

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [9.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 3 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 17th September, 1969

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS (35): ON NOTICE

### 1. MITCHELL FREEWAY FENCE

#### *Link Mesh Wings*

Mr. **GRAHAM** asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the cost of supplying and installing the link mesh wings which have been attached to the fence on the western wall of Mitchell Freeway in front of Parliament House reserve?
- (2) What is the number of these "wings"?
- (3) What is their purpose?
- (4) For how long are they and the fence intended to remain?
- (5) If to be removed, where would the wings then be used?

Mr. **ROSS HUTCHINSON** replied:

- (1) \$1,350.
- (2) 60.
- (3) To prevent children using the concrete gutter behind the retaining wall as a footpath.
- (4) Until Parliament House grounds are redeveloped and landscaped.
- (5) The department would have no further use for the wings. They would be sold through Government Stores.

## 2.

## HOSPITALS

### *Beverley*

Mr. **McIVER** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) When was the new hospital at Beverley opened?
- (2) What was its total cost?
- (3) How many patients can be accommodated?
- (4) How many patients are in the hospital at the present time?

Mr. **ROSS HUTCHINSON** replied:

- (1) The 18th April, 1969.
- (2) Building \$449,000.
- (3) 17 patients.
- (4) 12 patients and 2 new-born babies.

3. *This question was postponed.*

## 4.

## HEALTH

### *Aged People: Financial Aid*

Mr. **TONKIN** asked the Premier:

- (1) Has his Government notified the Commonwealth Government of its acceptance of the offer the latter made approximately six months ago of financial aid for the care of aged people?
- (2) What total of matching funds would he be obliged to provide this financial year?

Sir **DAVID BRAND** replied:

- (1) This offer is still under consideration and discussions have recently been held with the Commonwealth to clarify a number of details of the proposals.
- (2) It is not possible to say how much the State would be required to find in matching grants this financial year. The scheme relates to four areas of care for the aged, of which an annual matching grant is available in two. No limit is specified in the third and support for a five-year programme of expenditure is proposed in the fourth. Also in two areas, Commonwealth funds would be available to support expenditure by local government authorities in addition to expenditure incurred by the State.

The Leader of the Opposition is referred to the reply given by the Minister representing the Minister for Health to question 30 on the 19th August, 1969, for further details of the proposals.

## 5. EDUCATION

*Teaching Loads*

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What are the comparative teaching loads at the University, Institute of Technology and teachers' colleges?
- (2) Is adequate time available at the Institute of Technology to enable instructors to prepare for and to perform adequately their role as liberal educators in the fullest sense?
- (3) Is staff establishment of departments determined solely on a base of student numbers?
- (4) If "No", what are the other basic considerations?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The University has advised that it would be impracticable to supply a meaningful answer. The Institute of Technology advises that its average teaching load for lecturers is 16 hours per week reducible for special administrative responsibilities and higher degree studies.

Teaching loads at teachers' colleges—

Senior lecturers—8 to 14 hours.

Lecturers (theoretical subjects)—15 to 18 hours.

Lecturers (practical subjects)—17 to 24 hours.

In all cases plus practice supervision, demonstration supervision, staff advisory duties.

- (2) The conditions at the Western Australian Institute of Technology compare favourably with similar institutions throughout Australia.
- (3) and (4) If the question refers to departments at the institute their establishment is determined on their teaching responsibility.

## 6. PORT OF KING BAY

*Regulations*

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) What is the length of the period during which discussions have been taking place on regulations for the Port of Dampier which the Crown Law Department advised, as far back as the 22nd February, 1966, should be in the form of by-laws?
- (2) Have the discussions which he said on the 5th August were "nearing finality" actually been completed and agreement reached?
- (3) If "No", are they any nearer finality than the time alone of 43 days?

- (4) What are the points of difference between the Government and the company?

- (5) What explanation has he to offer for disregarding the advice of the Crown Law Department for such a long time?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) At appropriate times since the date mentioned by the honourable member.
- (2) Not quite.
- (3) Yes.

In answering this part of the question I have assumed that there is a misprint in the notice paper. I have answered it on the basis that the Leader of the Opposition is seeking information as to whether there has been any progress in the discussions since the last question was asked by him.

Mr. Tonkin: Yes.

Mr. COURT:

- (4) These are mainly matters of interpretation which are not expected to present any serious problems.
- (5) Crown Law advice has never been disregarded in this matter.

## 7. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

*"New Facts on Fluoridation"*

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he or the Commissioner of Public Health seen the article entitled "New Facts on Fluoridation" by John Lear, which appeared in the 1st March, 1969, issue of *Saturday Review* and which has been placed in the Congressional record of the United States, March 10, 1969 (Vol. 115, No. 42)?
- (2) If "No", will he request the Commissioner of Public Health to obtain a copy of the article as it has been stated with some authority that, "Current evidence shows that there is sufficient cause to warrant a moratorium in the addition of fluoride to water to allow a deeper scientific study to be made to prevent further unnecessary danger to an unwary public"?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.

8. *This question was postponed.*

9.

**TRAFFIC***Education Classes*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Adverting to my question relating to the requirement of errant motorists to attend traffic education classes in lieu of being fined or otherwise penalised, has he any records to show that the former gives any better results than the latter in the matter of subsequent behaviour as drivers?
- (2) If so, what are particulars?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) No. However, if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition so desires I will have some research undertaken and made available to him later.
- (2) Answered by (1).

10. *This question was postponed.*

11.

**EDUCATION***Resignations*

Mr. LAPHAM asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Do the figures given by him showing that 590 teachers resigned in 1967 and 491 teachers resigned in 1968 include—
  - (a) teachers in the Education Department who transferred to the Western Australian Institute of Technology;
  - (b) women teachers who have resigned because of marriage but continued to serve the department?
- (2) If the figures do include (a) and/or (b) above, how many teachers were in each category?
- (3) How many teachers both permanent and temporary who were on strength at the commencement of the 1969 school year are no longer teaching in departmental schools?
- (4) How many teachers both permanent and temporary who joined the department since the commencement of the 1969 school year are no longer in departmental schools?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (a) Yes. Teachers from the Education Department of Western Australia must resign in order to join the Western Australian Institute of Technology.
- (b) Yes.
- (2) 1967, Western Australian Institute of Technology 41 (nucleus of institute staffing).  
Marriage, 52.

1968, Western Australian Institute of Technology—

Statistics on the future occupation of resignees are not kept and therefore the number, if any, who later joined W.A.I.T. is not known.

Marriage, 55 to the end of November.

New regulations applied after that date and the count was discontinued.

(3) Not known.

(4) Not known.

12.

**TRANSPORT***Armadale-Kelmscott and Serpentine-Jarrahdale*

Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Transport:

Referring to his reply of the 11th September—

- (1) Have any firm decisions for the siting of a rail/bus terminal in the Armadale-Kelmscott and Serpentine-Jarrahdale Shire areas been taken?
- (2) If so, what are the decisions?
- (3) Because of the present tremendous increase in population and the expected future growth in the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott as a result of housing development decisions, will the rail/bus terminal to serve the Armadale corridor be built at Armadale?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) No final decision has yet been made but population increase of the various areas will certainly be taken into consideration.

13.

**HOUSING***Willagee-Carawatha*

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is the State Housing Commission still considering a proposal for the construction of buildings for high density habitation to replace dwellings in Willagee and/or Carawatha?
- (2) Is he able to supply a plan of the area covered by the proposals under consideration?
- (3) Is it intended to interfere in any way with war service homes?
- (4) If "Yes", has the Commonwealth Government given its approval?
- (5) Are properties in the vicinity of 171 High Road threatened under the commission's proposals?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes, this area is being considered for possible future redevelopment.
- (2) No.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) No.

14. *This question was postponed.*

## 15. HOUSING

### *Widows*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) Are there any standing arrangements for widows with children to get rental homes from the State Housing Commission—
  - (a) on eviction notice being served;
  - (b) where rentals of private homes become beyond the capacity of widows to meet same?
- (2) What arrangement is made in above cases?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) There are no standing arrangements between the Child Welfare Department and the State Housing Commission.
  - (a) and (b) Both are grounds on which the State Housing Commission will give consideration for the allocation of a house out of normal turn.
- (2) Both the State Housing Commission and the Child Welfare Department co-operate in dealing with such cases.

## 16. TRAFFIC LIGHTS

### *Guildford*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Are any traffic lights to be placed on any of the following corners at Guildford—
  - (a) Johnson Street-James Street;
  - (b) Meadow Street-James Street;
  - (c) Meadow Street-Swan Street?
- (2) When will traffic lights or other safety devices be arranged?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) No, not in the immediate future, as these intersections have a very low priority compared to others in the metropolitan area.
- (2) Channelisation in connection with the installation of boom gates has been carried out at the intersection of Meadow and James Streets,

and some work is planned for the Meadow and Swan Streets, intersection.

17.

## BRIDGES

### *Swan Electorate*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

When are the following proposed bridges for vehicular and pedestrian traffic likely to become operative—

- (a) over Helena River, West Midland;
- (b) over railway line at West Midland;
- (c) over Swan River to connect with Railway Parade or Swan Street, Bassendean;
- (d) pedestrian bridge for school children, etc., at West Midland?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (a) In May, 1970.
- (b) There are no firm plans.
- (c) No plans have been prepared for this work as it is possible that amendments to the proposed road system in this area will be necessary.
- (d) No decision has been made, but preliminary discussions have been held with the Midland Town Council.

18.

## CHILD WELFARE

### *Assistance, Wards, and Probations*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) What was the rate of State assistance to deserving cases in June, 1958?
- (2) What is the present rate of assistance granted to deserving cases for the same categories?
- (3) What number of wards were in departmental institutions in June, 1958, and June, 1968?
- (4) What number of children were released from the children's courts on probation at June, 1958, and June, 1968?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2).

	June. 1958	June. 1969
	p.w. \$	p.w. \$
Mother .....	6.75	12.50
Mother and one child .....	9.75	20.50
Mother and two children .....	11.25	23.00
Mother and three children .....	12.75	28.50
For each subsequent child .....	1.50	2.50

- (3) June, 1958—31.  
June, 1968—213.

- (4) June, 1958—331.  
June, 1968—304.

The difference in institution population in June, 1958, and June, 1968, is due to the fact that in the former year the department had only the Child Welfare Reception Home, Mount Lawley, as a facility.

## 19. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

### *Western Aluminium Ltd.: South-West Project*

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Can he inform the House of the progress in negotiations with Western Aluminium Ltd. towards the development of a major south-west project, possibly in the Pinjarra area?

Mr. COURT replied:

Negotiations are complex, but are at an advanced stage.

There are still a number of major matters to be finalised, but discussions this week and next should clarify whether arrangements which are mutually satisfactory can be negotiated.

## 20. STATE FORESTS

### *Mining Areas*

Mr. H. D. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the total area of State forests of the south-west of this State which is held currently under mineral lease, mineral claim or temporary reserve?
- (2) What is the percentage of State forests of the south-west which this area represents?
- (3) What is the total area of leases, claims, and reserves being worked currently?
- (4) Will he make available a map showing the areas of State forests held under leases, claims, and reserves?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) to (4). Information respecting areas granted over State forests in the south-west of this State during the past two years was supplied on the 4th September, 1969.

The request for the information now asked would require very extensive research and is considered to be unreasonable.

The honourable member is invited to discuss the matter with the Minister for Mines.

21.

## ARGENTINE ANTS

### *Preventive Spraying: Claims*

Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many claims for loss and damage, resulting from preventive spraying against argentine ant infestation, were received by the Department of Agriculture during the year ended the 30th June, 1969?
- (2) What was the nature of these claims?
- (3) Are any claims still outstanding and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

- (1) One.
- (2) Value of two cattle—\$250; paddock grazing, and cost of installation of alternative watering point—\$12.
- (3) The claim was investigated and, on advice from Crown Law Department, liability was denied.

22.

## EDUCATION

### *Halls and Gymnasiums*

Mr. BERTRAM asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Bearing in mind the Government's expressed policy to provide halls and/or gymnasiums in senior high schools and the criteria applied to establish priority therefor, has he determined the order in which senior high schools will be supplied with the aforesaid facilities?
- (2) If so, when will Tuart Hill High School be so supplied?
- (3) If not, why and when will he make such a determination?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) It is the Government's policy to try to provide one hall-gymnasium per year, subject to the availability of loan funds for this purpose. No priority list for construction has been drawn up.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) When money becomes available, all relevant factors will be considered in determining the next school to receive a hall-gymnasium.

23.

## RAILWAYS

### *Wages Staff: Resignations*

Mr. BURKE asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What is the total number of resignations of W.A.G.R. wages staff employed under the conditions of the railway employees' award—  
(a) for the first six months of this year;

(b) for the six months to the 16th September;

(c) for the 12 months ended the 31st August, 1969?

(2) What is the total number of resignations under each designation for each period?

(3) What is the total number of resignations from the wages staff, excluding those employed under A.W.U. awards, for each period?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3). This information is not readily available, but will be extracted and provided as quickly as possible.

24. *This question was postponed.*

## 25. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Rates: Re-assessment*

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has there been a re-assessment of water rates in the last 12 months throughout the metropolitan area; if so, what was the percentage increase?

(2) Has there been a reduction in the volume of water available before excess is charged in the metropolitan area in order to create a greater return in revenue for excess water used; if so, what is the ratio or principle used to arrive at these adjustments?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) and (2). No, not in the last 12 months, but the price of water allowed in return for rates was increased on the 1st July, 1968. This was not done for the specific purpose of obtaining more revenue from excess water. The controlling factor was the need to conserve water. The board felt that as a very reasonable allowance of water was being made in return for rates, this allowance should be controlled and not increased with every increase in water rates payable. The general principle used to decide on the variation in the price for rebate water was that a ratepayer, the valuation of whose property had increased by the average of the increases of the review operating from the 1st July, 1968, should be allowed the same amount of water in return for rates as he was getting before the review of valuations.

An extract of the Press release made at the time is—

Mr. Hamer said, also, that it was felt that all consumers must be aware of the need for

water conservation and the elimination of waste of water and wasteful usage. In the past two years metropolitan consumption had increased out of proportion to building development. With these considerations in mind, the price of water allowed for water rates had been increased from 20c per 1,000 gallons to 21.5c per 1,000 gallons, as from the 1st July, 1968. The general effect of this would provide the ratepayer whose valuation had increased by the metropolitan area average of approximately 25 per cent., with about the same allowance of water for water rates, in 1968-69, as he had in the previous year.

And water is still cheap.

Mr. Tonkin: I thought it was a case of pay as you use?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Leader of the opposition can do that.

## 26. DAYLIGHT SAVING

### *Consideration by Government*

Mr. DAVIES asked the Premier:

In view of the reports that Eastern States' Governments appear to be favourably disposed towards the introduction of daylight saving, can he advise what recent consideration the Government has given to the question in this State?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

No recent consideration has been given to this subject.

## 27. DROUGHT

### *Exploratory Water Boring Agreement*

Mr. GAYFER asked the Premier:

Will he re-examine the terms of the Exploratory Water Boring Agreement, as set up by the Drought Committee, with a view to easing the costs involved so that the hole in which usable stock water is found will be charged at the rate of 75c per foot of boring and all dry holes at 25c per foot?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

This matter is currently under examination.

## 28. DROUGHT

### *Printed Advice*

Mr. GAYFER asked the Premier:

When is it expected that the printed advice pertaining to drought assistance will be available for circulation?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

No definite date can be given, but every effort is being made to bring the matter to finality to enable the information to be printed.

## 29. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

### *Canning Vale*

Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Would he agree that the provision of electric light should, in order to attract and encourage people to move away from the developed areas, be made available to owners of five to 10-acre blocks which all adjoin and are ten miles from the city and owned by young families?
- (2) If so, would he agree to the extension of electricity in the Canning Vale area?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

- (1) For economic reasons, the commission does not extend mains further than six (6) chains for any one domestic consumer unless the consumer is prepared to comply with the terms of the commission's contributory extension scheme.
- (2) See (1).

## 30. FERTILISERS

### *Urea: Price*

Mr. McPHARLIN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is there any truth in the information that has been received by certain firms in Western Australia that the price of urea has risen to \$75.50 per ton?
- (2) If so, will he ascertain the reason for this?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

- (1) The price of urea in Western Australia for the whole of the coming season is \$74.80 per ton.
- (2) A copy of the statement made by the Minister for Customs and Excise, on the 12th September, 1969, which I request be tabled, explains the position.

*The statement was tabled.*

31 and 32. *These questions were postponed.*

## 33. HOSPITALS

### *Availability of Beds*

Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many patients are being cared for—today's date—in excess of numbers originally planned for the accommodation available at Royal Perth Hospital?

- (2) What is the cost of maintaining acute case beds at this hospital?
- (3) How many acute case beds are occupied by patients at Royal Perth Hospital rather than in acute beds if available at Sunset or elsewhere?
- (4) Is the Hollywood Hospital complex to cater for long care patients?
- (5) If so, to what extent numerically?
- (6) When will these beds be available?
- (7) If Royal Perth Hospital is accommodating long care geriatric patients to the exclusion of others needing non immediate but necessary surgery, is the Shenton Park annexe adequate to cope with the excess long care patients?
- (8) If not, why are the beds at Wooroloo Hospital to be occupied by transgressors of the law, rather than hospital patients?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 78—these being provided for on verandahs and in solaria.
- (2) \$18.30 per patient day (net).
- (3) Acute cases are not provided for at Sunset and similar institutions.
- (4) Hollywood Hospital is a repatriation hospital and under the control of the Commonwealth. It is presumed that the honourable member meant the Perth Medical Centre. If so, the answer is "Yes".
- (5) 110 such beds.
- (6) November, 1969.
- (7) Yes, but this is not the function of the hospital—it provides for the care and treatment of rehabilitation cases.
- (8) Because of the concern and interest of the Government in furthering the patients' welfare and the need for provision of more up to date facilities and services for such patients in a planned programme of work, closer to modern metropolitan and country hospital services where there will be closer links with relatives and friends.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you know any more funny stories?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Continuing—

The transfer of patients in such circumstances enables the vacated buildings to be utilised for "transgressors of the law"—to quote the terms used by the honourable member—in a similar situation to

that applying at the Karnet Rehabilitation Centre, where selected prisoners are receiving treatment and are trained, in the expectation that they will not again be "transgressors of the law", and, at the same time, to provide some relief to the inadequate and overcrowded facilities at the Fremantle Prison, concerning which the honourable member should have sufficient knowledge and interest.

I am indebted to the honourable member for the question.

### 34. FARMERS' DEBTS ADJUSTMENT ACT

#### *Administrative Members*

Mr. GAYFER asked the Premier:

- (1) Who is the present director under the terms of the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act of 1930?
- (2) Who is the deputy director under the same terms of the above?
- (3) Are there any other appointed administrative members under the terms of the above Act?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) There is at present no director or deputy director appointed under and for the purpose of the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, 1930.
- (3) No. Under the Rural Relief Fund Act, 1935, three trustees shall be appointed for the purposes of this Act. The trustees currently appointed are Messrs. A. R. Barrett (Chairman), E. B. Ritchie, and F. W. Byfield. The Rural Relief Fund Act, 1935, amends in certain respects the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, 1930.

### 35. LAND

#### *Flora and Fauna Reserves*

Mr. RIDGE asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) How many flora and fauna reserves are in the Kimberley region?
- (2) By what name are they known, and what is the approximate acreage of each?
- (3) Is it considered that the existing sanctuaries contain representatives of each of the major biological communities in the region?
- (4) If not, is consideration being given to the creation of additional reserves?
- (5) Is he satisfied that existing legislation sufficiently protects flora and fauna reserves from human interference with mechanical aids?

- (6) If not, will he take steps to ensure that the areas are given legal protection in perpetuity?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) A total of six reserves which include flora, fauna, and national parks.
- (2) (a) Prince Regent Reserve of about 1,565,000 acres (flora and fauna).  
(b) Pelican Islet of about 20 acres (wildlife sanctuary).  
(c) Kununurra Flora Reserve of 290 acres (flora).  
(d) Tunnel Creek National Park of 225 acres (national park).  
(e) Geikie Gorge National Park of 7,750 acres (national park).  
(f) Ord River Regeneration of 2,246,524 acres (regeneration).

(3) No.

(4) Yes.

(5) Existing legislation makes provision for the classification of flora and fauna reserves as of Class "A" under the provisions of the Land Act, and prohibited areas under the provisions of the Fauna Conservation Act.

(6) Class "A" reserves must remain dedicated to the purpose for which they are set apart, unless the purpose is amended by legislation. It is proposed to seek further amendments to the Fauna Conservation Act this session to include authority to protect, manage, and study the environment of reserves for fauna.

I might say that it is not possible, because of the system of Government and Parliament, to reserve anything in perpetuity. Parliament has the final authority in this regard. I would also like to add that all the reserves I have mentioned are Class "A" reserves.

### SAWMILLING

#### *Reserves in the South-West: Grievance*

MR. JONES (Collie) [4.53 p.m.]: On the 23rd day of June, 1961, under an agreement made between the Government and Hawker Siddeley, a number of State assets were passed over to that firm. In the debate on an amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply debate in that year, the Opposition in broad terms considered that this was a give-away to Hawker Siddeley. The then member for East Perth, who is now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, had this to say—

That is on Tuesday of next week, but I am speaking at this moment, and the sale took place several weeks ago. If I were selling something, I would surely know what I was selling and



the approximate value of the various items. However, this Government does not know and, what is more does not care. We find that this Hawker Siddeley group has now been granted a timber concession which no other sawmilling enterprise in the world could obtain, or anything equivalent to it, in Western Australia.

The point I intend to make is that what the then member for East Perth had to say at that point of time has now come to pass. In the short time that is available to me, I shall show that has happened.

Under the terms of the agreement a number of sawmills were passed to the Hawker Siddeley group. In the area I am referring to, the Banksiadale mill had been granted a permit of 135,978 acres; the Worsley mill had been granted a permit of 42,873 acres; and the Buckingham mill had been granted a permit of 88,660 acres. We find now that the Banksiadale mill has closed down, but under the terms of the agreement the permit is still valid so far as Hawker Siddeley is concerned. We also find that in December, 1968, the Worsley mill closed down; and it had a permit over 42,873 acres. Here again the permit has been retained by Hawker Siddeley for the purposes of its Buckingham mill.

On the 28th August, 1969, I asked a question as to whether an area, comprising 16,400 acres of State forest, in the Bowelling townsite was being retained for Hawker Siddeley. The answer was, "Yes." We find the situation is that there is one sawmilling operator in the Bowelling district, in the same area where the Buckingham mill is situated. It is possible he will cease operations at Christmas, due to the fact that there is no more timber available, but no additional leases will be made available to him by the Forests Department. This operator employs quite a number of workers. There are three other operators in the same area, and they are facing a similar problem.

We can therefore see that this question is giving the sawmilling interests in the south-west some concern. Only recently I had a discussion with one sawmilling operator (Mr. Mills) and the manager of Millars at Wilga. It was indicated to me that unless some areas of land can be made available to Mr. Mills he will have to cease operations at Christmas.

There is the question of the production of Hawker Siddeley. In 11 months in 1968 the average monthly intake of the Worsley mill was 52,391 cubic feet; and in the 12 months of that year the average monthly intake of the Buckingham mill was 58,005 cubic feet. The Worsley mill has now closed, and for the first six months of this year the intake of the Buckingham mill has been reduced. The average

monthly intake of the Buckingham mill in these six months was 55,892 cubic feet, as compared with 58,005 cubic feet in 1968.

It will be seen that not only the Banksiadale reserve, but also the Worsley reserve, has been set aside for this company. We find that 16,400 acres of State forest in the Bowelling district is also being retained for this company. In the meantime two mills in that area have closed.

I think this is a shocking state of affairs, to say the least. I do not know the policy of Hawker Siddeley, but it is rumoured in my district that there is a possibility of the Buckingham mill closing, and the company might centralise its milling activities in the Manjimup or Pemberton area. I pose this question: We are witnessing another closure of a mill, but what will happen to the reserves under the agreement? This is a shocking state of affairs. Why does the company require all these forestry permits? It has retained the Banksiadale permit, and that mill has been closed; and it has retained the Worsley permit, and that mill has also been closed.

We find that the intake of the Buckingham mill has been reduced, and that 16,400 acres of State forest in the Bowelling district is being retained for this company. At the same time other sawmill operators in the south-west are being threatened with closure at Christmas.

It is time the Government looked at this problem. It is fair enough for Hawker Siddeley to retain the permits if it is still operating the mills, but I would point out that three small operators have been threatened with the possibility of closure. In view of the intake of timber at the Buckingham mill having been reduced so drastically, it is high time the Minister and the Government looked into this matter, so as to enable the small sawmillers to continue operations. I have had an opportunity to discuss this problem with some officers of the Forests Department at Collie, and they advised me there are no reserves which can be granted to one timber mill, after the present leases expire sometime in December this year.

The fact of the large amount being reserved for Hawker Siddeley—and in my opinion it is not required—proves quite clearly that what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had to say in 1961 has now come to pass.

My grievance is quite clear. I believe the small operators should be considered. I do not think Hawker Siddeley requires these reserves, and the figures prove this; and I would ask the Government, in view of the conditions obtaining in my district, to study this problem.

**MR. BOVELL** (Vasse — Minister for Forests) [5.1 p.m.]: I assure the member for Collie that the small operators are given every consideration and it is the Government's policy to encourage them to continue in production. However, because of the consolidation of the timber industry, numbers of mills have had to be closed. I know that Millars had to close a mill in Busselton. This seems to be necessary, generally, for the economic operation of the timber industry.

Let me say that as far as Hawker Siddeley is concerned, its operations are under the supervision of the Conservator of Forests, who is also responsible for the issuance of permits. These permits are granted in accordance with the provisions of the Forests Act. Members can rest assured that the Conservator of Forests will carefully consider any actions of these companies, whether the companies be large or small.

Having been Minister for Forests for six years, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that the Minister has no jurisdiction over the granting of permits, any more than has the Minister for Lands over the granting of land to people. This is done entirely by independent people.

The Conservator of Forests is very mindful of his responsibility—as was also the previous conservator who retired on the 30th June, this year—and the fact that Hawker Siddeley has continued to be granted permits has been for a purpose; that is, to serve the timber industry.

Let me again assure the member for Collie that the permits for small operators are issued under the provisions of the Act and their issuance is carefully considered by the conservator. The Minister has no jurisdiction under the Forests Act.

## AIR POLLUTION

### *Dust Nuisance: Grievance*

**MR. JAMIESON** (Belmont) [5.3 p.m.]: My grievance concerns dust nuisance. Quite a deal has been said about this matter in the Chamber in recent times, but I do not think we can hear too much on this subject.

One of the problems in the community these days seems to be that the Government is ever bowing to the matter of industrial concerns being established. While we realise that these are necessary, surely the welfare of the people and their homes and environment should also be considered! I will not go as far as our learned friend who is reported in this morning's paper, as saying that because of this air pollution we would have another ice age. I think this would be quite beyond our scope.

However, as soon as the east winds blow, the people in the eastern extremity of my electorate suffer because of the dust

from the industrial establishments; and they have every reason to be bitter. We all recall that the Government, with much pride, introduced its Clean Air Act in 1964. Several years elapsed before the legislation was put into force. Regulations had to be drawn up, and even at this stage it is doubtful whether very much is being achieved as a result of the operation of the Act. I believe the public is entitled to more action under its provisions.

If only the long-established factories were at fault and were causing the trouble we could, perhaps, have some degree of sympathy for them. However, since 1964, other factories have been established. The members of the authority established under the Clean Air Act are fully aware of the fact that some of these industries have installed certain equipment. However, they are equally aware of the fact, as is the case with the principal offender in the Welshpool area—Wesply—that inefficient incinerators have been installed; they are not capable of disposing of all the dust and, as a result, large quantities of dust and particles are being blown all over the housing areas in the vicinity.

The Minister knows this full well. The excuse usually given is that machinery is on order to eliminate the problem. However, I have been hearing this story concerning Swan Portland Cement Works ever since I have been in Parliament. We have been told that machinery is on order. One needs only to go to the front of this building when the east wind is blowing strongly to see the pall of lime dust which rains down on the city and particularly its eastern extremity. This is not good enough and the situation requires some immediate action to ensure that these firms, which are making a profit, are not polluting the atmosphere to the detriment of the residents.

Some interesting features recently came to light on the subject. Certain information was supplied by several motor firms to the newly formed Citizens Clean Air Committee. These firms indicated they had been forced to employ additional cleaners at a cost of many dollars a week. Gregory's, situated near the Causeway, is one of these firms, and another one is Sydney Atkinsons, which has a holding yard at Belmont. It is interesting to know how these firms try to get away from their responsibilities. They even had some dust analysed, the dust having been supplied by one of the motor firms. They came up with the rather hilarious information that the analysis indicated that the dust was from the phosphate rock trucks passing along the main highway. Of course, lime and phosphate would bear a close relationship in a chemical analysis, and I would not be too firm on the company's report. As I have

said, the answer given to any approach on the subject has been that some action is about to be taken.

The other plywood factory, in the Carlisle area, creates a problem from both an aroma and a dust point of view. This has been the position for quite a number of years and insufficient has been done to reduce the nuisance in the heavy residential areas. Some immediate and early action should be taken by the authority established under the Clean Air Act so that a certain amount of relief can be obtained.

I understand the cement works apparently stopped producing cement some time ago. I believe they had some non-conforming rights and that they are now producing hydrated lime. However, from a survey of the chimney of that factory, it appears that more of the substance is coming out of the chimney than is going into the bags. Some years ago those concerned with the company admitted discharging some 10 tons a day into the atmosphere. Since the works have changed to producing hydrated lime, it would be anyone's guess concerning the amount now, but judging by a survey of the situation, it would be upwards of 25 tons a day. This must land somewhere and those with residences, businesses, or properties to the east, west, north, or south, are all affected, depending on the direction of the wind at the particular time.

These works on the western extremity and the plywood factory on the eastern extremity are making the Belmont area a rather uncomfortable place in which to live with the various prevailing winds. I therefore ask the Government to take early action to ensure that any industries which are established first obtain the approval of the authority under the Clean Air Act.

My suggestion is that the Government should give early and earnest consideration to the adoption of a policy under which industries which are to be established and which are likely to cause pollution should first obtain the approval of the clean air authority. In addition, the Government should ensure that those industries already established should, at the earliest opportunity, upgrade the efficiency of their dust preventive machinery so that the very minimum will be discharged into the atmosphere. The situation at the present is that what is being discharged into the atmosphere is causing the maximum amount of pollution to the extreme detriment of those in the surrounding areas.

**SIR DAVID BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [5.10 p.m.]: I think it fair to say that we know that the problem to which the member for Belmont has referred does exist. The problem relating to

Swan Portland Cement was the subject of a deputation to the Minister for Health only the other day, and I gathered that his reaction was that something would have to be done.

I have been in Parliament since 1945, and from time to time during the regime of our Government and that of the Labor Government I have heard of these complaints. Quite clearly everyone would desire to solve the difficulty, but as yet there has been no really effective action taken, because of the obvious reasons.

In fairness to the Minister in charge of the Clean Air Act I want to say that before I entered the Chamber today, he asked me to take over a further problem which has developed in relation to obtaining efficient machinery or equipment—whichever is the right description—to install in the factory to cut the output of lime dust to a minimum at least.

I am sure everyone sympathises with the people who are involved with this nuisance, and we must find some way of at least cutting down the output. I am positive that some equipment must be available which could be installed in a reasonable time to help in the situation. Whilst I was in Germany I saw the Lurgi people experiment with all sorts of devices to cut down dust output and smoke from chimneys; but they were only experiments. I imagine that any such devices would be costly to install in factories which have already been established.

The member for Belmont suggested we should be more watchful and vigilant about equipment being installed during the construction of new factories. I understand that this is the position and that those who are responsible for the enforcement of the Act are becoming more and more determined that as these factories are built, equipment must be installed to ensure that the air is cleaner.

This is not an easy problem to solve, but I can assure the House, and those who are vitally concerned, that the Government is as anxious as anyone else to tackle it, and to tackle it effectively.

The member for Belmont mentioned two other instances of which he says the Minister is aware. I have discussed them with the Minister, and I can assure the honourable member that as soon as it is possible, something will be done. We must have regard, of course, to the economics of the situation. We would like these works, which were established many years ago, removed from the area altogether, but this is not economically possible at this stage.

Nevertheless, I believe that the time has come when some long-range planning must be carried out to produce the desired effect.

**Resolved:** That grievances be noted.

**BILLS (3): RETURNED**

1. Water Boards Act Amendment Bill.
2. Land Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
3. Ord River Dam Catchment Area (Straying Cattle) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, leave of absence for six weeks granted to Mr. Burt (Murchison-Eyre) on the ground of ill-health.

**BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

1. Timber Industry Regulation Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Forests), and read a first time.

2. Transfer of Land Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Graham (Deputy Leader of the Opposition), and read a first time.

**ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL***Third Reading*

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

As promised I have had carried out an investigation into the matter of whether any students would suffer hardship as a result of the amendments contained in this Bill.

The chairman of the board has now advised me that his examination of the records was continued until it was discovered that, by virtue of the amendments contained in this Bill, hardship could be inflicted on at least one student as a result of increasing the student's experience in architecture from four to six years.

Such student was registered at the beginning of this year. This student, who had experience in building as a building supervisor but no experience in an architect's office, could theoretically complete his examinations and obtain the requisite four years' experience within the time stipulated in the Act at present.

As a result of this information I have asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to prepare an amendment for another place to provide that students already registered with the board will be allowed to complete their studies under the old provisions. Students enrolling after the Bill is assented to will be required to have the additional experience outlined in the Bill, which has passed through all stages to this point of time.

Finally, I have been informed by the chairman of the board that the grandfather clause was never contemplated, initially, as in the experience of the board no student had ever completed his course of study within the four-year period.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.18 p.m.]: First of all, let me thank the Minister for having made the inquiry and for his agreement to have the situation complained of rectified.

It was my intention to follow, for me, a rather unusual process; namely, to speak on the third reading of this Bill. This was for, in my opinion, a very good reason. First of all, as members are aware, the second reading is the introduction of the measure. During the Committee stage we endeavour to make amendments if we think they be appropriate. At the third reading stage we survey the result of our deliberations and see what effect the Bill will have.

What we have decided, in an amended form, is that there shall be an architects' board with an increase in numbers. We have also made some variations in the qualifications of those desiring to be registered as architects; and we have provided certain disqualifications and penalties. Basically, we have authorised a board composed of a majority of architects to be virtually the final authority. I acknowledge that there is provision for an appeal to a court to decide yes or no regarding the possible future of a person who desires to operate in the architectural profession. However, strangely enough, there is nothing contained in the legislation to debar a person from carrying out the work of an architect; the only bar is that he shall not call himself an architect.

The board, with its authority, can impose a tremendous handicap upon an individual. In other words, we have placed a tremendous power in the hands of certain people who are not answerable to Parliament. I now come to the point; the purpose of my speaking. There was drawn to my attention a case which has caused me to be disturbed and to question the authority in which we have vested these powers; namely, the Architects' Board of Western Australia.

Recently an applicant for registration had his application rejected, I understand, without any reasons being given for the rejection. The person to whom I refer is approximately 45 years of age. He is certified as a qualified architect—and I have seen the document—by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards of the United States of America. I believe that qualification is accepted by the Royal Institute of British Architects with which there is a reciprocal arrangement.

This person has been practising as an architect in the United States of America for some 20 years. He has been responsible for architectural work involving some millions of dollars in America, mostly industrial and commercial buildings. At the present moment he is the director of a development company in Western Australia, of which he is currently the architect of a building costing some \$350,000. However, he is unacceptable to the Architects' Board.

This gentleman is also the lecturer in architecture at the Institute of Technology, where he has been for the last four years.

Mr. Davies: Teaching at the Institute of Technology?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, teaching at the Institute of Technology. He is the instructor in charge of the fourth-year architectural division. In other words, he takes the students to the top grade. When somebody who is an architect in charge of a \$350,000 job here in the State of Western Australia; who has acted in the capacity of an architect, in the United States of America, involving millions of dollars; who has a certificate which I have sighted; and who is permitted to operate in the United States of America and yet is debarred by our board, that suggests to me there is something radically wrong.

In any event, what right has the Government to employ this man over the last four years as a lecturer in architecture? As I have said, he is employed by the Institute of Technology at the present moment.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: How long has he been employed there?

Mr. GRAHAM: For four years.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: At the institute?

Mr. GRAHAM: He has been employed by our educational authorities, whether it be at the University and for a period at the Institute of Technology, I do not know and I will not go into detail. There is no secret about this matter; the man's name is Clifford C. Holloway. I asked him whether relating the situation, or using his name, would have any effect on him and he said, "No." I anticipate he will take some action. He likes Western Australia, otherwise he would be going to another State of the Commonwealth where he feels he would be more fairly treated.

The burden of my complaint is that in good faith we established a registration board with no power or authority vested in the Minister, or the Crown. The members of the board are free to go their own way and it would appear, from the case I have cited, that people in certain professions—and important trades as well—desire their professions or trades, respectively, to be a close preserve.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: This happens with all types of registration legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Anyway, I will have this case closely examined by the board and I will ask for an explanation.

Mr. GRAHAM: The case suggests to me that there should be some escape clause; that there should be a more definite discretion.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Or no legislation at all?

Mr. GRAHAM: No; I think that is being a little ridiculous, because in medicine, architecture, engineering, and so on, there is a necessity to have certain standards. The person to whom I have referred—and I have no reason to doubt his word—has had more experience in architecture and jobs of all sizes and shapes than, unquestionably, the great majority of architects here in Perth, Western Australia. I have seen pictures of his jobs, and read descriptions of them where they have been highly commended both in their subject and design.

I repeat: This man has more knowledge and experience than the great majority of architects here in Perth and yet those architects, and their representatives on the board, are the ones who are debarring somebody who would appear to have every qualification, plus, and who would be readily accepted in the United Kingdom.

This, then, ties in with what I said during the second reading stage of this Bill. The Minister went part of the way with me when I stated that we should ensure, above all else—because of the negotiations that have been going on for a long time between the Commonwealth and various authorities, including the trade unions—that those who come to Australia with qualifications, professions, and trades should not be debarred because there is some variation in the course of training which they undergo in the country whence they come, when measured against our own standards.

It could be—and undoubtedly it is—that in very many cases the qualifications or the degree of training and experience elsewhere is far greater than what is required in this State. However, because of a word which has been bandied about—"reciprocity"—and because countries elsewhere do not recognise our qualifications or our institute, as the case may be, then it appears we must adopt the dog-in-the-manger attitude and not recognise those countries' qualifications.

The fact of the situation is that a young developing country like Australia requires those people and we should be doing everything possible to make their way easier. I am not suggesting, by any means, that there should be a wholesale scaling down of qualifications. I feel there has to be

almost a—I was going to say "liberal" but that is a dangerous word—wider interpretation to ensure no injustice is done.

This case has been brought to my attention since we last debated this measure. Indeed, the gentleman concerned called to see me and showed me certain papers, documents, and correspondence. I am satisfied as to his *bona fides*. He is a man of some substance who, I repeat, is associated as a director with a pretty large development company. Also, he occupies a responsible job, strangely enough, as an architectural instructor employed by the Government of Western Australia.

I hope there will be no more cases akin to this one, and that we can have an assurance that the Architects' Board of Western Australia will be generous in its interpretation and, indeed, go out of its way in order to accommodate those who seek to become registered and, thereby, without hindrance permit them to carry on their profession. I complete my remarks by saying that quite frankly it seems a little absurd that whether a person is registered or not—in other words, accepted by the Architects' Board or not—there is nothing whatsoever to prevent him from undertaking any architectural job from the smallest and most humble to the mightiest multi-storey building. The only thing is that he cannot call himself, or pretend to be, an architect.

If he is a building designer and calls himself such, he is able to proceed. I think this person feels he has suffered loss of face and dignity. Having for some 20-odd years carried on his profession in the United States of America, he is debarred by our State. I hope and trust there will be no repetition of the situation I have outlined to the House.

**MR. MENSAROS** (Floreat) [5.31 p.m.]: With your indulgence Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few brief comments to the third reading debate. When this Bill was discussed in Committee last Thursday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, with his usual eloquence, used his undoubted political and tactical skill to have recorded some remarks which, in themselves, and without further comment, are detrimental to me.

I am not hurt by his remark that he was disgusted that I supported the Government in detail. On the contrary, I am proud to support the present Government on a matter of principle as well as on a matter of detail and, furthermore, I am quite sure that the majority of my electors wish me to do so and therefore agree. However, in connection with one of his amendments to clause 5 (b) of the Bill which, generally speaking, could be termed a grandfather clause in regard to the requirements of experience of an applicant for registration, which I advocated

in principle, after the division the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that I go—and I quote—"down as speaking one way and voting in another."

My reason for voting as I did was not to vote against the principle I advocated but against the wording and the drafting of the amendment which the Minister—perhaps because of a lack of courtesy on the part of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—did not have the opportunity to examine and check with either the board or the Crown Law Department. The Minister promised to have the amendment properly worded and incorporated in the Bill in another place if the circumstances—that is, hardship to students who are presently doing the training course—warranted.

Had the Deputy Leader of the Opposition given enough opportunity to the Minister to examine it, the principle of his amendment—perhaps in other wording—could have been included in the Bill; as indeed it will be—we heard the Minister say so a minute ago—by an amendment in another place. This was the reason I voted as I did and, consequently, I submit with great respect that the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition concerning me, to which I referred, were not fair and were not justified.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Third Reading

**MR. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

In so doing I refer to the promise I made to the member for Kalgoorlie with regard to two matters. I promised I would confer with my colleague, the Minister for Justice, regarding these matters, and I have done so.

The first relates to the question of supervising solicitors, and there are two points involved; firstly, the possible employment of Crown Law Department officers; and, secondly, the location of the practice. I have expressed my views and I have no reason for wanting to change them. However, in view of the fact that these are technical matters and the honourable member is himself a solicitor, I felt it right to let him know the technical answer that has been given to me.

Section 62A of the Act was placed in part V of the Act, which relates to solicitors' costs. Subsection (1) of that section reads—

Every practitioner employed by the Crown in a salaried capacity shall,

while acting in his official capacity as a practitioner so employed, be deemed to be a certificated practitioner.

Such a practitioner would not be a certificated practitioner for the purposes of the proposed part VA. The Bar-risters' Board requested the legislation and it is anticipated that, if the need arises, the board will be able to appoint a competent and qualified person to be a supervising solicitor.

This places a different implication on the matter from what the honourable member and myself were placing on it when it was before the House previously. I do not think it is of any great moment, but it does clarify the situation in the eyes of the Crown Law Department with respect to Crown Law officers being appointed supervising solicitors for the purposes of this legislation should the need or desire arise for this to be done.

With regard to the second point relating to supervising solicitors—namely, the location of the practice during the supervisory period—it is the opinion of the Crown Law Department, and I think it would also be the opinion of the member for Kalgoorlie as well as myself, that the supervising solicitor will conduct the practice at the most convenient place. There are a number of circumstances which could dictate this.

The other point to which the honourable member referred, and about which he felt more strongly than he did on the previous points, is in connection with the proposed new section 58C. The comment of the Crown Law Department is that it is considered the spirit and intentment of the proposed part is abundantly clear and, consequently, that where no money has been deposited by the practitioner to the credit of the trust, the proposed section 58C would operate to empower a judge to make an order in respect of money in the practitioner's trust account only.

I think this is the way that I, personally, would read the section, although the honourable member posed the question of how one amalgamates something that is not there to be amalgamated—or words to that effect.

Mr. Graham: What is the meaning of the word "intentment"? I have never heard of it.

Mr. COURT: I myself take exception to the word because there are too many coined words finding their way into our legal jargon these days. Many of these words are taken from American legal phrases. However, I was only quoting from the advice given to me by the Crown Law Department, and not using my own language. Heaven forbid that I should ever use the word "intentment."

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.39 p.m.]: I thank the Minister for the trouble he has taken to follow up the three points to which I sought to draw some attention last evening. I thank him particularly for his comments relating to the first two points. However, I wish to make a further brief comment in relation to the third point; that is, the proposed new section 58C of the Act.

I would agree with the Minister that there is no doubt the spirit and intentment of the legislation is that a judge, in the appropriate circumstances, would have the power to make an order in a case where no trust moneys had previously been lodged on behalf of, or by, the practitioner concerned. There is no doubt that this would be the spirit of the law; but I still maintain that the law as expressed in this Act fails to provide the necessary letter of the law. Be that as it may, if the occasion ever arises it will be for a judge to decide.

I apologise to the House for holding it up on this occasion, being private members' day.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### BILLS (3): THIRD READING

#### 1. Legal Contribution Trust Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and passed.

#### 2. Fisheries Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), and passed.

#### 3. Methodist Church (W.A.) Property Trust Incorporation Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and passed.

### SHARK BAY SALT PTY. LTD.

#### *Disallowance of Approval to Occupy Temporary Reserves: Motion*

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the approval of renewal for a period of twelve months to the 31st March, 1970, of the authority granted to Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. to temporarily occupy Temporary Reserves Nos. 4172H, 4173H and 4174H situated at Useless Inlet, Brown Inlet and Depuch Inlet respectively, in the Gascoyne Goldfield, as published in the *Government Gazette* on 22nd August, 1969, and laid upon the Table of the House on 19th August, 1969, be and is hereby disallowed.

At the outset I want to make it perfectly clear that it is not my intention that Temporary Reserve No. 4172H, Useless Loop, should be included in my observations. As the three reserves are all included in the one document, it is necessary under our Standing Orders that all three should be disallowed—if Parliament sees fit.

The document concerning the temporary leases was tabled on the 19th August, 1969, and the matter was published in the *Government Gazette* on the 22nd August. It seems peculiar that a document which is virtually a regulation should be tabled in this House before it has been gazetted. It is also peculiar that the document has only one date on it, or anywhere in its text, and that is the date of expiry. It does not say on what date the leases were granted by the Minister.

The leases were granted under section 277 (3) of the Land Act which states—

Mr. Bovell: Is that the Land Act or the Mining Act?

Mr. NORTON: It is the Mining Act. Section 277 (3) states—

A right of occupancy may be granted for a fixed period in excess of one year, but in that event the Minister shall cause the terms and conditions relating thereto to be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament within fourteen days of the granting.

It says that the document must be laid on the Table of the House within 14 days of the granting of a lease. If this is so then the date of the granting of these leases must have been 12 months prior to the date of expiry, which would have been the 1st April, 1969. If these leases were granted on that date the document should have been tabled in the autumn session of Parliament, or certainly in the extended session, for the transaction to come within the 14 days' requirement. But the document was not actually tabled until the 19th August, 1969. Accordingly I wonder whether or not the document in question is actually operative.

So that members may be perfectly clear as to the areas concerned—and it is my intention to describe these as fully as possible—I have two spare maps available, which they could consult should they wish to do so.

The area in which Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. is operating—and it is the area in which the leases are set out—is in what is known as Shark Bay. Actually Shark Bay is a very large bay to the north and south of Carnarvon. It starts at what is known as the Zuytdorp Cliffs. These are south of Shark Bay and at the bottom of Freycinet Estuary. The coastline continues up to Dirk Hartog Island which is practically in a north-south line. This in turn runs up to Dorre Island and Bernier Island

which are to the north. A continuation of this line takes one virtually to Cape Cuvier which is 62 miles north of Carnarvon.

The waters in the area I have outlined are very rich indeed with fish. The northern areas, up towards Cape Cuvier, are the main prawning grounds. The chief fishing grounds are in the waters of Denham Sound, Freycinet Inlet, and Freycinet Reach. Between Hamelin Pool Bay and Denham Sound there is the Peron Peninsula on which Shark Bay—or more properly, Denham—is situated.

Two members from the other side of the House recently flew over this area, and some members from this side of the House who spent a week or 10 days in the area will know it well. I understand the member for South Perth recently spent 10 days in Shark Bay during the school holidays.

From the map it will be seen that the area in question is virtually an enclosed area and one with quite a big fishing potential. It has proved itself as such and it must be protected for purposes of fishing. If we consider the history of Shark Bay and its population we will find that well before the beginning of the century the people in that part lived off the sea. The first industry they established was the pearling industry, which was carried out by skin diving and dredging.

Pearling in Shark Bay was not operated for the pearl shell but for the pearl itself, which was recovered from the shell. In those days the pearl shell of Shark Bay had no particular value, as it was small, even though pearl shell in other localities was at such a high price. The main object of these people at the time was to recover the pearls which, I understand, were of various types of lustre even to the extent of some of them being amber in colour.

The people who have lived in that area for generations have lived on what they have obtained from the sea, and they did a very important job in the earlier years by establishing settlements in our more remote parts of the State. I understand the community there now consists of approximately 400 people.

After pearling was discontinued the people in Shark Bay took to fishing, and they have certainly had their ups and downs in this respect. In 1963 Shark Bay Salt Pty. Ltd. was granted temporary leases for the establishment of a salt industry in that area. This, in fact, was the first of the solar salt industries in Western Australia.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I have nothing at all against the Shark Bay Salt company; in fact I admire its tenacity and its perseverance, and the manner in which it has been operating



over the years. It has overcome tremendous difficulties by its initiative and foresight. In 1965—two years after the company commenced operations—I asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna, the following question:—

Are the inlets and estuaries in and around Shark Bay the breeding grounds for whiting and other commercial fish?

The present Minister for Works, on behalf of the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna, replied—

By no means all species of fish occurring in Shark Bay breed in the inlets. Such inlets are, however, regarded as nursery grounds; i.e., they provide protection for young fish.

I then asked—

Has he or his department considered what effect the closing of estuaries in Shark Bay will have on the fishing industry there?

The Minister replied—

It is assumed the honourable member refers to areas now cut off or proposed to be cut off, from the main body of Shark Bay by reason of the operations of the recently established salt works. It is certain that because of the shutting off of the areas concerned there must be a decline in the catch of fish there.

So it would seem that two years after the Shark Bay salt company started to operate, the Minister, speaking I presume on behalf of the department, admitted the closing of the estuaries could have some effect. The third question I asked was—

If the answer to (2) is “No”, will he have an immediate investigation made as the survival of this town is dependent upon fishing in the area?

To which the Minister replied—

The department has already commenced some inquiries, but will give serious consideration to making a full investigation if and when personnel and equipment become available.

So it will be seen that although the Minister admitted the closing of the inlets would result in a falling off of the fishing it seemed that he did not intend to take any action in the matter in the near future.

In 1967 the fishing industry really began to feel the effect of the closure of Useless Loop. Useless Loop is leased from the Lands Department. It is a comparatively small estuary, and the remainder of the area leased is used for a processing plant.

The fish catch was falling off so considerably in 1967 that the Minister, at the request of the processing company, I understand, asked the General Fisheries Advisory Committee to make a report on the fishing industry at Shark Bay. The

processing works in the area at the time were operated by Planet Fisheries, which also owned the prawning works at Carnarvon. Incidentally, these are also part of the Vestey's complex.

It did not take long for the General Fisheries Advisory Committee to go into action. As members know, this committee was appointed by Statute under the Fisheries Act. At that time its members comprised Mr. A. J. Mearns, acting chairman, Mr. T. W. Doak, representing the deep sea fishermen—incidentally Mr. Doak was one of the early fishermen in the Shark Bay area operating in scallops, and I understand he came to Western Australia with the Australian Pearling Company, which operated in scallops and later fished for prawns—Mr. N. K. Swarbrick, representing inshore and estuarine fishermen, Mr. K. L. Watson, representing the amateur fishermen, Mr. R. F. Boylan, who is an economist, Mr. R. J. Slack-Smith, who is a research officer, and Mr. K. J. Ammerer who was the secretary.

Mr. Slack-Smith has had quite a lot to do with fishing in the Shark Bay area and is, at the moment, carrying out research into the habits of prawns. Apart from those I have mentioned, a further member of the committee was Mr. N. E. McLaughlan, a senior inspector, who deputised for Mr. R. J. Slack-Smith. For a number of years Mr. McLaughlan was a fisheries inspector at Shark Bay and he knew the area pretty well.

It can be seen, therefore, that the General Fisheries Advisory Committee consisted of a fairly representative body of men who knew exactly what the position was likely to be so far as fishing was concerned.

The committee to which I have referred put out a report which is most explicit and very much to the point. It is not a very long report and I propose to use some of the findings of the committee to substantiate what I am saying. Before I do so I would point out that when this report was prepared the effects of the shutting off of Useless Inlet had not been felt by the fishing industry, because when the report was written the inlet had not been closed.

On page 4 of the report—under the heading “Production”—which relates purely to the waters in Denham Sound, we find the following:—

However, there has been a decline in the last three years of catches of whiting and snapper. These species are important as they bring the highest prices.

As whiting represents approximately 30 per cent. of the actual catch and 50 per cent. of the value of the catch taken from Shark Bay, it will be seen that whiting

is a very valuable fish indeed so far as that area is concerned. On the same page of the report the following appears:—

A report presented by Research Officer R. C. J. Lenanton indicates that the whiting fishery at Shark Bay is declining. From this it can be seen that catch per unit of effort (boat/days) has dropped by 50 per cent. over the past ten years. In other words whiting stocks have declined and a greater effort is required to catch them.

That is quite true, and if we examine the figures of the catch we will find that it has dropped quite considerably. On page 7 there is a section headed "Closing of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet" which reads as follows:—

The Committee found opinion unanimous that the closing of Useless Loop and Useless Inlet for the production of salt was harmful to the fishery. These were nursery areas for prawns and fish.

Three years after the closing of Useless Loop there was a big drop (60,000 lb.) in the whiting catch.

If members will recall, the lease of Useless Loop was covered by the Land Act. To continue—

This period represents approximately the time it takes for whiting to grow from spawning to catchable size.

The committee formed the opinion that the shallow water areas of Shark Bay are inhabited by juveniles of the dominant species in the catch. They felt that there is little doubt that further closing off of these nursery areas can only lead to the continued decline of the fishery.

This will mean a lower take of fish and a lesser supply of fish available to the local processing works.

So it can be seen that the committee recognised, right from the beginning that not only were these areas spawning grounds for whiting and prawns, but they were also nursery areas inhabited by juveniles of the dominant species in Shark Bay.

The processing works at Shark Bay handle mostly the higher-priced fish, whiting and snapper, although they certainly did take mullet and tailor, or whatever other fish came in, if the other types were not available. However, to enable them to make a living, the fishermen continually sought out the higher-priced fish, which is only natural. But, as I pointed out, it took the fisherman far more boat days to earn the same money over the period referred to as they had earned in the past. In fact, over a period of three years, the catches dropped considerably as

can be seen by a reference to appendix A of the report to which I have been referring.

Appendix A sets out the annual catch from 1962 to 1966, but as the period we are dealing with is from 1963 onwards the figures relating to that period are the only ones I shall deal with. The figures relate to two blocks only, as they are termed by the fishing industry, and the blocks are marked off on latitude and longitude by the Department of Fisheries and Fauna. This is done for statistical purposes and so that the fishermen can refer to those blocks when they register their catch. In this instance the two blocks were the enclosed waters in Denham Sound down to Freycinet Estuary and an area slightly north of Shark Bay in which a number of fish, particularly snapper, are caught.

It is interesting to note that over the three-year period to which I am referring the snapper catch dropped from 451,528 lb. to 193,773 lb., or a drop of 285,993 lb. Although the report states that the whiting catch dropped by 60,000 lb. that was a little, although not much, out. In 1963 the whiting catch for the two blocks already referred to was 430,392 lb. and it dropped to 349,312 lb.—a drop of 81,080 lb. So members will see that the value of the catch, taking into account the extra boat hours, had dropped considerably and the fishermen had not then felt the reaction, as they are feeling now, of the closing of Useless Inlet. Probably the references to Useless Loop and Useless Inlet are a little confusing to those members who are listening, but they can be followed if one looks at the map.

Appendix B is a preliminary report on the conditions of the Shark Bay whiting fishery, and a portion of the report reads as follows:—

In recent years an additional factor which has helped maintain a high level of effort is an increase in the actual time spent at sea by each boat.

In other words, to maintain the catch more time has had to be spent in the boats, and as a consequence, this means more expense to the fishermen. Further down the report states—

It is suspected that the fall to a lower level from 1964/1967 is a result of the Salt Works closing off valuable nursery areas in early 1963. Another substantial nursery area was closed off in August 1967. This may further deplete the fishable stock.

The area referred to there was a portion of Useless Inlet and, since then, another portion has been closed off.

I think from that it can readily be seen that the use of these inlets for salt works has had a detrimental effect on the Shark Bay fishing grounds. With the closing off of areas, such as these inlets, the first

thing that happens is that a considerable deposit of gypsum is found on the floor of the estuary; and gypsum, dropped in considerable quantities, renders the area barren so far as sea life is concerned.

I should like to refer to one of the conditions which is set out in the temporary lease. I refer to number 14, which reads as follows:—

The removal by the company of any dam constructed by it to seal inlets or alternatively bulldozing reasonably wide openings through the dams to enable the waters concerned to resume their normal functions as nursery areas for young fish.

Apparently the Minister responsible is under the impression that the estuaries can be used for as long as the companies like to use them, and when they are finished the estuaries are simply opened up and, once again, they can become nurseries or protected areas for young fish. I think this is illustrated by the answers I received to questions I asked the Minister on the 21st August. I asked the Minister the following question:—

Is it practicable for inlets such as Useless Loop and Useless Inlet, if reopened, to re-establish themselves as fish nurseries?

The Minister's reply was—

Yes—provided the salinity of the water is reduced to a tolerable level for marine life.

It is not a question of the salinity of the water; it is the gypsum on the ocean bed and on the banks of the inlets that causes the inlets to become barren to such an extent that no sea life or vegetation can live in the waters. So it is of no use returning the sea water to the inlets because the fish will not move into them to breed or live.

As regards the question of salinity, the average salinity of sea water is 35 parts per million, and the estuaries which are being closed off have a salinity of 50 to 60 parts per million. For some unknown reason—I understand our research officers have not yet worked it out—this is the degree of salinity that young fish like for nursery areas. Also, it would not be possible to flush out the inlets because there are no other outlets for sea water. The tide simply ebbs and flows and therefore the inlets cannot be flushed. Once they are closed off they are finished for fish breeding purposes.

Also, recently I asked the Minister whether any research had been done on this type of thing and he said "No." However, on inquiries I find that the Geological Department at the University has, for a number of years, been carrying out research in the Shark Bay area, and one officer from that department is now doing

his doctorate, I understand, based on research at Useless Inlet. He was there during the period when the two sections were closed off and he has made extensive notes in regard to the subject.

So some investigation has been going on and the Department of Fisheries and Fauna knows that it has been going on. The officers of that department are not happy about the closing of these loops. If the Minister would like to see a good example of a sea bed covered with gypsum I can refer him to one which is in this condition. This area is just north of Carnarvon. It was an inlet but the area is now part of the open sea and it is a good example of what I am referring to. It is situated in the Cardabia Station area at a place known as Maud's Landing. This is a well-known part of the coast, particularly to the masters of coastal ships because, at times, they have anchored there during cyclones.

This area consists of two bays, the first one being very fertile and the other completely barren. So that the Minister will know the bay to what I am referring I shall mention it by name—it is Chabjuwardoo Bay.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Thank you.

Mr. NORTON: If the Minister can remember that he is not doing too badly. It is hard enough to spell it. Apparently this bay was closed off at some time, but when it was reopened by the elements it did not improve the fertility of the water. So I think a good deal more research could be done to see what is taking place in these areas that are cut off at certain times.

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

Mr. NORTON: Prior to the suspension I was pointing out that estuaries, inlets, and so on which are closed for only a short period of time become barren.

I would like now to refer to the actual temporary reserves which have been granted in the Shark Bay area. A large number of temporary reserves have been granted there. All of the water which lies between Cape Inscription, Cape Peron North, and Greenough Point on the mainland comes under temporary reserves. Along the west coast of the mainland—that is, east of Hamelin Pool Bay—a reserve is held by the Continental Oil Company of Australia Proprietary Limited for potash, sodium, calciums, magnesium, bromine, lithium and sulphate. An area of 900 square miles is involved. Peron Peninsula is also held by the same company for the same types of things. This area is approximately 700 square miles.

Other than the areas to which I referred earlier, Shark Bay Salt holds another 2,500 square miles of a reserve for potash, magnesium, bromine, and sulphate. Hamelin Pool Bay, which is 1,500 square miles

in extent, is held as a Ministerial reserve. This area is a prawn nursery. I commend the Government on the action it has taken to declare that area, which is Reserve No. 4891H, a Ministerial reserve.

I consider the Government should also declare the area containing Temporary Reserve No. 4849H as a fishing reserve or a fish hatchery for wet fish together with prawns. It is interesting to note in this connection how quickly the Government reacted and closed Hamelin Pool Bay. As I have said, this reserve is a prawn hatchery. Of course the Carnarvon prawning industry relies on the increase in prawns in the area each successive year for the harvest of prawns in and around Carnarvon.

Denham Sound includes Freycinet Reach and Freycinet Estuary and this has been let out as a temporary reserve to Shark Bay Salt. I consider that had the Government reserved the waters within this bay as a fish nursery, it would have done something for the State. I estimate the area of water involved to be approximately 1,500 square miles. This is where the main fishing from Shark Bay is carried out, upon which the town has depended for many years.

I should like to refer to the estuaries or inlets which the Government has granted as temporary reserves. One is known as Brown Inlet, which is Temporary Reserve No. 4173H. The area involved is 10,000 acres. This is probably one of the most scenic areas for many miles in and around Shark Bay. One might almost describe it as a comparatively deep gorge where an inlet runs in for a distance of some 10 miles. This is one of the main inlets where snapper nurseries are to be found.

One fisherman told me that he ran a net there one year and estimated there was 5,000 lb. weight of snapper in the net. However, he did not take all the snapper because he considered some were undersized. As a matter of fact, he only recovered 500 lb. out of the 5,000 lb. in the net. It is generally said that whilst the snapper in that area might not be exactly undersized, they are too small. Consequently, the fishermen prefer to leave them to develop into commercial sized fish.

Depuch Inlet, which is further to the south, is a barren inlet so far as scenery is concerned. It mainly consists of samphire country and marshes; but, again, it is a wonderful fish nursery so far as the district is concerned.

One wonders whether the two inlets to which I have referred will be an economic proposition so far as salt production is concerned; because the solutions which will be produced will have to be pumped a considerable number of miles. I would estimate that the production from Brown Inlet would have to be pumped some 20 miles

to Useless Loop to the crystallising areas, and the distance from Depuch Inlet would mean that it would have to be pumped about 40 miles. It would be a pity if these loops were closed off and it was subsequently found that the proposition was not economical. I urgently implore the Ministers concerned to see that the two inlets to which I have referred are not closed off.

Recently—in fact, on the 14th of this month—a news item appeared in *The West Australian* headed "New Fish Processing Plant at Denham." Denham has been without a fish processing plant for the past 20 months. Some of the fishermen have managed to carry on by putting in mobile freezers. One fisherman has put in a small holding freezer. By and large the fishermen have had to cut down their catch considerably because of the circumstances.

The new fisheries plant, which is nearly completed, will be known as the Rose Cape Fisheries. The company estimates that the processing plant will be able to handle 1,500,000 lb. of fish a year. If one estimates the value of that fish at 10c a pound, the value to the fishermen in any one year will be \$150,000. It has also been estimated that some 60 people will be employed in the factory. If we estimate their wages at \$2,000 per annum, the wages coming into the town will be another \$120,000. Consequently, the industry will be worth at least \$270,000 to that small town. This represents a nice little income from the point of view of helping to build up the area.

It is quite possible, too, that the amount of fish could be substantially increased, because Shark Bay has averaged 3,100,000 lb. of wet fish per year in the past. Naturally, a great deal of this fish was not caught in the waters to which I have been referring. However, it has been caught in the general area and also around Bernier and Dorre Islands. That quantity of fish, which has been going direct to the markets in Perth, could logically go into Shark Bay and be processed there. That is the right place for the processing to be carried out.

The catching and processing of fish at Shark Bay will not only give a good supply of fresh, filleted fish to the local market, but it will also help to offset some of the imports which come into this State in very large quantities. Shark Bay is well-known for its whiting, which has a ready market in the Eastern States. Again, an export commodity is involved.

I cannot for the life of me see why the interests of the small person cannot be looked after in the same way as the interests of big companies are looked after. In Shark Bay the position is the reverse of what it should be in that the big companies are being looked after and the small family units who have kept the town going

over the years are not being considered to any extent. Many of the girls in the town have virtually no work at the present time. I know of one girl who is currently working for the Egg Board. Some of the men have moved away for the time being and taken employment with Texada Mines Pty. Limited at Lake MacLeod. Others have taken temporary jobs on the Shark Bay salt projects.

If we look at the situation we will see that the salt industry will probably employ between 25 and 30 men when it settles into a normal routine, whereas the fishing industry at Shark Bay will employ 60 people in the processing factory and probably a far greater number on the fishing side. Although fishing in Shark Bay might not return as much from overseas as the salt industry, it will bring far more into the district than salt will ever bring in. Not only will the fishing industry bring in the amounts of money which I have mentioned in connection with wages and the value of the fish, but it will also bring about an increase in the services available in the town. This brings in a multiplicity of factors with the result that there will be a far bigger return for the industry and for the town itself.

Shark Bay is a small, isolated place and one which I do not want to see die. For goodness sake, let us give the fishermen a go as well as giving big companies a go. The conservation of the two inlets to which I have referred will help to maintain the fishing industry in Shark Bay. Consequently, I commend the motion, which I have moved.

The SPEAKER: Before the honourable member resumes his seat, I would like to say that I was not in the Chamber for the early part of his speech. What is the subject matter of the motion? Is it a sort of proclamation; or is it an approval of renewal?

Mr. NORTON: The leases are temporary ones under section 277 of the Mining Act.

The SPEAKER: What is the authority of Parliament to disallow?

Mr. NORTON: The authority of Parliament is contained in section 277. As a matter of fact, I queried whether these were actually in order when they were laid upon the Table of the House, because subsection (3) of section 277 says—

A right of occupancy may be granted for a fixed period in excess of one year, but in that event the Minister shall cause the terms and conditions relating thereto to be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament within fourteen days of the granting.

(4) A right of occupancy granted for any fixed period may be renewed from time to time for any term not exceeding twelve months on each occasion of renewal, but if any such renewal is granted then the provisions

of subsection (3) of this section shall apply, and the terms and conditions of such renewal shall be tabled in each House of Parliament accordingly.

(5) The provisions of section thirty-six of the Interpretation Act, 1918 relating to the disallowance of regulations by either House shall apply to all intents and purposes as if the terms and conditions of the right of occupancy as tabled under this section were regulations tabled under that section.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr. BOVELL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that these are not regulations. You have already referred to this matter. They are not regulations in the true sense, but the granting of mining leases. Therefore I take it you agree the motion is in order and that these mining lease notices can be disallowed.

#### *Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: As I understand the position, after hearing the member for Gascoyne read subsection (5) of section 277 of the Mining Act, the powers of disallowing regulations under section 36 of the Interpretation Act apply under the provisions of this section as if they were regulations. However I will check the section further.

Mr. BOVELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands).

### **WOOROLOO HOSPITAL**

#### *Retention: Motion*

MR. McIVER (Northam) [7.48 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the retention of Wooroloo Hospital as an institution continuing to minister to the needs of the people as it has been doing is in the best interests of the district and the State.

From the outset I make it quite plain that this is not a political exercise. I make a genuine plea in this Chamber on behalf of the patients and staff of the Wooroloo Hospital, the people residing in the Wooroloo district, and the people of the State generally. The closure of this hospital will affect the industrial township of Wundowie, which, as members are aware, is in my electorate. It will greatly affect the economy of this community.

There are 45 women, married and single, who reside in Wundowie and who work at the Wooroloo Hospital. The money they bring into the Wundowie township, by way of their pay packets, is in excess of \$1,000 a week. Therefore it can be seen that if the Wooroloo Hospital is closed to the extent the Government intends, such action would most certainly adversely affect the economy of Wundowie.

To enable members to appreciate fully what has taken place up until the present date, I will briefly outline the history of the hospital. As members probably know, the Wooroloo Hospital was opened in 1914 by the then Labor Premier of Western Australia, The Hon. John Scaddan, and was constructed for the specific purpose of treating consumptive patients. Because of its geographical position, and its excellent climate, it was considered that Wooroloo was the ideal location for such a sanatorium. Over the years, however, the fight against tuberculosis reduced the disease to a minimum mainly because of the trial and error methods of treatment that were practised at Wooroloo up until the time the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital was opened on the 1st September, 1958.

The patients at Wooroloo Hospital were actually transferred to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital in August, 1958, and immediately the Government took steps to offer the Wooroloo Hospital to various institutions. It was offered to the Native Welfare Department and, subject to being corrected, I think it was offered to the National Fitness Council. It was considered that, following the transfer of the patients to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, the Wooroloo Hospital was not suitable for the treatment of such patients, and rumours were circulated throughout the district from time to time that the Wooroloo Hospital would be closed by the Government on a date to be fixed.

The first point I wish to emphasise is that in a statement by the Minister for Health on the 20th April, 1967, these rumours were refuted. When I am successful in finding a copy of that statement I will read it to the House. In the meantime, the Minister, in effect, said that full use of the hospital would be made. On the basis of that statement the people of the district felt more secure and considered they could remain in the area to expand their farms, because they were offered some hope for the future. But what do we find happens 12 months later?

As a result of questions asked in the Legislative Council by The Hon. F. R. White on the 28th August, 1968, the Minister replied that the closure of the Wooroloo Hospital was under consideration. The actual questions and replies are as follows:—

The Hon. F. R. White asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it proposed to close the Wooroloo Hospital?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes"—
  - (a) what are the reasons for this action;
  - (b) what is the proposed date of closure;
  - (c) what will be the future use of the existing buildings;

- (d) is an alternative hospital proposed for the area at some time in the immediate future;
  - (e) has the Mundaring Shire Council been advised of the proposed closure;
  - (f) where will existing patients be accommodated; and
  - (g) where will future patients be accommodated?
- (3) If the answer to (2) (e) is "No," will the Minister explain why this has not been done?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) This is under consideration.
  - (2) (a) to (d) As indicated, the matter is under consideration and no firm decision has as yet been made. The need to consider closure arises because of problems with regard to patient care, adequate staffing, maintenance, and other expenditure, together with visiting difficulties by relatives and friends.
  - (e) No; because no firm decision has as yet been made.
  - (f) and (g) See (a) to (d) above.
- (3) As no decision has yet been made.

After the Minister for Health had made his statement on the 20th April, 1967, we find that the Government, only a year later, was strongly considering the closure of this hospital. I repeat that this was under consideration despite the fact that the Minister had made a statement satisfying the people in the district that the hospital would be fully utilised.

If any member of this House were placed in a similar position to that of the people in the Wooroloo area at that particular time he would have felt secure in his occupation or mode of living and that he could plan accordingly, as the people of the Wooroloo district did after hearing the statement made by the Minister for Health.

I think all members know what took place following the publication of the Government's intention to close the hospital. A committee was formed in Wooroloo because of the rumours that were circulating that the hospital was to close, and a meeting was called. I would point out that at that meeting \$100 was immediately raised so that the committee formed for the retention of the hospital would have sufficient finance to fight the Government in its proposal to close this institution.

On the 28th November, 1968, a joint statement by the Minister for Health and the member for the district, The Hon. J. Craig, Minister for Police and Traffic, was made when they addressed the staff of the Wooroloo Hospital. They informed the

members of the staff that the hospital was to close. Five points were made outlining the reasons for the closure. I will deal with them later in detail in my speech, but at the moment I will quote the five points, which are as follows:—

- (1) That long-term patients can get better care in our large hospitals.
- (2) Visitors find Wooroloo difficult owing to distance.
- (3) Design of buildings create great problems of inconvenience.
- (4) Inability to secure trained staff.
- (5) The cost factor.

Following the joint ministerial statement, the opposition to the closure of Wooroloo Hospital was intensified. I have here Press cuttings which I will not quote, but I hold them up for all members to see. They cover the opinions of people from all walks of life and from all parts of the State; people who belong to various political parties. All of them are pleading to the Government not to close this institution. Over the years these people had been patients of the Wooroloo Hospital, and they are aware of the care and attention that had been given to them by the very capable staff.

Following that, various organisations held meetings. They also joined in the appeal to the Government not to close the hospital. It is interesting to note the organisations that dealt with this matter—

- The Farmers' Union at its State conference on the 23rd March, 1969;
- the Women's Service Guild on the 4th January, 1969;
- the Young Liberal movement at its State convention on the 16th March, 1969;
- the W.A. Housewives Association at its 49th annual general meeting on the 14th April, 1969;
- the Australian Labor Party;
- the W.A. Trades and Labour Council;
- the Shire Councils of Mundaring, Northam, Toodyay, and Murray;
- the Wundowie Progress Association;
- the Inkpen Bushfire Brigade;
- the Australian Pensioners' League (W.A. Division);
- the Amalgamated Engineering Union, Midland branch;
- the Parliamentary Country Party of Western Australia.

Mr. Gayfer: It was the State conference of the Country Party.

Mr. McIVER: I meant the State conference of the Country Party on the 29th July, 1969. I hope the honourable member will pay as much attention to my motion as to my misquote. Other organisations were—

R.S.L. Women's Auxilliary;

C.W.A. Chidlow, and many other branches;

C.W.A. State Executive;

Wooroloo and district residents; and the Committee for Retention of Wooroloo Hospital.

Mr. Craig: It was not suggested to any of these organisations that they should pass resolutions of this nature, was it?

Mr. McIVER: I would not be doing my duty if I did not bring this matter to the attention of the House. I would be shirking my responsibility to these people, who are so determined in their efforts to ensure that the Wooroloo Hospital continues to function in the manner in which it has functioned over the years. I trust that the members of this House will give this motion every consideration when they are called upon to cast a vote.

On the 10th December, 1968, a meeting, which the Minister for Health and the Minister for Traffic were good enough to attend to state their case for the closure of the hospital, was held. We all know what happened.

Mr. Craig: What meeting are you referring to?

Mr. McIVER: The meeting which the Minister for Health and the Minister for Traffic attended on the 10th December, 1968.

Mr. Craig: This meeting was supposed to be held to give the residents of the district the opportunity to express their views, but to which the Minister for Health and I were not allowed to bring anybody; yet it was most significant that five members of the Labor Party were present.

Mr. McIVER: They attended at the invitation of the retention committee.

Mr. Craig: Why did not the retention committee invite the Legislative Council members for the district? It did not invite them.

Mr. Graham: I think this is a most discerning committee.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Williams): Order! The member for Northam will proceed.

Mr. McIVER: The committee was very determined in its efforts, and it was undaunted in its pursuit, to retain this institution. It appealed to the Premier to receive a deputation. I cannot understand why this deputation was refused. It was not so long ago that I had the privilege of being a member of a deputation—although I was only present as an observer and not as a speaker—which occupied two hours of the Premier's time—time which he could ill-afford, because it was just prior to his departure from the State. Yet he gave us two hours to discuss some matter which was absolutely frivolous; the matter had no significance at all, and two hours of the Premier's time was wasted.

Nothing but good could have come of a deputation in respect of the retention of Wooroloo Hospital, yet a deputation was refused. Ministers are only human, and from time to time they can make mistakes. I felt it was the Premier's duty, at least, to hear what this body had to put forward.

Sir David Brand: The Ministers had already expressed the Government's viewpoint.

Mr. McIVER: At the same time it would not have done any harm for the Premier to receive the deputation.

Sir David Brand: I understand the position, but I cannot go over the heads of Ministers. They had made their decision, and they were backed up by the decision of the Cabinet.

Mr. Graham: As head of the Government the Premier could have had a second look.

Sir David Brand: When you were Minister for Transport you turned down many requests for deputations.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Williams): Order! The member for Northam.

Mr. McIVER: I must say in fairness that the Premier did write a personal letter to one of the patients at Wooroloo Hospital. It states—

I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th August. The Hon. Minister for Health advises me that he has also received the same letter from you.

There is no intention whatever of turning people out in order to make for wrongdoers. For many years there have been repeated recommendations that Wooroloo Hospital should be closed. It was never designed for the purpose for which it is now used.

I pause at this point. If we compare the buildings of Wooroloo Hospital with the Shenton Park Annexe we find there is very little difference between them. I would say that the Wooroloo buildings are slightly in advance, as far as construction is concerned. There are many hospitals in this State which do not have the facilities that are provided at the Wooroloo Hospital. To continue with the Premier's letter—

When originally built in 1914, it was of course, designed for the treatment at that time of tubercular patients. The lay-out of the establishment does not lend itself properly to modern nursing care.

Currently being either built or planned are 140 extra beds at the Homes of Peace, 150 beds at Perth Medical Centre, 40 at Albany, 40 at Bunbury, 20 at Manjimup. The new

Regional Hospital at Northam will leave 40 long term beds available there also.

The Perth Medical Centre is not yet completed, nor is the new Home of Peace.

Mr. O'Neil: Wooroloo has not ceased to be a hospital, either.

Mr. McIVER: In reply to a question which I asked the other night, it is quite obvious the Government has made up its mind.

Mr. O'Neil: We have. One set of hospital beds has not been completed, but the other set of beds has not been emptied.

Mr. Graham: Wooroloo has received the death sentence, so the member for the district is getting out.

Sir David Brand: That is a funny story!

Mr. McIVER: In relation to the Home of Peace. I asked the following question of the Minister representing the Minister for Health on the 16th September:—

- (1) When will the Home of Peace now under construction at Mt. Lawley be completed?
- (2) What is its anticipated capital cost?
- (3) What is the number of patients who will be accommodated in this home?
- (4) What is the anticipated cost per day to the individual patient for accommodation in this home?

The answer to the first part of the question was—

Building will be completed about January, 1970. Furnishing will take about one month.

It is important to emphasise that although the Government does not intend to close the Wooroloo Hospital until 1970, with the situation as it is at the moment, and with the high resignation rate of the staff, unless something is done very quickly this institution will no doubt, to my mind, close before Christmas. Something will have to be done to rectify the existing situation, because there are 85 patients in the hospital at the present time. I venture to say that at this point of time no arrangement has been made for the transfer of these patients. I might add that not knowing where they are to be placed is having a detrimental effect on their health. It is quite understandable that there is not the accommodation in this institution to take additional patients, especially aged patients and geriatric cases.

In his letter the Premier said that the new Northam Hospital will leave 40 beds available for long-term patients. I repeat that the Wooroloo Hospital could be closed before Christmas, because of the resignation rate of the staff. In the time lag between then and when the new regional hospital at Northam is completed—that



will be in 1970—the existing hospital at Northam could not possibly take one additional patient, because it is filled at the present time. There are already several long-term patients in this hospital. In the women's ward there are 37 patients, and this ward is supposed to cater adequately for only 27 patients, so verandah space and other space has had to be used.

Even when the new regional hospital at Northam is completed, of the 116 beds, 20 will be required for maternity cases, and that will leave 96 beds. How would it be possible to transfer the patients of Wooroloo Hospital to that hospital? There is just not the room, and I am sure there is not the room in the new Home of Peace, or in other institutions and hospitals in the metropolitan area. So I think we can disregard them.

The Premier's letter stated further—

It has never been possible to attract more than 130 patients to Wooroloo so, as you can see, more than adequate replacement facilities are being made available for the long term patients previously transferred to Wooroloo.

For local patients a very excellent 8 bed hospital is being provided. The average local patient intake has been in the vicinity of about four per week.

The prospect of leaving Wooroloo unused had nothing to recommend it. In the interests of the local district and of the proper safeguarding of the taxpayers' money, an alternative use was sought.

Let us refer to the taxpayers' money. I asked the following question of the Minister representing the Minister for Health in relation to the hospital at Beverley:—

- (1) When was the new hospital at Beverley opened?
- (2) What was its total cost?
- (3) How many patients can be accommodated?
- (4) How many patients are in the hospital at the present time?

The answer was—

- (1) The 18th April, 1969.
- (2) Building \$449,000.
- (3) 17 patients.
- (4) 12 patients and two new-born babies.

That is practically \$500,000 for a 17-bed hospital, yet the cry of the Government is that Wooroloo Hospital is too costly to maintain. It claims there is no money for this purpose. No wonder, when the Government makes decisions like this!

A short distance away from Beverley is Northam where a hospital costing \$4,000,000 will be opened next year. It is defeating the aim of regional hospitals to

scatter them around the country centres. Some country hospitals have been built for nothing else than political expediency.

Mr. Gayfer: Northam could do without a hospital, and use the Beverley Hospital instead.

Mr. McIVER: The object of regional hospitals is to cater for the region. That is why they are constructed; so that they can provide specialist treatment through physiotherapists and other trained personnel, and so that patients do not have to be transferred to the Royal Perth Hospital to receive treatment. That is the sole aim of the provision of regional hospitals. Lake Grace is another which comes to my mind. How long was that hospital without a doctor? I do not know whether there is one there yet.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There is.

Mr. O'Neil: I think you ought to carry your comparison on between Beverley and Wooroloo.

Mr. McIVER: I am pleased the Minister has raised that point. Wooroloo is only 27 miles from Northam and Midland is only 25 miles. However, members should not overlook the fact that 400 people are employed at the Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry at Wundowie while 72 are employed at the Tip Top Abattoirs in Linley Valley Road. If Wooroloo is closed there will be no hospital between Mundaring and Northam.

Mr. Craig: But there will be a hospital at Wooroloo.

Mr. McIVER: An eight-bed institution cannot be called a hospital.

Mr. Craig: It will be sufficient, as the daily average for the district is only 3.5.

Mr. McIVER: If this hospital closes, the resident doctor will leave and there will be no doctor. I will complete my point. Midland will not take patients from the hills, so there will be no hospital between Midland and Northam.

Mr. Rushton: But how far is Beverley from Northam?

Mr. O'Neil: The same distance as Wooroloo.

Mr. McIVER: We have the Beverley Hospital, which can cater for 17 patients. That hospital cost \$500,000, and at the moment it has 12 patients and two new-born babies.

Mr. Gayfer: So what?

Mr. Rushton: How far is that from Northam?

Mr. McIVER: So we can discount the point raised by the Government in relation to the cost of Wooroloo. Admittedly the costs have escalated since the patients were transferred from Wooroloo to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. However, what would be wrong with converting a

section of Wooroloo into a type of "C"-class hospital to cater for the aged and geriatric patients so that the Government could obtain the subsidy? At the moment the State Government is subsidising the Commonwealth by receiving only \$5 a day per patient, because the State Government has to make up the rest of the cost. The State Government is also providing many of the relatives of these patients with an added income because many of the relatives cash the pension cheques and the patients in the hospital received practically none of the money.

If members were to look at some of the "C"-class hospitals, they would agree that they are absolutely deplorable and the way the old people are exploited is shocking. I would go so far as to say that this situation is not as bad in this State as it is in New South Wales and Victoria; but the fact remains that a great need exists in this State for the provision of further care for these people. Wooroloo is the ideal place for this care. It has a beautiful setting and is a place of tranquillity. No-one in this Chamber could deny this. The gardens and everything about the place are designed to add to the comfort of the patients. For members of Parliament to say that the hospital is out of date and old-fashioned is just a lot of rubbish!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is.

Mr. O'Neil: It is inadequate.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It just is. That is the point.

Mr. McIVER: All I can say is that if Wooroloo were retained and I reached a ripe old age, I would be quite happy to spend the rest of my days in that hospital.

One of the principal aims of the Wooroloo committee was to ask the Government for the appointment of an independent committee, but this request was flatly refused and I am at a loss to know the reason. I believe it was a very fair request that an independent committee be established to examine all the facts of the case. It is a pity the committee did not have behind it the finances available to the Teachers Union. If it had, I think the situation would be a lot different. The rise in the teachers' salaries was not expected to take place for another 12 months, but this situation was changed when pressure was brought to bear. If the Wooroloo committee had had the same financial support, I am sure that the Wooroloo Hospital would have been retained, because it would have had the finance available to hold a campaign similar to that held by the Teachers Union.

Therefore, the first point in relation to costs which was submitted by the Government as being one of the reasons for the closure of the hospital can be discounted. I make it quite clear that I am not opposed

to the basic concept of a penal institution, because I think it is a good idea; but, with the thousands of acres available in Western Australia, why pick the Wooroloo Hospital? Why deprive the sick and old people, who comprise most of the inmates in Wooroloo, of this amenity? Why take away from them the extra love and affection they obtain in that hospital?

Most of the staff of the Wooroloo Hospital are married women and no doubt at some time they have been sick themselves and know what it is to be cared for in this manner.

Mr. Dunn: How many are on the staff?

Mr. McIVER: The Wooroloo Hospital, at the time of the suggested closure, employed 400. Whether that is the figure now I do not know because over the last couple of months there has been a big fluctuation in the number of staff so that it is very hard to ascertain the exact figure.

Mr. Craig: It is round about 200.

Mr. McIVER: I thank the Minister for that information.

Mr. O'Neil: There is a staff of 200 for 85 patients.

Mr. Graham: Why are there only 85 patients?

Mr. Craig: Because there are 200 staff.

Mr. McIVER: That raises an interesting point.

Mr. Graham: No wonder the Minister is walking out from the area.

Mr. McIVER: If I may continue! The Wooroloo Hospital caters for 200 patients, but it is a very interesting point the Minister for Housing has raised. He said that a staff of 200 looks after only 85 patients. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition then asked why there were only 85 patients. The reason is because the hospital has never been given the opportunity to cater for more patients.

Mr. Graham: That is so.

Mr. McIVER: When I know of the overcrowding at Royal Perth Hospital and all the other institutions, I just wonder why those patients could not be sent to Wooroloo and thus utilise the facilities to their fullest extent. By doing this the deficit would be reduced.

Mr. Graham: It is being deliberately strangled.

Mr. Dunn: Were there only 85 patients when there was a staff of 400?

Mr. McIVER: At that time there was a greater number than 85, but I mentioned previously that I do not know the exact figure.

Mr. Craig: About 150.

Mr. McIVER: The following is contained in the 1967-68 annual report of the Homes of Peace, Subiaco and Inglewood:—

Despite the fact that we now care for 324 patients, there are still long waiting lists for admission to both our Subiaco and Inglewood hospitals.

With a view to easing this unsatisfactory situation, the Board of Management is negotiating with the State Government to increase the capacity of Inglewood Hospital from 70 to 210 beds, with the possibility of also building on the site close to Dundas Road a unit for the care of the frail aged. (This is a field in which, to date, the Homes of Peace have not participated).

It is obvious that with a waiting list of 285, the Homes of Peace could not cater for any patients from Wooroloo. Despite this fact, the Minister has emphatically stated that, according to the nature of their illnesses, the patients from Wooroloo will be transferred to these various places.

The following is from page 16 of the annual report for 1968 of the Royal Perth Hospital:—

Many of the problems of this institution are related to the considerable overcrowding of all areas, and especially ward areas. It may well be a fine tradition never to have refused an admission to a patient seeking a bed at the Royal Perth; nevertheless, to continue in an overcrowded state to such an extent as to make it not only difficult but in many instances dangerous to carry out the proper medical and nursing care of patients, is something that demands a high priority for correction.

There is without a shadow of doubt overcrowding at other institutions, and this brings me to another point. This Government is always advocating decentralisation. I cannot go along with that when Wooroloo is to be closed. Such a move is certainly not in the interests of decentralisation, because it will bring all the patients into the congested metropolitan area where there is already inadequate accommodation for patients.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We are catering for them more and more in regional hospitals throughout the country.

Mr. McIVER: The Minister must have been asleep, because I have just quoted the situation at Northam. That hospital cannot possibly take any more patients, because there is no room. Members must also keep in mind the time lag which will occur when the hospital is closed. This of course could occur in a month, and where would the patients go? The patients at Wooroloo do not know themselves.

I know a woman patient at the hospital. Previously she had received treatment at Heathcote, but when she was sent

to Wooroloo her health greatly improved because of the occupational therapy available there. This woman was then determined to rehabilitate herself in this very fine hospital with its wonderful staff and facilities, but now her health has been detrimentally affected because she feels she is insecure. She has heard these rumours and does not know where she will be sent; and this is the situation with other patients, too.

I say emphatically that it is time these patients were at least told where they will be sent, and when.

With regard to the expenditure of the hospital, an unusual situation exists because not only administration costs are involved. We must keep in mind that a 1,600-acre reserve is attached to the hospital and the hospital staff is responsible for firebreaks and for the maintenance of the oval and other facilities. All this comes under the expenditure of the hospital, so of course that expenditure is high!

I repeat that if a section of that hospital could be converted into a "C"-class hospital the costs would be considerably reduced.

Mr. O'Neil: Do the patients use the oval?

Mr. McIVER: When the sanatorium developed, so did the facilities.

Mr. O'Neil: I am talking about now.

Mr. McIVER: Yes.

Mr. O'Neil: The patients do use the oval?

Mr. Graham: The staff does.

Mr. McIVER: I hardly think that the patients at Wooroloo would be capable of using the oval.

Mr. O'Neil: In other words, the Government is paying for the upkeep of the oval for the staff, not for the patients. Who are you worried about—the patients or the staff?

Mr. Rushton: I think you have him there!

Mr. Craig: The school children use it.

Mr. McIVER: I wish to list these five points. I have dealt with one of them. Another point raised was the difficulty visitors experience because of the distance involved in travelling to the hospital. What a lot of hogwash that is! It can be described in no other way.

Mr. Graham: Very aptly described!

Mr. McIVER: Only one of the many people I have interviewed complained of the distance and the difficulty experienced in getting to the hospital.

Let us take the case of a patient in the Royal Perth Hospital whose relatives live in Fremantle or in the Spearwood area. What is the difference between getting to the Royal Perth Hospital and parking

one's car there, and driving from Perth to Wooroloo? As a country member I find it is becoming increasingly difficult to park a car in the vicinity of the Royal Perth Hospital. It usually takes an hour or an hour and a quarter to drive to the Wooroloo Hospital, where there are no parking worries. So to put up the argument that visitors find it difficult to visit Wooroloo, because of the distance, is a lot of rubbish.

Mr. Fletcher: Many people treat a visit to the hospital as a day out.

Mr. McIVER: I agree with the member for Fremantle; that is just what a lot of people do, and they have a lovely day out especially in this month of September. Wooroloo is a real beauty spot with its wildflowers, and many people who visit the hospital make a picnic of the trip.

Mr. Craig: Have you ever asked the patients whether their friends and relatives go to visit them because of the beauty of the area?

Mr. McIVER: Many people find it extremely difficult to visit patients in the hospitals scattered throughout the State. I would like to emphasise to the Minister that most of the people in the Wooroloo Hospital are very old, and as long as they are being cared for—and they have their hospital visiting committees—they do not want a lot of people coming up to see them. Those people are living a life of contentment and they do not want a lot of visitors coming from Perth to see them. They have a very fine women's auxiliary.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Are you sure of that; that a lot of people do not want their relatives or friends to visit them?

Mr. McIVER: I do not want to make it too ambiguous, but those people would not want visitors daily. Many of the old people may not even have relatives.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: One of the troubles of our sophisticated society is that there is not enough visiting of old people by their children.

Mr. McIVER: Then the Government could do a little more by providing adequate facilities for the old people, because they are not provided at the present time.

Mr. Graham: If a family lived in Northam and the father was in hospital in Perth then the father would not receive many daily visits.

Mr. McIVER: I now come to the point regarding the inability to secure trained staff. What would be wrong with sending nurses to the Wooroloo Hospital on a rotational system? They could come from hospitals such as the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

Mr. Rushton: The union would not like that.

Mr. McIVER: I do not see that that has anything to do with it. I might say this suggestion was actually submitted and I am sure the nurses would like the system.

Mr. Rushton: Should not the nurses have a choice?

Mr. McIVER: I would say they would be delighted to go to Wooroloo knowing that it was for three months. It would give the nurses a wider scope of training, including training in the geriatric field. I think nurses would really appreciate an opportunity to go to Wooroloo, so I say this is one way in which we could overcome the staff problem.

The Minister for Health, Mr. MacKinnon, made a statement on the 20th April, 1967. That statement was published in the Wooroloo Hospital Newsletter of the 21st April, 1967. The Minister stated that the future of the Wooroloo Hospital was part of the overall hospital planning and that investigations were being carried out to plan the full utilisation of the hospital's facilities. I think that is something we should keep foremost in our minds.

Mr. Graham: What has the member for Dale to say about that?

Mr. Rushton: About what?

Mr. Graham: You didn't go back to sleep, did you?

Mr. Brady: They have all been struck dumb at once.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Williams): Order; the member for Northam!

Mr. McIVER: I will now quote some costs from the Medical Department annual report for the year ended the 30th June, 1967, which is the latest report available. The maintenance expenditure at the Wooroloo Hospital, for 1965-66, was \$380,288. In 1966-67 there was an increase to \$407,297. The Mt. Henry Hospital, for 1966-67 had an expenditure of \$269,975; and the expenditure for Sunset, for the same year, was \$393,353.

The expenditure at the Royal Perth Hospital was \$4,174,810; and at the Fremantle Hospital the amount was \$1,325,974. The expenditure at the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital was \$914,369.

Mr. O'Neil: What is the cost per bed per hospital?

Mr. McIVER: The cost per patient is roughly \$14 per day.

Mr. O'Neil: For Wooroloo?

Mr. McIVER: I am pleased the Minister raised that point because I will be dealing with it in a moment.

Mr. Graham: The charge in Perth is \$18 per day.

Mr. McIVER: We will look at the figures. The average cost at Devonleigh, Cottesloe, is \$16.72. The average cost for Woodside is \$16.62, and for Osborne Park it is \$15.61.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They are hospitals of a different type.

Mr. O'Neil: Give us the figures for the geriatric hospitals.

Mr. McIVER: The average cost at Mt. Henry is \$5.60, and at Sunset it is \$5.59.

Mr. O'Neil: That is right; \$5 against \$14.

Mr. McIVER: You are comparing "A"-class hospitals with "C"-class hospitals.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They are not "A"-class hospitals; they are geriatric hospitals. They are the ones to compare.

Mr. McIVER: That does not alter the fact that what the Government is endeavouring to do, in relation to the cost factor, is not in perspective in regard to the Wooroloo Hospital.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is in perspective.

Mr. Rushton: What does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say to that?

Mr. Graham: I will stand up to make my remarks; I will not snipe.

Mr. McIVER: Let us have a look at some of the other items concerning Wooroloo when compared with a lot of other hospitals. The Wooroloo Hospital has one superintendent, and three resident doctors, an X-ray department, laboratory, physiotherapy section, occupational therapy, air-conditioned wards, labour ward, concert hall, a swimming pool, a district oval, and extensive gardens.

Mr. O'Neil: Do the patients use the swimming pool?

Mr. McIVER: The staff mostly use it.

Mr. O'Neil: I am afraid you have a very poor argument.

Mr. McIVER: It is quite apparent that it does not matter what is put forward, or what type of argument is raised, the Minister for Housing has quite evidently made up his mind. However, the situation remains that the people I have mentioned are sincere in their plea that the hospital be retained.

The Government has put forward five reasons for the closure but the deputations that have met the Minister for Health have certainly knocked holes in those arguments. I feel that the request for an independent committee should be agreed to so that submissions could again be put to the Government to show that the closure of the hospital would not be in the best interests of the community or the State of Western Australia.

I am not the only person in support of this plea. Yesterday I presented a petition to this House which contained 10,000 signatures. The Minister for Housing said that I put up a very poor argument, but surely 10,000 people in this State cannot be wrong. Those people have

come from all over the State, and from all walks of life, and they support all political parties in Western Australia.

I wish to point out the importance of Wooroloo Hospital to the people in the area and to examine the statistics concerning patients. The figures are interesting and I hope the Minister for Housing is listening.

Between the 1st July, 1967, and the 30th June, 1968, the number of patients seen was 3,779, and the number of attendances was 6,972. Between the 1st July, 1968, and the 30th April, 1969, the number of patients seen was 3,074, and the number of attendances was 6,574. I ask members to keep those figures in mind while I quote the figures relating to other hospitals which have cost up to \$500,000. I refer to hospitals such as Beverley, where the number of patients for the first three months of 1969 was 776. For the first three months of 1969 there were, at the Wooroloo blood bank, 486 patients; biochemistry, 934 patients; and bacteriological, 265 patients, giving a total of 1,685.

If we examine the physiotherapy treatment we find that from the 1st January, to the 31st December, 1968, the number of patients was 661. The number of in-patient treatments was 7,691, and the number of out-patient treatments was 701, making a total of 8,392. That is a fantastic number in a district the size of Wooroloo, and I again emphasise that if the hospital was not available the people would be put to considerable inconvenience to receive treatment.

Occupational therapy is a very important factor, and I might say that occupational therapists are difficult to come by. The attendances for 1967 were 8,178, and for 1968 the figure was 7,830. The weekly average for 1969, so far, is 140, and the daily average attendances number 34. In the X-ray department for January-December, 1968, the total number of patients treated was 1,433, and the total number of examinations was 1,890.

So, just what facilities this hospital provides for the people of the community can be clearly seen. It would be a sacrilege if this hospital was closed because the Government was in a jam and had to have another prison. We all know that the Fremantle Prison is crowded, and we know that Karnet is filled to capacity; but why should this hospital be sacrificed when we have thousands of acres of land here upon which to provide a prison?

I repeat that I am in full agreement with the basic concept of building another penal institution; but not at Wooroloo and not at the expense of the sick, the injured, and the aged. I trust the members of this House will give that point every consideration. The member for Collie spoke tonight on the closed mills

in the south-west. Surely something could be formulated whereby prisoners could be used in that area.

The SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the subject before the Chair.

Mr. McIVER: I wish to draw attention to the intake of other hospitals. Let us have a look at the bed average in several of the hospitals throughout the State. We find that the Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital has a bed average of 31.3 per cent., Busselton District Hospital 28.7 per cent., Denmark Hospital 11.2 per cent., Northam District Hospital 56.8 per cent., and Wooroloo Hospital 115 per cent. We come again to the \$500,000 hospital at Beverley, and the bed average there is 10.3 per cent.

Mr. Gayfer: What about Cunderdin in your electorate? It is only 40 miles to the north, but it still has a new hospital.

Mr. McIVER: I make this quite clear, I am not opposed to the people of the Beverley district; but when the Government spends \$4,000,000 on a regional hospital at Northam only 30 miles from that town for the prime purpose of absorbing all these people, for the reason I have outlined one cannot—

Mr. O'Neil: We are spending that much a year on a hospital almost the same distance away as Beverley is from Northam.

Mr. McIVER: Half a million dollars?

Mr. Toms: Who is making this speech?

Mr. McIVER: I do not want any red herrings introduced into this debate.

Mr. O'Neil: We want some facts, though.

Mr. McIVER: The Minister is getting them.

Mr. Davies: What about some housing facts?

Mr. McIVER: At Beverley the bed average is 10.3 against the average of 115 at Wooroloo, which emphasises once again the concept of the Wooroloo Hospital and the work it is doing. What a great service to the people in that community and the people of Western Australia!

Mr. Cash: What is the year of the report from which you are quoting?

Mr. McIVER: It is the latest annual report of the Medical Department—the year 1966-67. These are the latest figures available to me.

Mr. Cash: Why don't you use the 1967-68 report?

Mr. Davies: It is 1969 now; the department is pretty far behind.

Mr. Cash: This is the latest report.

Mr. McIVER: Which report has the member for Mirrabooka got?

Mr. Cash: The report for the year ended the 30th June, 1968.

Mr. McIVER: That was not available when I prepared my speech.

Mr. Cash: I got mine from the attendant in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McIVER: I could go on quoting figures emphasising Wooroloo Hospital in comparison with other hospitals. It boils down to this: one of the main points put forward by the Government is in relation to the cost of running this hospital. I am sure that if the Government had another look at this matter in the way I have outlined with a view to making part of the hospital a "C"-class hospital in conjunction with this operation—or even making it a complete "C"-class hospital—the deficit would be automatically reduced. However, do not let us depart from the main fact and that is the very important role this hospital is playing.

I think I have aired the views of the Wooroloo committee and put forward reasons why the hospital should be retained. I would now like to read a short poem which was written by one of the members of that committee.

Mr. Cash: Lord Byron?

Mr. McIVER: It reads—

What is this place?

To me, this place is still,

And ever shall remain,

A haven—

A haven for the aged and the ill.

A gift of nature wisely taken

Wisely used, until

Some baser purpose now would seize the rein;

A purpose not endowed with reason  
Nor with saving grace.

Why should this place

Be thus unfairly used?

A prison!

Heaven mark this rare disgrace;

This spectacle of sad misuse;

Of goodness so abused!

Please keep this place

As wiser men ordained;

As, indeed, the One above should will.

Mark the urgency in reading

Of ten thousand voices, pleading

For this haven—blessed haven

For the aged, and the ill.

Ten thousand pens

Have pleaded in a voice;

'Please keep this place

As wiser men ordained.'

In charity, now make the braver choice—

Reverse this grave mistake

So unexplained.

Mr. Cash: Author?

Mr. McIVER: I conclude on this note: I trust that the facts I have presented will be considered with wise evaluation and balance by the members of this House, and that members will view this motion not as a political exercise but as a genuine plea by the people of the community of Wooroloo and the people of Western Australia for the retention of this hospital. I sincerely trust that when this motion goes to the vote members will support it and not look at the Wooroloo Hospital in terms of dollars and cents, but rather that they will adopt a humane attitude and by so doing enable the people of this community and the people of Western Australia to benefit from this very efficient institution.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [8.55 p.m.]: In reply to the member for Northam I would like to say at the outset that I speak on behalf of the Minister for Health whom I represent in this Chamber and, of course, I, as first speaker, speak for and on behalf of the Government. I would like to remind the House that for some six years I was the Minister for Health. I think the honourable member stated initially that his motion was not to be regarded in any sense as a political motion.

I really do not know whether he himself believes that or not; however, I do not believe it. I believe that the Labor Party has pledged itself to take up the cudgels on behalf of those organisations which are trying to keep the Wooroloo Hospital in its present status and form.

Mr. Graham: That is the Country Party and the Young Liberal Movement.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The party has pledged itself to support the organisations which have expressed themselves in this vein, and to fight the next election with this as one of the issues. Am I right or am I wrong? I would say I am completely right and, therefore, this motion is a political one and there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Fletcher: The elections are a long way off.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The members of the Labor Party are entitled to their views and as an Opposition they are entitled to express those views; but they hope this will be an issue which will result in the present Country Party member for the electorate of Toodyay being replaced by a Labor Party candidate.

Mr. Graham: We have already done that.

Mr. Jamieson: We could not get more votes from Wooroloo than we got last time.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Opposition is entitled to try to do this—and that is what it is trying to do with regard to

this motion. It smacks of hypocrisy for the honourable member to say that there is no political content in his motion.

The next thing the member for Northam spoke about—and he described it quite well—was the history of the hospital at Wooroloo. He described how it was used for a number of years as a sanatorium for tuberculosis patients; and it served this purpose well. But the honourable member said that because of the beneficial developments which took place in medicine—I am paraphrasing his own words—with regard to the treatment of the dread disease of tuberculosis, the purpose of the hospital was defeated and the patients were shifted. They were taken away from Wooroloo and sent to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

Whilst we are on the subject I might mention that it is one of the miracles of our time that we have been able to overcome the disease of tuberculosis to a great extent, except for the a-type disease which still exists. However, the member for Northam clearly demonstrated that with the passage of years there was no need for Wooroloo to continue as it had in the past. So it became a geriatric hospital—not a general hospital, although there is a central core there that could be treated as a G.P. hospital.

So we go on from there to carry the hospital to the present time. The need for Wooroloo as a geriatric hospital has largely gone. Of course, it could still be used, but it is not adequate and it is not satisfactory in modern terms as a geriatric hospital. Time has changed the necessity; and circumstances have altered, much the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as happened with tuberculosis patients.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Is not the number of geriatric patients increasing at the same time?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member is usually very quick to perceive the drift of an argument.

Mr. Graham: There is more drift than argument here.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I agree there is a necessity for geriatric hospitals in many places, and I will demonstrate later what the Government is doing and what its long-range plan constitutes. What the Government has achieved is really good if one looks at it with an unbiased eye.

The point I am making is that the purpose of this place has changed; it is no longer satisfactory as a geriatric hospital. There are others which can serve the purpose better, and I will subsequently prove this by using some figures I have.

Mr. McIVER: In 1967 the Minister made the statement that the hospital would be fully utilised, so how can you say that circumstances have altered in one year; and how can you say that the Government

said it was strongly considering closing the hospital after the Minister made the statement that the hospital would be utilised?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It will be utilised but not in the concept of a geriatric hospital. The needs of hospitalisation in a small G.P. centre will continue to be met. The area will be utilised in the best interests of the people of the State. This is a fact whether the honourable member believes it or not. The fact is that this hospital is no longer being usefully employed in the best interests of the people of this State.

Mr. Graham: Why?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Because times have changed, as I will try to point out.

Mr. Graham: Of course they have; people are still waiting in queues to get into these hospitals.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The hospital is no longer as usefully employed for its present purpose as it will be for the purpose for which it is intended when the changeover takes place.

Mr. Toms: When?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think June, 1970, or earlier, is the date that was fixed. The honourable member also said that the Wooroloo Hospital compared favourably with the Shenton Park Hospital. How he can say that I do not know. It just does not make sense.

Mr. McIver: The situation there is deplorable.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Shenton Park Hospital is regarded as one of the best rehabilitation hospitals in Australia.

Mr. Bickerton: Who regards it this way?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Wooroloo is not a very good geriatric hospital. It is no good getting emotional about this. I understand emotionalism; I rather tend to trade on it at times. But we cannot be emotional in this case because the people will be cared for elsewhere. The hospital is neither useful nor economical in its present status.

The member for Northam also mentioned the facilities the Government plans and made certain references to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and the new Homes of Peace and said that these could not take up the patients who were currently at Wooroloo; that the Government could not cope with the situation. This, of course, is not true.

The Government will cope with the situation. By November of this year there will be 110 new beds provided at the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital in a building almost specially designed as a geriatric hospital; and a good proportion of these will be used early next year. Apart from this, 140 new beds will be provided for the Homes of Peace out Inglewood way.

Mr. McIver: There are 245 waiting to fill it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Where?

Mr. McIver: On the waiting list at the moment—waiting to get into Homes of Peace.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am giving an example of what is being done to cater for these people—in addition to the 245 mentioned by the honourable member. The situation will be materially improved.

I was surprised to hear the member for Northam say that the regional hospital at Northam could not cater for any more people in that area. It can, and it will be able to do so. There is a hospital which will cost \$4,000,000 being built as a regional hospital which will discharge its duties eventually as a regional hospital. It will have all the necessary facilities and that is why it will be so expensive.

Mr. McIver: I would like to correct that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This hospital is a regional hospital, just as we have others around the countryside to serve the major medical needs. We still must have in this great country of ours various G.P. hospitals to cater for general practitioners and for medical purposes.

These hospitals must still go on, but Northam will have about 126 beds altogether, apart from which 40 beds in the old hospital will be retained in quite good circumstances to care for people within the district.

So if the honourable member did not know before—and I am surprised that he did not—he will appreciate that the beds in that hospital will be taken up for the use of ailing old folk.

Mr. McIver: I am aware of that fact.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member also mentioned the matter of the petition. A petition, of course, is always a petition, whether it has 20 signatures or 1,000. I have been presented with petitions with 20 signatures and less. This one has 1,000. I daresay there is some value in petitions but not a great deal.

A predecessor of mine in Cabinet who was a Labor Minister—and I refer to Gilbert Fraser, whose stature in the Labor Party was high—would not have a bar of petitions. He used to say that anyone would sign a petition; that one could get 10,000 to sign a petition one day and the next day the same people would sign another petition dealing with something directly opposite. There is not a great deal of value in petitions.

Mr. Bickerton: Would you favour a petition if it sought to close the Wooroloo Hospital?



Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am surprised that the honourable member should ask me such a question, because he knows I would have the same view irrespective of the circumstances.

Mr. Graham: I wonder.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Whether the honourable member believes it or not is his prerogative. The member for Northam did his duty well and faithfully but he made the classic statement and said, "I am fully in agreement with a penal institution." He is fully in agreement with a penal institution, but he does not want it established at Wooroloo.

Mr. McIver: Quite right.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: How often have I heard that sentiment expressed. When I was Chief Secretary I had a great deal of trouble in getting the Karnet Rehabilitation Centre started. Everybody wanted a penal rehabilitation centre, but not at Karnet; it had to go somewhere else.

Mr. Bickerton: How would you like it at Cottesloe? That would be an excellent situation.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We have various institutions in and around Cottesloe which deal with the frailties of our society and which provide certain necessities. There are numbers of such institutions near Cottesloe which are serving society and these, presumably, will be expanded as time goes on.

Mr. Fletcher: Where will the Fremantle Prison go?

Sir DAVID BRAND: Fremantle.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This motion asks that the Wooroloo Hospital be retained in the best interests of the district and the State. I believe that the best interests of the district and the State would be served with a change of purpose, because the place has outlived its full usefulness in its present capacity. Wooroloo cannot be kept as a major hospital in this area. I have already explained something about a new regional hospital at Northam.

In addition to this there is the Swan Hospital at Midland, which is an important hospital on the periphery of the metropolitan region. The medical needs of the district can be served by a small hospital being retained at Wooroloo—an eight or 10 bed hospital can be maintained there if necessary, and the Minister for Health has mentioned that additions can be made to this unit to lift the number of beds.

Mr. Davies: Is this a new hospital?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Has the honourable member been there?

Mr. Davies: No.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is a more intense hospital unit there which acts as a general practitioner centre.

Mr. Davies: Where are you going to put the rehabilitation centre?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: At Wooroloo. This will serve the interests of the people and if necessary the interests of the trainees who happen to be there. The whole of Wooroloo will be used as a rehabilitation centre.

Mr. Davies: With the hospital stuck in the middle?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: What is the matter with that? Has the honourable member been to the Karnet Rehabilitation Centre?

Mr. Davies: No, I am sorry I spoke; I will not interrupt again but I will have a word to say later.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will look forward to hearing the honourable member. The Minister for Health has said over and over again that the long-term patients of the type predominantly handled at Wooroloo should in all humanity be kept closer to their friends and relatives, if possible in the district where they have grown up and lived. This, of course, is not always possible.

Later I will demonstrate where beds have been placed in hospitals to cater for the old folk and where the State has served the interests of the country areas in an endeavour to keep the old folk in their own district if that is their wish. Wooroloo having outlived its usefulness and the purpose for which it was established, the area can now be served better by an institution similar to the one at Karnet, where those who have infringed society's laws can be catered for. Who is to say they should not be catered for? It would be better for these people than the old folks to be cared for there. This is the decision the Government has made. Is the honourable member right or is the Government right?

Mr. Bickerton: The Government is not always right.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Neither is the honourable member.

Mr. Bickerton: That is so; you were right that time.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let us look at the financial situation. I would like to emphasise, however, that the financial situation is not always the most important aspect; the welfare of the patient is more important. The Wooroloo Hospital is the most expensive hospital of its type in the State. During the deliberations of the Grants Commission in past years, the commission often commented on the high cost of servicing the Wooroloo Hospital and our own State Treasurer was always on to us for not trying to effect economies.

It is a Government's responsibility to do what we are doing. A Government must try to do the best it can financially in the interests of the people. I repeat, however, that cost is not the only factor, but it is a very big one because without adequate money we cannot adequately provide all the services required by the people.

The gross operating cost in 1967-68 was \$14.34 per patient per day, and that excludes any loading for the department's administration or sinking and interest fund; and this was after economies had been effected.

Mr. Davies: What was that figure per day?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It was \$14.34, but I will give some more figures in a moment.

Prior to the economies being effected, the figure was just over \$16 per day. In the year to which I refer—1967-68—very little was done in connection with major maintenance of buildings.

The net operating cost was \$8.35 per patient per day, after the receipt of hospital benefits, pharmaceutical benefits, and patients' fees. This again is much greater than in any other hospital of this kind in the State. The hospitals with which Wooroloo can be compared are Sunset and Mt. Henry and I will give the net operating costs per person per day in table form as follows:—

	1967-68	1968-69
	\$	\$
Wooroloo ....	8.35	8.80
Mt. Henry ....	3.01	3.91
Sunset ....	3.20	3.61

This indicates the costs range from \$8 to \$3, and this fact is highly significant.

The net loss per bed per annum in 1967-68 at Wooroloo was \$3,989 compared with Sunset and Mt. Henry hospitals, where the figures were \$1,709 and \$1,961 respectively.

I have here the figures of general hospitals in other parts of the State in order that we might compare them with those concerning Wooroloo Hospital.

Mr. Graham: Do those figures take into account all the activities of Wooroloo apart from the geriatric side? For instance, there are at Wooroloo some beds for maternity cases. There would not be many of those at Sunset.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This is taking everything into consideration. There are bed cases at Sunset, too.

Mr. Graham: Are there maternity cases at Sunset?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I see what you mean! I do not know the figures concerning the small general hospitals.

Mr. Graham: You see, Wooroloo is not exclusively a geriatric hospital.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made his point.

Mr. Graham: You said you did not know.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I said I did not know whether those figures included that small section or not, but I will try to find out.

Mr. Graham: Maternity and general, as well as geriatric.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Those are included in Wooroloo.

Mr. Graham: I think they ought to be excluded to make a fair comparison.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have already said I am not able to give the information, but I will find out.

Mr. Bickerton: You should have it at your fingertips.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The net loss I just gave per annum for Wooroloo was \$3,989, and this can be compared with Kalgoorlie where the figure was \$2,624, Northam \$3,272, Bunbury \$3,825, and Albany \$3,774. From those figures members can realise that the net loss at Wooroloo was higher than at any one of those other hospitals.

No Government can contemplate this situation with equanimity. Surely to goodness that is so! I can imagine, if the member for Belmont were the Minister for Health, how he would feel about it.

Mr. Jamieson: Don't growl at me, I haven't said anything yet!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: One thing about the member for Belmont is that he endeavours to be logical about such matters and responsible about government.

Mr. Jamieson: You might get me on your side yet! Keep going!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: These figures are illuminating and should be regarded closely before anyone becomes too emotionally charged about the poor folk not having a place to go to, because they will have.

Mr. Graham: Where?

Mr. Davies: Karrakatta.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have already referred to two places, and will refer to more later.

Mr. Graham: Yes, and they all have long waiting lists. You cannot afford to close down any geriatric wards.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Whether or not the facilities are being properly utilised! I am trying to convey to members—and I have convinced the more reasonable ones—that this institution is not being used to the fullest extent, but it will be if it is used for another purpose

Mr. Graham: What about those who are waiting and cannot get in?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There are the same types of troubles being experienced in another sphere about which the Government must be interested!

Mr. Bickerton: I wish you would not get so excited! You are disturbing the Minister for Lands!

Mr. Graham: No; he is still snoring!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is estimated that a capital expenditure of between \$250,000 and \$300,000 will be required to upgrade the standard of the institution if it is to be continued for its present purpose. I understand that even this is a conservative figure.

Mr. Graham: Who is complaining about the present standard?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Everyone would if the present plans had not been known. Many complaints would be made, and I hope the honourable member is not so naive as to deny that.

Mr. Graham: I am more concerned about the people who cannot get into these institutions.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Even with this expenditure, the institution could not be accepted as satisfactory, and it would not alter the basic deficiency in design.

It is further estimated that the operating deficit for the period of one year—1967-68—was over \$368,000; and this figure would more than pay for the construction of one ward to accommodate approximately 70 in-patients—

Mr. Graham: The loss at Mt. Henry is more than that.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —in modern facilities in the metropolitan area where the operating deficit would be greatly reduced and be somewhat in line with those of the institutions of Mt. Henry and Sunset.

Mr. Graham: Both of which lose more than Wooroloo!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: But of course the financial aspect is not the whole of the story. As the honourable member has said, it is quite correct to say that Wooroloo has fulfilled a useful purpose, and I have already intimated this; but I believe it has now outlived its full usefulness in its present capacity. It has done a good job in the care and treatment of people who have been inmates there and those who still are inmates. The medical and nursing staff have performed in a manner which commends itself to everyone. However I would not go so far as to say that they have any pre-eminence of commendation over those who care for the sick and ailing in other hospitals in our State. I would hesitate to say that.

These aspects are accepted and appreciated, but we should go into the situation a little more closely and realise, as the honourable member himself has said, that history is changing the whole feeling of Wooroloo. One change has already occurred because of circumstances, and due to different circumstances again, this second change is necessary.

Because of these circumstances which have been mentioned and because we would be faced within the proposition of a substantial capital expenditure to upgrade the hospital and an ever-recurring deficit of proportions which are unreasonable, and with the knowledge that planning and construction of new alternative accommodation of a modern standard is well on the way, some of which will be completed very shortly—and I refer to the 110 beds at the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and the 140 beds at the Inglewood Home of Peace—together with the necessity to relieve the overcrowded prison system which must be given high priority by this Government, as I said in answer to an interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Graham: Do you know the waiting list for entry to the Homes of Peace?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —and also because of what it will mean to the patients themselves, despite the feelings expressed here to the contrary, the Government decided it would close this institution by a specific date and establish this rehabilitation centre for those who have offended against our society laws. At the centre we will try to train the inmates not to offend again. As I said in answer to questions asked by the member for Fremantle this afternoon, this decision has not been taken lightly by the Government.

Mr. Graham: You put your foot in it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It was not taken lightly by the Government at all. Of course the Deputy Leader of the Opposition makes silly asides and says that I have put my foot in it.

Mr. Graham: The Minister for Police is not prepared to front up to the situation.

Mr. Rushton: He has not had a chance!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Only one person can talk at a time!

Mr. Graham: There were about 25 from your side trying to speak when the member for Northam was on his feet!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not doing a bad job now—

Mr. Graham: I am trying to balance the budget.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —by saying I put my foot in it.

Mr. Graham: Yes, the Government did!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Surely the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not so naive—

Mr. Graham: You should ask the member for Northam!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not know why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is stung so much.

Mr. Graham: So what?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I must say at this juncture that the reasons for the changeover are those I have advanced, and also because the buildings are more suited for the purpose for which they will be used in future. Apart from some workshop facilities which will be required, there is much there which can be used just as it is without a great deal of capital work being necessary.

The prison inmates, or trainees as we like to call them, will be usefully employed around the place and this will also serve a very useful social purpose without harming anyone except those who live in an emotionally-charged atmosphere and those who like the place. Obviously some of the patients do like it and I can understand this. I can understand this far more than I can understand the attitude of the Labor Party, which should be more responsible in regard to this matter. It should indulge in some balanced thought instead of seeking through political action to win the Toodyay seat.

Mr. Graham: How else can we win it? Can we win it by religious action; or what?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Labor Party will not win it on this basis.

Mr. Graham: You are out of touch with the local people, of course.

Mr. Bickerton: Every time anyone opposes your views you accuse him of being emotionally charged. Why is this? Do you not think that other people can have points of view different from yours?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think this is the first time I have used the phrase.

Mr. Bickerton: You used it with regard to the freeway and the Barracks Archway.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have no recollection of having used it before.

Mr. Bickerton: I will look it up in *Hansard* for you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I hope the member for Pilbara will not quote any poetry again too soon!

Mr. Bickerton: If it suits me, I might.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Within relatively easy distance of Wooroloo—not forgetting the small hospital which will still be there—the Government, as I have already mentioned, is providing hospital facilities at Northam costing \$4,000,000, and additions at the Swan District Hospital costing \$450,000. Wooroloo, roughly, would be 25 miles from both of these hospitals.

It cannot be said that by comparison with other country centres and related distances, Wooroloo will not be reasonably provided for in respect of hospital services. It cannot be said, as has been implied by the member for Northam and by way of interjection, that the Government is not concerned with patient welfare. Let us look at this question.

When, in recent times, the Government for the first time established in the Health Department a geriatric division under the directorship of Dr. R. B. Lefroy it had in mind the furtherance of plans for the development of a complete geriatric service. Indeed, this was done whilst I was Minister.

Mr. Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This is one of the reasons why Dr. Lefroy was appointed, and already we have moved a great way along the track of tackling one of the great social problems of the day.

By interjection I mentioned that we have to be careful in our sophisticated society that the children do not forget the old folk and that they should be able to visit them as often as possible. Indeed, it is preferable if the old folk can be cared for within the family home. However, there comes a time when this is not always possible. Everyone can appreciate this, and many old folk are left on their own.

Mr. McIver: The distance is no problem.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let me say that this is one of the great problems of the day. I do not minimise its importance. I do not deny that the taking away of Wooroloo in itself will mean that fewer beds are available for old folk. I do not have to deny it, because it has been said and will be said again. However, other things are happening and the old folk can be cared for elsewhere.

Mr. Sewell: It has been doing a very good job.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I say that this complete geriatric plan includes, and has included for some time, the transfer of patients from Wooroloo, because that fits into the plan. In connection with this scheme, I think it appropriate for me to say that it is planned to extend a chain of geriatric medical centres from metropolitan and regional hospital areas to enable more aged people to receive specialised treatment, in so far as it is possible, without being cut off from families and friends. This is quite a new development for hospital services in Western Australia. I repeat that it is quite a new development and no-one ever started it before.

Mr. Davies: It is a world-wide trend.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It was started off in Western Australia in an excellent fashion. I have already mentioned that, in November of this year, 110

beds will be available for geriatrics at the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and undoubtedly some members have seen the building. Consequently I am informed by the Public Health Department that the concentration of such services to old folk has been tried only on a limited basis in Australia up to this time.

It is proposed that the first of the centres will be established at the Perth Medical Centre, where 150 beds will be available next year. These will be in addition to the 110 which will be available this year. A total of 42 beds will be available at the Albany Regional Hospital by the end of next year. The Bunbury Regional Hospital will have 42 beds by the end of next year, and the Northam Regional Hospital will have 30 beds at that time. The Swan District Hospital will have 20 beds by 1971 and the Manjimup District Hospital will have 20 beds by that time. The Homes of Peace, which were referred to by the honourable member, will have 140 beds available by early next year.

Mr. Sewell: Aren't you going to include Geraldton?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Geraldton already has the old hospital, which is utilised for this purpose, as the honourable member knows.

Mr. Sewell: It does a very good job.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Also, one of the finest new regional hospitals was built in Geraldton some years ago.

Mr. Sewell: That is correct.

Mr. Davies: What assessment has been made—

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The cost of all these beds—and money is important for what it can provide—excluding the 110 which will be opened in November, of this year, will be \$3,500,000. I think the 110-bed addition at the Perth Medical Centre will cost something over \$1,000,000.

Mr. McIver: Where did you get the figure of 126 for Northam? I think if the Minister checks he will find it is 116.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I mentioned this half an hour ago. I am given to understand there are 112 beds in Northam. Also, there are 14 intensive nursing positions which gives a total of 126 when the two are added together. I cannot recall at the moment whether 30 or 40 of the beds in the old hospital will be used. I made these remarks some time ago and I am talking now about other matters.

Mr. Jamieson: It is awfully confusing isn't it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Of course, the advantage of locating the centres for aged folk under Dr. Lefroy's plan, which is also, of course, the Government's plan, at major regional hospitals is that the patients have access to a full range of

facilities for diagnosis, treatment, and specialised nursing care. This is one of the vital points in the plan; namely, one just does not put old people into a home and leave them there. In this way, they are attached to a hospital where they can be cared for, kept on their feet, and looked after. This is not the passive way which horrifies most people, but is a positive sort of way.

I do not want to go on and relate to the House all of the plan because it is a little outside of the motion, but this is a part of the whole of what the Government is trying to develop.

There is also a fine centre for aged folk at the Fremantle Hospital, and the member for Fremantle will know something about this place. Old folk are brought to the centre during the day for rehabilitation exercises and purposes and are taken back to their homes on the same day.

Consequently, these closer links between the aged people, voluntary agencies, and the Government's own geriatric services will help to bring to light many people who are in need of the kind of assistance which is to be provided, but who have hesitated in the past to take advantage of the medical and nursing facilities which are available to them.

The Commonwealth Government is assisting the State greatly in its attempt to implement this plan. There is no justification for the inference that this is not the right time to close the hospital at Woollooloo. The same people who say it is not the right time, would still say in five or 10 years' time that that was not the right time.

Mr. Graham: When there is no waiting list for admission of old people, that will be the right time.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: One would wait forever.

Mr. Graham: That is about the length of the waiting period now.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is not so. I say with all sincerity that we do not want to arrive at a situation where there is a tremendous number of aged persons' homes around the place to which people flock at a certain age. If possible, we want old folk to stay within the home environment.

Mr. Graham: More than 50 per cent. of those who apply for admission to the Homes of Peace die before their turn is reached.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This will not make any difference to the situation.

Mr. Graham: By taking away accommodation? Of course it will!

Mr. Davies: They will die all the quicker.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Government's approach to this matter is that the closure of Wooroloo, with all its pressing complexities, as a hospital, as well as the Government's endeavour to implement the plan I have mentioned, is in the best interests of the patients.

Our advisers on this issue are hospital and medical experts who are responsible to the Government for the planning and development of a vast health and hospital system for the care and treatment of patients' ills. These experts firmly believe that what is being done is in the best interests of the people of this State.

I will not go on and talk about the useful purposes to which this institution could be put so far as a prison is concerned. I have tried to tread warily in this respect, because of the terms of the motion.

I say again that a committee of experts was formed and it gave advice to the Government on this matter. Those on the committee from the Public Health Department included the Commissioner of Public Health (Dr. Davidson), the Assistant Principal Medical Officer (Dr. H. J. Rowe), the Under-Secretary of the Department (Mr. J. J. Devereux), and the Principal Matron (Miss P. F. Lee). They had the power to co-opt others to examine all facets of the matter. They have examined them over a lengthy period of time and have recommended that this step be taken.

Mr. Davies: Whom did they co-opt?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I suppose they co-opted representatives from a number of departments. I think at one time the committee asked the Child Welfare Department whether it would like to have Wooroloo.

Mr. Graham: It sounds like Government by bureaucracy.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is difficult to understand the interjection.

Mr. Davies: It should not be, the way the Minister is speaking.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is most unlikely, if not impossible, that these highly-respected officers would recommend such a decision lightly. The Government has accepted the recommendation and intends to proceed with the plan.

Mr. Graham: You will rue the day.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I say this is the right action for the Government to take. I say, too, that the Labor Party will find it will get nowhere at the next election from jumping on this political bandwagon. I oppose the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Davies.

*House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 18th September, 1969

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers

### QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

#### 1. MAIN ROADS

##### *Effect of Main Ord River Dam*

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Are any main roads, or road connecting Kimberley and Northern Territory station properties likely to be submerged by the waters to be impounded by the main Ord River Dam when completed?
- (2) If so, what approximate mileage of variously classified roads now in use are involved?
- (3) Have surveys been made, and are plans available, of alternative new routes where deviations are thought to be necessary?
- (4) Do some of the proposed deviations encroach on Northern Territory pastoral leases, and if so, have consultations taken place with Northern Territory authorities in regard to the use of the land affected?
- (5) Will the Main Roads Department of this State be responsible for the finance necessary to meet the cost of road construction involved?
- (6) Is a reliable estimate practicable at this stage to indicate the likely costs involved?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No declared main roads will be affected by waters of the Main Ord Dam. Almost 36 miles of the Duncan Highway and approximately eight miles of Argyle Downs Station access road will be affected.
- (3) Survey has been completed of the 36 mile deviation to replace the affected section of the Duncan Highway, and plans are now in course of preparation. In the case of Argyle Downs access road, no decision has been possible as negotiations are still in progress regarding continuation of the pastoral lease.
- (4) Yes. The proposed deviation of the Duncan Highway will be located in the Northern Territory over the greater portion of its length. Negotiations with the Northern Territory authorities will proceed as soon as plans have