

Mr. MITCHELL: The debate has been very successful because it has drawn the attention of members to the serious concern of the farmers. If members look at page 92 of *Hansard* for 1966 they will see that we on this side of the House have a very serious appreciation of the situation that can exist. When speaking to the Address-in-Reply in that year, I made the following comments:—

I issue a word of warning to those in the stock industry: They should remember that successive good seasons are often followed by one or two bad ones. Therefore it behoves them to take particular care of their position.

I went on to say that all farmers should, at least, make provision for one year's supply of feed and water irrespective of previous seasons. I think that shows to members on the opposite side of the House that we are constantly aware of the situation which can and does exist when drought conditions affect farmers.

We are taking all possible steps to alleviate the position at the present time. We on this side of the House are grateful for the support given by the Opposition and I want to remind those members again that it would have been far better had they moved this amendment earlier during the debate on the Address-in-Reply and not 10 minutes or an hour or two before the decision was to be made.

Mr. Jamieson: At that stage the Premier had refused to make a statement.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know what political gain Opposition members thought they would derive but, unfortunately for them, it did not eventuate. I oppose the amendment.

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

#### Ayes—19

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moir
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Toms
Mr. Graham	Mr. Davies
Mr. Harman	

#### Noes—23

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rushton
Dr. Henn	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. Kitney	Mr. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. McPharlin	

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hall	Mr. Burt
Mr. Tonkin	Sir David Brand
Mr. May	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Sewell	Mr. Lewis

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bickerton.

House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 28th August, 1969

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### WOOL EXPORTERS ROYAL COMMISSION

*Position of Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Ltd.*

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the President:

Following the question without notice I asked of the Minister for Justice yesterday afternoon, I notice that it is not placed on today's notice paper. You may recall, Sir, that the Minister asked me to put the question on the notice paper, and pointed out that he regarded some portions of it as being inadmissible.

I now ask: Are you able to indicate whether parts (1) to (6) of my question are admissible?

The PRESIDENT replied:

I direct the attention of the honourable member to the notice paper on which the honourable member's question is set out in an amended form for reply next Tuesday. On examination I found that parts (3) and (4) of his original question were inadmissible, and these have been deleted.

### QUESTIONS (3): ON NOTICE

#### 1. WATER SUPPLIES

##### *Survey for Rock Catchments*

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has there been a complete survey of rock masses in the agricultural areas of Western Australia to ascertain the possibility of suitable rock catchments for the conservation of water?
- (2) How many are in use at present, and where are they situated?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The majority of rocks with a catchment potential for water supply purposes have been surveyed.

- (2) Forty seven situated within respective shire boundaries as follows—

Bencubbin .....	1
Bruce Rock .....	1
Coolgardie .....	4
Dalwallinu .....	1
Kondinin .....	6
Koorda .....	2
Kulin .....	4
Lake Grace .....	7
Mt. Marshall .....	2
Mukinbudin .....	5
Narembeen .....	3
Nungarin .....	1
Pingrup-Nyabing .....	1
Wagin .....	1
Westonia .....	3
Wongan Ballidu .....	2
Yilgarn .....	3

## 2. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Connection to Education Camp at Point Peron*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Does a Metropolitan Water Supply Board water main pass the Education Department camp at Point Peron?
- (2) If so, will action be taken to have the establishment connected to the water main?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) No. A private main designed with a capacity to supply the National Fitness Council does pass the Education Department Camp.
- (2) As this is not a Water Board main, any proposal to have the Education Department Camp connected to it would have to be made with the owners of the main, the National Fitness Council.

## 3. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Private and Public Swimming Pools*

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Are there any regulations or by-laws under the Metropolitan Water Supply Sewerage and Drainage Act that allow the appropriate authority to restrict the use of water for either or both private and public swimming pools in times of water restrictions or drought?
- (2) What are the water charges in the metropolitan area for water used in swimming pools?
- (3) (a) Is it recorded how many private and public swimming pools there are; and  
(b) if so, how many are there of each in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Private Swimming Pools:  
Water allowed for rates: 21½ cents per 1,000 gallons.  
Additional water: 25 cents per 1,000 gallons, provided rates paid by 30th November; otherwise 27½ cents per 1,000 gallons.
- (b) Public Swimming Pools:  
Water allowed for rates or charges: 21½ cents per 1,000 gallons.  
Additional water: 22½ cents per 1,000 gallons.
- (3) (a) No.
- (b) Answered by (3) (a).

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition), leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to The Hon. H. C. Strickland (North) on the ground of ill-health.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: ELEVENTH DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by The Hon. J. Heitman:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [2.41 p.m.]: As I think my comments will be on various subjects, perhaps I can open in no better way than by repeating those famous words of Lewis Carroll—

"The time has come," the Walrus said,

"To talk of many things:

Of shoes—and ships—and sealing-wax—

Of cabbages—and kings—

And why the sea is boiling hot—

And whether pigs have wings."

I intend that my comments will be as diverse as that statement has indicated.

I regret that Mr. George Brand is not in the House, because my first comment is in reply to a sentence which he used in his contribution to the debate yesterday, when he referred to the growth of Carnarvon. I think his actual words, which I took down, were, "In the days when Mr. Willesee and Mr. Wise represented this area, Carnarvon was more or less static."

That sentence, lifted from its context, is not very flattering to those who represented that province for more than 25 years. In striking a response to that statement, may I say this without any ego, but just by making a plain statement of fact: after my arrival in Carnarvon, originally in 1923, a large area of Brick-house Station was excised and subdivided. I will make no unnecessary comment in detail on this matter, except to add that whereas in those days 200 sheep or fewer used to graze on the land, for one reason and another before Mr. Willesee and I ceased to represent that area there were 250 families living there in a district which produces up to \$2,000,000-worth of produce per annum. I am content to leave the matter at that, and hope that Mr. Brand will be privileged to live long enough to see the same sort of progress during his years of representation.

I would like to draw the attention of this House of Parliament to something which, surprisingly, has not been mentioned in either House in the course of the Address-in-Reply debate; and I refer to a momentous happening in the State's history. This happening is solidly in progress, and it appears inevitable that the ownership of West Australian Newspapers Ltd., is to pass into the hands of an Eastern States newspaper giant, the Herald and Weekly Times Limited of Melbourne. Not much has been said outside Parliament about this very historic and important matter. Many private disappointments have been expressed by old families of the State and by many State-righters, who are not necessarily shareholders of West Australian Newspapers, but who are very regretful that the ownership is to pass to an interest in another State.

The Perth Gazette of 1833 was the point of establishment of *The West Australian*, as we know it now, as a continuing newspaper. It was in the middle 1880s when two famous men of Western Australia—Winthrop Hackett and Charles Harper—became the joint owners of *The West Australian*. A little later Winthrop Hackett became the sole owner and the editor of this journal; later on he became Sir Winthrop Hackett, and was very prominent in the affairs of the State.

Sir Winthrop Hackett made possible the commencement of the University of Western Australia as we know it in its present form; and he became the University's first Chancellor. I think he was responsible to a great degree for inspiring many Western Australians to become extremely loyal, both in the case of the State's welfare and the State's attitudes.

*The West Australian* has very rarely seen eye to eye with me; and I with the newspaper, particularly when one recalls the very sharp influence it has on the point I have referred to; namely, the

thinking of the people of Western Australia. However, I have no quarrel with that; that is the policy of this newspaper, and its politics is a matter of its own concern.

In my 46 years—I think—of residence in this State I have had much to do with the pressmen of *The West Australian*. I recall four of its editors—Mr. C. P. Smith, who was brought here from the Eastern States, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Ernest de Burgh, and Mr. Griff Richards, the present editor. I knew Mr. de Burgh best, and I think his 10 years of editorship were very notable years; at that time things became very trying, during the war years and those following. I knew Mr. de Burgh well, and on one occasion I stated in another place that he had two inkpots—one containing ordinary ink and the other containing vitriol. With the ordinary ink he often wrote quite fairly, and certainly he wrote generous articles; but the pot of vitriol often burnt severely beneath the skin of many public men, and it had a very pungent effect on individuals and Governments of different political flavour. Nevertheless I regard him still as a fine Western Australian.

My purpose in mentioning this historic occasion, which appears to be inevitable, is that with the passing of the control of *The West Australian* from this State we will not have a change in attitudes so far as Western Australian representation and presentation, in a journalistic sense, are concerned. I speak in no way politically when I say that I hope the Herald and Weekly Times—which owns and operates newspapers in more than one State, and which I understand does not interfere with the local points of view and local staffing—will continue to perpetuate that attitude in Western Australia; so that we will retain the thinking of the local people whom we know so well as being capable of giving this journal a prominence in the newspaper world. I hope that this will continue to be the position. I felt I could not allow this event to pass unmentioned in both Houses of this Parliament.

I have already said—I may have said it twice—that what we read in the daily Press affects our thinking. Particularly is this so of the headlines, the by-lines, and the editorials. I would like to mention a few examples which appeared in the Press from last weekend onwards. There was the headline, "PM: We Reject Blackmail." Portion of the article reads—

Prime Minister Gorton said tonight that the D.L.P. could not blackmail the government into changing its foreign policy.

He was commenting on Senator Little's remarks. As some members may have missed the article I will read portion of it, as follows:—

[Senator Little said: "If it is necessary to fight the Liberal Party in the

interests of Australia—and destroy it as we destroyed Labor 15 years ago—we will tell them we have picked up the challenge.

"We crucified a lot of good men politically—and did it without regret. I would like to think we would not have to do that sort of thing again.")

Not very nice words. They came from one of the leaders of the D.L.P.

Two writers from Canberra wrote an article in *The Sunday Times* last Sunday. It was headed, "Is it all one big bluff?" Referring to the D.L.P. attitude, they made the following comment:—

In the past two years since Prime Minister, Mr. John Gorton, came to power, the D.L.P. leader, Senator Vince Gair, has made no bones about the fact that unless the DLP got its way with the Government, the Liberal Party would run the risk of losing DLP support at election time.

In addition, in *The Independent* of last Sunday there was a headline announcing the formation of a new political party. It was stated that the party expected Western Australian candidates, and there was a suggestion as to which electorates it was hoped those candidates would contest. Referring to Mr. Fergus McPherson, the article reads—

He said the party already had offers from six prospective candidates.

He hoped the party would endorse candidates in Perth, Swan, Moore, Forrest and Curtin.

"We think it unlikely that the DLP will allocate their preferences any differently in this election," he said, "That's just one of their black-mailing techniques."

I read it as it was printed, and I make no comment. On the same page of *The Independent* was another article which I will read in its entirety, in order to assist public thinking. The article was written by a staff reporter and reads as follows:—

#### 'STRIPPER FOR YOUNG LIBS PARTY'

A stripper was the main enticement, there was gambling and drinking—all for \$2—at a stag party organised by the WA Young Liberals.

But ugly scenes developed, when the stripper girl failed to appear and police were called, a member said yesterday.

Alan Wells (23), of Woodside Street Doubleview, said the bucks' night was organised just over a week ago by the State executive of the Young Liberal Party. He attended as a member of the Scarborough branch. There were about 100 young people there, about 30 of them non-members.

Advertised with risque posters, it was intended to raise party funds. Tickets were sold at \$2 each to cover the entertainment and liquor. The party was held in the Masonic hall in Ninth Avenue, Inglewood and about \$170 was raised.

Crown and anchor—

Whatever that is—

—dice and other gambling games were held.

Mr. Wells said the stripper had been booked but did not turn up though the organisers said they had called on her.

There was booing and some people began smashing glasses on the floor. Some started to draw on the walls.

It was announced the stripper would not be brought if the walls were not cleaned. The walls were cleaned but then it was announced the stripper was not coming anyway.

There was more uproar, and the organisers called the police.

Two policemen came and they took some names—but only the names of non-members, Mr. Wells said.

That is the end of the article.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Just as well!

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I hope our Metropolitan Province members were not there.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is interesting, is it not, to study the variety of news items in the Press. Some are read and some are passed unnoticed. However, I believe that this article was worthy of attention because I am wondering what the state of the funds of the Liberal Party would be if the police did find crown and anchor and other games in progress, to say nothing of drinking and the prospect of a stripper for the inclusive fee of \$2.

I know the Minister for Mines has been trying to interject. I would point out to him that he will have a lot to say a little later, but at the moment I will not allow him to interject before I have concluded.

The point is that if any ambitious members of the Young Liberal Party authorised this function—and according to the article they did use such methods to raise funds—I suggest to our other friends opposite, from the Country Party, that they do not try to adopt the same methods, because if they went into the situation they would find they would be liable to a very severe charge of encouraging prostitution.

It is very unpleasant to say the least of it, but I thought members would be interested in my drawing attention to that very serious matter.

To return now to shoes and ships and sealing wax. Shoes are, of course, a very necessary commodity for everyone, and any member who is fastidious in regard to his footwear, and will not wear a pair of shoes once they require half-soles, will know that if he desires to be up to date and wear imported shoes, he cannot do so for less than \$25 to \$30. Some English makes are a little less. I would say that extortion is almost practised with regard to the price of shoes, there being no price control at all.

A decent pair of shoes for a little girl of four or five years will cost about \$10. I am the father of a large family and, like many in this Chamber, I know what it costs to clad boys and girls at school, college, and University. The price of even locally-made shoes is extremely high also. A well-made pair of shoes for a teenager cannot be obtained for under \$12. Those of us who have children at high school and boys or girls at University, know that uniforms and sporting equipment, in the case of a boy, will cost at least \$100. In the case of girls who are teenagers, or younger than teenagers, even a skirt costs \$10 and a blouse approximately \$8.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is not much material in the skirt, either.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: To take the case of bathers, these cost \$8 to \$10.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Very revealing.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is not a case of neck to knee; it is a case of next to nothing. An ordinary bathing suit costs about \$15. Indeed, the cost of living generally, even excluding foodstuffs, has risen to be exorbitant and it is certainly frightening to those in the lower wage group. They are the ones to whom I wish particularly to refer.

I had a case only last Sunday when a pensioner at Wyndham came to me to say that \$3 per week was being deducted from his Social Service payment until he paid back \$150, which was the equivalent of what he had overearned in Wyndham last year.

How dreadful that situation is. Wyndham is a place where even a stick of celery costs \$1.50 and *The West Australian* newspaper costs 15c. It is a place where pensioners have great difficulty in buying enough food even to subsist. In this case, because a man has earned a few dollars more per week than he should have earned, this has been declared and its equivalent will be deducted over a period at a weekly rate. It is a very sad circumstance.

Electricity and other costs in the far north are enormous. A special rate applies in some cases because of certain circumstances, but I am speaking now not of those people who have gone to the far north to earn a great deal of money quickly, but of those who live there and

who have lived there from their youth to old age. These people cannot leave the area because of climatic circumstances; different weather would kill them. It is a very serious matter that such happenings are not governed by a district allowance. These people do not benefit from that, but have to pay all the heavy costs of transport which are associated with living in that area.

I have here a full list of the cost of foodstuffs at places like Port Hedland and Wyndham, but I do not think I will weary the House with it at the moment. If members compared that list with Perth prices which are shown in today's paper, where specials are paraded by many stores, they would find they could send some of the items by air mail and such items would not cost as much as the charges which are levied on the people who have to buy their goods in the far north.

I most earnestly ask the Minister to ask his colleague, the Minister for Transport, to study continuously all of the things which can be done and should be done in the payment of subsidies on foodstuffs and general requisites in the north-west. I know the State Shipping Service has rendered and is rendering an enormous service to the people in the far north.

I was present in the Select Committee room upstairs when the Chairman of the Grants Commission told the Under-Treasurer that the Grants Commission would not service a debt on State ships which was above \$2,400,000. The State Shipping Service has lost more than that amount since that time. The anticipated deficit for this financial year is over \$3,000,000. I do not care if the State Shipping Service loses \$4,000,000 a year if it gives to the people who live in the remote areas of the State—people who are glamorised for political reasons—and, most especially, to those who are permanent residents their just dues as a recompense for living in the area.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you mean when you say they are glamorised for political purposes?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Just exactly that. The permanent resident is the person with whom I am greatly concerned. I would like to see through the area an extension in the subsidies on foodstuffs sent by air, especially on perishable foodstuffs. Further, I would like to see concessions of a very substantial kind in the case of the State Shipping Service; subsidies which would cover goods for the industries operating at the Ord River.

Road transport is responsible for remarkable things which are happening in the north. When I arrived at the Six Mile Hotel a week or so ago I saw complete units which were manufactured in South Australia and which were taken from Perth to Wyndham by road. These units

consisted of double rooms, a kitchen, a dining room, and the like. They were arriving all in one piece. This means that they were hauled over nearly 2,000 miles of road. Of course, road haulage is also responsible for providing many of the other items which are necessary for construction at the Ord, and so on.

However, I feel that some freights on goods which are carried by the State ships should be subsidised much more heavily than they are at present. I wonder how members of the farming community, as represented by members in this place, would like the sort of burden on their operations as farmers which is imposed on farmers at the Ord. It costs \$43.60 per ton to take fertiliser by ship from Fremantle to Wyndham. The cost of fertiliser, spraying, and watering at the Ord is equivalent to approximately \$120 to \$130 per acre.

I make a plea through the Minister for Mines to the Minister for Transport to have a further look at the freight rates on fertiliser requirements for the Ord. Action should be taken quickly to help those at the Ord, even if it costs the State Treasury, through the State Shipping Treasuries, some hundreds of thousands of dollars.

If members multiply \$120 per acre by 600, they will see that the farmer on the Ord faces a fair sort of bill for fertiliser, sprays, and water. A lot of this money has to be paid in cash before the cotton crop is harvested. This means that farmers at the Ord are placed on a basis of inequality so far as the industries in Queensland and New South Wales are concerned. This is a prospect which we cannot afford. In addition, we have to remember that because of the transport difference, and transport costs in the main, cotton from Queensland of a like grade is worth \$35 per bale more than Ord cotton. This is a very serious matter. These facts were given to me in a detailed statement prepared by two of the most successful cotton growers at the Ord. Indeed, the statement was made available to me as recently as last Monday morning.

The Hon. T. O. Perry: Were they fertilising the whole 600 acres in one season?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, some farmers have 640 acres planted this year. This is a matter of great moment to me when I look towards the future of that industry. I know the Minister for Mines will comply with my request when I earnestly ask him to draw the attention of his colleague, the Minister for Transport, to this matter.

As most members present in the Chamber today have visited the Ord, I am sure they will be interested to learn that this year, an extraordinary season—brought about by a very heavy rainfall at the time of the normal planting, and variable within

the district itself—has led to great variations in crop results. The weather interfered with land preparation; that is, the timing of the seeding, the ability to side dress, to cultivate, and to weed, and on some properties owned by the best of the growers there are this year some dirty crops because the attention they have been able to give to them has been quite different from that normally given.

In the past, weed control has been a source of pride to them, but this year it has been a most difficult task. All the cotton farmers are not similarly affected. Types of soil, variations in rainfall, even over a distance of 10 miles, have brought about very surprising and varying results, but the quality of the two main varieties of cotton is excellent. In referring again to fertilisers, I stress the point that an enormous quantity of fertiliser is required to seed and to harvest a cotton crop grown on 600 acres. The total costs are enormous, running into \$100,000, and therefore they have to receive guarantees from some source.

The results obtained by the cotton growers are very high; not necessarily commensurately high, but still very high. Nevertheless, it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that when one hears of their enormous gross income, one should not be misled into believing that their net income is excessive, because the investment they make and the place they live in should be given every consideration.

The procedures now being followed to migrate cattle gradually to the coast, topping them up finally on some irrigated pasture, are not new. In fact, those procedures are quite old. They have been practised in other countries for very many years. The Ord was introduced to these procedures initially, I think, by the inspiration of that excellent officer, Mr. Auty, who was in charge of the Kimberley Research Station for some years. He was a prominent veterinarian who did much initially in the grazing of stock on different crops in irrigable areas.

Those members who can recall Kununurra would, if they visited the area today, see on the biggest farm of about 2,500 acres situated on the left hand side of the road, about 1,500 head of stock grazing, with their grazing being supplemented by cut-up stock feed which, in the main, consists of suitable varieties of sorghum.

There is no doubt in my mind that the future of the Ord will lie within the ability of the pastoral industry to provide, as a result of better husbandry, stock capable of being handled on small areas. For more than a quarter of a century it has been said in this House and in another place that there is urgent need for better husbandry in our pastoral regions, and that plea is all the more justified today

as being the guiding line; as being the greatest requirement for the growth and production of cattle in the Kimberley.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: Poll shorthorns are very suitable for that area.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, but the honourable member has had the privilege of flying over some of the more remote areas of the Kimberley, which opportunity has been denied to some of the other members of the Chamber, and he will realise the enormous cost—the almost impracticable cost—of boundary fencing in parts of the Kimberley area. This would include the Dunham Station, on some portions of which it would be perilous to try to land even with a helicopter. In other parts of the Kimberley one will find that the cost is very great if a proper endeavour is made to fence and to subdivide the land in an effort to control cattle for efficient handling on irrigated pastures.

Those men who sit opposite me and who are experienced in the handling of cattle will fully appreciate what I am trying to say; that is, it is almost impossible to handle some stock so that they are quiet enough to be pastured on 100-acre lots. Not a great deal of progress can be made in handling them on 1,000-acre farms subdivided into small paddocks.

I hope that Government officers will continue with their efforts at the Ord. They are fortunate in having among them many enthusiasts, but I hope inspiration will be drawn, especially from financing authorities, to indicate to them that the future of the Kimberley pastoral areas is in better hands.

It is very interesting to know that such world-renowned farming authorities as King Ranch Ltd.—a ranch which I visited and on which I stayed for three weeks—are coming to Australia in force. They are interested in Queensland, and in the Barkly Tableland in the Northern Territory, and they are now negotiating in the Kimberley. Their operations will not be of the kind practised by any novitiate. Their operations will be handled by the most skilled veterinarians and those people who are the most efficient in the world with cattle handling. In and around some of our tableland country in the North Kimberley they will not be making the mistake of selecting the poorer type of country, and I think we can expect from them greater results in pursuing policies they have introduced to Australia from America.

It is also conceivable that, in the lifetime of many members of this Chamber, instead of Wyndham Meat Works killing 35,000 head of cattle and the Broome Meat Works killing 35,000 head, more and larger meatworks will be necessary when agricultural and pastoral activities are linked, and when they are assisted by better animal husbandry.

Members will recall an occasion a few years ago when many of us present in the Chamber today were the guests of the Government in visiting the site of the proposed new Ord Dam. At Easter I was present at a function to mark the opening of the second stage of the big dam which will cost many, many millions of dollars.

Members will recall going over the grassy slope and around the corner where we were shown the place where the wall of the dam was to be built. Since April this locality has been transformed. A tremendous amount of work has been done in the area where the diversion dam or spillway is to be constructed. Likewise, on the precipitous cliffs on either side a tremendous amount of work has been done also. It appears that the company undertaking this job, with the supervision of some splendid officers of the State, is making very substantial progress.

It is obvious to one who knows the country as I do—I have not only flown over it, but ridden and driven over it as well—what picture will be developed when the wall of the dam is finally constructed, and the water covers much of the territory which at the present time can be travelled over. For instance, Argyle Station where I once lived for some time will be submerged to a depth of 20 feet, and submerged for many miles to the top of the dam. The wall of the dam will be over 1,000 feet thick at the bottom, and more than 75 feet thick at the top. It is really an engaging spectacle to see the activities being carried on there. One can see men driving machines which are worth \$25,000 each; bulldozing, scooping, and carrying out other activities; and huge earthmoving machinery carting the necessary materials to the spot. As we all know, this is to be an earth-filled dam.

It is fitting for me to conclude on this topic on the line of thought that there will be a potential facility for tourists when the dam is completed, and it will be a facility of great magnitude. Five days ago when I went from the Ord diversion dam by boat upstream to the races at Kununurra, I was able to walk off the boat, onto the bank, and into the racecourse. It was a most delightful sight, and this avoided a road journey of 14 miles.

With the new dam and its thousands of acres of water surface, one needs little imagination to visualise what a great tourist attraction will be available. The dam and the large water surface will offer enormous prospects. However, I would like to see the State continuing to control—as regards the decision on how this tourist facility is to operate—the tourist traffic in that region. It needs little imagination to believe that the tourist traffic there—if properly controlled and properly developed—could return to the State a

sum equivalent to the interest charge on the cost of the Ord Dam. The tourist attractions are the gorges, the wonderful scenery, the waterways, and the fishing to which I draw the attention of the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Some investigation is going on there now.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I heard that the Minister had already sent his principal officers to make an investigation, and that is very pleasing. He would in his own right become famous if he could fill the larger dam—when constructed—with the best fish in the sea. I refer to the barramundi.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We would like to do that.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have spoken to a person who has a deep interest in this subject. I am told that ladders could be built from the bend of the Ord up into the higher regions of the diversion dam, and then up to the new dam. The barramundi is a fish without peer in the world; it is the fish that has been sent from Darwin, Derby, and Wyndham to the Eastern States, to be sold as a costly delicacy.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: What about stocking the waters with marron?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: An immense variety of fish is suitable. I know that the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna is interested in this matter; and he will become famous if he can stock the waters of the new dam with fish as an attraction to tourists.

I think members will recall the few words I had to say in the last session of Parliament when I spoke on the Dunham River agreement. It was at 10.30 p.m.—in the dying hours of that session—that the Bill was introduced, the volume of which can be noted from what I am holding in my hand. I took up the debate the following morning at 10.30 a.m. No other member had a chance to look at the plans, because they were given to me the night before. The agreement was rushed through without members being given a chance to scrutinise all that it contained.

It will be recalled that I threatened to hold up the House long after what was intended to be the closing hour, unless I was given some reports from authoritative officers on the economics of this proposition. All that I had to say will be found in the weekly *Hansard*, No. 15 of 1968. I would make the same speech today, and even with more vehemence. I challenge the Minister to produce reports which comment favourably upon this project—reports from officers of the department concerned. There is already recorded in *Hansard* the comments of such prominent officers as Kevin Fitzgerald, who said that economically this proposition could not be considered; and he also said much more.

Naturally I know all the officers who are serving in the district. I know them as friends, but I do not know whether any of them have voted for me. However, that does not matter. These are men of great judgment. On Wednesday last I left this House at the tea suspension, and I was in Kununurra at 5 a.m. on the Thursday morning. At 9 a.m. on that Thursday I drove to the Dunham River to look at the progress. I do not know what has been spent on this project, but it is an enormous sum, in trying to give effect to the agreement.

When the Bill was dealt with in the Committee stage in this House, Dr. Hislop asked the Minister whether, if the particular clause under discussion was agreed to, the House would be given an undertaking that a report would be made in the March session of Parliament; that is, a report on the progress of the scheme. He was assured that that would be done. The discussion is recorded in *Hansard*, and it is unnecessary for me to repeat the words. In dealing with the project in the last session, I had this to say—

So I say to the Committee in great earnestness that we should let the arrangement with Goddard go on to allow the development of 10,000 acres for testing for themselves so as to ascertain their future and the future of the property, and the non-passing of this legislation does not impair their efforts to ensure that the economic situations are a certainty. We do not want uneconomic situations to obtain if the second phase is to be launched and which, in the meantime, should be thoroughly investigated.

Members will recall that I was defeated in my attempts to have three members appointed from each House to have a look at this agreement and report back to Parliament during the March session. What has transpired since? We have not received one word on the subject except from the Goddard interests themselves. There has been ministerial silence.

However, I would like to tell members that it is costing the company up to \$2 an hour for labour for 10 hours a day, whether the labour be utilised in the construction of a fence or the mustering of cattle. It is costing \$1.84 and keep for men to move sprinkler systems. This is without any report to us—which the Act itself demands—on the economics of the situation. The appropriate clauses are numbers 14 and 15 of the schedule, which is the agreement. These clauses insist upon the second phase not being agreed to unless the economics are proven.

I suggest that much more than \$200,000 will be spent on 8,000 acres on the Dunham this year. The Minister told us that \$500,000 had been spent up to that time,



and the prospect is for 8,000 acres, most of which is to be cultivated, to be the limit within this scheme until the new nebulous scheme of 30,000 acres of arable land is put into effect. Incidentally that acreage could not be found on the Dunham.

I do not believe for one moment that this is not costing the State anything. It is costing someone a great deal. It is American tax money, and its cost and use matter.

Would any member here, especially one who has had any association with farming, endeavour to suggest that 1,000 acres in that area, with a mythical 10,000 to 20,000 acres natural grazing added—which could not be contiguous because it would involve precipitous cliffs—could cater for what it is expected to handle, which is three beasts to the acre, on a capitalisation of not less than \$400 an acre?

If members read the agreement they will realise the necessity for subdividing this area, so the whole acreage could not be grazed at once. The statements concerning the potential carrying capacity are not possible to analyse satisfactorily.

The Hon. J. Heitman: How long has it been going now?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The project started early last month with a permit from the Minister for Lands. The permit was quite in order, but my point is that on the passing of the agreement there was the prospect of peddling this area to potential buyers in America; and although no figures of the ultimate expenditure have been given us, \$5,000,000 has been mentioned for an area which is very confined and which has no association with any contiguous country in connection with the water scheme—none whatever.

I hope that during this session of Parliament the Government will submit to us a report from the officers concerned. I would like a report on the possibility of using the light as well as the heavy land; and whether or not flood irrigation is practicable. However, when we realise that the wages I mentioned are being paid—

The Hon. J. Heitman: But they are paid on an ordinary farm.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The driver of a machine worth many thousands of dollars and working only 60 miles away is paid \$1.64, but a person who is mustering stock is paid \$2 an hour.

The Hon. E. C. House: It sets a bad example.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is not good either for the economy or for the district; but it does not appear to matter. Without being unfair or unduly critical, I

would like a report presented to this House on the subject. I think Parliament deserves this. We passed this Bill in five minutes—literally overnight.

The Hon. J. Heitman: But you would not expect the whole thing to be finalised in five minutes? A project of this sort must take some time.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am speaking to the Bill. After having analysed the Bill I invited anyone to enter the debate at that time. I had read the Bill and studied it overnight, and I make no apology for that; but how many others had had the opportunity to do so? They may have had the opportunity, but not the need, perhaps.

I had the responsibility of handling the Bill, and I hope I know what is in it. However, I do not want to be unpleasant about this. I stand on what I said in my concluding remarks. I would like to see the project succeed, but we must abide by the agreement and we must know whether it is feasible and economic for such an area to be so used.

I now turn to the most important part—most important to me—of all my remarks. Most members in this Chamber will have an awareness of the very great work being done by mission stations and those people who work with aborigines in the Kimberley. Mission stations have been operating for very many years; some have closed and some have been consolidated and moved to other sites.

A Presbyterian Mission known as Port George IV Mission, which was between the proposed bauxite deposit development and Yampi, closed some years ago and moved nearer to Derby. Forrest River, as a mission station, is closed. I remember a crop of cotton being harvested at Forrest River in 1928, and it had a very great influence on the movement of natives in a very difficult region. That is where natives were supposed to have been shot and burnt, and some members will recall the incident.

Beagle Bay, the Roman Catholic Mission, was founded by German brothers and priests a long time ago, as was Lombadina Mission near Cape Leveque. In more recent times, the Catholic Church has been very active in the education of children to higher primary stage and technical school stage.

A station and a mission was founded at La Grange on a property formerly known as Thangoo, which was bought from Farrell Bros. There is quite a large native population at the mission. If members picture the map they will realise it is about 110 miles south of Broome, lying between Broome and Talgarno. Very good work is being done as the priests and the brothers are very active in the training of the boys.

The last one to be founded was at Balgo Hills, and this is the most remote of all the missions in the Kimberley, including

Kalumburu, which I know Mr. Abbey has visited. That lies on Napier Broome Bay in the North Kimberley.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: It is a very good mission.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Balgo is on the desert edge, a long way from Halls Creek; it adjoins a pastoral property and the Northern Territory border. Balgo was first established mistakenly on a part of Billiluna Station. There were no surveys within 200 miles and consequently there were no fixed points. When an aerial survey was made it was found to be 10 miles inside Billiluna Station when it was thought to be 50 miles outside. A great deal of money was spent there including boring for water. Things were fairly harmonious until it was found that part of the mission was on Billiluna country. From that time onwards relationships became strained because of many factors.

I tried for a year or two to get the Minister for Lands to excise the portion of Billiluna and add it to the mission reserve, but my efforts were of no avail. I was very disappointed with the slowness which surrounded any action to clarify the situation. I took His Lordship, Bishop Jobst, to the Minister on more than one occasion, but very great difficulty was experienced in getting any bias towards the mission as against the pastoral owners.

Billiluna is owned by a company which has vast pastoral interests, some of which extend to north of the Murchison goldfields. Indeed, the division of ownership might be a very interesting exercise so far as the 1,000,000-acre provision is concerned.

As time went on there were many differences between stockmen and mission natives over supplies of foodstuffs and the provision of bullocks for meat. Consequently a feeling developed that has intensified very considerably.

Ultimately, we were able to get Balgo mission shifted to its present site, on a mission station not very far from the original site, but inside a new mission area. A new freehold area was developed around the new site.

I recommend that any member who feels so disposed should visit Balgo if he wishes to see something striking and remarkable which has been developed on the desert edge. I suggest such a visit should be taken through the winter months in any year up to the end of August. I would think that the church authorities concerned have spent something approaching \$500,000 on the establishment of this remarkable settlement where nuns, a priest, and brothers control hundreds of natives. At the mission 145 desert native children attend the school at the moment. The mission is a buffer between native areas and civilisation.

A medical gentleman in Derby commented to me on this last week when he said, "Thank God we have Balgo as somewhere to visit and we know that natives are ready and available to us for medical inspection." This is a very vital matter, too, in that region.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.*

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I had reached the stage where I was recounting some of the serious happenings of recent days in the area between Billiluna Station and Balgo Mission. I had traced the cause of some of the ill-feeling between the two entities and, I must admit, quite openly, that I am handling the case for the mission; because I believe, as I was advised by a doctor in Derby recently, that if one or other of those organisations has to go it would be much better for the whole community if Billiluna did not exist.

However, the feeling is, unfortunately, as I am about to show from correspondence I shall read, that Ministers have shown a partiality in their treatment towards the pastoral interests and have not understood the problem, which I think is a very sad state of affairs.

Earlier this year the Balgo Mission people were told by the Billiluna people that that pastoral company wished to move 1,300 head of stock across Balgo Mission territory into the Northern Territory and, therefore, would use the water—all waters—and some waterholes *en route*. There is no surveyed stock route through the mission area, but, as members know, when there is no stock route the Droving Act applies.

After much local dissension and comment between the two parties, they were brought together at Balgo Mission. There were two people representing the mission, two representing the station, and an impartial officer from the Northern Territory. Father McGuire, for the Balgo Mission, said that he would allow a passage through the reserve for Billiluna cattle up to the 31st July, 1969 provided Mr. Wilson, who is the manager of Billiluna and a part-owner of the property would by agreement, from 1970 onwards, use a route to the north of the reserve—this is a route to commence at the boundary bore and to proceed about 100 miles eastward to Tanami.

I would interpolate here to say that, with the exception of members of Parliament, who are exempt from having to obtain a permit—otherwise I would not be able to see a thousand of my constituents from time to time—entry onto a native reserve is not permitted. A reserve, or an aboriginal mission has, or we understand it should have, a measure of sanctity, the same as one's own backyard or home.

However, Billiluna people were determined that their stock would go through the reserve, and so the meeting to which I have referred took place.

The two representatives from Billiluna said that any route via Tanami would not be equipped by the Northern Territory Administration. The mission representatives then proposed a route to the Western Australian-Northern Territory border, due east from the boundary. If the position is to be resolved, and to avoid the crossing of mission territory, and the use of mission waters by large mobs of cattle, which must interfere considerably with mission activities, as members would appreciate—and also, interfere with the mission's cattle and horses—the mission authorities believe that the only solution is to have the stock route moved north, or to a prescribed area well away from land used by the mission.

At the meeting to which I have referred, the part-owner of Billiluna said that he would agree to a proposal as follows: that he would not use the new route until the necessary waters had been provided; that he had an opportunity to examine the route and satisfy himself that the feed and proposed waters would be satisfactory to him; and that an impartial and qualified person accompany him on his investigation of the route to the border to compare it with the route previously used. Finally, Father McGuire agreed to allow the passage of Billiluna cattle via the Balwina route pending final signature on the terms of the agreement, not later than the 31st July, 1969.

Let me make that clear. The part-owner of Billiluna agreed that the first mob, which was in the vicinity of 1,300 cattle, should cross the mission territory and use the waters pending the signing of an agreement before the 31st July, after which date future operations would be determined.

On the 4th August a wire was sent to Bishop Jobst at Broome, in the following terms:—

Have forwarded following text to Billiluna quote we honoured agreement signed early June with movement of your first mob Stop As you have not fulfilled this agreement we have no alternative but make our bore unavailable to any further movement of your stock Stop If you proceed unfavourable results solely your responsibility unquote Balgo Mission.

On the 5th August, the following day, by air radio, the following was received by Bishop Jobst:—

Following message received from Wilson of Billiluna Stop Drover Brown 6th August with 1,000 head cows and calves plus neighbouring stock Balweena Reserve taxes pussycat bloodwood border travelling stock permit and Native Welfare permit Stop state

publicly Wilson has not honoured any agreement signed with mission.

The notice given by the Billiluna people was that they were travelling across Balgo Reserve with a permit and were using the waters mentioned. On the 7th August the Minister for Native Welfare (The Hon. E. H. M. Lewis) wired Bishop Jobst at St. Mary's Cathedral as follows:—

Permit issued Billiluna cattle transit through Balwinna Reserve en route Alice Springs Stop Am informed that Father McGuire intends denying water from bore tanks Stop Am seriously concerned this information and seek your telegraphed assurance that no impediment to this stock movement will occur.

Lewis, Minister.

On receipt of that message his lordship phoned the Minister and pleaded for a passive settlement of the dispute. He said he could fly to Balgo on Saturday and see what he could do, but he would not take any responsibility if trouble occurred. That is what his lordship said to the Minister over the phone at 7 p.m. on the 7th August. In the absence of Father McGuire, one of the stockmen who had seen stock entering the reserve sent a telegram to the Minister for Native Welfare, as follows:—

We of Balgo staff are amazed your position allows you to make such a decisive policy on our demonstration without seeking causes and motives except those given by informant either ignorant or very biased.

John Kersh.

John Kersh is at Balgo. When Mr. Lewis advised the Bishop that he had been informed that certain waters had been interfered with and he wanted advice and an assurance that water would be available for travelling stock, the Bishop replied as follows from Lombadina Mission Station, which is hundreds of miles from Balgo from which he travels to and fro:—

Your concern Billiluna cattle noted Stop all bores and columns intact not sure about availability of our equipment but Wilson carrying his own equipment.

Bishop Jobst.

Following the 13th August the Bishop left Derby—I was in Derby at the time—by road, because his plane was out of order. He undertook a dreadful drive of approximately 600 miles across very difficult terrain to Balgo, to interview the Balgo people in order to see whether some reasonable action could be taken. He wired Mr. Lewis in these terms from Balgo—

Regarding your telegram and subsequent telephone conversation last Thursday Stop visited Mr. Wilson Billiluna yesterday unsuccessfully pleading for settlement Stop.

I am told he was asked to leave the property—

Deputation Balgo Mission Natives distressed by continuous violation of Marlee sacred grounds sanctioned by your permit Stop We are amazed permit issued without consulting superintendent Stop Staff have completely lost confidence in your department would appreciate acknowledgement returning Broome today.

Bishop Jobst.

That is a very bad state of affairs. Many members of this Chamber will know Bishop Jobst as a most inspired man; as a man who has done wonderful things, not merely for the Christian faith he represents but in relation to stimulating matters and efforts which the State could not possibly handle in remote areas.

I repeat that the Balgo Mission has cost the Catholic Church between \$250,000 and \$500,000 in capital expenditure. It is a very important outpost for whites and natives alike in this State, and it is a very sad thing indeed for a man of the ability and standing of Bishop Jobst to say that the staff had completely lost confidence. It is a very drastic statement for him to have made. What brought this about? It was the permit to enter a reserve which was signed by the Minister for Native Welfare. The permit was given as follows:—

I hereby grant permission to enter and remain on native Reserve No. 26399 at Balwina in the State of Western Australia, subject to the conditions that the persons named herein shall at all times, comply with the following.

These are clearly indicated on the permit. The mission was not consulted as to whether this would be suitable; it was not consulted whether it was suitable for this to be done on the mission which, I repeat, should be regarded almost with sacredness.

No person is allowed to enter a native reserve, because of the necessity to protect natives; to protect their interests and well-being; but this permit was issued to expire on the 31st day of August.

As can be appreciated, this hurt the mission authorities terribly, particularly Father McGuire who is a man who lives a very hard life physically; a very stressful life mentally in the responsibility he carries. When he found the arrangements were being made he took action and sent the telegram dated the 4th August, which I read.

Let me stress that this matter is not a storm in a teacup; it is not a local feud; it is not a clash of personalities; it is something of which we must sit up and take notice, and that very quickly.

There is a suggestion that Father McGuire will leave Balgo. He is fed up. I have a personal letter in that connection and there is the suggestion that Balgo may be abandoned unless it is regarded with a little more importance than it has been regarded—at least in the view of the mission people—by members of the Government.

The circumstances are so bad that any day we could get news of very serious happenings in that region. Knowing the personalities involved on the one side, and knowing the great work they do for the State, I implore the Government to take action immediately in an endeavour to get the parties together around a table. It is of no use feeling it is not the Government's business, because this matter is of national moment now—this quarrel between two people of very great importance to the State.

I would like to see the Government invite representatives—say three from Billiluna interests and three from the mission—to sit around a table under the chairmanship of John Morgan, the Surveyor-General, who knows the conditions and circumstances and who would be impartial in the extreme. They could then try to reach an understanding not only in an endeavour to make neighbours live together as neighbours, but to solve serious problems where prejudice is being strongly suggested.

I do not want that sort of attitude. I do not want anybody—especially one of the standing and stature of Bishop Jobst—to be able to wire and say that confidence is lost in the department by the natives whose destiny the Minister controls.

It is not good. Therefore it provokes me to say there is urgency in this, serious urgency, to enable them not only to live amicably together, but also help them overcome the difficulties which appear to be evident on both sides as these relate to the attitude of the State. I commend this very strongly to the Government as a most urgent matter.

**THE HON. E. C. HOUSE** (South) [4.24 p.m.]: I would like to add my congratulations to the Premier (Sir David Brand) for breaking the record term of Premiership which stood for so long. It is no mean feat to break a record of this nature. I would also like to congratulate the Premier for the knighthood that was conferred on him by Her Majesty the Queen, and to say that this is an honour, not only to Sir David himself, but to the entire State of Western Australia. I am quite sure all members wish him well and hope that he has a long term in office.

Quite frequently I have the feeling that back-benchers are not very popular, because they criticise the Government either

on the floor of the House or in other places. I think it would be agreed, however, that it should be the right of a back-bencher to do this, because a Government which is confident that there is no room for criticism obviously has nothing to fear.

I do not think we should ever be altogether satisfied with what we are doing, because if we do reach such a stage I feel sure it would indicate something was wrong. Accordingly, I cannot see why we should not, in a reasonable manner, occasionally take the opportunity to point out to the Government things with which we do not agree. It is not my intention to criticise the Government this afternoon.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Nobody minds if you do.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I thank the Minister for that remark. There are occasions, however, when one gains the impression that Ministers do mind being criticised. I would like to say at the outset, however, that I think we are very fortunate indeed to have in this Chamber Ministers of such a fine calibre.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is not what is said, but the way it is said to which some Ministers object.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I would go so far as to say that we have in this Chamber three of the best Ministers in the Government; they are a great credit to us. They administer their portfolios with a great degree of skill and are very well aware of what goes on within their departments.

It is my belief that we should, more often, debate things which have a Commonwealth flavour. There is so much that the Commonwealth Government does which affects us vitally, and since the retirement of Sir Keith Watson it is a very rare sight to see a member get up and say what he thinks about some of the legislative action taken by the Commonwealth Government. Accordingly, I feel that because the Commonwealth Government has such tremendous influence over our State we should have something to say about what is going on in that sphere.

Mr. McNeill did touch briefly on the question of Commonwealth-State financial relations during which he referred to loan moneys and so on. I do think, however, he could have enlarged greatly on his theme and referred to the amount of debt in which not only the States but also individuals in the States are involved. It is a good thing to have these aspects pointed out and brought to the notice of members and, if possible, to the notice of the public.

One subject which has been very widely discussed on this motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply is that of traffic.

I would like to add a few comments on this matter. It is possible that I might reiterate certain remarks I have made previously, because in the past I have had quite a bit to say and have expressed my opinion on traffic control and also on the accident rate within the State generally.

I am prompted to make these remarks, because I cannot agree with Mr. Willmott that a speed limit of 65 miles per hour is not an advantage. In relation to traffic, I would go so far as to say that this is probably one of the best pieces of legislation the Government has ever produced.

I cannot see why there should not be a speed limit. In my opinion it is essential that we have a speed limit and that it be policed. It is impossible to legislate for individuals, yet this is virtually what many people, and even some members of Parliament, want to do. It is all very well to go along with Mr. Willmott's thinking if one were brought up in the days of the T-model Ford, or if one has been driving for a long period of years. In these circumstances one could, at times, safely exceed a speed of 65 miles per hour.

Some cars today are much safer and in better condition than used to be the case. They can be relied upon when travelling at speeds in excess of 65 miles per hour; but it is our duty to think of the younger people who are inexperienced. We must think especially of young girls who are taken out in cars by young boys, and also of passengers who quite often are frightened by the way a person is driving, even though he may think the speed at which he is travelling is reasonably safe.

I do not agree with amphotometers being placed in low speed limit areas virtually to try to catch people for the sake of obtaining revenue. If the policing of traffic is to be done properly, then it is essential that we concentrate more on the dangerous and very fast drivers. Young drivers go through a period of over-confidence, which is quite natural, and they also experience road hypnosis after driving for a period of time. They might start off driving at 65 miles per hour, but this quickly creeps up to 80 or 90 miles per hour, something of which they are not aware unless they have a look at the speedometer, which so many of them do not do. The result is that when they come to corners, and so on, trouble occurs.

I agree entirely that training in all aspects of driving is important and I think the Government could achieve a great deal by lowering the age at which licenses can be obtained, provided the applicant is properly trained and coached by a driving school.

In the past I have criticised manufacturers in regard to the cars that are being produced. My comments were supported

by an article which appeared in a Sydney paper in connection with a manslaughter charge. The lawyer described the two popular cars on the market today as being completely unsafe, even when they leave the factory, and said that the manslaughter charge should have been directed at the manufacturers. I am quite confident that manufacturers should be forced to turn out a car which is not just a piece of flimsy tin with a powerful engine. But that is the position with some cars today.

With modern metals it should be possible to incorporate bars in the front of the driver to prevent an engine from being pushed back onto the driver's seat. In addition, the sides, the doors, and the roof should be reinforced by some means. This would not be expensive; it is a practical suggestion and could easily be given effect to.

The Minister for Police introduces measure after measure resulting from the known causes of accidents in an endeavour, on an overall percentage basis, to break down the accident rate. I think he is to be congratulated for a great many of the actions he has taken. Many of the things one sees at times are rather frightening. I refer to the fact that some young couples kiss while driving. I was almost involved in a head-on collision this side of Wagin not so long ago. A couple were coming downhill in a car travelling at about 50 miles per hour. They were embracing and kissing and I had to drive into the dirt at the side of the road to avoid that vehicle.

One sees the same thing going on when driving around Perth. Mini skirts could be one of the reasons when one is considering the causes of accidents. I do not suggest that we do away with mini skirts, but this reminds me of the story of two girls drinking in a bar who had just bought two of the shortest mini skirts they could possibly find in the shops. After a couple of drinks one said to the other, "Come on Mary, let us go out and cause an accident."

This sort of thing can happen, so the Minister for Police may have to legislate in regard to the length of mini skirts, which are a distraction to many drivers.

I was one of the members of the Country Party who had the privilege of visiting the Wooroloo Hospital, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate and sing the praises of Dr. Chappell, the nursing staff, the domestic staff, the pathologists, and those who work in the laboratories and outside the hospital. The hospital was a great credit to them all. It was quite obvious that it was being efficiently run. The hospital was very clean and there was no doubt about the pride of those working there—their aim was to obtain the highest standard possible. The patients were very happy and contented and looked most comfortable.

It was with a great deal of surprise that I saw in the paper a letter written by a Mr. Meehan criticising the Minister for Health for participating in this visit to the hospital. I can only say that I, and other members, appreciated the Minister's presence. I know that Ministers are very busy, but the fact that he took the trouble to be present, as chairman of the hospital board, as well as Minister for Health, was what we expected of him. He was most helpful and it was very encouraging indeed to be able to speak to him on the various aspects of the hospital during this visit. It was very courteous of the Minister to give us his time and be present at the institution.

The inspection revealed efficiency, but there is no doubt in my mind that the sprawling nature of the hospital is responsible for difficulties in regard to administration, especially if it were filled to capacity with patients. It was also obvious that a great deal of money would need to be spent if the toilet facilities were modernised; and I am confident the point has been reached where the Minister would be required to continue to spend money for very little return. So he made the decision to close the hospital.

It is my firm opinion that this decision was a good and correct one, not because of the staff or the efficiency of the hospital generally from a medical point of view, but because the hospital was originally built for tuberculosis patients and is not as modern as we now require a hospital to be. It is obvious that difficulty must be experienced in obtaining trained staff, so it would not be possible to accept the full quota of patients. The only other thing that could be done would be to turn it into a geriatric hospital. However, one wonders whether this would be wise in view of cost and its distance from Perth.

I have been given to understand from the Minister—I think I am correct—that 330 geriatric beds will be provided in hospitals throughout the metropolitan area, Albany, Bunbury, Northam, and so on, and that this will be to increase the number of beds available in lieu of those that could be provided at Wooroloo. One finds it difficult to understand why complaints have been made by local people in regard to the closing of the hospital, because figures show that local admissions represent a bed strength of only three per week. In addition, the Minister will retain a hospital unit of eight beds. Apart from the fact that it will be better than many hospitals in country areas, it will be a credit to the district; and outpatients will be catered for also.

Yesterday I had the good fortune to visit the Fremantle gaol in which there are 600 prisoners living in antiquated conditions. It seems almost unbelievable that we have this sort of thing in our community today, despite the fact that everything that can be done is being done. The

confined space and the construction of the building has prevented any worth-while improvements taking place.

I also had the privilege of visiting Karnet where about 150 inmates are being rehabilitated. I do not like to call Karnet a prison because it is not one. Rehabilitation, not prison, is the word to use when discussing any of these centres. Anybody who visited Karnet would agree that the work being done there is quite remarkable. This applies also to the facilities for the inmates, and the progress that is being made.

I believe that in 1963 the establishment comprised an administration block and one dormitory. Today there is a dining-room with all the necessary amenities. New units are being constructed, and single rooms are being built for the inmates. Some have served sentences up to 20 years, and some are serving life sentences. They will be able to enjoy all those conditions.

There is also a farm site with gardens, vegetables, and trees. A modern piggery has been constructed, and the inmates are killing all their own meat—bullocks, sheep, and pigs. A shearing shed has been built, and also a new dairy. All that work has been done by the prisoners and I think they would be very pleased, indeed, to be able to work under such conditions. The whole set-up is a great credit to the farm manager who has to supervise the prisoners.

An important point is that the men are taught trades such as bricklaying, building, and baking. They learn to use milking machines, and to kill their own meat, as well as gardening, painting, cooking, and so on. When the men leave the institution usually they are able to go straight into a job. That in itself is of tremendous value. It is wonderful to think that we are advancing at such a rate with regard to the treatment of those who have been unfortunate enough to be sentenced to a period in gaol.

I think we could say that about one-third of the prisoners at Fremantle should not be there because they are alcoholics. One-third of the inmates are there through sheer misfortune, and only about one-third can be called criminals. Even some of those have been turned into criminals as a result of the old fashioned treatment of prisoners, which has made them bitter. I do not agree that people should be sentenced as a deterrent or as an example to the rest of the community. That is not modern thinking.

I commend the Comptroller-General of Prisons (Mr. Campbell), for the work he has done and the improvements he is bringing about. Those improvements mean a great saving of the taxpayers' money—because of the goods produced—and the men are working and filling in their time gainfully.

I now return to the subject of the Wooroloo Hospital. I think that possibly some of the criticism of the closure of the Wooroloo Hospital was based on the fact that it was to be used as a rehabilitation institution. I only wish that my own district and my own town could be fortunate enough to have a similar institution, so great has been the benefit to the inmates of Karnet, and the Serpentine area. The inmates have provided a full manual training centre at the local school which would not otherwise have one. They have also constructed a new football ground and playing centre for the people of the district. The residents in the Wooroloo area should not be fearful of having a rehabilitation institution at the present hospital site.

I believe the centre will house about 350 inmates. About 2,000 acres of country are involved and that country can be cleared and turned into farmland. It can be used for the production of sheep, cattle, vegetables, and be of tremendous benefit all round. Once again, no barbed-wire fences will be used. If anyone desires to walk out he can do so. However, it has been found that these people do not walk out. There are no locks and there are no bars on the windows. The only check is when the heads are counted each night.

I am very pleased with the new thinking and the advancement which is being made on the conditions which exist at Fremantle. Another 350 people will be able to take advantage of this method of rehabilitation through the use of Wooroloo, and the system is of great credit to the Government. It is to be hoped that the public will very soon accept this method as a general practice and not look upon the people concerned as hardened criminals. I know that the idea of prison sentences will be investigated further, and that only a very limited number of people will actually go to gaol.

I would also pay tribute to Mr. Driscoll, at Karnet. The work he has done has really been the background to the success of the establishment and I think the taxpayers ought to be pleased that money is being saved to that extent.

I wish now to refer to the Wool Exporters Royal Commission and to thank the Government for its willingness to hold a Royal Commission so that a full inquiry could be carried out. I would like to say how pleased we are with the work performed by Mr. Justice Burt, and Mr. Justice Wickham, and the general conduct of the inquiry. As far as the woolgrowers are concerned, the inquiry was conducted in a first-class manner.

It is rather disturbing to read, in the report, Mr. Justice Burt's summing up of the bank concerned, and the part it played—or did not play—in the inquiry.

Mr. Justice Burt states that he was embarrassed by the fact that the bank refused to co-operate and to allow any of its officers to be questioned or any of its documents to be produced. The bank is known as the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney. It would not take any part in the inquiry and the excuse given was that it considered action might be taken against the bank and therefore it was not prepared to reveal anything of what had happened prior to the Royal Commission. I agree with Mr. Justice Burt that this is an interesting matter. If the bank had nothing to hide surely it should not have been frightened to come forward. On the other hand, the very fact that it did not come forward was probably only an excuse because it did have plenty to hide.

Mr. Justice Burt states that the bank refused to produce any documents, and refused permission for any of its officers to give evidence. He said that those decisions were most unsatisfactory, and it was quite obvious that the inquiry was not actually completed. The most essential and valuable evidence—the part the bank played—was never disclosed.

I call on the Government, through the Minister for Justice, to disfranchise the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney, and refuse it permission to trade in Western Australia. I think it was a direct insult to the Government and to justice in Western Australia, and I can look at the matter in no other way.

Banking is such an important instrumentality. Every person in the community has transactions with a bank in some way or another. If, when anything goes wrong, a bank is able to send its officers out of the State to escape any real inquiry, or escape justice, then I think the Government would be completely justified in taking the action I suggest.

Many woolgrowers have been placed in a serious financial position, and some have had to sell their farms. Eighteen farmers in the Gairdner River area are involved and now, in addition, they are facing serious drought conditions and could very well lose this year's wool clip. They face a hard road in trying to overcome their losses. As I have said, I think the Government would be perfectly justified in taking very stern action against that bank. It was a terrible and dishonest thing to do, which is not becoming of a bank, so I hope we have not heard the last of this matter. I hope at least some redress will be given to the people affected, who were so unfortunate to be caught up in what they thought was an innocent trading transaction.

I do not think Mr. Hewett played a very commendable part, either. He must have known—and if he did not know, he should have known—the position and he should

have faced up to his responsibilities. Unfortunately, because of our laws he, too, has been allowed to escape any real justice. If the right thing were done he should be made to pay some of the money owing out of profits which he might be earning now.

I thank the Government for the action it has taken to alleviate the drought conditions. I was very pleased to read the report published in the paper the other day and I am quite confident that the Government will do all it possibly can to help. It is a very difficult situation because no matter how much help is given some people will be financially embarrassed.

The water committee is operating under the guidance of Mr. Gabbedy, and it has moved very quickly. I have confidence in the ability of the committee to help. I also think that the wheat position should be examined so that wheat can be released to the farmers. There has been agitation—and justifiable agitation, too—for wheat to be released at \$1.10 a bushel. I think this problem could be looked at in the same way as we looked at the problem associated with Wool Exporters. Surely the wheat in the bins still belongs to the growers. The growers have been paid only a part of what they expect to get. The situation is different from that which occurred during the Eastern States' drought. At that time wheat was selling at a premium. All the wheat that could be produced was saleable.

The position has now changed and we find that wheat quotas have to be introduced to restrict the amount of wheat grown. If the price of wheat to the farmers is to be \$1.70 a bushel I would call that a very disgraceful situation.

I think it has been proved conclusively that a price of \$1.70 is too high for wheat for home consumption. Also, with the decrease in the international price another look should be taken at that, too. The wheat, which still belongs to the farmers, and which is still in the bins, undelivered, should be released at \$1.10. However, the wheat is not being released at that price because the representatives on the Wheat Board in the Eastern States will not agree to its being sold at that price, despite the fact that the Western Australian representatives are advocating that it should be released to farmers at \$1.10.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: What about the Wheat Growers' Federation?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: It is the Wheat Growers' Federation that is the stumbling block.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: You said the Wheat Board.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I meant to say the Wheat Growers' Federation. Thank you for correcting me.



The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You know the attitude of your own State Government, don't you?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes, and I do not think it has given up yet. Despite the fact that it is our wheat, and that the Government of this State, our representatives on the Wheat Growers' Federation, and the farmers themselves are advocating that the wheat should be sold back at \$1.10 for drought relief, the Wheat Growers' Federation is preventing this from being done, and the deadlock should be broken.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Technically, it is no longer the farmers' wheat, because it has been sold and they have received their first advance.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am glad the Minister has used the word "technically," because if one buys an article on hire purchase and one does not make the last payment the owner will repossess the article.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is a different thing.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Let us be sensible. Farmers in this State are desperate for this wheat but the price of \$1.70 is far too high for them to pay. I would advise the farmers—and I do not think this is an unreasonable suggestion—to approach the Japanese Consul and ask him to buy the wheat for them, because he would be able to buy it for approximately \$1.20.

The Hon. J. Dolan: But would he not charge you \$1.70?

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: He might charge more.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He is in business, you know.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Then again, he might charge only \$1.25 or \$1.30, which would be cheaper than \$1.70.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What would be the price to, say, poultry farmers?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: If we bought it through the Japanese Consul?

The Hon. N. McNeill: Any way.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am a wheat-grower, too, and I say that a price of \$1.70 is too high. The cost of production is worked out on what it costs the farmers to produce the wheat. I could go on for hours saying what I think about this subject and how land values are used in the cost of production and in many other ways for taxing purposes. The point I am making to Mr. McNeill, is that I think the poultry grower, the pig farmer, and any other producer who wants wheat for stock feed purposes, and the flour millers, are paying too much for wheat and this must be reflected in their costs of production, which we are trying to keep down.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That would all depend on whether one is selling it or buying it.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am selling it, but why should we be forcing the price of wheat so high on the local market? If it is sensible to sell it overseas at \$1.40—I know I am getting into trouble here—

The Hon. J. Heitman: I would not push it too far if I were you.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I will leave it alone, but I think I have made my point.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think you have made it very well.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You agree entirely with the action the State Government is taking?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Does the Minister?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am asking you.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Minister was asking you a question and not making a statement.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Just say, "Yes."

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes, I agree the State Government is doing its best. I suppose I should completely hang myself and start talking about wheat quotas.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: It is your prerogative.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Unfortunately Mr. Garrigan is not present this afternoon. I do not think there should be any doubt in any of our minds that ample warning was given that wheat quotas would be introduced. I have here the leading article taken from an issue of the *Farmers' Weekly* which, I think, was printed in the second week in May. That article makes it very clear that ample warning was given. The warning was given by Dr. Callaghan in October last year, followed up by warnings given by Mr. Anthony on numerous occasions, that we could expect wheat restrictions or quotas if production increased to any great extent.

I would go so far as to say that I do not think this State, unfortunately, will be subjected to any wheat quotas this year. It is indeed unfortunate that this should happen, because the drop in production will be a serious economic loss to the State generally. If in this State some sort of wheat quota system is proceeded with, or if the wheat quotas are, at the least, issued, it is fairly obvious that those farmers who do not reach their quotas will want to grow a little more wheat next year, and, *vice versa*—those who have exceeded their quotas this year may have to grow a little less next year.

On checking the number of wheatgrowers I was surprised to find that those farmers who each produced from 6,000 to 8,000 bushels a year represented 47 per cent. of the growers, but produced only

14 per cent. of the total production. This means that the majority of the wheatgrowers are producing the lowest percentage of the total production. About 6 per cent. of the growers, each of whom produced between 16,000 and 32,000 bushels a year had an aggregate production which was 19 per cent. of the total wheat production of the State.

It would appear to me that if we are to reduce the percentage of wheat grown, the only way to do it is to issue restricted wheat quotas to those few growers who grow large quantities of wheat for the simple reason that they produce the maximum amount. Of the total number of growers, 3.2 per cent. produced 2,887,400 bushels, and the other group, each of whom produced between 17,000 and 22,000 bushels a year, had an aggregate production of 2,062,000 bushels. So the point I wanted to make, which is rather important to the Government, and important from a decentralisation point of view, is that protection should be afforded to as many of the small growers as possible, because, virtually, as they represent the majority group in country centres, they make the greatest purchases and assist in boosting the school population. I would not like to think that those wheatgrowers have reached the stage where they should be subjected to restrictions on a percentage of their wheat quotas.

I know this is a tricky problem, and one which can be argued in several ways. Those who are on 6,000 to 8,000 bushels depend just as much, and probably more, on this as those on bigger productions. I think that producers in the pilot bushelage group would probably be able to stand a greater reduction than those in the smaller bushelage group.

It is interesting to note from the map that most of these large producers are located in the drier eastern areas. The big bushelage is coming from the producers in the eastern outskirts, and they will possibly have difficulty in always being able to maintain the production of wheat that they have produced in the past years. Up to date they have had a wonderful run of seasons, but I doubt whether they will be able to continue to produce the quantities they have produced year by year. If we adopt a quota on a *pro rata* basis, we will find that in some seasons these producers will not be able to grow the amount of wheat to fill their quotas. I see Mr. Heitman looking at me, so I shall not say any more on the subject.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I have never seen such an effective whip as Mr. Heitman.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Leader of the Opposition is very cheeky this afternoon.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: When I was mentioning the drought conditions I intended to refer to the key dam scheme and the vital need for the Government to put more money into this scheme. I realise that the Government has done a lot, and that it took a long time for the scheme to catch on. This scheme is essential, and I am sure it will be adopted more and more in the future.

I have said that the Government should be criticised at various times. I feel that in the introduction of the key dam scheme there is room for criticism of the Government, because it has not planned ahead for development. The key dam scheme has caught on, and it will proceed very rapidly. I am sure it will be the answer to protecting many of the producers in the eastern areas from a water shortage. I know that when Mr. Hart was the member for Roe he had a lot to do with this scheme, and he warned the Government that it would face the very situation it is now facing in regard to the building up of sheep numbers and to water shortages through dry years.

I now turn to the killing facilities at the Midland Junction Abattoir. I do not doubt that Mr. Abbey will deal with this matter, so I shall not go into very great detail and steal his thunder. At the moment there are in Western Australia approximately 30,000,000 sheep, but by 1976—which is only six years ahead—the number is expected to increase to approximately 70,000,000, or just over double the existing number.

We might ask what the Government has been doing to provide additional killing facilities and markets. Complaints have been made about the number of sheep which are being sent to the Midland Junction Abattoir, but what will be the position when the sheep numbers increase? There is no reason to doubt the figures which have been supplied, because they were given at a seminar held at the University. These figures have been compiled by some of the best brains in the State. In the years ahead there will be a great increase in the sheep numbers in the eastern areas, but the killing facilities at the Midland abattoir will not be adequate. The Government should be planning to cope with the expected increase in the number of sheep for killing and marketing of the meat.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Do you think that this is a responsibility which should fall on the Government?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes, when it comes to the planning of abattoir facilities. The Government should give a lead by encouraging people to provide these facilities. Does that not appear to be reasonable?

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Why should not private enterprise be given the opportunity to come in?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I cannot see why private enterprise should not be encouraged to come in. The Government has been trying to encourage private enterprise to establish an abattoir at Esperance.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: What about at Midland?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am suggesting that the same thing could be done at Midland. I am not suggesting the Government should provide a certain amount of money and then say that an abattoir has to be established at a particular spot. The Government should take a lead in these matters and plan for the provision of additional facilities to cope with the increased numbers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You referred to Esperance. An abattoir has just been opened at Esperance.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I was really referring to a large abattoir. Actually an abattoir there requires 16,000 beasts a year to make it pay. If there is that number available each year for slaughtering, then I am sure private enterprise will come in.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Will not the marketing of the increased sheep numbers be a greater problem than the provision of facilities at the abattoirs? There is now a problem with 33,000,000 sheep in the State. What will be the extent of the problem when the number reaches 70,000,000?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: In 1976 it is estimated that the sheep number will be 70,000,000. The Government should take a lead in planning for these things. I am aware it has appointed committees for various purposes and it could do the same for this.

One other matter I wish to refer to briefly is the problems which are created by the teenagers and by students at the University. I make special reference to what took place at the King's Park War Memorial on Anzac Day last year, when four University students misbehaved themselves. What they did was an affront to the widows, the sisters, the sons, and the wives of ex-servicemen generally. I do not think these students should be punished, but some advice should be given to them. At times I have taken this view; forgive them because they know not what they do. I do not think the names of those concerned were published in the newspapers; but if I had the opportunity I would like to invite them to lunch at Parliament House so that I could talk to them and obtain their ideas.

What they did was disgraceful, and there was very little excuse for them. Actions such as this could catch on. I suppose many of the problems that have been created by the students of the University were not intended to end up as boisterously as they have. To police these acts would be ridiculous, and I do not think it could be done.

In the case of the four students who created a disturbance at the war memorial, it would be a good thing if they could be tried by their own body. That is probably the best way in which justice can be meted out to them. I do not believe that in general the University students condone such an act. I am sure that most of them feel that what took place at the war memorial should not be tolerated.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I can imagine what the public reaction will be if there is a trial by University students.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Similar incidents have occurred at schools. I suggest it does not have to be a public trial at which the offenders can be sent to institutions. These people can be tried by their own body.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Provision already exists for University students to appear before the boards of the University to answer for any misdeeds.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes, but the most effective trial is one by the students themselves.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You could not give this the imprint of legislation.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am not suggesting that. Many of the protests by students are brought about by the fact that they are against the war in Vietnam.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Against establishment.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: They pick on Vietnam. It might be interesting for these students to know that Hitler virtually based his decision to go to war on the actions of students at the Cambridge and Oxford Universities. At that time they were acting in the same way as our students are now. Hitler said the British people would not fight because of the attitude of the students towards war. So what the students of today achieve might be the reverse of what they hope for. There is no doubt that when the time came the students of the Cambridge and Oxford Universities acquitted themselves bravely, as would these present-day youngsters. If we look at the Asian world today, we will find that these students are creating a greater impression there than did the students in England on the German population. I think it is a great pity they go to the lengths they do.

In speaking for the R.S.L., I can say that so far as Anzac Day is concerned there is no idea of warmongering or promoting war—it is a day of remembrance. I always find it amazing to recall the courage and bravery of the Australian sailors and soldiers who came from all walks of life, and the fact that 99 per cent. would so willingly sacrifice their lives when the necessity arose.

If the young people attending universities, and other youth, do not wish to be reminded of the part other Australians have played in war, they should think of the part played by pioneers and workers in this country, as well as everyone who has helped to build it up to its present state of development. Without the efforts of these people the students of today would not be able to enjoy their freedom to attend the University and obtain the education that is available to them. So I hope that we can reach the stage where we have trial by students, as this would stop a lot of the nonsense that is taking place in these times.

I had not intended to speak on a certain subject, but I think it might be advisable for me to do so. I am not well prepared, but the matter about which I wish to speak concerns containerisation. I was disturbed to read in *The Australian Financial Review* of the 13th August a report that the overseas container shipping consortia hope to introduce feeder services to Albany and Portland within the next few months, and to North Queensland and Tasmanian ports in the first half of next year. The article goes on to state that it is hoped rapid progress will be made in providing these feeder services so they can be introduced in a few months' time.

I am sorry it is necessary for me to speak on this subject, because I have not done the homework I would have liked to do. However, if we look at the general cost of a containerised service, we will find that a 24,000-ton vessel costs about \$5,000,000; port facilities approximately \$7,000,000; and then there is the cost of all the other facilities that go to make up such a service. All of a sudden, the people concerned with containerisation realised that they had engaged in a very costly exercise. If money of this magnitude is spent, it has to be amortised. The people concerned said that containerisation must be introduced to keep costs down, yet they are already talking about raising freight charges. Once they obtain a monopoly, one wonders what they might do.

There is no doubt that containerisation has many advantages, especially in relation to such commodities as fruit and meat. The fact that these commodities can be shipped in containers and arrive at their destination in good condition is a

wonderful new innovation and one that should be encouraged, but I do not like the idea of complete containerisation.

It is interesting to note that the Scandinavian countries—Denmark, Sweden, and so on—still look towards semi-containerised shipping—half containerised and half unit. To me, this is more feasible. We have 5,000,000 units of wool to ship out of Australia each year, which is containerised in its own right. The consortia had to bring wool into the scheme in order to make containerisation economic in Australian trade. Unfortunately, as far as this wool is concerned we will probably find that freights will be higher rather than lower.

What disturbs me is the news that there might be a feeder service between Albany and Fremantle for containerised goods. Earlier, there was some talk of wool being railed from Albany to Fremantle to be placed in container ships. At the present time we regard the Ports of Albany and Esperance as being of great importance. The wool trade has been built up at Albany and money has been spent there by the various companies in improving selling facilities, storage, and so on. This is something that should be encouraged.

Farmers are funny people and I doubt very much whether they will appreciate their wool being railed or trucked to Albany, sold there, and then brought back to Fremantle to be shipped when there is a port on the spot. The farmers will be suspicious that added costs will be involved. Not only will the sending of the wool to Fremantle detract from the Port of Albany but it will increase costs to wool producers, generally. When this sort of thing happens it is not good for the State, the producers, or the community, generally. While there is competition between containerisation and units, it will be possible to keep costs down; but the moment there is complete containerisation costs will rise. That will be the position if produce is railed from Albany to Fremantle to be placed on containerised ships.

As I said before, we are pleased to think that fruit will be able to go from Mt. Barker to Fremantle and be shipped in containers, but the same position does not apply to wool, as the progress of the Port of Albany will be retarded.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Has it been said that rail transport will be used?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: It was said that rail transport to Perth would be subsidised, but that offer was withdrawn. So the original intention was to use rail transport. Surely the Minister does not think that wool would be stowed into a ship at Albany, unloaded at Fremantle, and then loaded into a container ship!

It does not seem logical to me. I think that would be far more costly than trying to rail it to Perth. I believe the right thing would be to have enough volume at Albany to encourage unit ships to come in and thus keep the competition between the two systems. The facilities for the unit ships should be installed at Albany and the wool shipped from there.

It will not be very long before wool is being flown to overseas countries, especially with the new planes which have already flown. This will be quite a profitable venture. There is no question about that. It will be possible to transport the wool much quicker to Japan and other markets and I believe that this possibility is probably only from five to seven years away.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Is this dump wool?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes. That is all done by the agents, of course.

I think I have said sufficient on this debate, so I will conclude by expressing my support of the motion.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.31 p.m.]: May I first of all add my congratulations to those of other members to the Premier (Sir David Brand) for the honour recently bestowed upon him?

I apologise now for feeling the need to speak at this late hour, but I am constrained to do so in the main to follow on some remarks by Mr. Stubbs. Following his research he was led to believe that there were certain industrial medical dangers associated with the mining of nickel. I have been able to get some information which will perhaps clarify this matter and set the minds of some people at rest. I am referring to those who might have been concerned about this particular aspect of the industrial activity which is increasing in Western Australia.

I will put my remarks in more or less technical terms and then try to enlarge on some sections as I feel the need arises. My authority is Herbert E. Stokinger, who is the Chief of the Toxicology Section, Division of Occupational Health, U.S. Public Health Service, in the definitive textbook *Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, edited by Frank A. Patty. On page 1121, he says—

apart from the possible malignant effects of nickel carbonyl, dermatitis constitutes the only other serious nickel exposure hazard.

Nickel carbonyl is created by the fuel used in the roasting plant. Carbon monoxide is formed and this, passing over the boiling nickel, picks up the fumes, and makes the nickel carbonyl. This is highly toxic. There were some suspicions that this had very bad effects in that when the nickel

was recovered, the nickel carbonyl remained in the dust on the nickel. This was breathed in by those handling it and it was believed it could cause cancer. This was in the old Mond process used in South Wales, as was mentioned by Mr. Stubbs.

In the *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, volume 19, No. 3, of March, 1967, at pages 127 to 136, Ernest Mastromatteo—quoted by Mr. Stubbs—who is the Chief of the Occupational Health Service of the Ontario Department of Health, reported a complete review of its occupational health aspects. On page 129 he said—

In general there is no real evidence that nickel fume or dust produces any particular inflammatory disease or fibrosis of the lung in workers on either acute or chronic exposure.

The evil reputation of nickel in regard to lung and nasal cancers arose in the Mond process of refining nickel in South Wales where nickel carbonyl gas was produced, but even in this industry since safety precautions have been taken these conditions no longer occur.

There has never been any suggestion that nickel by itself caused cancer, and the nickel carbonyl gas will not be produced by the method of processing in the nickel refinery at Kwinana. What I have just said has been confirmed with interviews and discussions with experts in this field from Canada, the U.S.A., and the U.K.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Are they not using the Canadian or carbon process at Kwinana?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They are not using it now but they will be.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The information I am giving has been supplied by the industrial medical officers of the department, and, as I have just said, they have checked this with experts in the field from Canada, the U.S.A., and the U.K. One United States expert did say there was a faint cloud of suspicion about nickel and cancer, but there was no proof whatever and no-one else agreed with him.

Animal experimentation with nickel has produced controversial and conflicting results which are not applicable to man.

Nickel is admittedly a potent skin sensitiser and causes dermatitis in susceptible people. In so far as Kambalda is concerned, an inquiry a few months ago revealed that only one worker had claimed workers' compensation for dermatitis, and although the dermatitis was occupational in origin it was not specifically due to nickel. The nickel miners will be medically examined periodically under the Mines Regulation Act, and the refinery workers will be under the supervision of a competent industrial medical officer.

I secured this information this morning because I felt that the fears expressed by Mr. Stubbs might cause some alarm. I

felt also that this aspect of it should be submitted and I do so not in rebuttal of what Mr. Stubbs said, but as a follow on, because virtually everything Mr. Stubbs said was correct with regard to South Wales in the early days. It was strictly accurate. However, our advice is that under the modern methods of care it no longer applies.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: What is the reason for lung cancer being so rife in Canada where there are so many nickel mines?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is a carry-over from the process to which Mr. Stubbs referred. It must be remembered that a person does not get cancer the day he is exposed to the poison. The poison has a long-term effect. The honourable member has asked me a technical question. I am not a technical officer. I can only get advice from technical officers who are concerned with industrial medicine and who have seen experts from Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. These officers are confident that the care and welfare of our people will be safeguarded by the processes which will be used at Kwinana.

If members have any other technical questions, the departmental officers will be only too happy to discuss them, and in this way those members would be assured of understanding the full situation at the present time.

It is very difficult to convey the full story when answering certain questions, and Mr. Clive Griffiths in his comments during his speech, referred to the Swan Portland Cement Company, and he, as well as other members, have also asked questions about the company. I gathered that they felt that perhaps the company had not fulfilled the obligations the Act places upon it, and that something should be done about the matter.

There was, of course, difficulty associated with the Swan Portland Cement Company prior to the promulgation of the Clean Air Act. As members will recall, the Clean Air Act was passed and allowed to lie for some time while regulations were devised. During that period industry was warned. The Clean Air Act ultimately came into force in June, 1967.

In September, 1967, the cement company found it necessary to expand its lime production and this meant that the basis for the quotations for electrostatic precipitators had to be completely changed and new quotations sought. The material had already been ordered but the basis had to be changed.

The Clean Air Act lays down that the company has to adopt the best practicable means and this, by the United Kingdom definition, takes into account the financial angle. So long as the Swan Portland Cement Company was seeking a practicable solution it was conforming with the

Act. A condition was attached to its license, No. 61/67, in January, 1968, that it should keep the Air Pollution Control Council informed of its developments in the negotiations for dust arresting equipment.

I know of no Act under which the plant could be forcibly closed, and I think such a situation would be undesirable. It would seem to cut across the freedom we stand for. The company called in a firm of consultants to the cement and lime industries, in about June, 1968. The firm was Holderbank of Switzerland, and the company received very costly quotations for electrostatic precipitators with no guarantee that they would work. The estimate went up to \$750,000. The reason there was no guarantee was that the Swan Portland Cement Company's new factory used short furnaces and the temperatures were too high for electrostatic precipitators to work. From what I gather the higher the temperature of the gas the faster it moves, and the precipitators will not work properly. Again, I say that I am not technically competent in this engineering field but I understand that to be the problem.

Holderbank made laboratory trials and certain recommendations designed to reduce the temperature. The recommendations were adopted—which could only be done when the plant was stopped—but whilst the effect was in the right direction it was insufficient to greatly affect the matter. The effect was not marked enough to be able to solve the problem and make the electrostatic precipitator a workable proposition. I think the problem was that they could not get the temperatures low enough.

At the request of the company our senior engineer (Mr. H. H. Macey) went to South Australia where a company was using a method which was reported to be very efficient. I have seen photographs of the plant and the work it does, and it is very efficient indeed. It is a dust extractor of a totally different type and it is working very effectively indeed.

Of course, everyone immediately clapped hands and thought this was the answer. The company purchased and installed a small unit, and engaged a firm of consulting engineers, Crooks, Michelle, Peacock and Stewart of Sydney, to test the unit and advise the company. However, the results of the tests were unsatisfactory.

The cyclonic action of the unit broke up the particles, and the particles became too small in size. I think they are measured in microns. This had not occurred in the South Australian plant, but it did occur here and the unit was completely ineffective.

It has now been decided to use flooded disc scrubbers, which will go back to the wet scrubbing system where the fumes

are forced through a constantly wet slurry situation which traps the dust. When dried, it can be reused.

I understand that the consultants who were engaged are fairly confident that this will work. The company hoped to use a dry method to avoid the drying-out process, but it had to go back to the wet process. The advice of the consultants on which type of flooded disc scrubber, or its equivalent, is to be preferred is expected any day. The company is firmly convinced that this will work and it will be a relatively short period—a matter of some months—before it is installed.

The story, briefly, has been one of trial and constant frustration. The company has obeyed the letter of the law and has tried all practicable means, as the Act demands. We are hopeful that the people who live in the areas affected will soon get some relief, because it is a worrying situation. I do not suppose any of us would like to be living adjacent to the plant. I can understand Mr. Clive Griffiths being disturbed. He has a nice-coloured car and I can well understand that the lime dust does not do it any good.

Mr. Wise mentioned barramundi. Strangely enough our scientists seem to think that the overflow from the upper dam will be within the scope of the small barramundi. Our problem is the barrage dam—the one presently there. Perhaps if we had thought of this problem 20 years ago, the dams could have been constructed in a slightly different manner.

The barramundi adult fish go downstream to brackish water where they spawn. When the young fish are big enough they go back up the rivers where they grow to their full size.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They appear to have the opposite instincts to salmon.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There are two species of popular sporting fish in the north and both species go downstream to the brackish water. Unfortunately the Fitzroy barrage would be too much of a jump. Here again, if we had thought about this earlier we could, perhaps, have overcome the problem. However, nobody else thought of it so perhaps we can be excused. The matter is being looked at.

There has been mention of reserving the fish as a sporting fish. We would like to do that, because the area of the Ord Dam is a lovely place to make into a resort. We recently had Dr. Morrissey there. We believe there should be restrictions so that the fish can be taken only by sporting methods, and this would mean no nets. We are currently looking at this matter.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Nets have already been banned at Langi Crossing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think that is fair enough, especially for those who like to go out and get the barramundi.

I hope that my few remarks have cleared up one or two matters, in particular, those mentioned by Mr. Stubbs.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: It looks as though I will have to do some more homework.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: With those remarks I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. C. R. Abbey.

*House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 28th August, 1969

The SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

*Public Gallery and Speaker's Gallery:*

*Statement by the Speaker*

**THE SPEAKER:** With the indulgence of the House, I wish to make an announcement. On the 1st November, 1968, the member for Swan asked me three questions relating to the procedure in this Chamber. Really, the questions related not so much to the procedure as to the convenience of the public.

The first question the member for Swan asked me was whether I would consider allowing the general public to enter the Public Gallery and the Speaker's Gallery before prayers.

The second question was whether I would make available to the public copies of the Notices and Orders of the Day.

The third question was whether I would arrange to have a list of members placed in both the Public Gallery and the Speaker's Gallery so that members of the public who were attending Parliament could know which member was addressing the Chamber.

I have delayed making any statement, because I had hoped to be able to make a decision on all three questions at the one time. When I replied on the 1st November, I indicated that, on the question of the admission of the public before prayers, I felt there should not be one procedure in this Chamber and another procedure in another place. It was highly desirable, if a change were made, that it should be made in both places at the same time so that there would not be any confusion.

Since the 1st November I have had a number of discussions with the President of the Legislative Council on that question; indeed, on the last occasion only as late as last night. The President asked me to allow him a little more time to give