

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Yes.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In that case, should not the words "road board" be included in the amendment?

Hon. J. Nicholson: "Local authority" covers "road board."

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I cannot support the amendment, which, if carried in its present form, would bring this measure into direct conflict with the Road Districts Act.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: As a member for the Metropolitan Province I hope the amendment will not be carried, because I do not wish to see any difference between town members and country members, or town districts and country districts. If the clause as it stands could injure the Perth municipality or any other metropolitan municipality, I would oppose it; but it works no harm, merely enabling local authorities to use their own revenues in their own way. The amendment would create confusion and difficulties.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	11

Majority against .. 6

AYES.

Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)

NOES

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 4 stand as Clause 28 of the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART: The hon. member is now seeking to justify his alteration of the Title of the Bill. From a knowledge of conditions at Collie and Katanning I say the subclause is quite relevant to the clause, in the drafting of which the hon. member, I believe, had a share.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It does not matter whether the provision is a subclause or a

separate clause; if it is irrelevant, it remains irrelevant. I am trying to get over the difficulty by amending the title.

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

Bill reported with further amendments.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 24th November, 1927.

	PAGE
Questions: Land tax, railway freights	2131
Fremantle Harbour, reports	2132
Railways—1, Narrogin Institute; 2, Interlocking System	2132
Assent to Bills	2132
Papers: Avon Loc. 264	2132
Bills: Dog Act Amendment, report	2133
Bridgetown Lot 39A, 2A, Com. Report	2133
Leighton-Babbs Jetty Railway, to refer to Select Committee, Com.	2135
Supply (No. 3), £1,363,500, returned	2143
State Children Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2143
Motion: Centenary Celebrations, completion of Parliament House	2133
Return: Yarramony Eastward Settlement	2157

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

QUESTION—LAND TAX, RAILWAY FREIGHTS.

Mr. FERGUSON asked the Premier: 1, What was the amount of additional land tax levied for the period from 1st July, 1926, to 30th June, 1927, to recoup the loss arising from the reduction of railway freights on 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class goods? 2, What was the amount of such additional taxation levied on users of the Midland railway to whom such reduction does not apply?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Approximately £58,500, but it is impossible to state definitely the exact amount due to the increased rate. 2, This cannot be stated, as the records are not kept in this form.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR, REPORTS.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Minister for Works: Is it his intention to lay on the Table of the House—(a) the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners' report; and (b) the Chief Harbour Master's report on the proposed harbour extensions?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: (a) The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners' report was received by me only two hours before the question was asked and I have not yet had time to study it. The question could be repeated later. (b) No report has been received from the Chief Harbour Master.

QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAYS, NARROGIN.

Proposed Institute.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Railways: What action does he propose to take in regard to the repeated recommendations of the Commissioner of Railways for the establishment of a railway institute at Narrogin?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: This matter is one of very many recommendations by the Commissioner of Railways and will be considered in relation to its relative importance after the passing of the Loan Estimates.

Interlocking System.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Railways: In view of the very heavy traffic at the Narrogin railway station, is it the intention of the department to instal the interlocking system there?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The interlocking of Narrogin railway yard, together with the remodelling of such, is now under consideration by the department.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

1, Mental Treatment.

2, Loan and Inscribed Stock (Sinking Fund).

PAPERS—AVON LOCATION 264, GRANTING AND TRANSFER.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [4.37]: I move—

That all papers connected with the granting of Ningham Location block 264 to a Mr. Deane and the subsequent transfer of the block to a Mr. Carter be laid upon the Table of the House.

I desire to peruse the papers because I have received certain information that, if correct, indicates the adoption of an extraordinary procedure regarding the block of land referred to. I do not want to say much about it because I am not absolutely positive about the facts, but sufficient information has been given to me, and I have sufficient personal knowledge of it myself, to indicate that if what I have ascertained is true, we must take cognisance of the administration of the Land Board in the distribution of blocks and we must realise it is not all that it should be. I do not think the Minister will raise any objection to the tabling of the papers. After they are tabled, and I find that what I have been informed is correct, then I shall ask the House to appoint a select committee to investigate the matter. When the papers are tabled members will have an opportunity to peruse them with the idea of ascertaining whether they require further information. If I find the papers are as I think, they will disclose that the members of the Land Board have not acted as we would wish them to do, regarding the distribution of the comparatively few blocks available among the many applicants for them.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [4.40]: I do not propose to raise any objection to the motion, nor will I offer any comment at this stage. It is a matter entirely for the House and I will lay the papers on the Table at the first opportunity.

Question put and passed.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—BRIDGETOWN LOT 39A.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 9th November.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [4.42]: I support the second reading of the Bill knowing that it conforms to the wishes of all sections of the community at Bridgetown. We were becoming anxious for fear the Minister had forgotten to introduce the Bill this session. The facts have been outlined by the Minister. Originally the Mechanics' Institute and Library was built 60 years ago and was vested in a trust. Some 30 or 40 years ago additions were made to it. The old trustees passed away and new ones were appointed in their place. I was a trustee for many years. A meeting was held at which all the subscribers attended, and it was decided that the present building did not meet the requirements of the district. It was considered impossible for the trustees to raise the necessary money to build a hall that would satisfy the requirements of the district and therefore it was decided to hand the building over to the road board. With the consent of the ratepayers, the board accepted the responsibility, the trustees signed over their rights to the board, and that body now proposes to build, either on the present site or on a new one, a hall that will be more in keeping with the requirements of the district and yet serve the same purpose. The Bill is a simple one and I trust it will be agreed to without amendment.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

MOTION—CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS.*Completion of Parliament House.*

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [4.47]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the completion of the front of Parliament buildings should be associated with the centenary celebrations.

I would like members to note carefully the wording of the motion, because otherwise it may be suggested that this is some sort of an attempt to dictate to the Government. Whether that association takes place must depend upon the view of the hon. member to whom is entrusted the public purse, and if the financial position should be such when the centenary celebrations are imminent as to make it impossible or unjustifiable to carry out the proposal, I should not like him to think that he was forced to act against his better judgment by the expressed wish of the House. If, in the opinion of the Treasurer, it is justifiable, it is the thing that ought to be done before other things. I should like to put the reasons why this work should be carried out on four grounds, all of them but one purely material, the other being the aesthetic ground. Let me start with the least noble reason. The first on the upward scale is a purely selfish reason, and that is the comfort of members of the two Houses and of the staff of Parliament. Obviously the staff, particularly at this season of the year, carry out their work under conditions of great discomfort, and members also, in carrying out their duties of interviewing constituents and so on, are considerably hampered by lack of space and lack of really necessary conveniences. Another ground into which the first reason actually shades is efficiency. It is recognised by all, but by none better than the Minister for Works, that workmen cannot carry out their work to the best advantage in bad or uncomfortable surroundings. To expect, say, the "Hansard" staff to do their work efficiently in hot weather in the ramshackle collection of tin sheds they occupy is to be entirely too optimistic. Members, when they are actually in the House, have the best possible surroundings. I do not think we could improve the Chamber as it now is, but outside the Chamber our efficiency is seriously affected by the lack of room. That brings me to the third ground of reasons, still on the upward scale, and that is the business reason from the point of view of the whole State. If it is not the most important building, the building that is regarded as typifying the ideals and reflecting the prosperity of the country is Parliament House. If we go to any place we have not visited before, we ask where Parliament House is. Speaking for myself, I have never been to another State without having asked the question. When the visitor to Western Australia, impressed perhaps with what he has been told of the boundless

potentialities, the genuine possibilities and the certain future of the State, asks to see Parliament House and is shown this building, he must feel indeed disappointed. A man asked me to show him Parliament House, and he looked at the delightful grounds, the grassy bank with the trees growing more beautiful every year, and then saw the raw side of the brick building with nasty pieces of bond iron hanging at the ends of the unfinished walls.

The Premier: Jangling their discordant noises.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. It is not only the eye but the ear that is offended. I do not like publishing this fact, either, but even the olfactory nerve is assaulted by the smell that occurs in the corridors owing to the badly-placed kitchen. The visitor to Western Australia, seeing the raw side of the building, perhaps remarks, "Oh, you have not finished your Parliament House yet. When do you expect to finish it?" Perhaps in the circumstances a little untruth would be justified, but the answer of an honest Western Australian must be, "It has been like that for 23 years, and there seems to be little prospect of its being completed."

The Minister for Lands: "When the State has more money to spare" is a common answer to that question.

Mr. DAVY: That is so.

Mr. Sampson: Then it will lose its marine store aspect.

Mr. DAVY: At this stage when we are endeavouring to interest the people of the world in Western Australia and are, in a large measure, succeeding, it is a bad advertisement for the State that Parliament should be housed in a building occupying such a conspicuous and lovely position and yet looking so hideous from the outside. I now come to the last class of reason, and to my mind it is the best, namely the aesthetic point. Surely, without running the risk of being charged with conceit, we, as members of Parliament and citizens, may claim to have the deepest admiration for the institution of Parliament that has been handed down to us by our forefathers. Whatever may be our opinion of opponents or of fellow creatures as individual men, we have a pride in Parliament as an institution, and think it should be housed in a beautiful building and not in the temporary set of ramshackle tin and unfinished brick buildings that look so hideous to everyone that gazes on them.

Those are the four reasons that appear to be unanswerable why the Parliament buildings should be completed. Admittedly there are objections to the reasons, though the objections are not answers. The first objection would be that we cannot afford to complete the buildings. It is difficult to say just what a man can afford and when he can afford it. From some points of view it may be unjustifiable for a man, having a large mortgage on his house, to buy a new suit of clothes, or spend money on entertaining his friends without its producing any immediate financial return, but I do not think that is the point of view generally accepted by human beings. The sensible man realises that, so long as he is on the upgrade and his finances may be reasonably expected to be improved from year to year, and so long as he can meet his obligations as they fall due, he is entitled from time to time to spend money on advantages that are purely immaterial. From the aesthetic point of view it cannot be argued for a moment that it is not a highly proper thing to build a beautiful Parliament. Most places in the world that have risen to greatness have not been afraid to spend money in a manner in which the man with a soul of clay would call wasting it—on purely beautiful things that have not shown any pecuniary result. So, subject to the views of the keeper of the purse strings, I think the cannot-afford-it argument is not one that can be allowed to carry much weight on this occasion, our 100th birthday.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: As a matter of fact we could not afford it when we constructed the present buildings.

Mr. DAVY: Probably not. It has been argued that the money could be spent in a better way. I suppose it could. Disregarding the non-material for the moment, I suppose it would be better from a purely base point of view to spend the money on making more roads, but in point of fact there is no man, woman or child in Western Australia who does not agree that some money should be spent to celebrate the centenary. I do not think anyone has suggested otherwise. Some of the money is bound to be spent in a manner that will not give an immediate, if it gives any financial return. How much that sum is to be must depend upon the Treasurer. I am told that to complete the original scheme of Parliament House would cost probably £80,000. I see

no reason why the spirit contained in this motion cannot be met and substantial assistance to our birthday celebrations effected by the expenditure of a portion of that money. The Treasurer might find it better to set aside a sum of say £10,000, £15,000 or £25,000 per year for a period of years and thus, when we arrived at our celebrations, we might have a substantial portion at least under way and an immediate prospect of the completion of the rest within a comparatively few years. I can carry the question no further. I do not want the Premier to think that I wish to dictate to him as to what shall be done. I have a regard for his difficulties in financing the State, and I realise that it would be indeed unwise, simply because we are having a succession of splendid seasons and the production of wealth is increasing enormously from year to year, to think we are made of gold and can throw it around extravagantly. We can only achieve real prosperity if, during prosperous times, we keep down expenditure. We must not think these good seasons will exist for ever. The Minister for Lands warned us that we must not think we shall have for ever and a day seasons such as we have had during the last few years. We must not act as if we were always going to have such good prices for wool and wheat. We must prepare for the possibility of a setback. Even taking these things into consideration, we can still agree that at any rate some portion of the money, which we are determined shall be spent upon centenary celebrations, shall be devoted to the purpose mentioned in this motion.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

BILL—LEIGHTON-ROBB'S JETTY RAILWAY.

To refer to select committee.

Order of the Day read for the consideration of the Bill in committee.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.2]: I move—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

I indicated last night that I wished to get more information on this question. The reason why I felt more information should

be forthcoming is the statement contained in Sir George Buchanan's report. I had no knowledge then that the Harbour Trust Commissioner's report was placed in the hands of the Minister only yesterday. I assumed that the Harbour Trust had discussed the matter, and desired to know their views. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) also stated that there was not universal satisfaction regarding certain phases of the harbour extension. Sir George Buchanan, in his recent report, recommended the extension of the harbour up river. He said—

In my opinion, a new bridge for railway connection should not be near the existing road bridge, but should be either in the vicinity of Roe Point in the Blackwall Reach, as shown on the plan, or above Freshwater Bay between Point Walter and Point Resolution. I prefer the location near Roe Point, but it has been represented to me that south-east of Freshwater Bay, between Butler's Hump and Chidley Point, there is a site admirably situated for the location of a floating dry dock, if such is ever required, and that a bridge across the river, near Roe Point, would prevent vessels reaching the floating dock. The bridge above Freshwater Bay would be very expensive, and there are other objectionable features. I am, therefore, of opinion that the bridge should be at Roe Point, with provision for an opening span in the event of a floating dock being established in Freshwater Bay.

In 1837 and in 1875 certain schemes were propounded. Sir John Cooke, in 1875, dealt with the matter, and in 1877 submitted two designs. He considered it was impracticable to treat the existing entrance to the Swan River with a view to the formation and maintenance of a deep-water bridge. In 1891 the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, reported adversely on Sir John Cooke's scheme, and expressed the opinion that a harbour could be provided. In 1913 Mr. J. F. Ramsbotham was asked to report on the subject. He summed up the advantages and disadvantages of the various proposals and finally decided that there should be no harbour development above the railway bridge, and that the future needs of the port could best be met by the construction of large basins, or docks, in the open sea to the north of the existing harbour. That Mr. Ramsbotham's scheme is practicable is proved by the fact that it has been partially adopted by the present Engineer-in-Chief. Then we come to Sir George Buchanan's report. It is on that I think we should have further information. I am quite willing to give the Minister for Works au-

thority to spend £2,000 on the necessary plans and borings, but if we pass this Bill we commit ourselves to a definite scheme of railway construction and a definite site for the bridge. We have a detailed statement from the Engineer-in-Chief. Unfortunately, however, in view of the opinion expressed on the 31st January last by Sir George Buchanan, we are justified in asking that this House should receive further information. He stated—

After careful consideration, my views on port development at Fremantle are as follows, and are outlined on the plan accompanying this note:—In the matter of bridges and railway connections, at the present time there is a railway bridge across the Swan at the eastern end of the existing harbour, and 1,500 feet away there is a road bridge across the Swan which unites North Fremantle with Plympton and Fremantle. These bridges are very old and require renewal, and there is no doubt that both bridges interfere with harbour development. In my opinion, a new bridge for railway connection should not be near the existing road bridge, but should be either in the vicinity of Roe Point in the Blackwall Reach, as shown on the plan, or above Freshwater Bay between Point Walter and Point Resolution. I prefer the location near Roe Point, but it has been represented to me that south-east of Freshwater Bay, between Butler's Hump and Chidley Point, there is a site admirably situated for the location of a floating dry dock, if such is ever required, and that a bridge across the river, near Roe Point, would prevent vessels reaching the floating dock. The bridge above Freshwater Bay would be very expensive, and there are other objectionable features. I am, therefore, of opinion that the bridge should be at Roe Point, with provision for an opening span in the event of a floating dock being established in Freshwater Bay. The railway bridge having been removed, and the road bridge either removed or reconstructed with an opening span, the future extension of the port may be divided into four sections, each one self contained, and to be carried out as the development of trade demands. On the removal of the railway bridge and the diversion of the railway between Fremantle and Cottesloe, via Roe Point above Rocky Bay, the dockisation of the river as far as the existing road bridge would be carried out, and would give a wharf length of about 4,100 lineal feet, 2,700 lineal feet on the north-west side, and 1,400 lineal feet on the south-east side, with a width between the faces of the wharves of 1,000 feet, and a depth of water at low water of 30 feet.

There is a divergence of opinion between two eminent authorities, both expressed this year. That should be sufficient reason for the House to decide that further information should be afforded on the subject, and that there should be some check upon the report of the Engineer-in-Chief. Mr. Stileman's

estimate is that 5,755ft. of wharfage would cost approximately £2,000,000, or £348 per ft. Sir George Buchanan provided for 4,100ft. at an estimated cost of £1,015,500, or £274 per ft. There is a difference in these estimates of £74 per foot on the construction of wharves. I want the people of Fremantle to understand that in moving for the appointment of a select committee, I am not in any way antagonistic to the construction of a bridge at the port, or to the extension of the harbour. This scheme will cost many millions of pounds before it is completed. The House will be wise to take a little time to consider this matter. I know that the subject is urgent, and that a bridge must be constructed as soon as possible. There is no reason why the Minister should not proceed with the work he is desirous of carrying out, but I object to passing this Bill as it is, and pledging ourselves to a definite site for the bridge, in view of the opinions supplied by two experts. Naturally, the Minister for Works feels he must be guided by his responsible officer. I am not in any way reflecting upon the professional ability or integrity of the Engineer-in-Chief, neither am I reflecting in any way upon the Government. The position is a grave one. I wish to see that the money involved in these extensions and in the construction of the bridge, is wisely spent. It would be wise to appoint a select committee. The Minister could still give his engineers instructions to proceed with the preparation of plans for the work. It is anticipated that the House will adjourn very shortly. Even so, it is a practical thing, without in any way delaying the scheme, to turn the select committee that may be appointed into an honorary Royal Commission, so that the whole of the data might be available when the House reassembles next session. This course would not in any way hamper the progress of what the Minister desires. He has power to-day to go on with that. But I do not like the House committing itself at present to placing the bridge in the situation suggested by the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [5.16]: The suggestion is that a select committee be appointed to decide whether the proposal of the Engineer-in-Chief is right, or whether Sir George Buchanan's scheme is right.

Mr. Thomson: I gave that only as an illustration of the position.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is to say, a body of laymen are to determine differences of opinion between professional engineers.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is Parliament's responsibility, of course. We are all laymen, and we cannot swallow the expert every time. We would be in a nice old mess if we did.

Mr. Thomson: My word, we would!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would not like the job of sitting on a select committee to deal with a subject such as this. The proposal is that a body of laymen should sit in judgment on a highly technical question which many engineers have examined, and that those laymen, who are not engineers, should decide the question. They would be treading on extremely dangerous ground. I would not like to be called upon to decide the question.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You are doing it here now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government have decided to accept the recommendation of their chief professional adviser. In my opinion, it would be wrong if the Government did anything else. If, however, it comes to pitting Sir George Buchanan's opinion against Mr. Stileman's—

Mr. Thomson: I have not said that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member's whole speech consisted of that.

Mr. Thomson: No.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not wish to say anything derogatory to Sir George Buchanan, but I will point out that he was not in this State long enough to be able to form a sound opinion.

Mr. Thomson: Anyway, your Engineer-in-Chief has selected part of Sir George Buchanan's scheme.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Stileman has been engaged for over 12 months on this report, whereas Sir George Buchanan's stay in this State was a matter of days.

Hon. W. J. George: The engineers have all the information furnished to them before they come here.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We even sent a mass of information after Sir George Buchanan to London. He asked for details, and every detail he desired was supplied to him. The mover of the motion has not named one heading under which he himself wants

more information. He has not named any matter as to which the Engineer-in-Chief has not given full particulars.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, I gave as a reason that one of the engineers—

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member has not mentioned one point on which the Engineer-in-Chief has not supplied full information. He has merely said that engineers differ on certain points. Nor did the hon. member point to any phase of the whole recommendation as to which he can suggest that fuller information should be obtained.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, I can.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But the hon. member has not done it. I listened most carefully, with my pen in my hand, to take a note of any point on which the hon. member might say he wanted further information.

Mr. Thomson: The position of the bridges, for instance.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As to the position of the bridges we have all possible information.

Mr. Thomson: But I am not satisfied with the information that has been given.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is only a question of difference of opinion.

Mr. Thomson: That is so; a difference of opinion between two engineers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And the hon. member is going to set himself up as a judge of that question.

Mr. Thomson: What have you done?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are recommending that our professional adviser's opinion be accepted.

Mr. Thomson: You have decided which opinion you will accept. Will you not allow me the same privilege?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But the hon. member wants to examine both sides of the question and sit as umpire.

Mr. Thomson: Yes.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government do not agree that that is a job for the hon. member at all.

Mr. Thomson: The select committee's report might endorse the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief in its entirety.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In my opinion that would not take us any further. Would the Government then be in a position to say whether they should accept the select committee's recommendation, a recommendation of laymen, as against that of

their chief professional adviser? Does the hon. member want to place the Government in such a position? Not one member of the select committee would possess the training of a professional engineer, and are the Government to accept the committee's opinion against that of a man who is employed and paid on account of his training and experience as an engineer?

Mr. Thomson: The seafaring men are not satisfied.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not concerned about that.

Mr. Thomson: Of course not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am only stating the case as it presents itself to the mind of Cabinet. Tom Walsh is a seaman; shall we get his opinion on this matter?

Mr. Thomson: I thought this was a great and serious question.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know where the carrying of such a motion as this may lead to. The recommendation on which the Bill is based comes from a man of special training and years of experience, and now the Government are asked to disregard that recommendation and to wait until a body of laymen have inquired, whereupon the Government are to choose between what the laymen may put up and what the professional engineer has recommended.

Mr. Thomson: Did not a body of laymen inquire into the Churchman's Brook scheme with good results?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know that.

Mr. Thomson: I understand they did, as regards the foundations anyway.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The report of the select committee to which the hon. member refers had nothing whatever to do with the question of the foundations, which was decided long before the appointment of the select committee. I assure the hon. member that that is so. I think the select committee's investigation resulted from what I myself had to say in this Chamber.

Mr. Thomson: And yet you admit yourself to be a layman.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I hope the hon. member will not misinterpret that remark of mine. I suggest the investigation resulted from what I said here when voicing the views of the Engineer-in-Chief, not my own views. It was that, I think, which led to the question being taken up in the Legis-

lative Council. I did not put forward the views of the Engineer-in-Chief as my own views. It might as well be said that I was giving my own views when stating the technical case in favour of the Bill. I repeat, Sir George Buchanan was not in this State long enough to get a grip of the whole case. I repeat that he was supplied with all the information he desired. However, the study and time devoted to the question by Mr. Stileman, and the case he has presented, altogether outweigh the other engineer's efforts. After such an exhaustive investigation as Mr. Stileman undertook, after his report, which supplies the fullest details and particulars under numerous headings, it is hard to imagine in what quarter further information could be sought. The Government cannot accept the proposal that they should wait for a select committee to examine the question. If they did wait as suggested, they would then find themselves in the position of having to decide between their professional adviser on the one hand, and a committee of laymen on the other. However, really it is not a mere question of delay; I do not think an investigation by a select committee would delay the matter. Still, it would not take us any further. The select committee's report would not move the Government from the decision they have arrived at, namely, to accept the recommendation of the man who by reason of his training and experience holds the position of Engineer-in-Chief. I hope that the Bill will not be referred to a committee of laymen.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.26]: There is a great fear lest during the controversy which has arisen on this subject it may be made to appear that the Engineer-in-Chief is being criticised. Nothing has been further from the minds of those who have advanced criticisms. During the second reading stage I suggested that the question might properly be referred to a Royal Commission.

The Minister for Railways: Has there been controversy?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, during the second reading stage, and there has also been some this afternoon.

The Premier: There was some controversy as to the Dog Act Amendment Bill last night. Is that measure to be referred to a Royal Commission?

Mr. SAMPSON: That measure went through.

The Minister for Mines: Is every matter of controversy in this Chamber to be referred to a Royal Commission?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is the duty of members of Parliament to engage in controversy, and to endeavour to bring forward viewpoints which otherwise might not receive consideration, on matters coming before the House. My memory is neither over-long nor over-vigorous, but I can recall that even the present Premier on odd occasions criticised the work of the late Government. However, his criticism was kindly, and usually quite unjustified. It has been said this afternoon that the suggested select committee would mean that laymen would be placed in the position of criticising or judging work necessarily of a professional character. While I acknowledge my Parliamentary experience to be limited, yet I venture to suggest that surely it would be possible for an engineer of repute to be invited to become a member of the committee or commission, and assist in examining the subject.

Hon. W. J. George: Have we in Western Australia one equal to Mr. Stileman?

Mr. SAMPSON: A member faces difficulties when he urges further consideration, and hastening slowly, in a matter of such great importance. Not for a moment would I imply or suggest that Mr. Stileman is other than a thoroughly capable engineer; but we have had experience of other engineers of acknowledged capacity and high reputation, and we have read Sir George Buchanan's report on work of a similar nature, a report which goes to show that even professional men do disagree on important points. When the patient is sick, when the case is serious, other doctors are called in. That is a custom which has grown up in a highly-trained profession, and no objection is raised to it. It is never suggested that when a patient is sick the bringing in of a second or even a third doctor implies disregard of the dignity attaching to—

The Premier: But this is not a proposal to bring in a doctor; this is a proposal to bring in a quack, an unqualified person, to sit in judgment upon the doctor.

Mr. SAMPSON: As I understand the position, if the motion of the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) were carried, the personnel of the committee or commission would depend upon invitations issued by the Premier. Suppose before a definite decision were reached as to the scheme, a leading

engineer, perhaps the engineer in charge of the North Sydney bridge, gave consideration to it. But Australia is not so bankrupt in engineers—

The Premier: Then why look so hard at the member for Murray-Wellington?

Mr. SAMPSON: I was hopeful that he, knowing how engineers do disagree, would say that before we accepted the advice of any engineer we should go thoroughly into the subject.

Hon. W. J. George: But your illustration is unfortunate, for that big bridge is a mechanical question.

Mr. SAMPSON: Past experience carries justification for hastening slowly. I am glad that the mover and other speakers have dissociated themselves from any suggestion reflecting on the Engineer-in-Chief, or any member of the Government. Nautical men have declared that the proposed width of the Fremantle harbour would be insufficient for modern sea-going craft. If that is so to-day, how much more would it be so in the years to come, since there is a world-wide tendency to increase the size of ocean-going steamers. It is not unprofitable to refer to what has happened in the past. The late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor has been alluded to. Perhaps if this matter had been looked into more carefully and he had received fuller support than he did, the unfortunate circumstances by which the State lost that great man would never have occurred.

Hon. W. J. George: That was not in connection with the Fremantle harbour.

Mr. SAMPSON: But it was connected with another big scheme over which he was criticised. I hope that in view of the importance of this work the Minister will agree with the principle enunciated in the motion, namely, that when a very big scheme is under review it is wise to appoint a select committee, to be subsequently converted into a Royal Commission. That having been done and the fullest evidence taken, there could be no criticism at a later stage. But if in defiance of the reiterated desire of members of the House, the intention to proceed without the fullest information being obtained is persisted in, it is quite possible that at a later stage the Government will be open to serious criticism for having decided to throw aside all caution and go ahead with the work.

MR. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [5.35]: In my opinion the Leader of the Country Party has done a very useful service in bringing this motion before

the House and pointing out the great difference between Mr. Stileman's report and the recommendations of Sir George Buchanan for the extension of the Fremantle harbour. The Minister for Works was quite fair and candid with the House when he said that although the Bill was only for a small work, it was deciding the whole future of the Fremantle harbour. He pointed out that if Mr. Stileman's recommendations are adopted and if the Bill is carried, we are committing this country in 10 or 15 years' time to the future extension of Fremantle harbour out into the open ocean. A significant and unsatisfactory point of the report is that there is no estimate given of the cost of the extension of the harbour out into the ocean.

The Premier: How could there be? Did Sir George Buchanan give an estimate?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, an exact estimate in his report on the further extension of the harbour up the river.

The Premier: A very valuable report!

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: To a layman the extension up the river seems much more practicable. That was the scheme the professional officers of the Western Australian Government always held until Mr. Stileman came along. It was on the recommendation of the Engineer-in-Chief of the day that a large area of land up the river was resumed and the Public Works Department spent a great deal of money testing a site for the bridge at that point.

The Premier: There are scattered about the State many monuments to the blunders of engineers, monuments costing millions of pounds.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: And we do not want another one in a big bridge placed at a point where, until Mr. Stileman's report was laid on the Table of the House, no one ever thought it would be, and where it will block any further extension of the harbour up-river. Sir George Buchanan in his report said—

In my opinion a new bridge for railway connection should not be near the existing road bridge, but should be either in the vicinity of Roe Point, Blackwall Reach, as shown on the plan, or above Freshwater Bay, between Point Walter and Point Resolution.

Here we have one of the most famous engineers in the British Empire, an engineer that the Commonwealth Government thought the proper man to bring to Australia to advise us in regard to harbours.

And I take it the State Government of Western Australia were very pleased to have his services. He distinctly points out that the new bridge should not be put anywhere near where it is now proposed to put it, and he says that in his opinion it should be either in the vicinity of Roe Point or else much further up the river again, between Point Resolution and Point Walter.

Mr. Lambert: Do you think he was qualified to give an opinion, when he stayed here only three or four days?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I take it a man of his ability and reputation would spend the time necessary for the purpose, and would get all the available information before he made his report. He went on to point out that the bridge should be at Roe Point, Blackwall Reach, and that provision should be made for an opening span, in the event of a floating dock being established in Freshwater Bay. It is now proposed to put the bridge 1,000 feet or so from the existing road bridge, with no provision for getting through it and going up the river. Sir George Buchanan points out that the bridge should be a couple of miles or more further up the river, which would permit of the extension of the harbour right up to and through Rocky Bay. He also points out that even if the bridge is put at Blackwall Reach, it should have an opening that would permit of ships going into Freshwater Bay, where there is a most excellent site for a floating dock. It is a very serious responsibility for the Government and the House to set aside that report and put the bridge opposite East-street, Fremantle, where it will block any further extension of the harbour up-river. Then we are asked to commit the State to the building of another huge breakwater from the North Mole, and to the extension of the harbour into the open sea.

Hon. W. J. George: Are there any local interests?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I do not know, but I do know we ought to have a proper sense of responsibility before we block the extension of the harbour up river, especially when we look at the shipping that goes into Melbourne and Sydney. Are we not to believe that in a few years time our volume of shipping will be just as great? I remember, Sir, your own visualising of the shipping likely to go into Esperance in a few years time, and I say that in agreeing

to block any further extension of the Fremantle harbour up-river we are not showing a proper appreciation of the future. Let me give Sir George Buchanan's figures: He divides his plan into four sections. In section 1 there are to be 4,100 lineal feet of wharfage at a cost of £1,015,500. In section 2 there are to be 3,200 lineal feet of wharfage at a cost of £757,300. Then he makes provision for two other sections, both of which, being further up the river, will never be permissible of construction if the bridge is built at the point proposed by Mr. Stileman. In section 3, from Brown Point to Direction Point, there are to be 4,700 lineal feet of wharfage at an estimated cost of £1,330,800, and in section 4, which is almost entirely in Rocky Bay, in a system of docks there are to be 16,300 lineal feet of wharfage at an estimated cost of £3,644,000. So it will be seen that Sir George Buchanan's report provided for an extension of the Fremantle wharves by 28,300 lineal feet to be built in sections at a total cost of £6,747,600. It is now proposed to build the bridge at a point that will for ever prevent the building of the last two sections, representing more than 21,000 lineal feet of wharfage. It means in effect that we are discarding Sir George Buchanan's comprehensive report, that we shall not ultimately extend the harbour into Rocky Bay, that there will not be the 21,000 lineal feet of wharf space up the river and that we shall make it impossible for Sir George Buchanan's proposals to be carried into effect. It is proposed to put the bridge where the Engineer-in-Chief suggests, without adequate consideration, from this Parliament, and without any report other than that of the Engineer-in-Chief, and that when we find the river harbour too small for our requirements we shall set to work, and at untold expense, build a great breakwater from the North Mole into the ocean and I suppose go on dredging it for ever. I cannot speak from a professional standpoint of the two schemes; I do not know whether Mr. Stileman's scheme is better than that proposed by Sir George Buchanan, but I do know that the proposal set forth by Sir George Buchanan is on the lines of what was always considered by the professional men of the Public Works Department in this State to be the direction in which the harbour should be extended up the river.

If that was not so, why were tests for the bridge made at the point near where Sir George Buchanan recommended the bridge should be constructed. Again, why was land resumed in that vicinity? The consensus of professional opinion is in favour of the extension of the harbour up the river, and in my opinion we shall make a mistake if we build the bridge in the position now suggested, unless of course, we have the fullest and most complete inquiry. I do not for one moment say that a select committee would be capable of deciding the question. The select committee could do what I urged last night the Government should do, and that is obtain additional evidence before going further with the work. In the circumstances a select committee should be appointed, or it could be a Royal Commission, in which case there would be the opportunity to obtain the opinion of another competent engineer. It seems to me that we are doing a wrong thing by blocking the extension up the river as recommended by Sir George Buchanan. I remind the House again that that recommendation provided for over 21,000 lineal feet of wharves. That, however, can never be carried out if the bridge is built at the point now suggested and where it will prevent ships from proceeding up the river. The matter is of great urgency. Reference has been made to the mistakes of the past. Some of those errors were due to lack of foresight. We are not asking the Government to discard the bridge at the point recommended by Mr. Stileman. The importance of the matter merits the most careful investigation and we should be quite certain before the bridge is built that we are building it in the correct position, having in mind the tremendous increase in shipping that must take place to and from Fremantle within a short period of time.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [5.50]: There are two matters in respect of which the Minister should satisfy the House. One is that he should leave the question of expenditure until we meet again next year. In the meantime he can go on with the work of the preparation of plans.

The Minister for Works: I gave that undertaking last night.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He can also go on with the work of resuming land, and he can also take the opportunity to get another opinion. We are embarking on a

tremendous undertaking. We propose to erect across the river a barrier that will have the effect of ultimately driving us out to the outer harbour project. Before we face that we should get the best expert opinion possible, even if we have to send to the Old Country. The Minister should also assure us that there will be no expenditure other than that involved in land resumption until the House has had an opportunity to discuss the matter. Those assurances would be better than the appointment of a select committee or a Royal Commission at this stage. I am not in a position to say whether Mr. Stileman's report is better than that of Sir George Buchanan, but I do not think that even Mr. Stileman would object to another opinion being obtained.

Mr. Kenneally: And should it not confirm his advice?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then we could still seek advice.

The Minister for Works: If the assurance I gave to the House last night was not definite enough, I repeat the assurance now that no expenditure will be incurred on the bridge until Parliament has had an opportunity to discuss the matter. All we want to do is to get the plans ready and to go on with the resumptions.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That assurance, I think, should be satisfactory. It will, of course, commit us to a slight expenditure.

Mr. Thomson: Do we commit ourselves to a particular site?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No; that is understood.

The Minister for Works: We can sell the land that we resume, if we have no use for it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not fair to take land from the people unless we need it. There cannot be much harm, however, in giving them notice that we require it.

The Premier: We can serve notices in order to fix the values.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think we can accept the assurance given by the Minister. Apart from the assurance, I hope the Minister will give consideration to the advisableness of getting a report from another eminent engineer so that there may be no delay when we meet again.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.55]: I am not quite sure what attitude the hon. member is going to adopt towards the suggestion, but I do say that the proposal to appoint a select committee to go into the question will get us nowhere at all. In my opinion a select committee would be futile, and as to the proposal to get the opinion of some other engineer, well, where are we going to find such an engineer in Australia?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You might have to go outside Australia.

The PREMIER: I have no hesitation in saying that there is no other engineer in Australia better qualified—I doubt whether there is one so well qualified—than Mr. Stileman, to make a report and recommendation on a subject such as this. The Leader of the Opposition knows that it has been the practice to select the best professional men available to fill high offices, and the Government must of necessity, unless there is some glaring or obvious reason why they should not, accept the report and recommendations of their professional advisers.

Mr. Thomson: I said that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is asking us to appoint a committee of members of this House to sit in judgment on the reports of Sir George Buchanan and Mr. Stileman. It is not possible to do it, and I do not hesitate to give my opinion that I do not care whether a man be ten times as eminent as Sir George Buchanan, he could not have gone thoroughly into this question and given a sound opinion in the short time that Sir George Buchanan spent in this State. He was not many months in the whole of Australia and in that time he reported on all the harbours. The major portion of his time here was devoted to social questions and to matters that had nothing to do with the object of his professional visit. He went down to Bunbury one day and came back on the next day and presented a report on the Bunbury harbour. He spent a few days at Fremantle and then gave us a report on the Fremantle harbour. Reports prepared in such circumstances are not of much value and certainly will not stand, in my opinion, against the matured judgment of a man who has given 12 months of close thought and study to the subject, and moreover, a man who is eminent in his profession, and who has a world-wide reputation in respect of harbour works. Where are we going to find in Australia a man

with equal qualifications, a man of experience wider than that possessed by our Engineer-in-Chief?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We can consult other engineers in the world.

The PREMIER: Where are we to find them?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Mr. Stileman will tell you.

The PREMIER: I do not know that he will. If we go to Great Britain we might again get Sir George Buchanan, or someone like him, to whose opinion I would not attach very much importance, that is, insofar as a work such as this was concerned. Mr. Stileman is an outstanding figure in his profession with regard to harbour works in Great Britain. He has been in different parts of the British Empire—India and Canada included—in connection with harbour construction. I do not think we should reject the opinion of somebody else if we can be told where we can get that opinion.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Mr. Stileman will tell you.

The PREMIER: I do not agree that there is anyone in Australia who should be asked to sit in judgment on the report of the Engineer-in-Chief. I do not know that we would get anyone in Great Britain either. If the same doubts had been expressed when the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor submitted his proposals with regard to the Fremantle harbour, we should never have had a Fremantle harbour, and if select committees and Royal Commissions had been appointed to investigate the goldfields water scheme, the goldfields could not have continued to exist. The Government of the day had to do what Governments all over the world have to do.

Hon. W. J. George: Yes, accept the responsibility.

The PREMIER: If they have confidence in their professional officers, they have to accept the recommendations of those officers.

Hon. W. J. George: And stand up to them afterwards.

The PREMIER: What could we do? If we went to Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland or South Australia, we would see that their professional men are carrying out huge works, infinitely greater than the one under discussion. There are works such as the irrigation schemes along the Murray River, and bridge construction as well as harbour construction. I have not read in the newspapers that the Governments there, having obtained the advice of men whose duty it was to advise them, have turned round

and gone to some other State to obtain additional advice, nor yet have they gone to some other country with that object in view. On the other hand, they have accepted their engineers' recommendations; and there can be no alternative for us, if we are satisfied with the qualifications of our expert professional advisers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But surely the Engineer-in-Chief should not object to consulting someone he knows.

The PREMIER: Where shall we go to secure the man for that purpose?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Mr. Stileman will tell you.

The Minister for Works: Mr. Stileman has consulted other engineers.

The PREMIER: I understand our Engineer for Harbours and Rivers is a man of wide experience and high attainments. He was recognised as that in Great Britain, and he has been in consultation with the Engineer-in-Chief.

Hon. W. J. George: Probably he did a good deal of the work.

The PREMIER: I do not think the Government would object to securing further advice on this question if it could be shown that there was someone possessing professional knowledge who transcended in that regard the men who had already reported upon this problem; but I am not prepared to commit the Government on that score at present. The Minister for Works has given the House an undertaking regarding the expenditure, and has explained the position as to the necessary resumption of land and so forth. The House will have an opportunity to discuss the matter further before any expenditure, apart from that entailed in the preliminary work, is incurred. I think that is reasonable, and as far as the Government should be expected to go.

HON. W. J. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) [6.3]: The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson), as the mover of the amendment, should accept the assurance of the Minister for Works, and that should serve to attain the object he seeks at present. I agree with many of the remarks of the Premier, but I would point out to the Government that the scheme furnished by the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Stileman, has come as a bolt from the blue to the public. For many years past it has been considered that there would come a time when it would be not only necessary but advisable that the shipping problem should be dealt with and vessels probably

brought to Perth, in the same way as the shipping in Victoria has been taken to Melbourne itself.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Heaven help the metropolis then!

Member: It would be a fatal mistake.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Naturally there are differences of opinion on that question, but admittedly there were many people who felt that that was the objective in front of those who have been dealing with the harbour proposals. Before my time as Minister for Works, I think the then Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Thompson, had gone into a scheme for the harbour works and, in order to secure data upon which operations could be based, certain cylinders were placed in the river and tests made over a period of years to see whether the foundations were good enough for a combined road and railway bridge. I believe it was proposed that in any bridge constructed, there should be an opening provided to enable vessels to pass through should it be decided that the shipping was to be taken higher up the river. For the moment I will not presume to criticise the work of Mr. Stileman, as indicated in his report. It is most interesting and shows that he has gone thoroughly into the subject from A to Z in the course of his inquiry. He has presented the information he gleaned in a way that it can be readily understood. The mass of information is so great, and covers such a wide scope of no inconsiderable importance, that no cursory reading of the document can enable any member of this House, irrespective of what experience he may have, to form an opinion for or against the Stileman scheme. Certainly the idea of extending the harbour outside the North Mole and along the coast at North Fremantle is new to me. Without being egotistical, I can claim that all the proposals that have been put forward regarding the harbour at Fremantle have received my attention from time to time, and I hope to be able to take the same interest in Mr. Stileman's scheme. I cannot refrain from pointing out, however, that what is going on now is practically the same as we witnessed when C. Y. O'Connor brought forward his scheme for the construction of a harbour at Fremantle. I do not remember that Mr. O'Connor's plans were regarded otherwise than as the present Government would desire to regard Mr. Stileman's plans. Having the advantage of the advice of all the reputed authorities in regard to harbour works, the then Engineer-in-Chief

for the State dealt with the harbour work scheme on lines which, from his experience, he considered best for the State. The Government of the day, under the Premiership of Sir John Forrest, dealt with the scheme and accepted the responsibility for pushing on with the work. I take it that the present Government, having had the reports in connection with this undertaking, have faith in the Engineer-in-Chief and are prepared to accept full responsibility. There is, of course, anxiety amongst the people, even if it is not made very manifest through the Press, who desire to know if the fullest information on the subject has been obtained, and probably that has influenced the member for Katanning in his desire for the appointment of a select committee, as the result of whose labours information could be collected and made public. The Minister for Works has pointed out, and his remarks were endorsed by the Premier as well, that members of this House, however earnest and untiring they might be in their labours, could not claim to have the training or experience to enable them to deal with such a subject as that under discussion as they would desire. The member for Katanning will, I am sure, appreciate that fact. In their endeavour to find another authority to criticise the work of Mr. Stileman, the select committee would really put Mr. Stileman on his trial. I think we have had enough of that sort of thing in this State. It has led to consequences of which we are not exactly proud. I would not accept the dictum of every engineer blindly. In the selection of Mr. Stileman for the responsible position of Engineer-in-Chief of this State, the Premier used his judgment—I must say I believe his judgment is to be commended—in making the choice. No one will doubt for one moment that he made full inquiries and made use of advice at his disposal in the Old Country. The result was that he selected the man for the post. He did more than that. He brought out other British engineers of standing and experience, and it is quite obvious that that experience was utilised by the Engineer-in-Chief in the preparation of his report.

The Minister for Works: They had conference after conference.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Their names may not appear in the report, but it is evident to me that Mr. Stileman could never have

found time to have gathered all the data that is included in the report. There is no portion of that document in which statistics appear that does not carry with it the indication that someone who knew his job had been at it. The figures disclosed by the Engineer-in-Chief show that the mature judgment of an experienced man has been brought to bear upon the compilation of them. No one will suggest for a moment that the appointment of a select committee to deal with this matter could possibly get information that has not already been collected, sifted and considered by men who have been trained for this particular branch of engineering work. I suggest to the member for Katanning that if he accepts the assurance of the Minister for Works he will have achieved his objective quite fairly. Then, again, the Press of Western Australia has always, from the time I came here and probably before that, too, been keenly interested in questions affecting the harbours and shipping of this State. It is not to be doubted for a single moment that the Press of to-day will not recognise it to be within their province—it may even be considered by the Press to be their duty—to use every means possible to educate the people regarding this important question. The Leader of the Opposition and others have pointed out that the expenditure involved is indeed very great for a State like Western Australia. We may be pardoned if we feel it necessary to draw the attention of the public, through the published reports of the debates in this Chamber, to the importance of this undertaking. We should also disclose to them the fact that we desire everything possible to be done to make the undertaking a success.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is a very ambitious scheme.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I do not know of any scheme to be put forward that could be regarded as too ambitious for an engineer who knows his job. At any rate, no such scheme can be too ambitious for Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: You engineers protect one another very well!

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Personally, I place the fullest reliance upon the statement made by the Minister that there will be no big expenditure incurred in any shape or form until the House has an opportunity to meet again.

Mr. Thomson: I have not cast any reflection upon the Minister.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: During the interval it will be for hon. members to seek information in any quarter and to bring it forward when we meet again.

Mr. Thomson: I want it to be clearly understood that I cast no reflection upon the Minister.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No one has done so.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I do not think the member for Katanning did so, nor do I think he desired to do so. He has merely been actuated by the desire I have already indicated, but, in the meantime, I hope he will accept the Minister's assurance that has been given to the House.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [7.30]: In view of the magnitude of the work and its great importance to the State for all time, I should like the Minister to say whether, in the event of the proposed site for the bridge, after being tested, proving unsuitable, we shall be pledged to its adoption by the passing of this Bill?

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. BROWN: Then that will make a great difference. I am a great admirer of the Engineer-in-Chief, whose report I consider is a masterpiece, though possibly some people would not agree with me in that opinion. When we realise the liability of anyone to error, however, it behoves us to proceed with caution. Some members consider that Mr. Stileman has interfered by taking into account what produce should go to the port of Fremantle.

Mr. Mann: Do you agree with his views on the railway to connect with the Esperance line?

Mr. BROWN: I think that a railway connecting with the Esperance line is desirable. The cereals grown within a reasonable distance of Esperance would not be transported to Fremantle because Esperance will become an important port. It has ample depth of water, and a harbour could be constructed there with less difficulty than the Bunbury harbour could be extended.

Hon. G. Taylor: Question!

Mr. BROWN: Some people hold that Hopetoun will make a good port, but I do not think that will be possible without the expenditure of millions of money. On the report of the Engineer-in-Chief, Western

Australia in ten years' time will be producing from 50 to 60 million bushels of wheat and two-thirds of it will be taken to Fremantle for shipment. Consequently an extension of harbour accommodation is absolutely necessary. The engineers cannot guarantee to maintain the existing railway bridge for more than three years, so it will be necessary to build a new one. If the extension of the harbour upstream for a distance of 1,000 feet will not give the requisite accommodation, we should seek information from other engineers. Sir George Buchanan, one of the most eminent engineers in the world, was engaged by the Federal Government to visit Australia and various States took the opportunity to get him to report on their harbours. His report does not coincide with Mr. Stileman's. Against that we have to remember that Mr. Stileman has been in Western Australia for 12 months, has made a study of local conditions, the river, the tides and the products grown, matters that Sir George Buchanan could not study during his brief visit. If a select committee were appointed, what evidence could it procure? It is impossible for the average layman to give evidence on such a big scheme.

Mr. Mann: But he could hear evidence.

Mr. BROWN: That is so. If a report was made to Parliament by the select committee, Parliament would have to give a decision. If we desired to get a check on Mr. Stileman's work, we should have to engage an engineer of equally high qualifications, and according to the Premier such an engineer is not to be found in Australia. That means we should have to go to America or some other country where big works of the kind are undertaken. That would occupy considerable time, and before the engineer could tender evidence to the select committee, he would have to make a personal inspection. If it took Mr. Stileman 12 months to collect sufficient information on which to base his report, we could not expect another engineer to do it in less time.

Mr. Mann: We got an engineer from Victoria to report on our water supply.

Mr. BROWN: We should obtain all possible information because the work is so great and the expenditure so large that not only we but our children's children will be affected. One would like to think that future generations would be able to say that the men of to-day showed great foresight and judgment when providing for the

needs of the future. Mr. Stileman is making provision for only one decade.

The Minister for Works: That is the upper part of the scheme.

Mr. BROWN: Whether increased accommodation could safely be provided by extending the existing moles, I do not know. To construct an outer harbour would cost a considerable sum. There is no doubt that the river is the natural place for the harbour. Rocky Bay, with its high cliffs, is not suitable for harbour extension, but according to Sir George Buchanan suitable land could be obtained a good deal further upstream. The Minister has assured us that we are being asked to vote only £2,000 to be spent in testing the ground for the bridge piles. If the ground proves to be unsuitable, he has assured us that we shall not be pledged to construct the bridge at that place. I take it, however, that the site of the bridge has been determined by Mr. Stileman, and that the Government approve of his report. We as the custodians of the public purse should have an assurance that we will not be committed to large expenditure on work that might not prove completely satisfactory. No harm would be done if the question were postponed for the present in order that additional expert evidence might be obtained. Though I regard Mr. Stileman as an engineer far above any other in Australia, I do not like to commit myself to give a decision on the information supplied by one man. If I was suffering from illness and the doctor told me I had only two months to live, I would not feel satisfied, but would seek another doctor's opinion.

The Premier: Might not you go further and fare worse with the doctors?

Mr. BROWN: I agree that is possible.

The Premier: And similarly with engineers.

Mr. BROWN: It might be found eventually that the first doctor was right, and I should then be willing to follow his advice.

Mr. Chesson: And die!

Mr. BROWN: Possibly if we obtained further expert evidence, it would go to show that Mr. Stileman was right. The Government, however, must admit it is our duty to protect the public purse. We are all working for the good of the State, and we realise that harbour extensions are necessary. A new bridge must be built before long. Before we commit ourselves to any scheme, however, let us get the best information obtainable. If the Minister assures

us that we are not being pledged to the site that Mr. Stileman has indicated, we have not much to fear.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning—in reply) [7.41]: It has become quite a custom for Ministers to give us an assurance that something will or will not be done. If the Minister can give an assurance that we shall not be pledging ourselves to a certain site for the bridge, why should we be asked to pass the Bill? For a considerable time a certain agricultural railway has been authorised and the member for the district has been assured that it will be built, but so far nothing has been done to carry out that assurance. We have repeatedly had assurances from Ministers that they will accept full responsibility for certain things, but what does that amount to if a blunder is made. A certain Minister said he would take the responsibility for the Fremantle dock, on which over a quarter of a million of money was thrown away. Another one said he accepted full responsibility for the group scheme. Certainly he must accept responsibility for having introduced it. But Ministers, when they say those things, do not accept any real responsibility to the State, and they cannot be expected to bear the financial responsibility.

Hon. W. J. George: You mean to make up the deficiency out of their own pockets?

Mr. THOMSON: There is surely a greater responsibility involved than that of merely saying a certain scheme shall or shall not be proceeded with. I quoted one of the blunders made at the port of Albany. We took to Katanning the largest and most representative deputation ever assembled in that part of the State to ask the then Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) not to proceed with the construction of the jetty. To say that a layman is in a position to offer suggestions is regarded by engineers as an impertinence. As farmers and practical men, we begged the Minister for Works not to construct a "T" piece out from the deep-water jetty, but to put wharves there, and reclaim the area along the foreshore with the sand that would be dredged out in order to give the required depth of water. An eminent engineer, who is supposed to have stayed in the State only for a few moments has propounded the very scheme we asked for in 1912. This shows that mere laymen, who might be accused of presumption in criticising an engineer, were right in their conclu-

sions, and that the eminent engineer who stated that something else was the only practical proposition was entirely wrong.

The Premier: It only proves that the engineer was wrong as well as yourself.

Mr. THOMSON: This is a serious subject.

The Premier: You are not proving anything.

Mr. THOMSON: There is ample proof that the statements made by laymen who waited on the then Minister for Works in Katanning were the correct ones. As laymen and members of Parliament, who carry a great responsibility, we are justified in having more time in which to examine the Fremantle harbour scheme. Suppose we were attacked by an enemy? So far as my judgment goes the scheme that Sir George Buchanan has submitted will give Fremantle greater protection than that proposed by the Engineer-in-Chief.

The Premier: Modern guns 20 miles away could tear the place to pieces.

Mr. Panton: There is undoubtedly greater protection from the weather.

Mr. THOMSON: Just so. Sir George Buchanan said that the total cost of the work was estimated to be £6,774,600. If we pass this Bill we shall be fixing a definite site for the bridge, as outlined on the plan. We shall be pledging ourselves to the construction of the line along the route set out in the Bill, unless sufficient evidence is brought to bear in the interim to cause the Minister to change his mind. How do we know that the Engineer-in-Chief has not overriden every officer in his department? I do not say that is so, but the only way members can obtain full information is by appointing a select committee to make the necessary inquiry.

Hon. W. J. George: He is the head of his department.

Mr. THOMSON: At one time the hon. member was Minister of the department. He stated that he accepted full responsibility for the collapse of the filter beds.

Hon. W. J. George: You could belt me, but you could not belt my officers.

Mr. THOMSON: I have no desire to attack anyone, but I must say the hon. member did accept the full responsibility for the collapse of that work. We are faced with what is practically a somersault with regard to the construction of the Fremantle harbour. In the scheme submitted by Sir George Buch-

anan the cost was approximately £7,000,000. By the extension of the harbour up to the site of the proposed new bridge, and including the bridge, an expenditure of £3,200,000 will be incurred, approximately half the expenditure upon the scheme outlined by Sir George Buchanan. No estimate has been submitted as to the cost of the proposed outer harbour. I hope the Minister will agree to the appointment of a select committee. I have brought the matter forward in the interests of the State and of the port of Fremantle. The produce that our people are turning out has created the demand for this extension. It is of vital importance to producers that the best possible scheme should be evolved. It is the wealth of the country that will pay the interest and sinking fund on the Fremantle Harbour.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	20

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. Richardson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Heron	Mr. Rowe
Miss Holman	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lamond	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Latham	Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Maley	Mr. Withers

Question thus negatived.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Authority to construct:

Mr. THOMSON: I should like the Minister's assurance that this clause does not absolutely pledge us to the construction of the line.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know what I am to do. Already I have twice given an assurance that the Chamber will be asked to vote money specifically for the construction of the bridge and the railway before those works are put in hand. Is not the Leader of the Country Party prepared to accept my assurance without my reiterating it all night long? Am I to take his question in a personal sense? It is too much to ask that a Minister should give an assurance over and over again.

Mr. Thomson: This is the first time I have asked for it.

The Premier: Do you want it personally?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Am I to give the assurance to every member of the Committee individually? The assurance has been given, and the Chamber is entitled to accept it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 3), £1,363,500.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of 12 amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 6.—Delete:

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I cannot agree to the Council's amendment. Clause 6 was inserted expressly to legalise what the department have been doing ever since the passing of the original Act, in 1908. The Council takes exception to Clause 6 because it asks that the department shall

be entitled to release on parole or probation before the boy or girl reaches the age of 18 years. Up to the present the court usually have committed a child to an institution until the age of 18 years shall be reached. The Minister now has the power sought by the clause, but the department have not. On his own initiative the Minister can release upon parole.

Mr. Davy: Is not that sufficient?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: It is not the department's function to refer every case even to the Minister: the Minister would have no time to do anything else if all these trivial matters were referred to him. A man can be liberated from prison without the court that sentenced him being consulted. The corresponding power is desired for the State Children or Children's Welfare Department. I say nothing derogatory to the ladies and gentlemen who function in the Perth Children's Court, but they believe themselves to be the Children's Court for Western Australia, which they are not. A child released on parole is placed in a situation and looked after, and has his or her money banked, by the department. The Perth Children's Court deals with the majority of cases occurring in Western Australia, but there are 63 Children's Courts in the State. The Children's Courts at Fremantle, Kalgoorlie, Boulder and Albany do a fair amount of work. There is a Children's Court as far away as Broome. What knowledge can the justices of the Broome Children's Court have or obtain of the conduct of a boy or a girl on probation in the metropolitan area? On the other hand, the department have officers who keep in touch with children on parole. The court is, in fact, now consulted; and I think every member of the Children's Court knows of some cases liberated on parole, and has approved of such liberation. When the department made their agreement with the Salvation Army, who conduct an industrial school for delinquent boys as well as the other school, the following clause, to which I believe no member of the Perth Children's Court objected, was included:—

Clause 3. The Director will co-operate with the Minister and with the State Children Department of Western Australia in the matter of placing such boys at suitable service, finding them suitable situations or employment, and in releasing them on parole, and will use every endeavour to arrange in this way for the suitable disposition of the boys.

That clause has worked admirably. A circular letter, signed by ten of the justices of the Perth Children's Court, has been sent to every member of Parliament; but I do not know whether the members of the Children's Court are unanimous even regarding that letter, as the court has 16 justices.

Mr. Sampson: Those who signed the circular letter are the ones who usually sit.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Some of the other justices sit just as frequently.

Mr. Davy: What about reducing the 16 to one?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is a possibility of that being done. I find that in every country where there is a child welfare department, the department has the right to liberate on parole. When a boy or girl has relented or reformed, it is next to criminal to keep him or her in the institution until 18 years of age, instead of releasing the child on parole and finding for him or her a suitable job.

Mr. Davy: Does anybody dispute that that is the proper thing to do? The Minister, on the advice of the department, does it now.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: But the Minister is not always consulted.

Mr. Davy: Well, he should be.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Unless there is something doubtful about the case, there is no need to submit it to the Minister. I suppose 95 per cent. of the members of the House have approached either the Minister or the department to have some child released on parole. Before I was a Minister I went dozens of times to the department in order to get a boy out on parole and send him to a good home. The department treats all these cases sympathetically and wisely. Of course mistakes have been made, and boys and girls on parole have been brought before the court for the second time. However, for every one such case there have been 10 or a dozen that have given no further trouble. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. DAVY: Already under Section 47 of the Act there is full power given to the Governor to release any child committed to an institution. I also have succeeded in securing the release of a child committed to an institution, and I must say that I found the Minister in charge very helpful and sensible about the whole thing. Now the present Minister proposes to hand that authority over to the department, a collection of officials. The Council object to that pro-

vision, and I confess I share their objection. Not that I want to see difficulties put in the way of releasing boys and girls from these institutions. On the contrary, I want to see it made as easy as possible. Half the boys and girls who appear before the Children's Court have done no worse things than have most members of Parliament, including me.

The Premier: Sometimes they have been only kicking a football in the park.

Mr. DAVY: I know of one boy whose offence was having a free look at a picture show from an adjoining roof. A policeman ordered him down, and when he refused the policeman arrested him, and so he appeared at the Children's Court.

The Premier: And had his finger prints taken.

Mr. DAVY: The objection to the clause is that it places the power in the hands of the department. I want to see the Minister continue to exercise this prerogative. To hand it over to the department would be absolutely wrong. All the power necessary is given under Section 47 of the Act.

The Minister for Health: Section 47 provides for the release on probation of children not sent to an industrial school.

Mr. DAVY: If the Minister thinks there is not sufficient power under Section 47, I will be in agreement with him should he desire to amend that section.

Mr. SAMPSON: In the superior courts it is necessary that the matter should be referred to a judge.

The Premier: Not at all; neither the magistrate, the judge, nor anyone else.

Mr. SAMPSON: I stand corrected; I was under that impression. To hand to the department the power sought to be conveyed by Clause 6 savours of a lack of that courtesy and consideration that should be given to the members of the court.

The Minister for Health: Why should they have to consult the court at Broome if the child was sent from that court?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is but right that the justice should be given consideration, but if Clause 6 remains, the consideration will be removed. Under Clause 6 it will be competent for the department to release a child.

The Premier: A child can now be released on parole by the Minister.

Mr. SAMPSON: But suppose the department overrules a magistrate, it will savour of lack of consideration or courtesy.

The Premier: Then there is dignity in it.

Mr. Davy: Is the court a court or a grandmother?

Mr. SAMPSON: Parliament has always placed these matters in the hands of the Minister. The powers that exist are ample.

The Minister for Health: What you want is a Minister for State Children, is that it?

Mr. SAMPSON: The matter should be in the hands of the Minister. I hope the request will be agreed to.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The function of the court is to hear evidence, to weigh it and to mete out punishment to fit the crime. There the function of the court ends. It is not right to allow the department always to release a child. If we have a court to put a boy away, we want something more than the department to let him out. I wish we could go into camera so that we could talk on this matter without fear of being considered hard and cruel men. The Minister referred to justices of the peace who followed up cases and kept an eye on children. Fancy 80 justices of the peace in different parts of the State doing that!

The Minister for Health: There are 186 justices.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Just imagine all those justices nosing round like stickybeaks, looking after the children. I can imagine one gentleman we all know well nosing round, with some amendments in his hand!

Mr. MANN: I do not think the Minister should insist upon Clause 6, because Section 47 of the principal Act gives him power to release a child from an institution, and from the control of the State. Certainly the Minister should not give his authority away to an official of the department. Influences might be brought to bear on an official that would not be indulged in if the Minister were concerned. To-day we may have officers upon whom the Minister can rely, but he does not know what officers there will be in the future.

The Minister for Health: Section 47 deals only with neglected or destitute children, not those sent to an industrial institution.

Mr. MANN: It deals with any State child.

Mr. Kenneally: But that section does not give the Minister power to release a child on probation.

Mr. MANN: I admit that point, but it gives the Minister greater powers and I take it the greater includes the less.

Miss HOLMAN: The whole objection is to the power being vested in the depart-

ment. That objection would fall to the ground if the Minister retained that power in his own hands. I move an amendment—

That the question be amended by striking out "not agreed to" and inserting "amended by substituting the word 'amend' for the word 'delete,' and by adding the words 'by inserting the words 'with the approval of the Minister,' after the word 'Department,' in line 4.'"

Amendment put and passed, the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

No. 2. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 5, as follows:—"Section 7 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following proviso to Subsection (1):—Provided that at least two of such inspectors or officers (one being a male person and the other a female person) shall be charged with the supervision and control of children released on probation under Part IV. of this Act."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The effect of the Council's amendment is to say that neither the Minister nor the department is capable of sincere in the management and control of children coming under the jurisdiction of the State. In fact, so much was stated emphatically in the Council when the amendment was moved. The Council desires one female probation officer to look after four girls. One particular gentleman came to me two years ago and offered to pay the salary of a woman probation officer for two years if we would appoint one. I said that if there was any necessity for such an appointment the Government would find the money, and we did not require a private individual to contribute that money. No case has been made out in support of any such appointment.

Mr. Davy: Was not the object of the appointment that the female probation officer would look after the girls?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, and there are four girls on probation in this State!

Mr. Davy: Is not the argument that there should be more?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have heard only portion of the argument. A memorandum has been issued to members and if some of the statements contained in that document are correct, they prove that some members of the Children's Court have been exceeding their duties for the last couple of years.

Hon. G. Taylor: Some do not know what their duties are.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Included in the memorandum are comments upon a paragraph appearing in the departmental report for 1927. For instance, it is stated—

This paragraph (from the departmental report) is entirely misleading. True only four girls have been released on probation, but the fact is that although the number of delinquent girls approximates the number of delinquent boys—

I am informed by the department that that is incorrect—

—girls by direction of the court are not brought before the court unless absolutely necessary.

Mr. Davy: That is rather rich!

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Whom have they directed not to bring the girls before the Court? If they have directed anyone in authority, they have exceeded their duty.

Mr. Davy: And if the persons concerned have done that, they have neglected their duty.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes. There is only one section to whom that direction could be issued and that is the women police. I think that is the inference from the statement. Another statement to boost the claim for a woman probation officer is that the five inspectresses in the State Children Department cannot act as probation officers to four girls because they have too much to do. The circular goes on to detail the duties of those ladies and adds—

Seeing, however, that there are only five lady inspectresses, and that there were at the 30th June last no less than 355 children boarded out on subsidy, who have to be visited at least fortnightly, when the foster mothers are paid by the inspectresses, etc.

That was drafted by an hon. member who sits in another place and takes an active interest in the Children's Court. It is surprising to find such a statement coming from him. One would think the inspectresses went round paying the foster mothers. Foster mothers are not paid by the inspectresses: they are paid by the Treasury.

Hon. G. Taylor: No other department should pay them.

Mr. Davy: Of the 355 children boarded out, how many would be with their own mothers?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Probably 290.

Mr. Davy: How many homes would the 355 children represent, about two-thirds of the number?

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Probably.

The Premier: They are merely with their mothers and getting the State assistance.

Mr. Davy: Would it be fair to say there were only 175 homes?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes.

Mr. Davy: If 175 homes had to be visited fortnightly by five inspectresses each would have to do 17 a week.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The statement goes on to boost up that aspect of the case. Members of the Children's Court formed a deputation and waited on me two years ago to urge the appointment of a lady probation officer. I asked the department beforehand for particulars of the number of girls on probation, the number in institutions, and the number being brought before the Court, and whether the numbers were increasing. After hearing the deputation I informed them they had not convinced me that a lady probation officer was necessary. Since that date the number of girls on probation and in institutions has decreased, so that if there was no justification for the appointment at that time, there is less need for it to-day. I know it is said the women police are not doing anything as probation officers. I contradict that.

Mr. Mann: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The women police are doing excellent service of a probationary nature, just as good work as Mr. Bulley is doing.

Hon. G. Taylor: He appears to be a good officer.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: He is, and is doing splendid work. On Friday last I discussed the Council's amendment with the head of the State Children Department and ascertained there were only four girls on probation. There are only 29 girls in institutions as a result of Children's Court proceedings. When it was decided by the then Government to appoint women police, the Minister laid down their duties as follows—

The women police are on duty at all hours of the day and night, and they perform the under-mentioned duties:—(1) To keep young children from the streets, more especially at night. (2) To assist, where necessary, the Education Department in the prevention of truancy from school. (3) To watch the newspapers and furnish reports of persons endeavouring to decoy young girls by advertisements or any other means. (4) To patrol railway stations and visit picture shows, theatres, and

other places of public entertainment, in order to guard and advise women, girls and children who are strangers, and have no friends waiting for them. (5) To patrol slum neighbourhoods and look after drunken women and to obtain assistance for their neglected children. (6) To keep under observation reputed brothels, wine shops, hotels and other places frequented by women of ill-fame, in order to prevent young girls being decoyed and drugged with liquor and entrapped. (7) To protect women and girls in the public parks and gardens, and when going to and leaving work. (8) To make inquiries for the State Children Department and Charities Department in cases where it is desirable that the inquiry should be made by the police in plain clothes. (9) To watch over and safeguard unprotected and innocent girls against unscrupulous employers and other persons. (10) To keep a separate file for all young women and girls whom they endeavour by their assistance to put on the straight path, such file to record their movements and behaviour until the officer is satisfied that they have either reformed or have become incorrigible. (11) Duties to be performed in plain clothes, and the hours of duty will be eight hours a day or more as required at times best suited for their carrying out, and such duties to be arranged by the inspector in charge.

If we appointed a lady probation officer and she performed none of those duties, there would be only one thing for her to do, and that would be to look after the four girls on probation. The Government would not be justified in appointing such an officer to look after four girls. The members of the Children's Court endeavoured to show that if there was a probation officer, many girls would not be taken before the court at all. They admit they have authorised someone not to bring them there, and they said that a probation officer should look after such girls. That is a fallacy because a probation officer has no right to interfere with or exercise control over a girl unless she has been brought before the court. The members of the court refer to the number of girls that would be put on probation if we had a lady probation officer. It is two years since they waited on me as a deputation and, if they had given effect to their proposals, they would have had a large number of girls on probation now. The number of girls in institutions is decreasing rapidly, and I believe that is largely due to the splendid work of the women police.

Hon. G. Taylor: It appears from what you have said that there should be an inquiry into the Children's Court.

Mr. Davy: I should like you to find out to whom they gave orders and what

reason they have to suppose the orders were obeyed?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is only one section I know of to whom they could have issued the orders, and they are the women police.

Mr. Davy: Not the department.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The department is not responsible. If one of the inspectresses finds neglected children they are put into the receiving depot pending inquiries without being taken before the court. If it is necessary that they should receive assistance they are granted assistance without being taken before the court.

Mr. Davy: You say the court gives orders to someone not to bring up children for prosecution.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: This is their own circular. It says "Girls by the direction of the court are not brought before the court unless absolutely necessary."

Mr. Davy: Will you find out whom they directed?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not know that the members of the court would care to tell me. The memorandum deals with all the amendments on the Notice Paper. It is dated the 14th October, 1927, and is signed "A. Lovekin." I oppose the amendment.

Miss HOLMAN: I support the amendment. The Minister and the department might release children on probation under a probation officer, who should be a woman. I do not think members of the Children's Court can be accused of not trying to improve the present position. If one woman probation officer were appointed mothers would undoubtedly seek her advice, and their daughters would not go before the court. It is intended that girls who are released on probation should be placed under the control of a policeman or a police-woman?

The Minister for Health: They would be under the control of the inspectresses of the department.

Miss HOLMAN: If I had anything to do with a young girl, I would not like her to go before the court and be marked for life.

The Minister for Health: The male officer has about 120 boys to look after. It is absurd to ask for one woman officer to look after four girls.

Miss HOLMAN: I do not know what is the matter with members on this side of the House, who are supposed to stand for sympathy and humanity, that they do not see

the necessity for the appointment of a woman probation officer. By what authority would women police keep cases out of the court?

Mr. Davy: What would a woman probation officer have to do?

Miss HOLMAN: She would be able to look after girls who were released on probation, and those who might be allowed out under the previous clause. Evidently a policewoman has been appointed to bring children before the court.

The Minister for Health: She does so occasionally.

Miss HOLMAN: I have been asked to act as probation officer to keep an eye on a certain girl. The Minister would be showing an excellent spirit if he agreed to appoint a woman officer. That undoubtedly would increase the usefulness of the department.

Mr. KENNEALLY: At the risk of causing amusement amongst members opposite, I wish to support the proposal that a female probation officer should be appointed. She would be able to carry out very important duties.

The Minister for Justice: We do not want to legislate for that.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If the Minister will agree to appoint such an officer, there is certainly no need for legislation. In my view the probation officer who has 120 boys to look after has too much work to do. It would be a good thing to appoint a female officer to assist him and learn her duties from him. The best interests of the girls, and of some of the younger lads on probation, would be served if such an appointment was made.

The PREMIER: A principle is involved in this amendment, and I hope that members will not accept it. Members of the Children's Court in Perth have an erroneous idea of their duties. It is their duty to act as other courts act. When it has disposed of a case it wants to follow it up, and to be the State Children's Department itself.

Hon. G. Taylor: The boss!

The PREMIER: Exactly. It wants to decide what shall be done with the children afterwards, how many inspectors shall be appointed, and whether they shall be male or female. That has nothing to do with the court. Its duties cease, and those of the department begin, when the case is disposed of. I do not remember any other occasion when we have been asked to state in an Act of Parliament how many inspec-

tors may be employed and of what sex they shall be. We generally state that the Governor-in-Council is empowered to appoint such officers as are necessary. How can Parliament know the requirements of such a situation? Some members may want it laid down in an Act as to how many typists shall be employed in a certain department, or whether the staff shall be increased by 20 or 25 per cent. It is for the Minister to decide that point, and for members of the general public who are interested to endeavour to persuade him one way or the other. The Children's Court have no conception of their functions when they endeavour not only to be the department itself but to legislate with regard to State children. This amendment originated from members of that court. It is a most improper thing for the Children's Court to circularise members of the House asking for certain amendments to the Bill. No doubt it is within their province as citizens to endeavour to influence legislation, but to circularise members of Parliament as these justices have done is most improper. The question whether a female inspector shall be appointed is one for decision not by Parliament but by the Minister, just as the Minister decides hundreds of matters of greater importance, accepting responsibility for his decisions.

Miss Holman: The Minister has been asked for this appointment.

The PREMIER: Then I say the Minister's judgment is quite as good as that of members of the Children's Court. Because I myself am not able to accede to all the requests made to me, is Parliament to tell me that I shall appoint this or that officer?

Mr. Davy: It would be proper for Parliament to do so, but not in an Act of Parliament.

The PREMIER: That is so. Because a Minister is not able to see the matter in the light in which it appears to members of the Children's Court, are we to insert their view of it in an Act of Parliament? I am seriously thinking of reconstructing the Children's Court altogether.

Members: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The whole of the work can, I think, be best done by an experienced and qualified man, instead of amateurs, no matter how well-meaning they may be. At all events, the members of the Children's Court should be told where their functions begin and where their functions end—to deal

with a case in court and leave it at that. I hope the principle suggested in the amendment will not be accepted.

Mr. MANN: I have looked up the record of juveniles charged during the year 1926, and find there were 935 males, from seven years to 17, and only 38 females, from 12 to 17.

The Minister for Health: The circular letter stated that the numbers were about equal.

Mr. MANN: Of the males, 882 were convicted; and of the females, 34, the latter being dealt with as follows: eight were fined, eight were sent to the reformatory, eight were bound over, four were cautioned. Now, if one officer can deal with 882 convicted lads, surely the Minister is right in deciding to allot the work of looking after the 38 girls to one of the lady inspectors of the State Children Department. It cannot be necessary to appoint another lady inspector for the purpose, the department having five lady inspectors already. They are nurses by profession, and women of the world.

The Premier: The trouble is that the Children's Court, mainly one man, desires to run the whole department.

Mr. MANN: It was said that the women police did no social work.

The Minister for Justice: Who said that?

Mr. MANN: The Minister for Health read that out from the memorandum.

The Minister for Health: No; that they were not doing probationary work.

Mr. MANN: Here is the record of the women police of Perth for last year: 67 girls and women assisted, 22 girls and women placed in homes, 23 girls and women put in hospitals, 13 situations secured for girls and women. Surely that is probationary work. Five country girls and women were located, 180 were escorted, first aid was rendered to three, 31 girls and women were located, 13 children were removed from immoral surroundings, 16 absconders were located, five women were reconciled, nine girls were charged with being neglected. Surely that is an excellent record of work done by the women police.

The Minister for Railways: Yes; and the work done has been so satisfactory that we are thinking of extending it.

Mr. MANN: The Minister might well double the number of the women police.

Miss Holman: He might well double their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about women police. We are getting right away from the subject.

Mr. MANN: The male probationary officer, the Minister has told us, is doing his work satisfactorily and well.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 3. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 7, as follows:—"Subsection two of Section 15 of the principal Act is amended by the omission of the words 'and reformatory' and of the words 'established before the commencement of this Act.'"

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have no objection to this amendment, especially in view of a later amendment proposing a schedule of subsidised institutions. I move:

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 4. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 8, as follows:—"Section 70 of the principal Act is amended by omitting in paragraph (b) the words 'twelve shillings and sixpence,' and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'one pound.'"

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Neither have I any particular objection to this amendment, which merely gives the court discretion to order up to £1 per week maintenance for a child. The Act limits the amount to 12s. 6d. per week, whereas in many cases the department have to pay 15s. and 17s. 6d., and in special cases as much as £1 and 25s. per week, for the maintenance of children placed with foster mothers. Subsection 2 of Section 70 will also have to be amended, as otherwise the court would only be empowered to order as much as £1 per week maintenance against an individual, and not against several persons jointly.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know whether members realise that under this section if a man is charged with being the father of an illegitimate child, with most important results to himself, it is decided by this amateur court.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the Minister that he will be in order in dealing with Subclause 2 as he proposes.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Then I move—

That the Council's amendment be amended by deleting the words "twelve shillings and

sixpence," in lines 5 and 6 of Subclause 2, and inserting "one pound" in lieu thereof.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The proposed amendment is an admission that it costs more than 12s. 6d. to keep a child. Yet the State Children Department pays only 9s. a week for a child.

The Minister for Health: You cannot name one child under 12 months of age for whom only 9s. per week is paid.

Amendment on the Council's amendment put and passed; the Council's amendment as amended agreed to.

No. 5. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 12, as follows:—"Section 106 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the word 'horses,' in the fourth line of paragraph (b), and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'any animal.'"

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I see no objection to this. Section 106 prescribes that no child under 14 years of age in the control of the department shall be employed in or about racing stables, or in connection with the training of horses for racing. The Council propose to delete "horses" and insert "any animal." I do not think any State child under 14 years of age should be employed in the training of any animal for racing. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. Davy: You will find that this applies to all children, not merely State children.

Mr. SAMPSON: Can the Minister inform the Committee what animals, other than horses, can be trained for racing?

The Minister for Health: Whippets and greyhounds.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We might as well go the whole hog. After the discussion we had in the House the other day about racecourses, we should insert also the words "nor be allowed on racecourses." I have seen on racecourses children in knickerbockers putting together their sixpences in order to get a totalisator ticket or a ticket from the bookmaker.

Amendment put and passed.

No. 6. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 14, as follows:—"There is hereby inserted in the principal Act, after Section 147, a new section as follows:—147a. Whenever any person is liable to arrest under Part IX. of this Act, and such person is arrested at a distance exceeding twenty miles from the Court which has

caused the warrant to issue, the person arrested may be brought before the Children's Court nearest to the place of arrest, and the case shall forthwith be adjudicated upon by such court. For the purposes of the hearing at such court, a certified copy of the proceedings of the court which caused the warrant to issue, together with a certified account of the arrears of maintenance and costs, shall be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of the proceedings therein set forth and of the amounts which are owing and payable. Such certified copy shall be under the hand of and signed by the clerk of the court which caused the warrant to issue. The court which adjudicates upon the matter so transferred to it may make such order as it may determine, and thereupon such order shall be deemed to have been made by the court which caused the warrant of arrest to issue."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have discussed this with the Solicitor General, who says he can see no harm in it, provided we insert a small amendment. I would not agree to it without that amendment. I move an amendment on the Council's amendment—

That after "may," in line 5 of the proposed new section, the words "with the consent of the complainant" be inserted.

The object in inserting this new clause was to save time and money and the convenience of the person for whom the warrant had been issued. But I have more sympathy for the complainant than for the defaulter. Under the clause as it stands, if an order were made at Bunbury or Albany and a warrant were issued, and the defaulter were arrested at Meekatharra, he would be tried by the Children's Court at Meekatharra.

Mr. Marshall: He would get justice there.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: May be, but what about the girl, who might be living in Albany or Bunbury? Who is going to look after her interests before the court at Meekatharra? The principal reason put forward in support of the new clause was that in many cases it would prevent the man from losing his job.

Mr. Davy: This will save the department and the police a lot of money in bringing the defendant under arrest.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: But the department is not prepared to accept

the risk that some outside court, on the strength of what is told them by the defaulter, may vary the original order, reducing it from 10s. or 15s. to 5s. per week.

Mr. Davy: But the variation of the order would not be an issue.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: But the court have power to vary the order. The court cannot vary the amount owing, but on the representation of the defaulter the court may vary the order. That is the Crown Law opinion. The department is not prepared to accept the clause without the amendment I have moved.

Mr. DAVY: The only reference to arrest that I have been able to find in Part IX. comes under Section 130 which merely gives power to the court to issue warrants for arrest upon complaint on oath by the secretary or any other officer of the department. However, I have no intention of opposing the Minister's proposal.

Amendment on the Council's amendment put and passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

No. 7. Insert a new Clause to stand as Clause 15, as follows:—

Amendment of Second Schedule.

12. The second schedule to the principal Act is repealed, and a schedule is inserted in place thereof, as follows:—

Second Schedule.

St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Orphanage for Girls, Subiaco.

The Anglican Girls' Orphanage, Adelaide terrace, Perth.

The Salvation Army Girls' Home, Cottesloe Beach.

The Salvation Army Girls' Industrial School, Gosnells.

The Home of the Good Shepherd Industrial School for Girls, Leederville.

The Swan Boys' Anglican Orphanage, near Midland Junction.

The Clontarf Roman Catholic Boys' Orphanage, near Victoria Park.

The Salvation Army Boys' Home, West Subiaco.

The Seaforth Salvation Army Boys' Home, Gosnells.

The Seaforth Salvation Army Backward Boys' Home, Gosnells.

The Seaforth Salvation Army Boys' Industrial School, Gosnells.

The Methodist Children's Home, Victoria Park.

The St. Vincent's Roman Catholic Foundling Home, Subiaco.

The Children's Home, Parkerville.

The Government Receiving Depot, Walcott Street, Mt. Lawley.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have no objection to this amendment. It is only right to have a correct schedule of the institutions that are in existence. I move—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Minister for Health, the Honorary Minister (Hon. H. Millington) and the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) drew up reasons for disagreeing to amendment No. 2.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

RETURN—YARRAMONY EASTWARD SETTLEMENT.

Debate resumed from 2nd November, on the following motion by Mr. Griffiths: That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(a) the number of soldier settlers who have been placed on that portion of the country through which the Yarramony Eastward railway is surveyed from Yarramony to North Hines' Hill and for twelve miles wide, i.e., six miles north and six miles south of survey; (b) the amount of Federal money that has been advanced to them under the Soldier Settlement Scheme for (1) purchase of land; (2) all other advances.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS
(Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [10.15]: There is no objection to the motion and I herewith lay the return moved for on the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.18 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 29th November, 1927.

	PAGE
Questions: State Insurance	2157
Mr. Milligan's University record	2157
Bills: Audit Act Amendment, Report	2158
Land Tax and Income Tax, Assembly's further message	2158
Dog Act Amendment, 1A.	2160
Leighton-Bobb's Jetty Railway, 1A.	2160
Bridgetown Lot 89A, 1A.	2166
State Children Act Amendment, Assembly's message	2166
Constitution Act Amendment, 2A.	2179
State Insurance, 2A.	2182
Motion: Claremont Training College, appointment of Vice-Principal	2187

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

QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN asked the Chief Secretary: Have the State Government placed, either directly or indirectly, any insurances or re-insurances with the Industrial Insurance Company of Australia, Trades Hall, Melbourne. If so, for what amount and on what date?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: No.

QUESTION—MR. T. J. MILLIGAN'S UNIVERSITY RECORD.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Will the Minister ask the Vice Chancellor of the University to furnish a report on the University record of Mr. T. J. Milligan, and lay the report on the Table of the House.

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: I thank the hon. member for having supplied me with a copy of the question, which enables me to give an immediate reply, as follows: No. That Mr. Milligan has University passes is known. With them I am not in the least concerned. Mr. Milligan was not appointed because of his University qualifications, but because he held the highest certificate enjoyed by the teaching profession in the Education Department, and had proved himself over a long period of years highly skilled in the art of teaching and in teaching that art to others.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Then I give notice that at the next sitting of the House I will move my question as a motion.