know from the financial statements published from month to month.

Mr. Thomson: At times they are difficult to understand.

The PREMIER: But I do not think the delay, if there is any delay, in presenting the Auditor-General's report is in any way due to insufficient staff. No complaints in that direction have been made to me, nor has there been any request for an increase in the staff.

Mr. Thomson: In other States the Auditor-General's report comes down with the Estimates.

The PREMIER: I do not know about that. Anyhow, there must be some good reason for the system in this State. Never since I have been in the House has the Auditor-General's report been available when the Budget was delivered, and frequently it has been close to the end of the session when that report has come down.

Mr. Thomson: It would be of great value if we had it here when the Budget is delivered.

The PREMIER: I doubt it. I have sat in the House and listened to members reading extracts from the Auditor-General's report, and I confess they have not been

able to throw any additional light on the finances as the result of information supplied in that report.

Mr. THOMSON: The same thing applies to the Estimates. If we propose to reduce an item by ten per cent., there are always adequate reasons given why it should not be done.

The PREMIER: There are explanations for all these points. Most of them are but small points which the Auditor General has to make, and are of small consequence in the financial affairs of the State. No doubt the Auditor General will take notice of the remarks made by the member for Katanning, but I am not prepared to say the Auditor General is in any way blameworthy because his report is not ready as early as the hon. member would like to have it.

Mr. MANN: I would not have spoken but for the interpretation the Treasurer has put upon the remarks made by the member for Katanning. The Treasurer says they amounted almost to censure on the Auditor-General. It is all very well for us to criticise the Auditor-General and his department, when probably we know little or nothing about the work he has to do in preparing his report.

The Premier: Much of that work cannot be approached until the financial year has closed.

Mr. MANN: I am coming to that. The financial year does not close until the 10th or 12th July. Then, in addition to dealing with State departments, the Auditor General has to deal with sub-departments, such as the Perth Hospital and other institutions. From my knowledge as a Government servant for many years, I know there are delays over which the Auditor General has no control. I should say that 10 or 12 weeks is a fair and reasonable time to be occupied by the preparation of his report. If he does it in that time he is doing very well. It would not have been fair if the hon. member's remarks had been allowed to go as a censure, as the Treasurer says, on the Auditor General, and no other member had got up to defend that official.

The Premier: I have not said he was deserving of censure.

Mr. MANN: No, but the Treasurer drew attention to the fact that the remarks of the member for Katanning amounted to censure, and so I felt it my duty to explain some of the difficulties confronting the Auditor General.

The Premier: I said that personally I did not hold the Auditor General blame-worthy.

Mr. MANN: Yes, that is so, and I am endeavouring to show that he is not blame-worthy.

Mr. THOMSON: While my remarks may be construed as a vote of censure on the Auditor General, my criticism was really directed at the existing system.

Hon. G. Taylor: You did not make that clear.

Mr. THOMSON: Well I will make it clear now. The man responsible for that system, I take it, is the Auditor General. If he is not able to prepare his report in a reasonable time, he should take such steps as will provide the House in good time with the information to which we are entitled. I am not casting any reflection on the gentleman occupying the position of Auditor General. We receive a monthly statement—

The Premier: Who does?

Mr. THOMSON: The State does. I mean the monthly financial statement that appears in the Press.

The Premier: That is not a monthly statement to the House.

Mr. THOMSON: Indirectly it is. It is a monthly statement to the people.

The Premier: It does not purport to cover the whole of the finances.

Mr. THOMSON: It shows the monthly progress of the State. In my private business I have submitted to me a monthly statement of my affairs. If the affairs of the State are run on proper lines, then in less than six weeks after the books are closed we should have the Auditor General's report. But the existing system, like many other systems, is an unfortunate one, although certainly it has been most acceptable to succeeding Treasurers.

The Premier: It makes no difference to the Treasurer.

Mr. THOMSON: Oh yes, it does.

The Premier: Do you suggest collusion between the Treasurer and the Auditor General?

Mr. THOMSON: No. It is remarkable how ready some members are to twist what one may say.

The Premier: I have never spoken to the Auditor General in my life. I do not know the man.

Mr. THOMSON: The system in existence is very suitable to successive Treasurers.

surers. Why? Because they get their Estimates through the House, and members are not in a position to discuss them. When my financial position is placed before me—

The Premier: Are you comparing your financial position with the financial position of the State?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes.

Mr. Marshall: Each shows a deficit.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not in any way casting a reflection on the Government or on the gentleman occupying the position of Auditor General, but I say it is time we altered the existing system, and that this House in reasonable time each session should be in possession of the balance sheet certified by the Auditor General. In his report he unfailingly points to various deflections.

Hon. G. Taylor: We never do anything because of it.

Mr. THOMSON: This House is supposed to have control of the finances of the State. I say emphatically the House has not control of the finances of the State.

The Premier: And a good thing for the country that it has not; for you always want about 20 millions more than I can find.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing, not with that phase, but with the money that has been spent. The member for Perth defended the Auditor General. But I am not attacking the Auditor General personally. What I am attacking is the existing system. It is time that system was amended.

Mr. ANGELO: The question that suggests itself to me is, do we want an Auditor General or not?

Mr. Marshall: You badly want one in the P.P.A. Bank.

Mr. ANGELO: If we have an Auditor General, what can he require?

Mr. Teesdale: Boodle!

Mr. ANGELO: It has been suggested what one or two big institutions do. Their shareholders do not meet to allocate their financial outgoings for the following year, do not declare a dividend until they have an auditor's report. The directors of big companies are not always regarded as highly honourable men, but no shareholder would suggest collusion between a director and an auditor. Sometimes there may be, but as a rule there is no reflection of that kind. The reason why a big company is able to have an auditor's report for the shareholders

within a few weeks of the closing of the books is because it has a continuous audit. I suggest that if necessary the Auditor General should be given an extra staff, and should be requested to keep a continuous audit all the year round.

The Premier: Who is to make the request?

Mr. ANGELO: The House. Let it be done by motion. The Auditor General could be asked to keep a continuous audit, which would enable him to have his report on the Table of the House by the end of August in each year. We are going to be asked next week to consider the Budget and the Estimates. It is about 14 weeks after the closing of the books, yet we shall not be in a position to be satisfied that everything is in order. The Treasurer does not go into every single penny of the finances. In any case, he or his Ministers may not be at fault. It may be an official that has made a mistake. We should be in a position to know that financially everything is above board before we make the allocations for the coming year. I suggest that, later on, some member moves that the Auditor General be asked to maintain a continuous audit, and that his report shall be available to the House before the end of August in each year.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I hope the speech made by the member for Gascoyne will not convey to the Committee that the Auditor General does not enter upon his audit of the books until after they are closed in July. Actually his audit runs from January to January.

The Premier: It is continuous all the year.

Mr. Angelo: Then his report ought to be ready by the end of August.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Nobody is more anxious than am I to see his report on the Table at an early date. Still I am not going to pass strictures on the Auditor General. His report, we are told, will be here by the middle of October, and I do not suppose the Estimates will be through before that date. I hope the Committee will not run away with the idea that the Auditor General does not conduct a continuous audit at present. It is carried on throughout the year.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Committee of Ways and Means.

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

On motion by the Premier, resolved—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1929, a sum not exceeding £850,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £350,000 from moneys to credit of the General Loan Fund, and £50,000 from the Government Property Sales Fund.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Bill introduced, etc.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, passed through all stages and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FERTILISERS.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Debate resumed from the 5th September on the following motion by Mr. Thomson (Katanning)—

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

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [5.10]: In view of the fact that the hon. member who moved the motion dealt with a good deal of the criticism that has been levelled against the Engineer-in-Chief's scheme, I propose first of all to answer that criticism before declaring the attitude of the Government to the motion itself. It has become a common phrase to class this scheme as a one-man scheme. The view put forward by the mover of the motion and by Press correspondents, too, is that the scheme of the Engineer-in-Chief is a one-man scheme:

that the proposals put up by Sir George Buchanan represent a one-man scheme and that with the two engineers differing, someone should decide between them. Let me say at the outset that the scheme now before us is not a one-man scheme. Although it bears the imprint of Mr. Stileman, as Engineer-in-Chief, and he takes the responsibility for it, he has a staff of engineers in the Public Works Department whom he has been able to consult and whom he has not failed to consult regarding their particular branches of the proposition. Mr. Young, the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers, has been constantly with Mr. Stileman during the whole of the preparation of the scheme, and he is a man of wide experience of harbour construction in other parts of the world and came here with a big reputation. The Engineer for Railway Construction has also been consulted, and he is a man of wide experience of bridge construction as well. The other engineers and expert advisers have been called in to consult with Mr. Stileman whenever he deemed their services desirable. In addition, Mr. Stileman has not failed to consult the engineers of the Working Railways, and the Commissioner of Railways also. Conferences have been held, and the opinions of those engineers have been obtained, so that this scheme is really the outcome of an exchange of ideas and views held by the engineers in those two departments. I wish the House clearly to understand that while I am dealing with the criticism levelled at the Engineer-in-Chief's scheme, I shall be giving the views of the Engineer-in-Chief. I shall not presume to submit my opinion as a layman on engineering proposals; the views I put forward will be those given to me by the Engineer-in-Chief himself. The first objection raised to Mr. Stileman's proposal is that he does not propose to extend the harbour far enough up the river, that he differs from Sir George Buchanan who proposed to extend the harbour upstream nearly as far as Blackwall Reach, while Mr. Stileman proposes to limit the up-river scheme to a distance of approximately 1,000 feet above the bridge. Mr. Stileman has given his reasons for disagreeing with Sir George Buchanan, and I think those reasons can conveniently be classed under three headings: firstly, the tidal effect on the Perth waters; secondly, the uneconomical working of such a harbour; and thirdly, the diffi-

culty of railway approaches. Dealing with the first reason, that of tidal levels, I wish to emphasise that Mr. Stileman is the first engineer to direct attention to the effect that the up-river extension of the harbour would have on the tidal levels of the Perth waters. Of all the experts who have previously examined the harbour scheme, no one has left a record of having considered that phase of the proposal at all, and apparently it was unobserved by all of them. Sir George Buchanan says, in his letter to the Press, he is prepared to prove that the proposed works would not affect, to any appreciable extent, the water levels at Perth. It is difficult to know how he can prove that. The only way he can do so is to carry out the work. How else could it be proved?

Mr. Davy: That is the only way you can prove the other contention.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think so. I am going to cite what has happened elsewhere. That can be taken as some guide, if not an absolute proof, of what is likely to happen here.

Mr. North: Did the original harbour affect the water level of the river?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The Engineer-in-Chief has pointed that out. He says that the obstructions in the river between the top bridge and Blackwall Reach govern the water levels in Perth. It is the removal of the blockage that now occurs in the river that would have a tidal effect upon the waters between Fremantle and Perth. Sir George Buchanan's scheme would bring that about. The Engineer-in-Chief says it is a recognised principle of hydraulics that when the levels of high water in tidal rivers at their upper end are lower than the levels at the mouth some miles away, some obstruction in the river beds, or because of the banks of the river, is indicated. The department has records of the levels of the Swan River over a number of years. Mr. Stileman has directed my attention to this matter, as disclosed by the figures. He points out that the levels taken at Guildford show that the water level there is lower than the water level at the Causeway. One would imagine from this that instead of the river running down to Fremantle, it runs back to Guildford. The water level at the Bunbury Bridge again is lower than the water level at the Causeway. The Engineer-in-Chief points out that where this sort of thing occurs we

can look for some obstruction either in the bed of the river or along the banks of the river. The obstruction in this case is at the Causeway. Mr. Stileman says that when the work at the Causeway is completed, it will have a big effect on the present flooding at Guildford, because the water will be able to get away when the obstruction is removed. I would draw attention to what has happened elsewhere, as this will afford some guide as to what is likely to happen here. The work done on the Clyde, 20 miles from Glasgow, has resulted in a gradual lowering of the level of the waters by 10 feet since 1873. The Harbour Board there have taken vigorous measures to deepen the river in the lower reaches, and the effect of the work carried out since then has been to lower the low-water level at Glasgow by 2 feet, and raise the high-water level at spring tide by 1ft. 8in. On the Tyne at Newcastle the low-water level has been reduced by 3ft. 6in. by the deepening of the river lower down. In the Thames the low-water level at London Bridge has been lowered 4 feet for the same reason. In the Penn district in England there are numerous records of changes in the high-water levels in the higher regions due to the removal of obstructions in the lower reaches. In the case of the Thames the records are available over a period of nearly three centuries. The highest tidal record at Westminster Bridge, 50 miles up the river, and 2½ miles above the Tower Bridge, shows 15ft. 10in. in 1663. That record was not beaten for nearly 211 years, namely, until 1874. The records since then have been beaten three times, in 1875 by a level of 17ft. 3in., in 1881 by a level of 17ft. 6in., and in 1927 by a level of 18ft. 5in. At Hammersmith, four miles higher up than Westminster Bridge, for 10 years the average tidal levels have been, from 1898 to 1907, 11ft. 8in., from 1908 to 1917, 12ft., and from 1918 to 1927, 12ft. 2in. The flood protection works from the Thames, originally built for a level of 17ft. 6in. in 1881, have been increased to a height of 18ft. In 1881, and last year, that proved to be totally inadequate. I suppose the member for Roebourne saw the same sight as I did when the Thames was flooded last year. The water ran past the Tate Gallery, past the Horseferry-road, the headquarters of the Australian troops, and right back through that end of London. I was there while surveys were being made of the foundations of the Tate Gallery. The

authorities were afraid they were seriously injured by the flood. The whole of that area was covered with water. Walls were washed away, and sandbags were put in place of them. Most of the houses in the district were inundated. That was because the flood levels had altered. The figures I have quoted were got out by the Commission appointed by the Government to inquire into the reasons for the alteration in the flood levels. This Commission has issued a preliminary report, and the figures are taken from that source. They say that the increase in the flood levels is due to the river improvements at the mouth of the Thames, thus facilitating the up-stream running of the tidal waters. They go on to say that the more improvements that are effected at the mouth of the river, the greater will be the effect up river. The place I am speaking of is 50 miles away from the work that is going on.

Mr. Angelo: What is the rise and fall at the mouth of the Thames as compared with the mouth of the Swan?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Stileman has given the figures. No one has argued that the rise and fall of the waters in Perth will be the same as in the case of London. The rise and fall in the tide at Fremantle varies between 5ft. and 6ft. Mr. Stileman has reckoned out what will be the effect upon the rise and fall in Perth.

Mr. Angelo: You do not know the rise and fall at the mouth of the Thames?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is a matter of working out the difference of the rise and fall at Fremantle as compared with the rise and fall at the mouth of the Thames. The engineers worked it out.

Mr. Davy: We have built our city on the basis of one rise and fall.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: All the approaches to the river, and the levels along the Esplanade, have been constructed on the basis of the existing levels. If the levels are increased according to the figures put up by Mr. Stileman, it will mean that a lot of this reclaimed ground will be flooded, because the low level will be lower and the high levels will be higher.

Mr. Thomson: Would that area be flooded immediately?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am speaking of high-water level. It has been pointed out that the River Seine at low-water level has been lowered 2ft. 6in. In

the face of all this evidence, Sir George Buchanan says he can prove that this will not happen in Perth. I do not know how he can prove that. Here are the records and official documents of what has occurred in other countries.

The Premier: He may prove it by criticising our railway system.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is most fortunate that Mr. Stileman has called attention to this phase of the matter before the work is put in hand. No other engineer has called attention to it. There is nothing more unsightly than to see muddy, dirty banks in a river, where there is a big rise and fall, particularly where we have such beautiful natural banks as we have on the Swan River. To increase the rise and fall would make our river frontages unsightly.

Mr. Thomson: Was there any appreciable increase in the levels when the bar was removed?

Mr. Davy: We do not know that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think the records are available. Mr. Stileman has pointed out the position that governs the rise and fall of the tide as lying between the upper bridge and Blackwall Reach. That is where the blockage is. If that is removed, the trouble will occur.

Mr. Thomson: Was there any difference in the levels when the bar was removed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think there was an appreciable difference.

Mr. Davy: It would not have been so apparent if there had been; the banks of the river were not grassed then.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Esplanade was then a backwash, or a swamp. That is the first reason given by Mr. Stileman for rejecting the proposal to go up as far as Sir George Buchanan recommends.

Mr. Lindsay: It is remarkable that no other engineers found that out.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If they did examine the question, they have put nothing on record. It is all on record now, and is made a feature of the case. The next point is the uneconomical working of a harbour which would extend for $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles in length, and only be accessible from one side or the other at the extreme end. That would mean, Mr. Stileman points out, practically two independent harbours. Rail and road traffic which desired to communicate with one side of the harbour or the other would have to travel practically six miles

in order to do so. He pointed out that would create a position similar to that existing between Liverpool and Birkenhead. In order to overcome that difficulty the port authorities there are now constructing a tunnel under the river at a cost of £5,000,000. They found the other system so expensive to work and so uneconomical to manage, that they are spending this large sum of money on this new work, thus obviating the necessity for having a long narrow harbour such as is suggested by Sir George Buchanan. The bridge recommended by that engineer is near Blackwall Reach. Mr. Stileman proposes that it shall be at Point Brown. From there on to Blackwall Reach, either on one side of the river or the other, the banks are high and steep. Up to the point where Mr. Stileman goes the banks are fairly flat and level. Beyond that point, either on one side of the river or the other, the banks are precipitous and continue in that form for a considerable distance on both sides. If a railway had to cross the river at the place indicated by Sir George Buchanan, before traffic could get to the wharf level it would have to go down to North Fremantle. The train would then have to travel back beside the river, along the wharf front.

Mr. Thomson: There is railway access now where the present bridge is.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Stileman proposes to go a thousand feet above the present bridge.

Mr. Thomson: You would not remove the present railway bridge from North Fremantle?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have explained that road and railway traffic would have to go round North Fremantle and come back again to Blackwall Reach if Sir George Buchanan's proposal were adopted.

Mr. Thomson: It is as broad as it is long.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not only would it mean that the railway would have to go to North Fremantle and that traffic would have to come up the side of the river in order to reach the wharves, but all cargo unloaded on the north side of the river would have to do the journey the reverse way. That is what it would mean. Not only would it make for uneconomical working, but it would have the effect of blocking the activities on the wharf.

I was listening the other morning, when we toured the waterfront at North Fremantle, to Mr. Stileman explaining to the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) how awkward it was to work one berth on the North Wharf because if a rake of trucks were drawn up there, it would be impossible to get past.

Mr. Thomson: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That would be the position along the whole of the quay if we were to construct the longer harbour suggested. It would mean tremendous earthworks and huge expenditure, not only in connection with land resumptions but with other work that would be necessary to complete such a scheme. It would be very expensive construction work indeed. Mr. Stileman holds that economical operations for quick dispatch would not be possible under such conditions. The complaint now is that the Fremantle harbour on either side is too straight. I will deal with modern wharf construction directly. It is pointed out that great difficulty is experienced now in connection with the railway facilities at the different berths. It further means that railway access to the north is possible only from the North Fremantle end; there could be no means of access from the Perth end at all. It would mean that we would have to go into North Fremantle and then come back again along the foreshore. I want to point out further that the full accommodation that Sir George Buchanan's scheme provided is approximately half that which Sydney has at present, and he made no provision for any shipping accommodation beyond that. Sir George Buchanan does not say in his scheme what is going to happen when the State reaches a stage at which the accommodation he proposes is fully utilised. He does not seem to have any idea that Western Australia will ever require anything more than approximately half the existing accommodation available at Sydney! I do not think any hon. member would subscribe to the idea that the greatest developments we can look forward to in Western Australia are such that we will not require more than half the wharfage accommodation that Sydney has at the present time. Yet, beyond that, Sir George Buchanan has made no provision whatever! On the other hand, Mr. Stileman's proposal permits of unlimited extensions.

Mr. Thomson: Along the foreshore?
 The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Over the whole harbour.

The Premier: There is the ocean, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I wish to make the point clear that I am, generally speaking, giving evidence that is supplementary to the printed report that Mr. Stileman has already made available. I take it that every hon. member has carefully read Mr. Stileman's printed report, and while I may, to a certain extent, have to duplicate the information he made available, the facts I am presenting are to be taken as additional to those the Engineer-in-Chief has submitted. It is on the whole of these facts that Mr. Stileman has decided it is unsafe to go further up-river than the spot he recommends for the site of the bridge. The next point of criticism is that in the up-river portion of Mr. Stileman's proposals, he has not allowed sufficient width and depth. At the present time the Fremantle harbour is 1,400 feet wide, and has a depth of 36 feet. Regarding the further additions up to the site of the bridge, Mr. Stileman proposes to gradually work down from a width of 1,400 feet to approximately 800 or 900 feet and he proposes to limit the depth at the upper end of the harbour extension to 32 feet as against the existing 36 feet. The original idea was that the Fremantle harbour should be constructed with 1,000 feet clear. A complaint was received from the Orient Steam Navigation Company, whose officials said that the company would not use the Fremantle harbour unless they were provided with a jetty on the north side. They suggested at that time that if their vessels berthed at Victoria Quay, it would not be possible to get them away if a north-west wind was blowing. To induce the Orient Company to make use of the Fremantle harbour a jetty 400 feet long was constructed on the north side for the use of that company. That jetty was never used by the Orient Company; it was not found necessary to make use of it at all! That jetty was ultimately taken away, and that has given the 1,400ft. clear that is available at present. Mr. Stileman holds that to provide accommodation for larger vessels than have been regularly using the harbour, is wasteful and extravagant. It is on that point that he differs from the Commissioners of the Fremantle Harbour Trust,

who are pressing for a width of 1,400ft. to be continued throughout the whole length of the extensions, and for a uniform depth of 36ft. to be maintained. The Harbour Trust Commissioners do that in face of the fact that not 7 per cent. of the vessels entering the port draw 29ft. and not 1 per cent. of the vessels afloat draw 30ft.! Despite that, they ask for a depth of 36ft. all over the harbour!

The Premier: For every berth!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, for every berth.

Mr. Davy: I suppose a safety margin is necessary.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, I am allowing for that.

The Premier: A couple of feet are required.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To ask, in the face of these facts, that Parliament shall impose upon the taxpayers of the State the cost of providing such a width and depth for the Fremantle harbour, is wrong. As Mr. Stileman suggests, such an expenditure would be wasteful and extravagant. Mr. Stileman is of the opinion that the requirements of the harbour will be fulfilled if the entrance channel is deep enough for the largest vessels that enter, if the number of berths having the full depth is sufficient for the greatest number of such vessels likely to be in port at one time, and if there is room for the vessels to turn.

The Premier: Obviously that is all that is required.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is the basis Mr. Stileman lays down, and he says that anything else will be extravagant. I do not know whether hon. members are aware what they have suggested really means. Did they see the coastal steamer "Eucla" tied up at the wharf? That small vessel is to have 36ft. of water. When the State's small motor ship "Kybra" berths at Victoria Quay, she is to have 36ft. of water. All the small coastal vessels that tie up there are to have 36ft. of water.

The Premier: And the "Lady Forrest" must have it, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Even the coal hulks will have it.

The Premier: Of course that provision is really to enable submarines to get underneath the boats!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The idea the Engineer-in-Chief has when he

proposes to narrow the extensions up-river from 1,400ft. to between 800 and 900ft., and to decrease the depth to 32ft., is that that section shall be used by the smaller vessels, thus still leaving two-thirds of the harbour to provide accommodation for the larger vessels. That is a complete answer to the criticism of hon. members.

Mr. Mann: What is the depth of the harbour where the s.s. "Ulysses" went aground?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: She went aground outside the harbour.

The Premier: Yes, she struck a rock just outside.

Mr. Thomson: But she was in the channel.

The Premier: No. She went aground outside the channel, and the officer concerned was disgraced.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Stileman reports that the policy of providing sufficient width at every berth for vessels to turn is out of date, as it has been found that the furnishing of such provisions is thoroughly uneconomical. He says no such space is provided in modern harbour construction and that it is totally unnecessary and uneconomical. Yet the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners and the pilots want that provision made at Fremantle! My attention has been directed to the fact that in connection with every such scheme of harbour construction, the pilots in particular have always sought ample facilities at the entrances and have always urged extreme views. In a way we cannot blame them for adopting that attitude, but that is what pilots have done when such propositions have been discussed. I wish again to refer to the position to be found elsewhere, because that is what must guide us in what we do at Fremantle. At Southampton, where the largest steamers afloat are handled weekly, the waterway is only 400ft. wide and 1,600ft. long. The vessels proceed to an upper berth while the lower berths are occupied, and the waterway available for the passage is less than 200ft. The boats that are handled there include the "Majestic," which is 916ft. long and 100ft. wide, the "Berringarra," which is 814ft. long and 98ft. wide, and the "Olympic," which is 813ft. long and 93ft. wide. Those vessels proceed up-river where a width of 200ft. only is available for passage way!

Mr. Thomson: Where do those vessels turn?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They back out into Southampton waters to turn.

Mr. Thomson: I would not like to back out a ship from the Fremantle harbour.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why?

Mr. Thomson: It would be a long back.

The Premier: Nothing to compare with the back-out from Rocky Bay.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I want to impress upon hon. members what their proposals would mean from the standpoint of expenditure, if we were to provide the turning space desired and the depth of water suggested at every berth. I want to show them what it will mean to the people of this State. If the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners are listened to, our money is to go in the direction of providing water space, and there will be very little left for accommodation.

Mr. Thomson: We want both.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If we listen to the Commissioners there will not be adequate space for the accommodation of vessels.

The Premier: We do not require more than is necessary.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What is necessary is required; more than that is merely extravagance. What we require to decide is what is necessary to cope with the shipping trade of the port.

Mr. Thomson: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A dock, such as the one I have referred to at Southampton, gives 3,600ft. of quay with a water area of 14¾ acres. At Fremantle, if we provide the width of 1,400ft. that is pressed for, the same harbour area will give a little more than a quarter of the quay length. It will give 904ft. as against 3,600ft. Fancy asking the people of this State to agree to involving themselves in all that expense to deal with the shipping at Fremantle; when that is the experience of Southampton where the largest boats in the world are handled and where they have four times the wharfage accommodation with a similar water space! The biggest boats that make use of Fremantle to-day have a tonnage of 22,000, whereas the big boats using Southampton have a tonnage of 45,000. The Commissioners of the Fremantle Harbour Trust seem to have lost all sense of financial responsibility when they make such a proposal.

Mr. Marshall: Our people seem to have a snug job compared with that of the Southampton officials.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. When I read those figures, they appeared to me absolutely startling. Western Australia is certainly not in a position to afford the expensive luxury the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners suggest. I do not think there is any argument at all in the providing of a maximum width and a maximum depth for every vessel that comes into the harbour, and yet that is the case that the Fremantle Harbour Trust has put up. The next point is the harbour extension to the north. That has been inaccurately described as an outer harbour. There is no doubt about it that it is quite uncanny to read the arguments that were used at the time the present Fremantle harbour was being constructed, arguments against the proposals that were then advanced, and compare them with the arguments that are being used at the present time against the extension to the north as suggested by Mr. Stileman. As I said, it is quite uncanny to notice the similarity of the opposition. At that time catastrophes were predicted and again to-day fear is expressed in a similar direction. Yet we find that nothing whatever has occurred. It appears to me that the same people are behind the present-day opposition as were behind the opposition that was advanced against the late Mr. O'Connor's scheme. Personally, as a layman, my inclinations were always towards an up-river scheme. But after discussions and having all the facts put before me, I came to the conclusion that a layman was a very rash individual indeed if he staked his opinion against the facts and figures submitted to him by professional men. If, by the end of ten years we adopt the scheme of bulk handling, I think that by the time the up-river section is completed, we shall not want further extensions for many years. Mr. Stileman's scheme will accommodate all our trade for a good many years. That is what I think, but I suppose every one of us would be very well pleased if we found the trade of the country had increased to such an extent that it demanded even greater extensions. Nobody will complain if the State makes rapid progress, and if we adopt bulk handling. The extensions proposed, however, will meet all requirements for a long time, and there will be no need for us to discuss whether we

should go north or south, for a good many years to come. The engineers have to look ahead, and this is a point that surprises me in Sir George Buchanan's report. He fixes a limit and I want to emphasise that point. Mr. Stileman's proposals permit of the scheme being constructed by stages. Every engineer carries out his scheme to a stage. Sir George Buchanan took his to a stage, but provided nothing further. Mr. Stileman, in his extension to the north, enables his scheme to go on to an almost unlimited extent. The first complaint was from the pilots, who went as far as to say that they would never be able to enter the harbour. I desire to draw the attention of members to the position of the proposed extension north, the accommodation that will be provided for the piloting of ships as compared with that existing to-day. The point where the trouble occurs, known as "The Knuckle," is 450 feet wide. The narrowest part in the new scheme will be 600 feet wide—an additional 150 feet. The widest point where vessels turn in the present harbour is 1,400 feet across. In the proposed harbour, provision is made for a turning basin 2,000 feet wide. Ships that come into the docks will back out and swing in this 2,000-feet basin and then go out. That is the position so far as the channel is concerned and it will be a much safer channel to negotiate than the existing one. It will give much more space and make the swinging easier. Another argument used by the pilots was that north-westerly winds caught the high ships and so controlled them that it was not possible to steer them. The land at the back of the north wharf—there is a great length of it—is lower than the wharf level. There is absolutely no protection whatever from the wind at the north wharf or for Victoria Quay. The only protection afforded vessels is from the small screen on the top of the wall; there is no protection on the wall that cannot be put on the top of the new breakwater. The whole of that is exposed and Mr. Stileman says that any protection that can be given there now can easily be afforded on the top of the new breakwater. That cannot be disputed.

Mr. Stubbs: If that scheme is adopted, on which portion does the Engineer-in-Chief recommend that a start should be made?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The up-river section first. The member for

Katanning pointed out, that if the extension goes up-river, the high land at Rocky Bay can be used on which to build silos and run wheat into the ships. With the harbour to the north, instead of having a long narrow stretch, we shall have marshalling yards and railways will be able to come in to serve the vessels on either side. The ships will be so berthed that they will be easily handled and the arrangements generally will make for economical working. Mr. Stileman is emphatic in his declaration that it will be possible to give rapid despatch to ships so berthed, despatch that would be impossible if they were drawn out over six miles of wharves as suggested by Sir George Buchanan. The existing entrance is to remain. I would remind members that this is not to be a new harbour; it is the same harbour but extended northwards. If at any time the depth requires to be improved for larger vessels that may be coming out, provision can be made in this direction. Mr. Stileman draws attention to the fact that in the Suez Canal provision is being made for vessels 920 feet in length and that we have always to be governed by what happens in the Suez Canal. It will be possible at Fremantle to carry out improvements to suit the requirements of the big ships if they call here. As against Mr. Stileman's swinging basin of 2,000 feet, we have that of Sir George Buchanan up the river of 1,250 feet. Still the pilots complain against Mr. Stileman's proposal!

Mr. Thomson: One would be in a sheltered position.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is a little in that. Comparison has been made between the boats that would be in the new harbour as against those that were tied up to the old jetty or were out in Gage Roads where they would be exposed to the sea and were not behind any wall. In Mr. Stileman's scheme, on each one of the wharves there is a shed. The boats will have the protection, not only of the breakwater, but of the wharf on each side as well as the sheds on the wharf. Surely no comparison can be made between vessels in that position and those exposed to the elements tied up at the old jetty or anchored in the roads. The docks as proposed in Mr. Stileman's scheme are to be found in all modern harbours. I noticed that wherever I went. All are going in for docks, because docks provide for each vessel being worked inde-

pendently and consequently economically. Ships make arrangements to suit themselves and they are not governed by railway working at all. The wall can be carried to any height necessary to give the protection required and we claim that the vessels that will be tied up in the docks will be in just as safe a position as the vessels moored to Victoria Quay at the present time. The member for Katanning referred to the question of bulk handling and used that as an argument why the harbour should go up the river to Rocky Bay.

Mr. Thomson: I did not argue that; I urged that the best scheme should be adopted and that there should be further inquiry.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Everyone will agree that wherever wheat is being loaded you must have vessels loading wheat in bags and in bulk at the same spot. There is no alteration or special design in harbour construction needed for bulk handling. In this scheme the terminal elevator will be somewhere towards the western end of North Quay, and it will serve the ships along both the North wharf and the new extension. I have seen vessels being served from an elevator, and the grain carried by conveyor belts hundreds of yards down the wharf from the same elevator to other vessels.

Mr. Lindsay: It all adds to the cost?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It only means that other elevators must be erected. But the point is that if a vessel has to take part bulk and part bags, the bags can be loaded at the same berth as the elevator is worked, the bulk grain coming over the top of the shed. Both operations can proceed from the same berth. The elevators are not on the wharf front, but back from it. Both means of loading should be together. Facilities for loading by bags exist now, and it will be quite possible for one elevator, if ever the bulk handling scheme comes into being, to load either in the new section or in the old section without the shifting of a vessel at all. The next point is that the extension, instead of going to the north, should go to the south. Mr. Stileman tells me he has not gone into details as to cost, but that we may take it for granted southward extension would be very much more expensive. We cannot get to the south by the present channel; a new entrance would have to be made, and a new break-

water would have to be built. Moreover, that breakwater would be in water of just about twice the depth that obtains in the case of the other breakwater. In point of cost, Mr. Stileman states, that does not mean merely two to one; the cost would be nearly three times as great. Under the present scheme we have ample land for marshalling yards and so forth. In the other scheme the marshalling yards, wharves, etc., would have to be where the Indian Ocean is now. The other scheme calls for half a mile of reclamation.

Mr. Davy: Why would you have to reclaim that land?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Because at present it is all water.

Mr. Davy: Why could not that water be the harbour?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But where are we to get marshalling yards and wharves and sheds in that case?

Mr. Davy: I follow you.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On the south side there is no room whatever for unloading. The adoption of that scheme would mean that all the existing works would have to be built over the water. The next point is how shall railway communication be obtained? The line cannot be brought around the town from the Fremantle wharf. Cliff-street is now feeding the wharf, and the result of that proposal would be absolutely to block Cliff-street. The only thinkable approach would be by way of Jandakot, coming in at the other end altogether. That would make two separate railway approaches to the port, one to the existing harbour, the other to the south side harbour. Thus there would be two distinct harbours, with the town dividing them. In Mr. Stileman's scheme everything is concentrated so as to permit of easy handling. The views I have stated are the views presented to me by the Engineer-in-Chief, but as member for the district I wish to state that in my judgment the alternative scheme proposed would utterly spoil Fremantle as a seaside resort. Under that scheme Fremantle would be without any seafront at all, a mere mass of wharves and boats. Its attractions as a seaside resort would then be absolutely gone. Yet another point is that the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners—and even Sir George Buchanan did not go so far—suggest a bridge with an opening span over the

river somewhere about the point Mr. Stileman recommends, or possibly nearer the old bridge. In this regard the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners are unique. Nowhere else in the world are harbour authorities favouring opening-span bridges. Everywhere else harbour authorities are opposed to them. The Fremantle Harbour Trust, I repeat, is unique in that respect. I will quote an extract from Mr. Stileman's report—

Take European river ports: Bordeaux, Hamburg, Antwerp, London and Liverpool are sufficiently representative. Each has been developed according to plan for at least the last 25 years, some of them for very much longer; together they represent nearly every existing form of port control and administration. Bordeaux is 62 miles inland, Hamburg 85, Antwerp 54, London 50, Liverpool 15. Each of these ports was located where the first river crossing existed. In spite of the great advance in the science of bridge building since the days when those ports were first established no bridge has been permitted on any of those rivers seaward of the port. American ports have, on the other hand, not been deliberately designed, and have developed by private exploitation to a great extent. Economic influences have therefore had free control. Yet where there is interchange between ships and barges for inland transport, the latter invariably go to the deep water facilities where the ship lies. There has been no attempt to carry deep water inland. Take Chicago, first developed up the Chicago River, which is crossed by bridges with opening spans. The constant delays to shipping, as well as to road and rail traffic, by the necessity for opening a bridge made the provision of facilities below the bridges inevitable. An independent Commission of engineers has recently reported on the future development of the harbour. While acknowledging that the traffic on the Great Lakes is not of a character which produces street congestion, they state that there should be no bridges below a commercial harbour, and their proposals provide for making all the existing bridges fixed, and for removal of the port facilities down to the shores of Lake Michigan, where they will be protected by a breakwater. The cargo traffic handled at Fremantle, on the other hand, is very largely a general one, which is undoubtedly each year adding to the congestion of street traffic and must continue to do so. Conflict between river traffic through any opening bridge and road traffic across that bridge must arise and continue to grow, causing delay to both and serious economic loss. How much road traffic has increased in recent years to and from the ports of the world is shown by the following figures for Liverpool, very recently published:—1913, 884,208 tons; 1920, 4,816,656 tons; 1927, 15,201,576 tons.

The only suggestion from an authoritative source in favour of a bridge with an opening span is the Fremantle Harbour Trust's

suggestion. Another point raised by the hon. member relates to the railway route from the new bridge to Robb's Jetty. He points out that it involves level crossings. As regards any proposal for a railway, when it comes before the House the definite route is not laid down; a certain extent of deviation is always allowed. There has been no detailed survey of the line in question, and the Engineer-in-Chief is not bound—

Mr. Thomson: I am merely going on his plans.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He submits those plans as merely conveying an idea. There is no trouble as regards removal of the line a mile or two either way to get over any difficulties in that respect. On that point there should not be much controversy between the contending parties. Mr. Stileman already has his engineers out to see whether a better approach can be obtained. When laymen express opinions as to whether a railway should be located elsewhere—

Mr. Thomson: I did not do that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; but in public meetings held outside, a definite route has been laid down for the railway. That is a question to be examined from the engineering point of view. Now I wish to deal with the proposals of Sir George Buchanan. If it is to come down to a question whose opinion the House should be guided by, Sir George Buchanan's or the Engineer-in-Chief's, the House is entitled to some information that is in my possession. In a way I am sorry that I have to make these statements, and I would not have made them but for the fact that Sir George Buchanan saw fit to enter the realms of public controversy through the Press. He has invited this: it has not been the desire of the Government or myself to do it. However, Sir George Buchanan, by entering into the controversy, has opened the ball and cannot complain if answer is made to him. I wish to remind the House of what I said at the time Sir George Buchanan's report reached me. I quote from the "West Australian" of the 2nd June, 1927—

I waited for some time for certain plans which should have accompanied the report, and I did not get these plans until I was in Melbourne recently. Since then I have looked into the report with the Engineer-in-Chief, and I regret to say that it does not take us any fur-

ther. There is nothing new in the report. It does not contain any original ideas, for it is merely a criticism of schemes put up by other engineers. No further information has been supplied by Sir George Buchanan.

It cannot be said that I have formed opinions to express now that Sir George Buchanan has come into conflict with the Government or the Engineer-in-Chief, for those are the views I held at that time, 15 months ago.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was pointing out that it is not the seeking of the Government or of myself that we now find ourselves confronted with the necessity to say something about Sir George Buchanan. On the other hand he himself came out in public and attacked the Premier. In the circumstances, I think the House is entitled to know something about the information we have on hand. I do not propose to go as far as I originally intended. We know that Sir George Buchanan had experience in South Africa, Australia, India and England. So far as his estimates for the Fremantle harbour works were concerned, he gave figures to guide the Government in undertaking the work. When Mr. Stileman and his staff examined his estimates, they found that, although he had recommended, as the first stage, the building of a bridge over the Swan River, he had omitted from his estimate any provision for money for the construction of that bridge. He provided no money for dredging, or for land resumption, and the only railways he provided for were the sidings on the wharf. Just imagine what that would mean to the Government if we were to undertake that work and rely upon Sir George Buchanan's figures. Then he proposed that the Government should build wharves but he did not provide for any dredging! The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) asked, when I introduced the Bill to authorise the construction of a railway from Robb's Jetty to Leighton, how it was that Mr. Stileman provided in his scheme for a certain length of wharf at the stated figure, whereas Sir George Buchanan provided for nearly double that length of wharf in his estimates.

Mr. Thomson: That was a natural query to raise.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The answer to that query is that Sir George Buchanan provided for the wharves but

for no dredging to enable the ships to get to the wharves! That is the explanation.

Mr. Thomson: That is information we have obtained that was not available previously.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In an undertaking of this description, land re-sumption will represent a large expenditure of money.

Mr. Stubbs: Is it not an extraordinary thing for an engineer of the repute of Sir George Buchanan to exclude such statistics from his report?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is what I am pointing out.

The Premier: Sir George Buchanan is an extraordinary man!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will give the House particulars of the experience of other people regarding Sir George Buchanan, but I will deal with that later on. Hon. members will realise that the provision of railway facilities represents one of the most important factors in connection with harbour works. Sir George Buchanan did not provide anything in his estimates for railways other than for the sidings on the wharf. Mr. Stileman says that, in respect of these omissions alone, we could easily multiply Sir George Buchanan's figures by two.

Mr. Stubbs: I should think so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He omitted these essential factors, and provided no money for such works. I will leave Sir George Buchanan with the statement of these facts: He reported on the harbours of South Africa, just as he reported on the harbours of Australia. In not one instance has there been a recommendation of Sir George Buchanan adopted in South Africa. So far as we can ascertain, in no single instance has any recommendation he made been adopted in Australia. Fremantle is the only place where his recommendations seem to have been taken seriously. In India the Government were so dissatisfied with his work at Bombay—I inspected his work there when I went through recently—that they appointed a Commission to investigate his undertakings and that body presented a most scathing report upon Sir George Buchanan's work and upon his management. In England the name of Sir George Buchanan has been struck off the roll of the Engineers' Institute.

Mr. Stubbs: That is a serious statement.

Mr. Davy: There is an explanation of that.

The Premier: Yes, one that does not do him credit.

Mr. Davy: What is the explanation?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not want to go into those details.

Mr. Davy: If you make a serious statement like that, you should be prepared to give the explanation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A body like the Engineers' Institute does not lightly strike the name of an engineer off its roll.

The Premier: And the reasons do not do Sir George Buchanan credit.

Mr. Davy: You should not leave it at that. It might mean that he had taken money out of the till!

The Premier: No, it was on account of unprofessional conduct.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was not on account of dishonesty regarding money matters, but owing to unprofessional conduct.

Mr. Stubbs: How did Sir George Buchanan secure his reputation as an engineer?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At any rate, he has built up a reputation for himself now.

Mr. Davy: If the Minister knows why Sir George Buchanan was struck off the roll, he should give us the reason.

The Premier: He was invited to give the explanation himself, but he would not do so.

Mr. Davy: He said he would.

The Premier: No, he invited me to write to the Institute and find out.

Mr. Davy: Did you do so?

The Premier: Certainly not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That would have been a nice thing to do! What would the Institute have done? The hon. member knows there is such a thing as the law of libel.

Mr. Davy: Quite so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A reply might have left the Institute open to an action for libel.

Mr. Davy: There would be no libel in it if you wrote to the Institute in the circumstances and they replied to your query.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, the libel might have been in the reply.

Mr. Davy: Certainly not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think that legal advice is worth a guinea!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Davy: A little while ago you were saying that opinions were not worth much.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The London Institute of Engineers has traditions to live up to. That organisation represents a body of men not likely to act lightly, but only after due consideration and for grave reasons.

Mr. Davy: It is most unfair to say that a man was struck off the roll and not tell us the reason for that action.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You have been told.

Mr. Davy: We have not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He was struck off for unprofessional conduct.

Mr. Davy: What unprofessional conduct?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not want to go into details.

Mr. Davy: No, of course not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I could continue talking for an hour if it was necessary.

The Premier: Why did he not explain the position himself?

Mr. Richardson: Where did the information that he was struck off the rolls come from?

The Premier: The information is contained in the records of the Institute.

Mr. Davy: And Sir George Buchanan invited you to write to the Institute and ask for the reason. What is the use of introducing this sort of thing into the debate? What has it to do with it?

The Premier: It has a lot to do with it.

Mr. Davy: It has nothing to do with it at all.

The Premier: Of course it has. What would the hon. member say about the credibility of such a witness if he had him in court?

Mr. Davy: I do not think it has anything to do with the question at all. What we are discussing is whether one scheme or the other is to be preferred.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have indicated his record in South Africa, India and in the rest of Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think Sir George Buchanan is too popular on the Government side of the House!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government have been asked to adopt the ideas advanced by the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, but we cannot sub-

scribe to that proposition. The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners are all laymen; not one of them is an engineer. When they ask the Government to commit the people of this State to the responsibility of undertaking an engineering proposition involving millions of money, merely on the advice of laymen, they ask us to do the impossible.

Hon. G. Taylor: What did someone say recently about monuments to engineers?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I shall say something about that in a moment. The strange feature of the attitude of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners is that on the two points that the Government, Parliament and the people as a whole would be prepared to listen to them, and to give weight to their views, as well as to those of the secretary of the Fremantle Harbour Trust are the two points upon which they are absolutely silent. The Harbour Trust Commissioners, because of their experience at Fremantle, are qualified to express an opinion upon the economy of operations and the quicker despatch of vessels, but they are silent on those points.

The Premier: They confine themselves to the engineering problems.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, they have been too busy dealing with engineering problems to pay attention to their own job.

Mr. Richardson: You will have to get rid of them!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We could not be expected to ask Parliament to approve of a scheme advanced by mere laymen. The same contention I have raised could be applied to the motion moved by the member for Katanning. He asks that we shall appoint a select committee comprising members of this House, in order that the committee may examine Mr. Stileman's scheme and recommend to the Government what should be done. I do not think for one moment that Parliament would endorse such a proposal. I am positive that the people of the State would not think much of Parliament if that course were adopted. The Government cannot sanction any such proposal for one moment. We could not agree to laymen deciding such big issues as are involved in such an intricate engineering problem.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think the motion suggests that the committee shall decide anything.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Murray-Wellington (Hon. W. J. George) said that the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson), when moving his motion, had shown himself such a partisan and had displayed such bias as to class himself as unfit to preside over such a select committee; because he, as the proposer of the motion, would naturally be the chairman of the select committee.

Mr. Thomson: Would that be a crime?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To be partisan?

Mr. Thomson: I am nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am merely repeating what the member for Murray-Wellington said; I am not fathering his views at the moment. Notwithstanding the protestations of the member for Katanning about taking a national point of view and not dragging in party politics, I was very sorry indeed to see that he had already dragged them in outside this House.

Mr. Thomson: I have done nothing of the sort. What do you mean?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I saw a letter in the public Press in which he attacked the member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) for being disloyal to his constituency of Albany because he would not support the hon. member's motion for a select committee.

Mr. Thomson: I said nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have the letters here! If the hon. member denies what I say, I shall deal with them.

Mr. Thomson: Well, read them and substantiate your statement.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not going to wade through the lot of them.

Mr. Thomson: I do not mind.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If that is the hon. member's attitude, and bearing in mind his suggestion regarding the extension of the Fremantle harbour and competition with Albany—

Mr. Thomson: I wrote in reply to an attack the member for Albany made upon me.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know that we have any evidence of that.

Mr. Thomson: Well, read the letters.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Engineer-in-Chief was so particular when he set out his scheme that he marked out the various zones that he thought would be catered for by the various ports. He set out the zones that will be catered for by Albany, Bunbury, Esperance, and so forth, and his recommendations regarding Fremantle were based on the zone that Fremantle will cater for.

Mr. Thomson: Well, read the whole of the correspondence.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, I will not.

Mr. Thomson: No, of course not.

The Premier: What, the whole of it!

Mr. Thomson: That will be more fair.

The Premier: We get enough reading from you.

Mr. Thomson: Quite so, and I will read what I desire again if I think fit.

The Premier: I have no doubt that you will.

Mr. Thomson: That is what the Premier would do if he were attacked.

The Premier: I would not weary the House with reading as you do.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At any rate, I do not intend to read all the correspondence.

Mr. Davy: If the Minister says that that was contained in the correspondence, surely the House is entitled to the information.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Surely the hon. member does not desire me to read all those letters?

Mr. Thomson: The member for Albany attacked me.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I did not.

Mr. Thomson: He attacked me unnecessarily in the public Press.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I had no desire to introduce this question.

Mr. Thomson: Then why did you mention it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I mentioned it because of your protestations when moving the motion.

Mr. Thomson: But the findings of a select committee are based on the evidence supplied to it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not as green as all that.

Mr. Thomson: You are very unfair.

The Premier: Your findings would be on the evidence that Mr. Stevens would give

you. I know a good deal of what is going on.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member quoted instances of engineers having made mistakes in their estimates, with the result that the ultimate cost of the work was very far beyond what had been estimated. There are numerous such instances. But the Government have in mind what happened at Fremantle in relation to the graving dock. There, instead of the advice of engineers being openly sought without restriction, and that advice being accepted, politics were brought in and local agitation was listened to, with the result that over a quarter of a million of the people's money now lies at the bottom of the ocean. That was consequent upon the advice of laymen being accepted and party politics being allowed to come into the question. The Government are not prepared to allow that sort of thing to happen this time.

Mr. Thomson: Are you suggesting it is likely to become a matter of party politics?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are not taking any move that we think would allow party politics to come into the decision at all. There was another part of the hon. member's argument that I could not follow. He said the Government had no option but to accept the recommendation of the Engineer-in-Chief. He said, "I do not see that Ministers could do anything else; they had to adopt it." But if there is any force whatever behind the hon. member's motion, it means that in his view a body of laymen of this Assembly could examine the scheme and put up a recommendation to the Government, and the Government could accept the recommendation of those laymen and turn down the Engineer-in-Chief; although, according to the hon. member, they cannot turn down the Engineer-in-Chief of their own initiative.

Mr. Thomson: What do they do in the Commonwealth Parliament, where they have a Public Works Committee to advise them?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know.

Mr. Thomson: You don't want to know.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What does it matter? In this case the hon. member says the Government dare not do other than adopt the Engineer-in-Chief's report. But at the same time he says, "If a few of us examine the scheme and report to you,

you can turn down the Engineer-in-Chief's report."

Mr. Thomson: I said nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is the only inference to be drawn from the hon. member's motion. It is practically saying to the Ministry, "There is not amongst you the ability to examine the scheme and report intelligently upon it. You cannot do anything that would differ from the Engineer-in-Chief. But we here have the knowledge and ability to do it, and you can act on what we report to you."

Mr. Davy: I do not think by the way you are arguing now you are improving the excellent case you were making.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am just putting forward these points, not as affecting the position, but as against the motion, and what the motion means. I do not think for a moment this House can expect the Government to accept the motion. It appears to us it would be useless and an entire waste of time. I do not by that mean that the Government are opposed to any inquiry, that we claim for Mr. Stileman or that he claims for himself the attribute of infallibility. Mr. Stileman would be the last to submit such a claim. Every engineer makes mistakes, just the same as all other human beings, no man being infallible. We have no objection whatever to a further inquiry, provided the inquiry is made by a competent authority. At the present moment we are inquiring with a view to securing the services of a highly qualified consulting engineer to confer with the Engineer-in-Chief upon this scheme. We desire to secure the services of the most highly qualified man available; one who has specialised in harbour construction.

Mr. Davy: Now you are talking sense.

Mr. Thomson: Well, if my motion has done nothing else, it has brought this about.

The Premier: It has done nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The egotism of some people!

The Premier: "Alone I did it!"

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I feel confident that will be accepted by the House and the country generally as being the correct step to take. Then the people can be assured that we have exhausted all means at our disposal to see that the best is done in undertaking this work and the huge expenditure involved. All that Parliament wants, and all that the people will expect,

is that the Government shall obtain all the information from the most highly qualified official available, and that when his report is given the work shall go on.

Hon. G. Taylor: Are you limiting the selection of the consulting engineer to the Commonwealth?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Oh, no! When I moved the second reading of the Bill for the railway from Leighton to Robb's Jetty, I gave to the House a promise that before any large expenditure on this work was undertaken, Parliament would have a further opportunity of discussing the whole proposition. That promise will be kept, and probably before the session is out the House will be given an opportunity for a full discussion on the subject. Although, of course, at the present moment we are unable to definitely promise, still we will do our best to hurry things on to get the opinion of the consulting engineer ready by the time Parliament is asked to vote the money. Of course that may not be possible. It all depends upon whom we get and how the gentleman who may be selected is situated, whether he will be able to come to us immediately. I feel that the case that has been submitted, the information contained in Mr. Stileman's original report, plus the facts I have been able to present to the House this evening, will justify the recommendations that Mr. Stileman has made to the Government. We are imbued only with the one idea, which is to have an up-to-date port at Fremantle to cater for the growing requirements of Western Australia and to assure the people, when we ask Parliament to vote the money, that the very best will be done with the expenditure incurred. I hope the decision of the Government which I have just announced will meet with the approval of the House.

On motion by Mr. Davy, debate adjourned.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SUPERANNUATION FUND.

Second Reading.

MR. MANN (Perth) [7.55] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is brought down with a view to providing the employees of the Perth City Council with a superannuation fund. Most of the capital cities of the Commonwealth have superannuation funds for their employees and so, too, have many

large employers, both in Australia and in England. There are several reasons for the establishment of such funds, the principal one being that they make for greater efficiency and satisfaction amongst the employees. Statistics have shown that in England, where superannuation funds are provided, employees live to a greater age; the implication being that they are content in mind and free from the worry of the risk of being turned on to a scrap heap in their declining years. For many years past the Perth City Council have been making some provision for their employees. Section 155 of the Municipal Corporations Act provides—

On the resignation or death of any officer, or on the cessation or abolition of office of any officer, the council may in their discretion cause to be paid to such officer or to such of his surviving relatives as the council may think fit, any gratuity not exceeding the amount of one month's salary for each year of the service of such officer.

That is very unsatisfactory, because the employee is at the will of the council that happens to be in power for the time being. Councils come and council's go, and it may be that the employee happens to be in favour with the council in power, and so he may be well treated. On the other hand, although a perfectly loyal officer and doing his work in unexceptional fashion, because for some reason he does not stand well in the eyes of the council, he may not get the treatment he is actually entitled to. So the Perth City Council have decided to inaugurate a superannuation fund. To that end they have consulted with Mr. Ross, who compiled and put into operation the Commonwealth superannuation fund making provision for Commonwealth officers. The Bill asks for an amendment to Section 179 of the Municipal Corporations Act, which gives the council power to make by-laws. Authority is now sought to make by-laws to inaugurate, control and carry on a superannuation fund. It is proposed that all permanent employees shall be included in that fund. Provision is made for the fund to include clerks, foremen, caretakers, stablemen, health inspectors, storemen, collectors, meter readers, sweepers and anybody else employed in a permanent post. Both the City Council and their employees are anxious that the scheme should be put through. It may be suggested that it will involve a drain on the ratepayers. That is not so, for investigation shows that it is not anticipated that

the drain will be any heavier than that represented by the payments that have been made under Section 155 of the Municipal Corporations Act. It is proposed that employees on retiring shall draw 50 per cent. of the salary they are receiving at the time of retirement. The employer will not be asked to provide any money until there is a retirement, and then the council will find its 50 per cent. of the amount required.

Mr. Stubbs: It is a very fair scheme.

Mr. MANN: Yes, and it will save the council the necessity for finding a large sum of money at once.

Mr. North: That is so.

Mr. MANN: If an employee is receiving £6 per week at the time of retirement, he will draw £3 a week under the superannuation scheme. If he dies leaving a wife, she will draw 30s. a week, plus an allowance for each child under the age of 14 years. The scheme has been well considered and the best official—Mr. Ross—available has been consulted. Consideration has been given to all the numerous points involved in the scheme.

Mr. Panton: Is it to be compulsory or voluntary?

Mr. MANN: Compulsory.

Mr. Davy: Not necessarily. This Bill is merely to give power to run the scheme.

Mr. Panton: I have been informed by some of the employees that it is to be a voluntary scheme.

Mr. MANN: It is intended to give the council power to make by-laws, and if the council decides that it is in the best interests of the fund to make it compulsory, it will be compulsory. It is intended that where an employee has a life insurance policy, the premium for which is as much as he can pay, the council will take over the policy and pay his premiums until his policy becomes due when deductions will be made for the premiums paid. All such matters connected with the scheme have been carefully considered.

Mr. Panton: It is similar to the Post Office employees' scheme.

Mr. MANN: It will be similar to the Commonwealth superannuation scheme. Such a scheme cannot be inaugurated without difficulty.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Bill aims merely at giving power to inaugurate it.

Mr. MANN: Yes, power to make by-laws for the scheme.

Hon. G. Taylor: It will give the council power to do something in that direction.

Mr. MANN: Yes; and it has been suggested that the scheme should be run on the lines of the Commonwealth scheme. I think I have said all that is necessary to commend the Bill to the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [8.3]: One or two of the objectionable features contained in the Bill of last year have been eliminated or at any rate toned down in this measure. What was proposed to be done under the Bill of last year is now to be done by regulation, but still the metropolitan area and towns are not exempted. It is true that if the local authorities in the metropolitan area, in the goldfields towns or the big ports desire to make the regulations, which in my judgment should not apply to the metropolis and towns and are not necessary, the Minister can refuse to endorse the regulations, and the measure would not then apply to the towns. But it will depend who the Minister is. The decision is left entirely to his discretion. Personally I prefer to see it set out in the measure that the provisions shall not apply to the metropolis or the towns of the goldfields or the ports. Whatever argument there is in favour of applying the measure to the agricultural and pastoral areas, it does not hold with respect to the towns. The other point to which I took exception last year was that all the appeals had to be made to the Minister. Under this Bill appeals will be made to the local magistrate. That is a big improvement. There will be a number of magistrates throughout the State to deal with appeals which, under the former proposal, would have centred on the Minister.

Mr. Mann: It will be more expensive to go to the magistrates than it would be to go to the Minister.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is handier to go to the magistrate.

Mr. Mann: But more costly.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To appeal to the Minister would necessitate everyone with a grievance coming to Perth. We could not expect the Minister to tour the State to deal with appeals about dogs. As I said before, it would have been necessary for the Minister to set aside one day a week as dog day, when any man with a grievance about a dog would be able to see the Minister. Then we would have had people coming to Perth from all parts of the State to appeal to the Minister about their dogs. It will certainly be handier to appeal to the magistrate. That is an improvement on the previous proposition, at any rate from the Minister's point of view. Those are the two points to which I took exception last year. If the hon. member in charge of the Bill is agreeable, I should like to have it specifically set out that the measure shall not apply to the metropolis or to any of the big towns.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.7]: While I would be prepared to assist the member for Toodyay to get a workable measure to control what might be deemed to be destructive dogs, I think that he, in his ambition and desire to accomplish that end, has brought forward a Bill so drastic in character that it is almost impossible for us to support it. I appreciate the fact that there are dogs which from time to time destroy sheep and lambs—valuable assets of the State—in no small numbers. If the hon. member had introduced a Bill to enable us or the local authorities to control such animals, without making it a persecution of a fairly large section of the community, I would have been prepared to support him.

Mr. Thomson: How do you mean a persecution of a large section of the community?

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course, the member for Katanning never travels out of Perth, Albany and Katanning. He does not realise that the Bill will apply from Perth to Wyndham, and he has not seen the large number of people who gain a living by means of their dogs.

Mr. Thomson: Quite a number of people also making a living by keeping sheep.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Bill is specifically designed for the rural areas of the State. The dogs that do most damage in the pastoral areas are not those controlled by the white population, but the dogs allowed to be kept by the aborigines.

Mr. Lindsay: Is there anything in the Bill dealing with that?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but the member for Toodyay is desirous of putting the white man below the level of the aboriginal.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not so. Any dangerous dog will come within the scope of the Bill.

Mr. MARSHALL: But if the hon. member looks at Clause 7 he will see it is intended to give power to regulate the number of dogs that any person may keep.

Mr. Davy: That will have to be knocked out as it applies to towns.

Mr. MARSHALL: I wish to give an illustration of what occurs under the powers contained in the existing Act. A few weeks ago I was coming south from Peak Hill, and called in at a little place known as Holden's Find, where I met a kangarooer. Tears were rolling down his cheeks. He was living on the Holden's Find common; he and his dogs had not been off it, but a million-acre squatter delegated one of his employees to poison those dogs on the common. When squatters exercise powers that are not theirs and we are asked to give the wider powers proposed in this measure, I can see that the white population who live by means of kangarooing, prospecting and droving—a big and valuable section of the community—will be ferociously persecuted by some; I do not say by all.

Mr. Ferguson: By the local governing bodies?

Mr. MARSHALL: No; I am referring to the powers proposed to be given under the regulations. Most of the road boards in what at one time were goldfields areas are being controlled by squatters.

Mr. Thomson: That is no crime, is it?

Mr. MARSHALL: No; in my electorate I cannot point the finger of scorn at one of them. They are very fair.

Mr. Thomson: Why not trust them with the powers under this Bill?

The Premier: It is too great a responsibility to trust them with all these dogs.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the father of the Bill will give way somewhat and agree to delete some of the clauses of the Bill, I may be able to see eye to eye with him. As the Bill stands, I cannot support him, although I am as desirous as he is to protect sheep raisers from having their flocks destroyed by dogs.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [8.13]: I am rather surprised at the remarks of the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall), who represents an area having large pastoral pursuits as one of its principal industries.

Speaking as one who is interested in the land, my opinion is that the Bill is absolutely necessary. This matter has been given due consideration and the conclusion reached is that its proposals indicate the only effective way by which dogs allowed to wander at large may be controlled. In a portion of my district a man informed me last Saturday that a pack of dogs had come out from the town, nine or ten miles away, had entered his paddocks and been responsible for the death of 64 sheep. It is all very fine to show consideration for the owners of the dogs. My sympathy is with men like the kangarooer mentioned by the member for Murchison, and also with the prospector. Nevertheless, the kangarooer could probably replace his dogs. Had they been chained up, as is provided in the Bill, they would probably not have got the baits.

Mr. Marshall: They were taken to his camp and thrown there. The dogs were not off the chain.

Mr. THOMSON: No doubt there are cases where hardship may be inflicted. That is not the intention. It is a matter of great importance to a man if he loses in one night 64 sheep as a result of attack by dogs that have come out from the town in a pack on a killing expedition. In one night a man may have stock worth £100, and after two or three such attacks his whole flock may be gone. The Bill has been carefully drafted with a view to giving protection to sheep-raisers. I think it would be possible to cope with the situation as it affects the metropolitan area. The dogs are actually coming from the country towns. Very frequently they are the cause of all the damage that is done to the flocks.

Mr. Ferguson: Of 90 per cent. of it.

Mr. THOMSON: If people want to keep dogs they should hold them under restraint at night time. It was a very reasonable request to make in the interests of an industry which is suffering severely at the moment because of the damage done by dogs.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [8.17]: No doubt to the surprise of the member for Katanning, I will support the second reading of the Bill. Some good may occasionally come from the cross benches. People who know anything about sheep-raising realise what those concerned suffer

through the negligence of the owners of dogs.

The Premier: Has your district, like the Murchison, turned into a squatting district?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: They are all sheep-raisers there now. I believe that sheep were recently killed there having gold in their teeth.

The Premier: Was it not in your district that the famous dog, Bullocks Foot, was killed?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It has been known, more particularly in the agricultural areas, that the wild dogs were not so much the cause of trouble to the sheep-raisers as the tame dogs that had got out of hand and become half wild. Many of them go out from the towns at night, hunt and kill the sheep under cover of darkness, and return to their homes in the morning.

The Premier: Quite innocent-looking.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes.

Mr. Withers: And you get nothing for their scalps.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Bill provides that the owner of a dog shall keep him in captivity and subjection between the hours of sunset and sunrise.

The Premier: That may be a hardship to the owner.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is harder upon the sheep owner to find that 10 or 20 sheep have been killed overnight than it is for the owners of dogs to keep the animals tied up at night. In Committee I shall have something to say against one clause, but in the meantime I hope the House will pass the second reading. The enactment of this Bill will give those who are engaged in the sheep-raising industry an opportunity to sleep soundly at night without the fear of their stock being killed by valueless dogs.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.20]: As the representative of a sheep-raising district, I am aware of the damage done by dogs. I support the Bill, but it will be very hard to put it into active operation. Every dog should be registered. These animals are not registered, because many of the road boards will not go to the expense of employing a dog inspector. The job is a thankless one. When people know an inspector is coming round, they try to hide their dogs. The official in question is not so popular with the residents. Most of the damage that is done by dogs is done by those which are owned

by people in small towns. One can see dozens of dogs in the streets of our provincial towns. One often finds that a Collie dog and a small terrier will hunt together, and will do a great deal of damage. The small dog will round up the sheep, and the big one will kill them.

The Premier: That is the worst of the Scotch and the Irish element being mixed.

Mr. BROWN: If a farmer finds a dog rambuling amongst his sheep at night, he is justified in shooting it.

Mr. Heron: That is done already.

Mr. BROWN: Sometimes a good sheep dog may get away, but a man will think twice before he shoots another man's dog, although I think the animal should be shot. The economic loss due to the killing of sheep is very great. The only doubt I have about the Bill is whether it can be put into operation, or whether it will become a dead letter. Most of the clauses have been plainly and concisely worded, and the measure ought to be passed without amendment.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay—in reply) [8.22]: The Minister for Works seems to be under the impression that the Bill passed last session contained a clause dealing with the exemption of the metropolitan area. That is not so.

The Minister for Works: I said that was the intention.

Mr. LINDSAY: The principal objection on the part of the Minister was to the hearing of appeals. That has now been altered, leaving the matter in the hands of the local court. The question of appeal has been given too much consideration. In all probability no court would be called upon to deal with appeals more than once a year. The Bill gives local governing bodies certain powers if they wish to exercise them, but it is not mandatory. I am quite sure that the local authorities will not make use of the Act unless they are obliged to do so. Further, I do not think it will be put into operation in the metropolitan area. If, in order to save the Bill, it is necessary to accept certain amendments, I am prepared to accept them. I know I have the support of the Premier.

The Premier: I opposed the Bill last year, but I am inclined to think I shall support it this year.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Premier received a deputation at Kulin when this matter was

brought up. Last year we paid £4,125 for wild dogs in the agricultural area. I am a member of the advisory board appointed under the Vermin Act. Fully 90 per cent. of the dogs we paid for were not dingoes. They were domestic dogs that had been allowed to run at large.

The Premier: Did you pay for the scalps?

Mr. LINDSAY: We could not refuse to do so. It is rather a difficult position to be placed in. We do our utmost to overcome it.

The Premier: The man who has a dog and wants to get rid of it, may now get £2 for it.

Mr. Davy: It is better than breeding some dogs.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Vermin Act states that a wild dog is a dog running wild and at large. We have to depend upon the road board secretaries to assist us. When an individual takes a scalp to that official and he agrees that it is the scalp of a wild dog that has been running wild and at large, he sends the scalp to us and we pay. In the road board district in my area we have been paying £2 a head for the last 14 years, and to-day we are paying £4. In order to protect ourselves, we insist upon getting a sworn declaration, so that if the claim is not lawfully made, we may prosecute the claimant. It is time that these dogs, which are not really wild dogs, were brought under control. Not only do they destroy sheep, but they affect the progress of the sheep-raising industry in the agricultural areas. We talk about wheat, but it is the sheep that will eventually be the principal factor. Unfortunately hundreds of thousands of acres of land are carrying no sheep to-day as men are afraid to put them on because of the dog menace. There is nothing drastic about the Bill. It has been agreed to by every public body that has dealt with it, such as the Road Boards Association, the P.P.A., and the advisory board appointed under the Vermin Act. I hope the second reading will be carried.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Mr. Lindsay in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

MOTION—PHYSICAL WELL-BEING.

Debate resumed from the 5th September on the following motion by Mr. North (Claremont):—

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

MR. NORTH (Claremont—in reply) [8.33]: Since no one else wishes to speak on the motion, I should like to say a few words by way of reply. The subject is highly important, perhaps too important to be brought forward from the Opposition side of the Chamber. It so happens that during the course of the debate there arrived from England a work dealing with this subject which I had sent for two or three months ago. It contains matter more interesting than any I put forward in opening the debate. Let me say how pleased I was to find the Minister for Health, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Country Party showing themselves sympathetic and taking a close interest in the debate. The Minister for Health dealt with two matters which rather went to show that I had not taken all the care I should have used in bringing the motion forward. I do not wish to start an argument between the advocates of different forms of diet. I do not claim to be an expert on that subject at all. With regard to the hospital figures I gave, I tried to make the point that one person in three operated on at the Perth Hospital during 1926 was operated on for a digestive disorder. Among the digestive disorders I had in mind was appendicitis, and the Minister pointed out that appendicitis is not due to bad nutrition. I do not say to what appendicitis is due, but I would quote the opinion of somebody who is supposed to know. In the "Lancet" of the 21st January, 1925, the following statement is made:—

The characteristic difference between those peoples who do and those who do not get appendicitis is that the food of the latter is much simpler, contains a relatively larger bulk of coarse vegetables, and often a smaller amount of meat.

That extract from the "Lancet" is quoted in a new English work which arrived last Saturday. I do not say the opinion ex-

pressed is right or wrong. Still, it affords some ground to those who say that appendicitis is due to faulty nutrition. As regards the Education Department's film dealing with nutrition, I am glad to know that we have such films showing in this State to-day. It is quite news to me, and I do not think any member of the House had knowledge that such films were being shown. I hope that their use will be extended and that they will be shown over and over again. Now I wish to come to three points I could have dealt with in opening the motion but did not touch upon. The first is the war statistics of the United States, England and Australia. The figures as to recruiting gave us a shock. We found that the wonderful white race as represented in the United States, Britain and Australia showed only one in three of eligible men efficient. That is a terrible commentary upon our living and feeding during the last 50 or 60 years. Again, there is the question of teeth. Only two weeks ago Mr. Poock told us—and we have been told the same thing year in, year out by the Minister for Health—that 85 per cent. of our teeth are defective.

The Minister for Health: That 85 per cent. of the children have defective teeth.

MR. NORTH: Yes, and that an enormous percentage of the adult population also suffer from defective teeth. That is a situation we cannot take lying down. Such a matter should be ventilated. It is not desirable that a new member like myself should have all the say regarding it. I would like the matter to get into the hands of the big men, so that conferences may be held and investigations made. I should be sorry to think that there is a conspiracy of silence on the part of those who might well speak. I would not like to think that vested interests are keeping back the subject. It may be that certain commercial interests are not aware of the facts. When they do become aware of them, they will have to stand the test of investigation. Let me quote a few lines on the subject of teeth. Here I have the report of the First International Health Congress, held at Wembley Exhibition two or three years ago. Dr. C. F. Peyton Baly is reported as saying—

The human tooth begins to grow seven weeks after conception, and unless the mother is receiving the correct food, sufficient mineral

salts and the essential vitamins, the child will be born with deficient teeth. Later on, unless the child gets the correct mother's milk, by the mother getting foodstuffs which give her those vitamins, she will be unable to pass on to her child the vitamins essential to the growth of that child's teeth. But there is another point than the chemical one in the modern food, and that is the mechanical one. No feeding will exercise the child's jaws so well as the breast feeding. Bottle feeding is a different action and is not exercising. Consequently the child does not get the same blood supply to its mouth that it does get when it is on the breast. Later on we get probably the biggest mistake of all in eating over-ground food. Bread is supposed to be the staff of life. Our millers are very carefully removing from it the most nourishing and most cleansing part of the grain. Sir William Arbuthnot Lane told us that the grit in the commonly-ground flour scours the mouth. It not only scours the mouth, it scours the teeth, and not only does it scour the teeth, but that grit contains the mineral salts which are essential for the health of the teeth, and which are missing from the over-ground—I might call it emasculated—bleached white flour which they make into what we call bread.

That quotation also occurs in the work I received by mail last Saturday, a work by Mr. Ellis Barker. Mr. Pocock perhaps knows those facts, but he does not mention them. He has a salaried position in which he is called upon to handle teeth as he finds them just as we deal with the important questions of health on the principle of a fire engine: we wait until there is a fire, and then an efficient machine turns out to put out the fire. But prevention is better than cure. We do not seem to realise that it is much cheaper to spend money on prevention than to spend it on cure. All the doctors, through no fault of their own, deal with a public who take health as it comes. They have to deal with people who are practically crocks, the cases coming to the doctors too late to be treated. Ancient Hippocrates, the first of the doctors, used to advocate that physicians should worry, not about cure, but about prevention. The Chinese have the same system. Are we to despise such people just because we are so efficient in mechanical means and wealth production? When during war time we find only one in three of our limited population efficient, when 85 per cent. of our children have teeth which must be pulled out or stopped, when all other diseases follow practically on that beginning, surely it is time to take in hand the feeding of the mothers and see that everybody gets a fair

start in this respect. I believe there is a feeling amongst members of the medical profession that we should consult them every year rather than go to them too late and spend the same money in another way. If all of us spent small amounts on the doctors by way of insurance, a lot of the present expenditure would be saved, and the Minister for Health, when meeting the responsibilities of the Perth Hospital, would have a much better case. Let us try to drive it into the public that they should not wait until they are sick and then call out the fire brigade, but that they should make a practice of keeping fit by seeing their doctors. That will ensure a much more even distribution of medical expenditure amongst us all, and will also ensure the doctors having a much easier and pleasanter task. What a terrible task it is when an expert surgeon has to perform a major operation upon a human body simply because the mother has forgotten to eat the proper kind of bread and a sufficient proportion of vegetables during her pregnancy. Apparently, while we have fine streets and big theatres and plenty of banks, we are prepared to have such terrific sufferings in our hospitals, and equally dreadful sufferings in the home, which are never heard of. The mere cost of these sufferings is so enormous that I have thought it well to try to bring before the public in a very general way what is the position. We know what the Government are doing; undoubtedly, as the Minister for Health has shown, the Western Australian Government are doing more than any other Australian Government in this matter. I consider that the motion would have had an equal effect in any British Parliament, because the figures everywhere are practically the same. For some reason, ever since mill flour came into use, there has been a kind of conspiracy to hide the evils it entails. Men who do understand the subject have now, however, come forward and sacrificed their professional principles to show the extent of the evil. Sir William Arbuthnot-Lane has done that before the First International Health Conference. Quite recently he has been instrumental in forming a new health society in England. That society has a branch in New Zealand, but not, I am sorry to say, in Australia; I hope the first Australian branch of it will be formed in this State. The matters to which I have drawn attention must be faced. Members are far better

read than I am on the subject of racial decline—I refer especially to the writings of Lothrop Stoddart, great long rignaroles about how the white man is to be swallowed up by the yellow man. All these theses can be based upon the fact that as a white race we are eating ourselves into degeneracy. Nothing will hide the facts. Going along the streets of any big city of Australia or the British Empire one can see for oneself that the charges as to CS men are true. And these things are not necessary. I came across an article in the "Primary Producer," a paper with which I am not acquainted, really by a fluke.

The Premier: The loss is yours.

Mr. NORTH: I found that references were made to an extraordinary member of Parliament—the reference was to myself—who introduced matters of microscopic importance or of such profound depths that no one could follow the topic; and at the same time that paper published about two columns on the subject of the nutrition of stock and the nutrition of pastures. After ascertaining that stock had been eating bones, the writer arrived at the conclusion that not sufficient phosphate was included in the food for stock. The paper devoted two columns to the position regarding stock, but the fact that 85 per cent. of our children suffer from defective teeth furnished the "Primary Producer" with an opportunity to indulge in fun. Perhaps the Press may have been kind in their attitude and have kept off the subject, because it will be dealt with more efficiently by the Government. Let me deal with the position of some of the foreign nations. In Japan the people do not use wheat, but confine themselves largely to rice. It is illegal there to sell rice such as we purchase here. Our rice would be classed there almost as flour. Again, in New Guinea, it would be illegal to sell rice such as we procure here. If the natives ate the rice that we buy, they would develop beri-beri and they would not be able to work. I am convinced that the Government should take steps to let the people know what foods are dangerous. If the public were warned of the danger of certain foods as they are warned regarding certain poisons, much good would result.

The Premier: You think the foods should be labelled so that people would know what they were purchasing?

Mr. NORTH: Yes. For instance, if we go to Boan Bros., one of the largest de-

partmental stores in Australia, we can see posted up over one portion of the shop, "Health Counter." The inference to be drawn is that quite 75 per cent. of the food-stuffs sold are apparently non-health foods.

Hon. G. Taylor: Those labels are all right on foodstuffs and are all right so long as you do not put them on patent medicines!

The Premier: If the Government were to issue regulations to do what you suggest, they would be promptly disallowed.

The Minister for Health: And the strange part of it is that at that counter are to be found health foods that should be investigated.

Mr. NORTH: I think so. I am convinced that some of the health foods require investigation. The point is that a departmental store like Boans can post up such a notice over portion of their shop, leaving the inference that I have indicated.

Mr. Clydesdale: That is where they get their profits.

Mr. NORTH: I would not have returned to this subject, were it not that it is so vitally important. If by hook or by crook we could get some of these facts published in the Press, it would be of great assistance in remedying the evils. I am glad that the Minister for Health intends to issue a booklet dealing with this subject and that it will be placed before the students at the Training College, through whom the knowledge can be passed on. The public should receive a shaking up so that the parents may commence to take an interest in the subject. Should a child of 14 years of age insist to his parents that they should not eat white bread, he would certainly get into hot water. Thus it is necessary that the interest of parents themselves shall be aroused. I have mentioned one phase; there are dozens of ways in which everything is wrong. These things are so wickedly simple that they are not considered worth talking about. The result is that we go on eating and doing things instinctively, and so the existing conditions continue. In the last three days I have read sufficient in the book I have already referred to, to realise what is going on. In that book Mr. Barker deals with many subjects, but I shall refer to one homely item to lend point to what I mean. He suggested that the next time the reader drank a cup of tea, he should put his little finger in the liquid to see if he could keep it there for 30 seconds. No one can do so. I have tried it myself, and I was amazed at the result. Mr. Barker points out that we are accustomed to putting in our

stomachs liquid that is nearly boiling and he regards this as largely the cause of most of the trouble that is going on. No one would have thought of such a little thing! If it had been suggested to us, we would probably have said it was rubbish because liquid so hot would scald our tongues.

The Premier: What about the hot drinks that are not hot when you buy them?

Mr. NORTH: Both Mr. Barker and Sir William Arbuthnot-Lane are in favour of those drinks, nor do they condemn meat-eating either. After all, I think this subject is one that requires publicity more than anything else. It does not involve great technical knowledge. When I suggested procuring a picture, I meant one on commercial lines such as we see to-day. We could have a sandwich man being taken round the streets on a stretcher en route to the hospital, and by that means we could bring home to the people the effects of what they are accustomed to eat. It is because people are not interested that they do not pay attention to this subject. I am a married man and I know what it all means. For six years I have been fighting about this matter in my own home and at last I am getting a little of my own way.

Mr. Panton: I have been married for 20 years and I have not been able to get my own way yet.

Mr. NORTH: At any rate, it has made a great difference in my home.

Mr. Panton: Tell us how you did that, and it will be of more advantage to us.

The Premier: It would help us if you told us how you went about it and succeeded in getting your own way.

Mr. NORTH: It has saved me a lot of trouble.

Mr. Panton: I have got into a lot of trouble trying to get my way.

Mr. NORTH: Since I have had my own way at home, things have been very different. There has been a much better temperament all round; no more sickness, pains or trouble. It has had a wonderful effect. The question of diet is so extraordinarily simple. I would like to see published the diet used at the Perth Hospital. That diet costs some £80,000 for the year. I wonder if wholemeal bread finds a place on the menu, or whether the patients there are fed on what is known as pap. Pap feeding is said to be the curse of our civilisation, and to furnish the explanation of what is wrong with our children. We would expect that

in our hospitals better feeding would be the order of the day.

The Premier: I intend to put Mrs. Farrelly on the committee of management.

Mr. NORTH: That is good.

Mr. Davy: That is a sensible thing.

Mr. NORTH: Mrs. Farrelly has reformed the prison, for they have wholemeal bread there.

Mr. Panton: At any rate, the Perth Hospital committee of management have nothing to do with the diet; that is the job for the medical man.

The Premier: Perhaps the committee will be able to exercise a little pressure.

The Minister for Railways: Even if it takes a matter of six years!

Mr. NORTH: We know what the experience of Oscar Wilde was when he was sent to Reading gaol for a few years. On the simple diet in the prison, he became a fit man.

The Premier: I have noticed how well prisoners look when they are released!

Mr. NORTH: Oscar Wilde went into the prison a gross, pap-fed, water-logged man. When he was released, after a period of better living, he became a spare, firm-fleshed, healthy man.

The Premier: I do not think it was a question of the food so much as the early hour at which he went to bed.

Mr. NORTH: I will not say any more, because I do not want to spoil a good subject. I realise that the Government intend to act, and I believe that any suggestions made will be welcome. This matter is no longer a question of a few food cranks talking about vegetarianism. That is not the point. The Eskimos live on meat all the year round, apart from the blubber they get from time to time. Although they have a full meat diet, their teeth are good and no ricketts are to be found among the children. Yet the Eskimos are probably the lowest type of human beings on earth.

The Premier: What, the Eskimos?

Mr. NORTH: Yes. They are said to be a very low type of humanity.

The Premier: I have not seen white people with as good teeth as those possessed by our own aborigines.

Mr. NORTH: That may be so. Of course they do not enjoy our splendid diet! The curse of this subject is that all the time we are talking against our own habits, and habits are so easily formed. The children of a fruit and nut eater are con-

tent to live on fruit and nuts, and think no more about it. The children of a meat eater follow in the same routine. We are all like little monkeys imitating one another. The real fight will be with the first generation, for once started along the right lines, they will develop new habits. If inquiries be made amongst the bakers in Perth it will be found that the consumption of wholemeal bread is increasing very largely.

Mr. Davy: Yet we cannot get a bit at Parliament House.

Mr. NORTH: We can at one table. So vital do I think this question, that I ask every member to take into consideration the lines that I am now going to quote in conclusion. This is a preface written by Sir William Arbuthnot-Lane, consulting surgeon at Guy's Hospital, London—

The valuable material which he has collected shows us that approximately 90 per cent. of our physical defects, disorders and diseases would appear to be preventable, and that they are due in the main to faulty nutrition, lack of fresh air and exercise, stagnation of decomposing intestinal contents, and other simple matters which can easily be corrected.

He then says—

Mr. Barker wisely leads us back to Hippocrates and to nature. We can learn much from the ancients. Physically and intellectually the Greeks have never been surpassed. Yet they sprang probably from ordinary, average human material. A wise diet, exercise in the open air, etc., converted ordinary human stock into a race of demi-gods. Physical degeneration is general among us. We have become a race of invalids and semi-invalids. The regeneration of the race is urgent, is possible, and is easy. Public opinion must wake up to its supreme importance. . . . Doctors cannot afford to disregard this book. Their health is none of the best, and they die at a relatively early age, not owing to the strain of their profession, but owing to mistaken methods of living and faulty feeding. In the tenth chapter Mr. Barker quotes Government statistics relating to the mortality of various occupations, which show that to every 93 deaths of physicians and surgeons from diseases of the circulatory system there are only 51 deaths among agricultural labourers.

He then quotes other diseases in the same ratio, showing that in each instance it is about four doctors to one of the patients they are treating. Then he says:—

Being convinced that prevention is infinitely more important than cure, friends of mine and myself founded some time ago the New Health Society.

That was dealt with by the London "Spectator," an important widely-read monthly. This is what the "Spectator" said of this book:—

No medical man can be exempted from the necessity for grasping the essential significance and so far as he can the detail of this book. It is for the medical profession to take hold of a startled public opinion and mould it according to the principles expressed and implied. By boldly exerting the full force of their authority they may stem the tide of refined, "doctored," devitalised and mummified foods, and lead the mass of the people back to dietetic sanity.

I do not want to say any more, for this subject has now been well thrashed out. Any effort made by Parliament or the Government in this direction will come at the right time. As members see, there is a fairly large audience in the gallery to-night, drawn here by this subject, although not at my bidding. There are doctors in the community who think as I do about this; but what can any doctor do? It is like a man going to a lawyer and saying, "I have cut somebody's throat; get me out of the trouble." If he had gone along beforehand and said, "What is the law about murder?" he might have had a chance. I want to see this wonderful work entered upon, so that the next few years may be the beginning of our getting out of the great mistake we made in the early Victorian days by trying to take the refinement of the brain into the body. This ridiculous notion that food should be refined has had such a terrible effect upon the white race that it has to be faced. I am glad to think this is not the only Parliament in the British Empire that has dealt with the subject. Mrs. Farrelly to-day handed me a report of a deputation to the House of Commons on this very subject. That deputation was promised that action would be taken to have all these dangerous foods labelled. That would not be very difficult to bring in by regulation, and it would strengthen Dr. Atkinson's hands, and the hands of the Minister, if it were given effect to. The trouble is that the average person is so secure in his ordinary life and affairs that he takes as gospel all that he has learned from his parents. I thank the House for having listened to me. I trust the motion will be carried, and that during the next few years there will be a very big improvement in the position as I see it.

Question put and passed.

BILL—POLICE OFFENCES (DRUGS).*Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [9.7] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced for two purposes. First of all, to comply with the request of the drug conference held at Geneva, and secondly because I believe it is necessary that every State in the Commonwealth should have such legislation. There was a conference called at The Hague in 1912, when the first resolutions dealing with opium and other dangerous drugs prepared from opium were framed and certain decisions were arrived at. As the result of that conference, a Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on the 10th June, 1920. That Bill dealt with the first resolutions passed at The Hague conference respecting dangerous drugs. I might point out how seriously other countries take this matter. The Allied Powers at the Peace Treaty at Versailles made the ratification of the International Convention a condition of peace. It is embodied in Article 295 of the Peace Treaty. I secured a copy of the House of Commons "Hansard" in order to read the debate which took place when this Bill was introduced. It was surprising to find there was not one speaker in opposition. Various speakers were in favour of the Bill, but I wish to quote from only three of them. The Bill was introduced by Major Baird himself. Two others supporting the Bill who in my opinion carried some weight were Dr. Murray and Mr. Wooleock, the latter being secretary to the Pharmaceutical Society, and so administering the Pharmacy Act and the laws relating to poison for years before entering the House of Commons. I quote that to show that at all events this man had some knowledge of what was required in respect of dangerous drugs. There is no doubt every big city in the world has its troubles from the drug habit. I am pleased to be able to say that, so far as is known, there is very little of the drug habit in Western Australia. Still, it is not unknown. It is here, but it is very limited. I say that because the Bill, if carried, will act as a preventive to the drug habit, which has not yet got a hold in Western Australia. The Bill will make it very difficult for the habit to get a hold. Australia did not come into the Convention until the second drug conference was held at The Hague. The Commonwealth of Australia, together with all

the other Dominions, signed the convention and protocol of the second opium conference, ratification being made effective on the 17th of February, 1926. Since then we have had two or three letters from the Prime Minister of Australia, asking if any action had been taken in this State to give effect to the decisions of that conference. We got into touch with the Medical Department of the Commonwealth for the purpose of obtaining some information as to what was really desired at the hands of the State. New South Wales and Victoria have already passed this legislation, and from what I can gather a similar Bill is before the Queensland, the South Australian, and the Tasmanian Parliaments at the present time. The importation of opium will be controlled wholly and solely by the Commonwealth Government, but that Government cannot notify the Geneva people that they have complied with the request until such time as every State has passed some legislation dealing with the prohibition of injurious drugs. The Bill defines the drugs to which it shall apply and restricts them to morphine, cocaine, ecgonine, and diamorphine, commonly known as heroin, and their respective salts, etc. Also the Bill gives to the Health Department and to the Pharmaceutical Society, which will administer the Act in conjunction with the Health Department, power to recommend to the Minister, and gives the Minister power to make regulations to include any other drug if it is discovered that it is manufactured under some other name but contains a certain percentage of any of the drugs specified in the Bill.

Mr. Mann: A popular drug is veronal, is it not?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: So far as I know, there is none of it here, unless that is another name for one of the drugs mentioned in the Bill. The Bill provides for the manner in which the percentages of the drugs mentioned shall be calculated. It provides also that the Governor may declare this measure to apply to any new derivative or alkaloid or other drug in the same manner as it applies to the drugs already mentioned. The Bill prohibits the manufacture for sale or possession of prepared opium, except by persons licensed under the regulations to sell, manufacture, etc., the drugs mentioned in the Bill. I do not think any of the drugs are manufactured in Australia. Anyhow, I have been so

advised by the Medical Department. They are imported, and the object of this measure is to obtain control of the distribution. The Bill provides that regulations may be made by the Governor prohibiting the manufacture of the drugs mentioned except on premises licensed for the purpose, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, etc., except by license, and regulating the issue by medical practitioners and others of prescriptions containing such drugs, and for other purposes necessary to give effect to the provisions of the Bill. When members read the Bill they may be inclined to think it goes too far. I thought the Bill went too far in taking power by regulation that in a way would interfere with the prescription of a medical man.

Mr. Davy: I think we shall have to put the regulations in the Act.

The Minister or Mines: I do not know how it can be done.

The Premier: Everything is set out in the schedule.

Mr. Davy: If I have an assurance that the regulations will not extend beyond the schedule, well and good.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Let me explain why doctors' prescriptions should be dealt with in this way. If the measure becomes law, a doctor will be allowed to write for a patient a prescription containing a certain percentage of these drugs. For many ailments it is necessary that a doctor should be able to prescribe some of the drugs. The provision in the Bill—it is asked for by the British Medical Association—is to enable us to prevent a dose being repeated without the authority of the doctor who gave the prescription.

Hon. G. Taylor: You mean that a patient cannot get a refill on the original prescription.

The MINISTER OF HEALTH: The New South Wales regulations fix a limit of three re-fills of a doctor's prescription if it contains more than the specified quantity of the drugs in question.

Mr. Davy: You are asking for greater power than that.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not think so. Still, I am not wedded to the Bill, word for word. If the hon. member can suggest any amendment that will be beneficial in preventing the use of such drugs, I shall be only too willing to accept it.

Mr. Davy: So long as I prove it will be beneficial.

The Premier: Yes, subject to your being able to prove it.

Hon. G. Taylor: We may not be able to prove it to the satisfaction of your side.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Members opposite have had a fairly good run this session.

Mr. Mann: Yes, I think we have succeeded in carrying two amendments!

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: If members continue to occupy the Opposition benches for the next 10 years, they might then even be able to draft some clauses.

Hon. G. Taylor: We shall redraft some of yours.

Mr. Lindsay: I think it is the draftsman that was responsible for this Bill.

The Premier: Look out for your Dog Bill! It is not through yet.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The Bill is a fairly technical one. It is introduced to keep faith with the decisions arrived at by the Geneva Conference.

Mr. Mann: Some of the clauses are pretty drastic.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The Bill has the approval of the executive of the Pharmaceutical Society of Western Australia, and while I have not consulted the executive of the British Medical Association, I have been given to understand by a medical man that it is approved by that association as well.

The Premier: And it is also requested by the Commonwealth Government.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes. It must be realised that drastic powers are necessary to prevent the drug habit gaining a hold in Western Australia.

The Premier: John Nicholson will watch it in another place.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not think he will object to it, because it does not deal with patent medicines. If it did, no doubt he would object. Twenty-three nations have signed the protocol and agreed to introduce legislation on these lines.

Mr. Mann: Not on the lines of this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is very little difference between this Bill and the Act on the statute-book in England. The British Act of 1920 was amended in 1923, and on the amended Act New South Wales based its legislation. The only difference I have been able to find between the British

Act of 1923 and New South Wales Act is that New South Wales includes one more drug.

Mr. Davy: You cannot work up a scrap with us about this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Perhaps I had better read the list of countries that have subscribed to the second opium conference.

Hon. G. Taylor: It might prejudice us against the measure.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The countries are—Albania, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, British Empire (including Canada, Australia, Union of South Africa, New Zealand, India and Irish Free State), Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Zecho-Slovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Siam, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland and Uruguay.

The Premier: We are in step with all the world.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: All those countries have signed the protocol which has practically put them under a moral obligation to do something, and most of the countries have already introduced legislation. Australia should not lag behind other countries, and seeing that Bills have been passed in two States of the Commonwealth, introduced in three other States, and now in Western Australia, and as the same measure must be passed by all the States before the Commonwealth can fulfil its obligation to the conference, I commend the Bill to the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Davy, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,250,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 9.26 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 13th September, 1928.

	PAGE
Bills: Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 1R. ...	722
Bunbury Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 1R. ...	722
Electoral Act Amendment, recom. ...	722
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, Com. ...	729
Forests Act Amendment, 2R., Com. Report ...	739
Group Settlement Act Amendment, 2R. ...	740

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

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

2, Bunbury Electric Lighting Act Amendment.
Introduced by Mr. Withers.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

Resumed from the 11th September; Mr. Lutey in the Chair, the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clause 5—Application of this part (partly considered) [an amendment had been moved to strike out "4" from line 4]:

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I have had circulated in typed form amongst members, an amendment which I think will meet the wishes of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the time given for objections to be taken to the enrolment of electors. The Federal Act provides that all names on claims lodged up to 6 p.m. on the date of the issue of the writ shall immediately go on the roll. Under our Act it is provided that 14 days must elapse prior to the issue of the writ before those names can be placed on the roll.

Mr. Teesdale: That is the time allowed for testing those names.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. Our Act also provides that no name may be struck off the roll after the issue of the writ up to the time of the election. The object of the amendment is to allow sufficient time to elapse so that objections may be made to any claim, and that people