

always exceptions. I do not brand all employers as bad, as has been stated in this House on many occasions. Nor do I believe that workers do not produce enough. Such argument does not impress me. In a large community, we shall always find good and bad. There are good workers and poor workers; and there are good employers and poor employers. It is no use blaming one section of the community or the other. I believe that the question of the basic wage should be decided on the amount required by a man to sustain himself and his family in reasonable comfort. That is the very basis on which the basic wage has been fixed since the inception of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you not think the court has considered the needs of workers on this occasion?

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: Evidently the court did not consider them, because it did not increase the basic wage. No doubt evidence is available from the statistician that there has been an increase in the cost of living. Do not let us think that we can stabilise the basic wage and not stabilise the cost of living, and by so doing stabilise the economy of this country. I do not claim to be an economist, or a person with great business acumen. I believe that commonsense comes into the argument a great deal. If members view this Bill with commonsense, we might arrive at a better decision now than we did previously.

On motion by Hon. A. R. Jones, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.51 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 8th September, 1954.

CONTENTS.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Personal explanation, the Minister for Railways and incorrect report in "The West Australian" | 1488 |
| Questions: Killarney Estate, as to disposal of shopping area, etc. | 1489 |
| Hospitals, as to contributions from Lotteries Commission | 1489 |
| Harbours, as to Government and outports commission report | 1490 |
| Australian Trade Mission, as to representation of W.A. firms | 1490 |
| Kwinana canteen, as to cost, date of opening, etc. | 1490 |
| Narrows bridge, as to routes linking Kwinana | 1490 |
| Water supplies, (a) as to Roleystone scheme | 1490 |
| (b) as to plumbing testing branch and charges | 1490 |
| (c) as to reject plumbing fittings | 1491 |
| (d) as to untested pedestals and cisterns | 1491 |
| Bricks, as to production of cream type | 1491 |
| E. V. and K. Hepworth case, as to tabling papers | 1491 |
| Assent to Bill | 1491 |
| Motions: Fremantle harbour, as to extension and railway bridge construction | 1491 |
| Electricity from solar energy, as to utilisation to increase amenities | 1491 |
| Basic wage, as to cost of living adjustments | 1491 |
| Bills: Potato Growing Industry Trust Fund Act Amendment, 3r. | 1491 |
| Health Act Amendment (No. 1), report | 1491 |

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The Minister for Railways and Incorrect Report in "The West Australian."

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Mr. Speaker, I would like your permission to make a personal explanation to the House. It is in connection with the report in "The West Australian" of my remarks on the Bush Fires Bill last evening. I complain because there is nothing in "The West Australian" report which truly represents what I did say. It is a complete negation and entirely opposite to what I said when speaking to that Bill. The report has been put up in such a way that it will bring discredit upon me, upon my truthfulness and veracity. "Hansard" was quite capable of taking down what I said.

Newspapers are allowed to have their representatives here as a privilege, and I remember your immediate predecessor refusing a newspaper the right to have a

representative in this Chamber because of incorrect reporting. Even although a newspaper, for purposes of political partisanship, does not wish to record all that a member may say, I think members are entitled, at least, to know that something they did not say, or did not even infer, will not be published.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You do not think that it is deliberate misrepresentation, do you?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not know how it could happen otherwise. For the information of the House, I will read the report of my remarks on the Bush Fires Bill which appeared in "The West Australian" this morning. That part of the article dealing with my remarks reads as follows:—

Compensation.

The Minister for Railways (Mr. Styants) said that he was concerned about the views of some Opposition members that the penalties in the Bill were inconsistent with the attitude of the Railway Department.

The department accepted responsibility for fires which spread from burning-off on its land, but it could not accept responsibility for fires started by locomotives.

In actual fact, I said that the Railway Department does accept responsibility for fires which are started by locomotives within the boundaries of railway property.

That is the first inaccuracy in the report. That statement is entirely incorrect and in opposition to what I said. It continues—

However, the department usually paid for fire damage caused by locomotives.

I did not say that at all. I said that where a fire was started by a locomotive outside the boundaries of railway property, the department would not accept responsibility; but if a railway gang lit a fire which got away during burning-off operations, the Railway Department almost invariably, if not always, paid for the damages caused by the fire. However, this is the real gem of the report. It reads—

Last year it had paid £36,000 compensation for fire damage.

What I did say was that £36,000 was paid by the Railway Department last year in burning fire breaks and ploughing fire breaks in an endeavour to stop fires getting away from within the boundaries of railway property.

I would like you, Sir, to request, or to intimate to "The West Australian" newspaper proprietors that correct reporting is expected of it. Whether it reports my speeches or not does not concern me very much, but when it does report any speech that I make, I demand that it shall be reported correctly and not create a totally

erroneous impression in the minds of people in the country. I anticipate that, simply as a result of misreporting by "The West Australian" newspaper, within a fortnight there will be 20 branches of the Farmers' Union writing to that organisation drawing attention to the fact that I told a pack of lies in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad the Minister for Railways has brought this matter to my notice. I have had complaints previously, not made in the House, but privately, from members who claimed that they had been misreported. From my own memory, the remarks made by the Minister this afternoon regarding his statement last night concerning the amount of £36,000, are correct. I will request that "The West Australian" make a correction and tender an apology. I will get in touch with the proprietors, and I hope that my action will stop any misrepresentation of remarks made by members in the future.

QUESTIONS.

KILLARNEY ESTATE.

As to Disposal of Shopping Area, etc.

Mr. NIMMO asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Will he indicate when the blocks in the shopping area in the Killarney Estate, Scarborough, will be sold?

(2) Also the theatre site?

(3) How many shopping sites have been sold at Scarborough?

(4) What would be the average price of each block when acquired?

(5) What was the average price of each block when sold?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) When titles are available to the commission.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Five.

(4) Lots were not individually acquired but were created by a commission resub-division.

(5) Average price realised at public auction was £472 per site.

HOSPITALS.

As to Contributions from Lotteries Commission.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What amounts has the Lotteries Commission contributed to—

(a) the Royal Perth Hospital;

(b) the Mount Henry Home?

(2) In view of the urgent need for the regional hospital at Albany, will he endeavour to arrange for the commission to finance its construction by means of a grant or a loan to be repaid when loan funds are available?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) (a) £386,000. Royal Perth Hospital.
- (b) £456,000. Mt. Henry Home.

(2) The method of finance will be decided when plans are ready for commencement of building.

HARBOURS.

As to Government and Outports Commission Report.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Works:

As he has stated that work on the No. 2 berth at Albany cannot continue on account of loan funds not being available, will he advise if it is the intention of the Government to continue to ignore the report of the Outports Royal Commission—of which the present Minister for Railways was chairman, and the Minister for Lands a member—and to continue with the deep water berth at Bunbury?

The MINISTER replied:

The action in proceeding with the jetty extension, etc., at Bunbury may not appear to be consistent with the report. However, the decision to proceed was made to cater economically for anticipated greatly increased development and production from the large zone behind it.

With respect to Albany, the recommendations of the Outports Royal Commission are being implemented to the fullest extent of available finance and £135,000 has been allocated for this financial year.

With respect to Bunbury, £40,000 has been allocated to carry on the work already in hand on the jetty to a stage where it can become operative.

AUSTRALIAN TRADE MISSION.

As to Representation of W.A. Firms.

Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

(1) With reference to the Australian Trade Mission to S.E. Asian countries to leave Australia at the end of October, and which is being sponsored by the Commonwealth Government, does he know if any Western Australian firms are nominating representatives?

(2) Has the Western Australian Government made representations to any Western Australian firms encouraging them to nominate a representative in an endeavour to ensure that this State is represented?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No information has been received by the Government from any local firm of an intention to nominate a representative.

(2) No. It is thought that local firms have sufficient initiative and enterprise to nominate representatives without encouragement from the Government.

KWINANA CANTEN.

As to Cost, Date of Opening, etc.

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is the building at Kwinana for the sale of fermented and spirituous liquors being constructed for the State Hotels Department?

(2) What is its estimated cost and what is the source of finance?

(3) Is it proposed to apply to the Licensing Court for a licence?

(4) When is it expected that the premises will be ready for business?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) £22,113 including furnishings. Loan funds. Provision has been made for the recoupment of the expenditure and the protection of the State against loss.

(3) No.

(4) The 1st November, 1954.

NARROWS BRIDGE.

As to Routes Linking Kwinana.

Hon. A. R. V. ABBOTT asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he able to indicate the routes which are likely to be utilised to link Kwinana with the Narrows bridge?

(2) As this matter is one of great public importance, is he prepared to make public the possible routes before a final decision is made in connection with the matter, so that the various interests may have an opportunity of placing their views before the Government?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Only partly; the Main Roads Department is actively engaged in making appropriate surveys and investigations for determining the best routes.

(2) Yes.

WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) As to Roleystone Scheme.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

In connection with the allocation of money for the continuance of the Roleystone water scheme, what work is to be undertaken this financial year and what route will the water line follow?

The MINISTER replied:

Construction of No. 1 pumping station and installation of pumping equipment. Construction of No. 2 pumping station, installation of pumping equipment and erection of 60,000 gallon storage tank. The laying of about 4,000ft. of 6in. cast iron or steel pipes in Peet-rd. from Roleystone-rd. to Hall-rd.

(b) As to Plumbing Testing Branch and Charges.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

In connection with the pumping testing branch of the Water Supply Department—

(1) Is each individual item tested?

(2) Is a charge made for such testing?

(3) If "Yes" is the answer to No. (2), what is the approximate charge per item, and what is the total amount received for such testing?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Either inspected or inspected and tested as required, according to the type of article.

(2) Yes.

(3) Charge for items varies over a wide range of items from 1d. to 5s. per item. The charge for special initial tests for new type articles is 10s.

Total testing fees 1953-54—£12,946.

(c) *As to Reject Plumbing Fittings.*

Mr. HEARMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Further to the question concerning the testing of plumbing fittings, will he indicate what happens to articles which have not passed the test, and under what conditions are such articles sold to the public?

The MINISTER replied:

Where it is felt possible that articles which have not passed the test can be rectified, they are returned to the manufacturers with an indication as to the faults. An opportunity is thus provided for them to be rectified. They can be submitted again and re-tested; if passed, they can be sold to the public. In cases where the defects cannot be remedied, then the articles are returned and the manufacturers can do what they like with them.

(d) *As to Untested Pedestals and Cisterns.*

Mr. HEARMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Is he aware that certain pedestals and cisterns sold to the public have not been passed by the department?

The MINISTER replied:

I am not aware of that, but I shall have inquiries made into the matter.

BRICKS.

As to Production of Cream Type.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Have yellow bricks been made at the State Brick Works since the 1st January, 1954?

(2) What quantity has been produced?

(3) To which jobs have they been allocated?

The MINISTER replied:

First of all I want to say that I have not heard of yellow bricks. I assume the question applies to cream bricks. Accordingly the answers are as follows:—

(1) Cream bricks have been made.

(2) 273,826 bricks.

(3) (a) P.W.D. took delivery of 179,525 bricks, of which total 49,340, including seconds, were unsuitable, and made available to private jobs, chiefly housing. * (b) Bricks additional to 49,340 above were made available to 50 contractors and other customers, totalling 94,301.

Of the additional (b) 20,000 were supplied to South Perth hospital.

E. V. AND K. HEPWORTH CASE.

As to Tabling Papers.

Mr. COURT (without notice) asked the Minister for Justice:

Would he be prepared to lay on the Table of the House the file dealing with the E. V. and K. Hepworth case?

The MINISTER replied:

I am agreeable to lay it on the Table of the House forthwith. I move—

That the file relating to the E. V. and K. Hepworth case be laid on the Table of the House for two weeks.

Question put and passed.

BILL—POTATO GROWING INDUSTRY TRUST FUND ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Report of Committee adopted.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Inquiry Agents Licensing Bill.

[Mr. Hill took the Chair.]

MOTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR.

As to Extension and Railway Bridge Construction.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [4.49]: I move—

That this House requests the Government to go on with the outward to the south extension scheme instead of the upriver scheme for the Fremantle Harbour, and also that this House does not agree to the building of a short-life wooden structure railway bridge downstream and adjacent to the present traffic bridge as per Messrs Brisbane and Dumas's report.

I have to say a few words regarding a couple of questions answered during the last few days. Yesterday the member for Albany wanted to know the approximate expenditure that would be necessary should the Fremantle harbour extension be southward before the construction of berths could be commenced. The Minister for Works replied that should the harbour be extended southwards into Cockburn Sound

the expenditure before berths could be commenced could be about £4,500,000 for navigable channels, dredging, reclamation roads, railways, etc. and, additionally a large amount—£4,500,000 at least—if breakwaters proved necessary.

That is not, I think, the answer to the question. When we speak of harbour extension to the southward, we do not allude to a place at Cockburn Sound 14 or 15 miles away. I regret that I did not bring the plans and hang them on the wall of the Chamber because they show that the harbour suggested by Sir John Coode, Mr. Stileman, Sir Alex Gibb and Partners, Col. Tydeman, and Mr. Myer would be immediately adjoining the river mouth at South Fremantle, and so I say that the answer to the question should have been different.

The answer given would lead the member for Albany to believe that if the Government tomorrow scrapped the idea of extending the harbour up to the traffic bridge, it would immediately go to Cockburn Sound. It would do nothing of the sort; to do so would be just too ridiculous. It would start to build the extension at the entrance to the river. Consequently, I say it was misleading to tell the member for Albany that there would not be any money left for expenditure at Albany after going to Cockburn Sound and spending £9,000,000 there.

Another question asked was as follows:—

What is the anticipated total cost of resumptions involved in the proposed new siting of the railway bridge?

The reply of the Minister was—

£200,000 for railway purposes.

Quite a lot of different amounts seem to be named. If we look at Col. Tydeman's report, we find that he estimated a cost of £700,000 for resumptions. Yet the Minister said the amount would be £200,000—a big difference.

The Minister for Works: Was not that the scheme for Point Brown?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Col. Tydeman's report says, "Estimate No. 12. Upriver scheme, alternative seven-berth scheme railway bridge and approaches, land resumptions, £700,000." I shall refer to that later. The Minister said the amount for resumptions would be £200,000, which would lead people to believe that there would not be many resumptions at North Fremantle, but that there would be a straight run through and £200,000 would clear the lot. It would not. The £700,000 estimate was made in 1948, and we know the difference between the price of property then and now. I venture to say that if the amount was £700,000 in 1948, it would be double that figure now. Thus the Government will not get away with an expenditure of £200,000 for resumptions at North Fremantle if the bridge is placed there.

Although Col. Tydeman said in 1948 that the cost would be £700,000, he is evidently not too sure of that figure. This is what he said a few days ago in a statement that appeared in the "Daily News"—

Until an accurate survey of the river above the Fremantle railway bridge was made, it was impossible to say what North Fremantle properties would be involved.

So he evidently thinks that the cost will be greater than when he made his estimate in 1948. I can imagine what it is likely to be if the figure was £700,000 in 1948. I asked the Minister whether he was aware that Messrs. Dumas and Brisbane estimated the cost at £1,480,000 including £175,000 for land resumption.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I asked the Minister for Railways a series of questions regarding the Fremantle railway bridge, including the following:—

Is he aware that Messrs. Brisbane and Dumas estimated that a short-term wooden structure would cost £1,400,000 including £175,000 for land resumption?

The Minister, in his reply on this point, said—

"The figure of £1,400,000 for a short term wooden structure, including £175,000 for land resumption—Messrs. Brisbane and Dumas' estimate—cannot be confirmed in departmental records.

I do not know what is wrong with the department; evidently it ought to be shaken up a bit. I can find the information easily enough and the department should be able to do so, because it has more opportunities to get information than I have. At times we in this House have to battle in order to get the information we want. Details in the Dumas-Brisbane report are as follows:—

Site just below highway bridge.

| | £ |
|--|-----------|
| Steel framed bridge on masonry piers | 675,000 |
| Railway approaches | 525,000 |
| Demolition of existing bridge, railway tracks, etc. | 180,000 |
| Ancillaries and contingencies | 250,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 1,630,000 |
| Land resumptions | 175,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 1,805,000 |
| Less if timber construction bridge be adopted | 325,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 1,480,000 |

So the department ought to be more up to date than it seems to be and should be able to give the information we ask for.

When I speak of the upriver scheme, I do not want anyone to tell me that this is not an upriver scheme. The present harbour is an upriver scheme; it is called the upriver harbour now. It is a harbour in the Swan River. The bar was cut away and the harbour was constructed in the river. If one went one yard or a thousands yards, it must be upriver. It is merely a matter of degree. So I do not want anyone to tell me that this is not an upriver scheme.

I want to point out that I think I had a close call—what I might call a photo finish, because so many people have to have a say before anything is decided. At first it was a committee of the Cabinet, which took some considerable time to discuss the matter. Apparently it could not reach a decision; it must have been divided fifty-fifty. Then the matter went to Cabinet, which handled it for a while and could not reach a decision. Then it was handed to a committee consisting of Alex. Reid (chairman, Under Treasurer), J. W. Young (Director of Works), F. W. E. Tydeman (general manager, Fremantle Harbour Trust); A. G. Hall (Commissioner of Railways); Gordon Stephenson (town planning consultant); and John D. Leach (Commissioner of Main Roads).

There is only one name missing from the committee, namely, that of the member for Fremantle. Recently a committee was appointed to draw up a case for Commonwealth assistance for the development of the North-West and to that committee we appointed two members representing the North-West. Why should not the member for Fremantle have been appointed to the harbour committee? I have an idea of the reason. The report states—

The question to be considered by the committee is whether the Government should, during the next few years, provide additional wharfage accommodation upstream at Fremantle or, alternatively, start to construct such accommodation at Cockburn Sound.

By the terms of reference the committee was given two options, whether the harbour should be extended upstream or accommodation provided at Cockburn Sound. Hence the hands of the committee were tied. It was not asked to state its first, second, third or fourth priority. It was asked whether additional wharfage accommodation should be provided upstream at Fremantle or whether a start should be made to construct accommodation at Cockburn Sound. There was only one answer to that. They could not possibly go to Cockburn Sound, and they said that they realised that if they recommended the provision of additional wharfage accom-

modation upstream at Fremantle, a decision would have to be made on the future of the Fremantle railway bridge, and, of course, they were aware that that decision would have to be made by Cabinet.

Therefore they did not have to report on the bridge at all, their job being simply to say whether the harbour should go upriver as far as the railway bridge or down to Cockburn Sound. I feel that the committee should have been asked to report on where it considered the harbour should go, instead of being restricted in this way. They continued on to say that the most suitable part of Cockburn Sound for general cargo berths would be between the oil refinery and Rockingham.

They had to say something about Cockburn Sound as that was one of the two matters on which they had to report. In this regard they said—

This area is about 14 miles south of the present inner harbour and about 25 miles distant from Perth. At present between 85 and 90 per cent. of the inner harbour general cargo is transported to Perth and Fremantle for reprocessing and distribution. The cost of the extra transport from Cockburn Sound at present rates would impose a burden of about £1 per statistical ton of cargo. Unless consignees of general cargo handled at berths in Cockburn Sound were relieved of this extra cost, these berths would be in disfavour and would be used only under compulsion.

I am not afraid to say that the harbour will not be moved to Cockburn Sound within the next 50 years, because the nearer site will eventually have to be used first, and, in addition to that, we have already been told that it is not sure whether a harbour would be safe at Cockburn Sound. In volume 2 of his report, in paragraph 186, under the heading of "Economics" Col. Tydeman said—

Although port extension schemes beyond the outer harbour on the exposed coast are unsuitable on the grounds of distance from the existing trade centre, they are an engineering possibility. Such schemes would not have natural primary protection from rough westerly weather, as is afforded to the outer harbour by reefs and islands. This would have to be provided artificially, and the immense capital cost expended on such massive marine structures, i.e., breakwaters, etc., would militate against such port extension projects.

This is where they are talking about spending possibly £9,000,000, when it becomes necessary, but it is not necessary today. On the more salient points he says that it is an exposed coast, that the land is unlimited, the land approaches easy, the

harbour works expensive and the trade centre too far away. I ask the House if it is thought that the harbour will go to Cockburn Sound within many years?

Of course the committee had to say something about Cockburn Sound and so it said that, if the harbour were to go there, the best place would be between the oil refinery and Rockingham. I do not profess to be an engineer, but I can read English and understand it reasonably well. After going through these reports one could not agree that we should go up-river first, in considering extensions to the harbour, but I say we have no right to go up there and I would like to see the Government scrap this plan just as it scrapped that relating to the railway line up Bassendean way, which was recommended by all the engineers. The Government turned that down and could do the same in this instance.

Members of Parliament are usually laymen and if they make a mistake in ignorance can be excused, but if they make a mistake with their eyes wide open, after they have been warned of the dangers ahead, they will be cursed by posterity for what they have done. No member has the right to ignore the remarks of the engineers who have pointed out what is likely to occur if certain things are done. It might be asked how I know that a short term three-track wooden bridge will be built adjacent to the traffic bridge.

I assume that is what will be done if the Government does not change its mind and my reason for the assumption is that the Government met us down there one morning and pointed out where the bridge would be—the Brisbane-Dumas bridge. I did not agree then, but the Government did not want to discuss the question there in front of so many departmental heads as were present.

The Chief Secretary was not to be put aside so easily and, saying, "Come with me and I will show you where I think the bridge should go," he took us down adjacent to the present railway bridge and said that was where he thought it should go. I agree with what he said, because that is the right place for it, but evidently the Chief Secretary had not enough supporters in Cabinet to have his proposition agreed to. I still think that is where the bridge should go. We then came up to the Minister's office to discuss the matter with the Cabinet committee which had been appointed. This is what the Town Clerk of North Fremantle wrote—

As previously reported, a Cabinet sub-committee was appointed some time ago to investigate and recommend future harbour and railway development in the Fremantle area. At the last meeting of the Council, I reported that the Ministers concerned had been inspecting the dis-

trict, and it appears that the sub-committee is approaching the stage where it is in a position to make recommendations to the Government.

The Ministers concerned are desirous of meeting representatives of this Council in conference prior to reporting back to Cabinet, and an invitation has been received to attend a conference on Wednesday 24th February, 1954, at 2.15 p.m. at which I understand the Fremantle City Council will also be represented, being the authority concerned with alterations and improvements on the south side of Fremantle Harbour.

To enable this Council and its representatives at the conference to fully understand the nature of the proposals, Mr. Bond, the Under Secretary for Works, made available to me the report of Messrs. R. J. Dumas and D. W. Brisbane recommending certain developments of the port area. This indicated that the recommendations of the gentlemen mentioned was the one in which the Government was most interested and in order that this Council might be in a position to consider something concrete in the way of proposed alterations, I took the liberty of giving Mr. Bond the opportunity to say that this was a fact or otherwise. He was quite considerate and aware of the problem we faced in discussing something which was quite indefinite, and, to overcome the difficulty, made known to me that the recommendations of Messrs. Dumas and Brisbane was the one most favoured by the Government.

In view of that, I think I am entitled to assume that that is what the Government had in mind. In answer to a question asked the other day, the Minister for Works said that Cabinet would make the decision when the time arrived, but it will be all the better if this House carries the motion and shows Cabinet what the opinion of this Assembly is in regard to the bridge. I believe Brisbane and Dumas are the only ones who have advocated a bridge alongside the traffic bridge.

I have gone right back to Sir John Coode and I find that none of the others ever recommended that a bridge should go there. In their report, Brisbane and Dumas stated:—

At the present time Fremantle harbour has the equivalent of 18 berths and the construction of a further berth within the existing harbour is possible, making a total of 19 berths.

Construction of a new railway bridge upstream but near to the existing railway bridge: This scheme would provide for an additional two berths, making 21 in all, and would reduce to a minimum disturbance to the existing

railway and property, but would not provide the additional amount of berthage required to make the most economic and efficient use of the present harbour.

Their recommendations respecting the bridge were—

- (a) That a new railway bridge be constructed immediately below the existing highway bridge and approximately as shown on Sir Alexander Gibb and Partners plan 3080/20.
- (b) That the bridge be built so far as possible of timber, the piles being protected to have a life of 50 years.
- (c) The number of tracks to be provided on the bridge to be determined by the Railways Commission.

The latest committee appointed by the Government recommended the present proposal, and I do not agree with it. If we look up the reports of all the other engineers we will see that this plan is not what it should be. In my opinion, Sir Alexander Gibb would never have brought down a plan of the sort that he did had he not been requested to do so. In fact, he did not recommend it, but damned it with faint praise. He did not report on the idea favourably. Dumas and the others wrote and requested him to bring down a plan for a bridge alongside the present bridge—

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Hon. D. Brand: Would Sir Alexander Gibb be more in favour of a bridge at Point Brown?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Yes, Sir Alexander Gibb and Partners mentioned Point Brown. For the information of members who may not know, I would point out that Sir Alexander Gibb produced two volumes, the first for the "A" and "B" schemes and the second for the "C" and "D" schemes. On page 2 of the "A" and "B" schemes report, he says—

Under the terms of the agreement dated the 3rd May, 1951, between the Government of Western Australia and ourselves we were required—

- (a) To make a detailed large scale survey of the existing port of Fremantle and the adjoining areas likely to be affected by the scheme for upstream development of the port as proposed by Colonel F. W. E. Tydeman in his report, dated August, 1948, and referred to as the "Tydeman Port Development Scheme."
- (b) To prepare detailed designs, drawings and contract documents for the construction of bridges, railways, roads and such other additional works, as might be requested by the co-ordinating engineers.

We find that he was given the job but was not allowed much time in which to complete it. That was on the 3rd May, 1952, but he was not given time to finish his work before he was requested to do something else. He states—

As instructed by Mr. R. J. Dumas, Co-ordinator of Works and Industrial Development, when he called at this Office on 26th August, 1952, we have pleasure in submitting our report on a modified scheme of development for the Port of Fremantle, involving the construction of a new railway bridge to replace the existing structure.

Colonel F. W. E. Tydeman, General Manager of the Fremantle Harbour Trust and Co-ordinating Engineer, wrote on 6th May, 1952, instructing us to prepare a report and estimate for a modified 7-berth development scheme, as an alternative to the 12-berth "Tydeman Port Development Scheme."

He did not forget to tell us that he was only carrying out his instructions. On page 3 of the report appears the following:—

At our meeting in London on 26th August, 1952, with Mr. R. J. Dumas, he explained that, as a result of the proposed developments along Cockburn Sound, it was necessary to review the whole question of the future development of the Port of Fremantle. He further stated that, in view of the Government's desire to exercise economy in capital expenditure—

There is too much damned economy in this country, and always has been. We are always spoiling the ship for a ha'porth of tar. We are prepared to take anything that is cheap and nasty and are not prepared to take anything that costs a few pounds more, even though it may be the better article and give us much better service. The extract continues—

—the proposed railway bridge could be regarded as a temporary one, with a life of some 25 years or more, if a saving in cost would thereby result.

The proposal was to put a three-track bridge across the river which would take up half as much room as the present railway bridge. These engineers were given a job to do, and before they finished it, they were requested to do something else, whether they liked it or not. They did not like the proposition and they told us so.

Hon. D. Brand: The present road bridge is a temporary structure.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Yes, I said that. Sir Alexander Gibb said—

The proposed railway bridge could be regarded as a temporary one with a life of some 25 years or more, if a saving in cost would thereby result.

If one tells a man what to do, he does it. Now let us see his opinion of a wooden bridge, and I refer to paragraph 15 on page 6. He says—

As the railway bridge is to be regarded as a temporary one, we first considered its construction as a multiple shortspan structure in timber or a combination of simple steel joists and timber, of somewhat similar construction to the existing bridges. We found, however, that, owing to the requirement of providing three rail tracks, combined with the heavy loading which each would have to carry, the number of piles required would be so great as to form a serious obstruction to river flow. This was especially important when taken in conjunction with the adjacent road bridge. We do not, therefore, consider that a structure of this type would be satisfactory, apart from which we understand that there might be some difficulty at the present time in obtaining timber piles of the requisite size.

He tells us that it would be a serious obstruction to river flow and in his opinion would not be satisfactory. We pay a man £32,000 to tell us these things and he says that the bridge would not be satisfactory, and I want to know if we intend to carry out the job in face of his recommendation.

Mr. Ackland: Why not make the terminal in North Fremantle?

Mr. Lawrence: What do you mean by North Fremantle?

Mr. Ackland: Not across the river at all.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Messrs. Brisbane and Dumas estimated the cost as being £1,400,000, including only £175,000 for resumptions. That sum was for the bridge and the resumptions only—nothing else. Such a project would cost a good many more million pounds on top of that, if the berths were constructed upstream. Sir Alexander Gibb estimated a sum of £1,630,000, and that sum did not include resumptions. I will read his report. He states—

Estimate of cost for modified scheme of development:

Based on present day costs, as far as these can be determined, we estimate the approximate cost of the works as follows:—

| | £ |
|---|---------------|
| New Railway Bridge | (A) 675,000 |
| Northern Approaches | |
| (Scheme "A") | (A) 355,000 |
| Southern Approaches | (A) 170,000 |
| Demolition of existing bridges and provision of a labour camp | (A) 180,000 |
| Ancillaries and contingencies | (A) 250,000 |
| | (A) 1,630,000 |

Now let us have a look at Col. Tydeman's report, and in this case people thought we would get a bridge and a harbour for £2,100,000. I refer to Estimate No. 12 on page 170 of volume 2 of his report—

| | £ |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Dredging and excavation | 1,150,000 |
| Quays | 805,000 |
| Transit sheds—3-floor | 1,630,000 |
| Quay and rear cranes | 749,000 |
| Mechanical cargo equipment | 227,000 |
| Railways (a) | 80,000 |
| Roads | 87,000 |
| Ancillaries | 470,000 |
| Contingencies | 232,000 |
| Rail bridge and approaches | 1,400,000 |
| Land resumption | 700,000 |
| Total | 7,530,000 |

This was supposed to be for a seven-berth scheme, but at the bottom of the estimate there is a note which says—

There is insufficient area to operate adequate railways for seven new berths.

Sir Alexander Gibb cut the number down to six berths and in their report Messrs. Brisbane and Dumas refer to only five berths. Col. Tydeman and Sir Alexander Gibb thought the scheme could be a six-berth one, but the other two mention only a five-berth scheme. That is the position, Mr. Treasurer. You do not have to find £2,100,000 for this scheme but a sum of £7,530,000; that is, if the scheme can be carried out as cheaply as it could have been in 1948.

I think it is about time we had a look at the whole position to see what can be done. In paragraph 87 of volume 2, Col. Tydeman says—

A site for a rail bridge beside the adjacent road bridge is a possibility from the railway viewpoint (such a scheme is indicated in Appendix 27) but there are disadvantages. With a 12 chain curve and a bad gradient of 1 in 60 southern approach to the bridge, continued use could be permitted of the existing Fremantle Yard Station, but the main line entry into the port system, and port rail operation, would be inefficient. If a 1 in 100 grade (ruling in the Metropolitan Area) were introduced, it would cause serious disturbance and inconvenience at Fremantle on the south side. Grading would be satisfactory on the north side of the river, but a new North Fremantle Station and re-organised yard would be necessary, entailing at its best, inconvenient and inefficient operation to berths and railway alike. The scheme is feasible purely from the engineering side, but not from the operating angle; disturbance of the

north side of the river would be considerable and almost as much as the Point Brown scheme.

So we are to have a bridge that is not considered feasible from the operating angle. He goes on to say—

The existing rail bridge is a timber structure not suitable for replacement in timber because:—

- (a) Jarrah timbers of the size required for piles are not now readily procurable.
- (b) Wheel loads are now greater, and will be still greater in the future, than those for which the existing structure was originally designed.

And now we come to the important statement—

Thus if the bridge is rebuilt, a temporary short-life structure in timber would be neither possible nor desirable; a more permanent long longer-life structure only would be acceptable. This being so, and better rail curves and gradients, and river traffic head-room being required, a permanent structure should be sited upstream, the further towards Point Brown the better.

He says that a temporary short-life structure of timber would be neither possible nor desirable, and that is a fairly damaging statement. Col. Tydeman reported that an alternative seven-berth upriver scheme, but not beyond the traffic bridge, would cost £7,530,000, but as a footnote he says that there is insufficient area to operate adequate railways for seven new berths.

Using Col. Tydeman's estimate of £7,530,000 for a seven-berth scheme, it works out at a cost of £1,070,000 per berth. But if only six berths were built for the same sum, the cost would be £1,225,000 per berth. In paragraphs 32 and 33 of Sir Alexander Gibb's report on the "A" and "B" schemes, there appears the following:—

Considering the problem of upstream development, after the existing railway bridge has been removed it would be possible to construct four 500 ft. berths on the north side of the river. On the south side, however, irrespective of the new railway bridge, we do not consider it would be possible to construct more than two such berths without further restriction of the waterway at the road bridge. To overcome this it would be necessary to reconstruct this bridge by lengthening at the north end, and also by providing new navigation spans. A considerable amount of dredging would also be entailed.

It should be noted that with the new railway bridge located on the downstream side of the road bridge

the working space behind the quay for the third berth would be so restricted as to impair the efficiency of working. In view of these factors we do not consider that the additional cost of locating and lengthening the new railway bridge to allow for the future construction of the third berth would be justified.

He then goes on to say—

The construction of a new railway bridge on the downstream side of the road bridge does not rule out the possibility of further upstream development of the Port. Removal of the existing road bridge will probably be necessary within the lifetime of the new temporary railway bridge and in consequence it would be possible to locate both bridges upstream, in the vicinity of Point Brown.

On page 3 of the Brisbane and Dumas report we find the following recommendation:—

Construction of a new railway bridge just downstream of the existing road bridge: This scheme would provide an additional five berths.

We were going to have seven, but Brisbane and Dumas say that we will only have five. On a previous occasion, I referred to foundations, or bottoms, as some members like to call them. It is always necessary to have decent foundations and to have a job done at reasonable cost.

Engineers can, of course, do the job, provided they are given sufficient money; and at times they have to be found a good deal of money. In about 1911 or 1912, an engineer was to build a dock at Fremantle and when he was asked by the then Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) whether he could do it or not, he replied, "Mr. Johnson, we could build a dock in the middle of the ocean, provided we had enough money." Mr. Johnson then said that that was the end, and that the project must stop.

Let us have a look at the reference to foundations in paragraph 291 of vol. 2 of Col. Tydeman's report. It states—

Construction of any of the initial or later stages of the comprehensive Ultimate Development Scheme should not present any difficulties other than routine problems normal to such heavy marine civil engineering work.

Before any constructions are undertaken, or even detailed drawings or estimates prepared, bores must be taken extensively over the areas concerned to check accurately information already to hand. Since these bores may take anything from one to two or more years to obtain in detail, this work must be planned well ahead of programme dates.

In paragraph 297, on page 158 of the same report, we find the following:—

There is insufficient information from bores or geological data to determine exact quantities of rock or sand involved in dredging, either in the river or seawards. Where it has been possible to determine quantities of sand and rock involved, separate items have been given for these. Elsewhere, where reasonable, it has been assumed that half dredging is in rock and half in sand and an average price quoted.

There seems to be a lot of guesswork about that. It has to be an average price for dredging in half sand and half rock. Let us see what Sir Alexander Gibb had to say in paragraph 13 of his report. On page 6 we find the following:—

Before finally deciding upon the location of the proposed bridge, as indicated on the drawings, we examined various alternative possibilities in order to determine whether or not some other location would offer any greater advantages. These alternative sites were located upstream of the road bridge, but we found that additional cost would be incurred, largely on account of the greater length of approaches required.

Paragraph 18, on page 7, states —

With regard to the pier foundations, we have tentatively proposed steel cylinders, sunk under compressed air. From the information at present available with regard to foundation conditions, we believe that this type of construction should prove to be the most economical, but before making a definite recommendation we should require to have the conditions underlying the river bed confirmed by means of trial bores. In the meantime, we consider that, other things being equal, cylinder foundations would have the advantage of offering less resistance to river flow than other types of foundations.

Accordingly, although we have that report, we are no better off than we were before.

I said that Col. Tydeman did not know what the foundations were like, and it would take him two years to find out. We were told that we would know when Sir Alexander Gibb's report was received. But we are none the wiser after having received the report, and we are still seeking information on foundations. I think there is some doubt as to whether we require five berths at present. I do not think we do. We have heard a good deal about wharfage space, but I do not think we need five berths. I would now like to quote another extract from Col. Tydeman's report. In paragraph 4, on page 8 of vol. 1, we find the following:—

The port's existing 18 berths are capable, with improvements, of meeting likely trade expansion of the next

20 years or so. No new berths need be constructed until then. These improvements, on a 5 per cent. annual increase basis, can be effected gradually for completion about the year 1970. The estimated cost at the high ruling prices of today would be £352,000 for immediate improvements, and £7,730,000 for longer-term improvements.

So Col. Tydeman tells us that in his opinion there is no need for any improvements for the next 20 years, and I believe there is a lot in what he says. I would now like to quote paragraph 34 of the same report by Col. Tydeman. It states—

Port expansion can be effected either by improving the capacity of existing facilities or by constructing more berths. Analysis of existing port facilities and operation methods show that existing facilities can be improved to produce greater capacity and that this is the most economic first stage of development to undertake. Initial port capacity increase should therefore be by this method, and beyond it new berths will be required.

The maximum annual port tonnage, 1,983,464 (s) tons in 1945, can be accepted as the capacity of existing facilities. By remodelling North and South Quays, this maximum capacity can be increased to 4,000,000 (s) tons per year, only possible in busy times with ship following ship.

By constructing one new berth in the existing Inner Harbour (on the available site upstream of the bulk wheat plant on the north bank), the total annual port capacity could be increased to about 4,200,000 (s) tons.

It is going to be rather busy if it gets that tonnage, and I have my doubts whether it is necessary, after No. 10 berth is completed, to go on with any others. If we adopt the Chief Secretary's idea to go across adjacent to the railway bridge at North Fremantle, it will mean that after No. 10 berth is completed there will be two more berths on the site on the upriver side of the railway bridge. I should think that would suffice for some considerable time. From Col. Tydeman's report it will be found that once we reach 4,000,000 tons, other work will have to be done; breakwaters will have to be looked at, and modified. That, too, will be expensive. I think we should make inquiries to see what it will cost before we complete the business.

I would like now to refer to a report by the commissioners of the Harbour Trust to show what the capacity is at present. As I said before, we have to get 4,000,000 tons, and Col. Tydeman says that can be done. The report to which I have just

referred is dated the 30th June, 1954. In it we find that the inward cargo was 1,694,993 tons, and the outward cargo 842,376 tons, making a total for the year of 2,537,369 tons. Accordingly, it will be seen that if it is made up to 4,000,000 tons, Fremantle is going to be very busy. Last year it was 2,829,000 tons, and the previous year, which was a record and abnormal year, it was 3,100,000 tons. So, even in an abnormal year it is well short of 4,000,000 tons. We must examine the figures and see whether we require extra wharfrage.

Hon. D. Brand: Did you organise support on the Government cross-benches before you moved your motion?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I cannot hear the hon. member.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Are you getting support from the Government cross-benches? They have all gone.

Hon. L. Thorn: Have you much backing? All the members on that side seem to have gone.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: They are all right. I have seen all the benches opposite empty from time to time. Anyway, hon. members opposite seem to be very interested. I dare say the member for Toodyay is anxious about the harbour being constructed at the 14-mile; he might have to shift to the country.

Hon. D. Brand: When we leave, you will have to get Government supporters to form a quorum.

The Minister for Housing: We have heard this before.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: A very valuable statement was made in the reports about the disadvantages of going upstream and the insoluble difficulties we would leave to posterity. Paragraph 186, vol. 2, of Col. Tydeman's report states—

Schemes within the Outer Harbour would be lightened financially by nature's existing provision of islands and reefs. Partially protected deep water exists naturally and is capable of expansion by dredging. Such dredged material might be utilised for reclamation to produce port land and also for township or commercial development, the latter contributing towards lightening the financial burden.

Schemes within the Inner Harbour—

I would like members to listen to this—

—involve costly and difficult problems of cross-river communications; nature has provided but shallow waterways which would involve considerable cost of deepening and straightening; and land resumption of surrounding township and commercial areas might prove expensive.

There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt that that will prove expensive. The figure was £700,000 in 1948. We do not know what it will be in 1959-60. I do not anticipate anything will be done very quickly. The report continues—

Upriver schemes must not be cramped in outlook. Adequate land for efficient berth and port operation must be included. Existing berths operate with restricted land at consequent low efficiency. In such condition, greater capital cost per ton of cargo moved is involved. Similar lay-out must not be repeated further upstream.

That is a very damaging statement. He advises us not to make the same mistake as was made with the present harbour. The report goes on to say, in paragraph 187, vol. 2—

The essential requirement of protected deep water for ships includes many important considerations. The site for a port or port extensions must allow safe approach of the ship to the port from the open ocean. Approaches to the port must be of sufficient width, depth and capable of easy identification day or night to allow safe navigation at all times. The actual entrance or entrances to the port must be navigable with or without the assistance of tugs, and of sufficient width and depth, taken into consideration with local weather and marine characteristics, for the purpose.

That does not prevail now. If there is a big blow, ships will stay in the harbour for 12 to 14 hours, even with tugs. Here the report says that the actual entrance must be navigable, with or without the assistance of tugs.

Ships cannot go out with the assistance of tugs at present. Two or three were held up not very long ago. I went down to the wharf to see a ship off but I was informed that the "Stratheden"—I think that was the vessel—was not able to leave until 8 o'clock in the morning, having had to remain in the harbour overnight because there was a bit of a blow. I will now quote paragraph 6, pages 9 and 10 of vol. 1, as follows:—

If port development takes place upstream, existing rail and road bridges also must be re-sited further upstream. In consequence there will be an even greater extent of intensified township area downstream on both river banks, requiring direct cross-river communications for the greater traffic involved; more high level bridges or tunnels (the only positive communication method that does not obstruct shipping) will be required in consequence. This problem to posterity, of virtually insoluble difficulties of bridges high enough to pass increasingly large ships beneath, or tunnels deep enough to

allow gradually deeper navigable dredged depths of water, will thus be intensified by upriver development. High level bridges and tunnels are costly structures running into several millions of pounds.

If port development takes place seawards, away from existing town-ship areas, the bridges will remain sited as they are and cross-river communication problems will remain, but in less concentrated form initially than for upstream development. Other problems, arising from re-siting existing rail and road bridges, as the first initial stage, will thus be avoided.

Purely from the viewpoint of cross-river communications, in order to avoid immediate complications, or to hand on to posterity intensification of future insoluble or extremely expensive problems, upstream development of the port is better avoided. Port expansion, therefore, if undertaken, would better be seawards and not upstream, unless there are cogent reasons for doing so.

Such important reasons exist. Both rail and road bridges should be re-sited upstream in the near future. This will automatically open up the river for expansion, which even including the bridge structures and approaches, is more favourable in cost initially than seawards expansion.

A very important reason why the existing rail bridge must be re-sited further upstream is that reasonable and economic port railway operating efficiency is impossible with rail approaches as they are today, limited by the location of the existing rail bridge. The rail river crossing is too close to the berths for proper port rail lay-out. Re-siting the rail bridge further upstream near the road bridge would only improve rail approaches partially, and though it would open up the best upriver dry-dock site and permit limited upstream berth expansion, would not improve port rail operating efficiency sufficiently to justify the cost involved.

I think we can rule that out; we are not going to have that. In another paragraph, referring to the proposed upriver dry dock site, Col. Tydeman points out that, although it may be the best upriver dry dock site, the best site would be outside.

Hon. D. Brand: Do you think that there could be a dry dock at Cockburn Sound?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I would not like to pass an opinion on that. It might be all right. I turn now to paragraph 200 on page 95 of vol. 2. This reads as follows:—

As will be shown later, the port is not fully used, and were more ships and trade available, the existing

maximum tonnage of some 1,800,000 (s) tons is capable of increase with improvements to 4,000,000 (s) tons. These tonnages are within the capacity of the entrance channel. Thus if no more than the 18 inner harbour berths are to be operated, little or no change to the existing channel movement and method of ship change-over need to be contemplated. But if port extensions upriver are visualised providing more berths with a capacity greater than 4,000,000 (s) tons, and involving more ship moves through the entrance each day, the existing entrance channel and its method of operation will need special examination and possible modification. Beyond 8,000,000 (s) tons per year duplication of the entrance will be necessary.

So if there are more than 4,000,000 tons, the channel will have to be modified. Col. Tydeman says that the existing maximum tonnage is capable of increase, with improvements, to 4,000,000 tons. With an alteration in the mechanisation of the wharf and with new sheds, I believe that could be done, because up to 3,000,000 tons has been accommodated. When the 4,000,000 tons stage is reached, the question has to be asked as to what modifications are necessary with regard to the entrance to the harbour.

Col. Tydeman says that there may have to be a modification. The capacity can be brought to 4,000,000 tons, with improvements; with the No. 10 berth, to 4,200,000 tons; and with the two other berths available if the bridge were put alongside the present railway bridge, another 400,000 tons could be accommodated. That would give us a 4,600,000-ton port instead of one of between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 tons as at present. In paragraph 35 on page 21 of vol. 1, Col. Tydeman says—

Whatever scheme is adopted must provide sufficient land to operate the berths efficiently, and not repeat the serious restrictions in land area now extant.

He goes on to say—

Development seawards suffers from no restriction of land, would cause lesser problems of cross-river communication, and impose no restriction on the number of berths possible. It thus offers to posterity an area for unlimited port expansion for all time. From the engineering and navigational standpoints seawards development schemes are possible.

Development seawards of the port, unrestricted in the matter of land area, will be more to the advantage of town planners than upstream development in congested and developed

areas, and where land resumption and considerable changes would have to take place.

The width of the existing waterway in the port, viz. 1,400 feet (and the existing narrow, curved harbour entrance), limits the general use of the port to ships of about 750 feet long in favourable wind and current conditions and with full tugbage requirements. Thus in upstream development, unless this stream width is increased in the existing inner harbour or a larger diameter turning basin created at the expense of many of the existing berths, ships of no greater size than at present will ever be able to use the inner port. If seawards expansion takes place there will be no difficulty in creating immediately a turning circle of sufficient size to admit the largest ships afloat today or likely to exist in the reasonable future. Thus seawards extension has an advantage in the matter of ship size.

Col. Tydeman warns us that if we adopt the upriver scheme we will never be able to handle any larger ships except at the expense of a couple of berths. I think that is an important statement. I now propose to read paragraph 85 of vol. 2 as follows:—

There are many instances past and present where problems of cross-river communication versus port development have reached an impasse. In the Port of London, the necessity of maintaining continuously usable navigable waterways in the past has brought about the construction of many cross-river tunnels for rail, road and conduit traffic. The depth of these was governed by economic and engineering considerations of the past. Today these structures restrict deepening of the river beyond certain limits, and will continue to restrict navigational development until their useful life has been served. The cost of such tunnels is high, the Liverpool four-lane traffic tunnel under the River Mersey, for example, cost about £5,500,000 sterling. Today, on the River Tyne, a tunnel is being proposed as essential for cross-river land traffic to meet present and future town conditions, but is only possible from the engineering aspect, of being constructed at a certain depth. This depth will restrict further deepening of the navigable channel for port improvement, and the port authorities are strenuously opposing the scheme. Thus, if cross-river communications are not considered in all aspects, particularly for the future, the provision of costly permanent cross-river structures may be handing to posterity costly, difficult, and perhaps insoluble problems.

I read that paragraph because I have heard it suggested that instead of having a bridge we should construct a tunnel under the river. It has been seriously suggested that a tunnel would be better than another bridge. The paragraph continues—

Thus river crossing of an expensive type will always be required downstream of wherever the first low-level bridge, shipping obstruction is sited. For this reason it does not matter within certain limits where the low-level bridges are sited now, i.e., either on the present sites, or upstream at Point Brown as proposed in the Stilleman and Gibb scheme; the major future problem of high-level bridges or tunnels further downstream will always remain for posterity to settle as best it can. From the standpoint purely of cross-river communication problems, existing bridge sites can remain where they are.

In paragraph 210 Col. Tydeman points out that at present there are two berths in the harbour which can be used for only a portion of the year, whereas if an outer harbour were established at the entrance of the river, it would provide some protection for them. This paragraph states—

Two berths, A and B at the South Quay, are stated to be untenable for two months of the year to certain classes of ships only, due to swell and surge entering the Inner Harbour entrance in stormy weather. This permits of a maximum efficiency of 98 per cent. and is represented in the 26.4 per cent. figure. Its effect will not be felt until Fremantle becomes a full and busy port. Improvement can be effected to these two berths if required, by considerable expenditure in extending the existing breakwaters. Seeing that the return will be a very small increase in efficiency, it is unlikely that such expenditure would be embarked on in that particular form. Seaward extension schemes in the future, however, if decided upon, could be adaptable for providing adequate protection for these two berths.

If the outer harbour were there, it would provide considerable protection for these berths, and they could be used the same as any others. Paragraph 120 of the report states—

The existing waterway of 1,400ft. maximum, used as a turning basin for swinging ships, has only a net width of 1,100ft., when ships are berthed at the North and South Quays. This is suitable for:—

- (a) 750ft. ships in calm quiescent water and wind conditions with little current, and with adequate tugbage.

- (b) 550ft. ships in river flood conditions or with much wind, and with adequate tuggage.

If North and South Berths were clear or cleared of ships for the purpose of handling a large ship the sizes above could be increased to about 800ft. and 625ft. respectively. For very special occasions, dependent on favourable weather, these lengths might be slightly bettered; for regular callers, however, they are maximum.

The Inner Harbour curved entrance, only 450ft. wide, is not suitable in the normal course for ships of more than 750ft. long. Ships of this length when leaving South Quay berths are limited to berths far enough from the curved entrance channel to enable them to negotiate it under weigh, and when entering have to do so at such speed that the Inner Harbour waterway is barely long enough.

Further down we find this—

If regular calling ships of greater length than 750ft. are contemplated, either seawards extension of the port will be essential for providing larger turning circles, or the entrance channel must be widened at great cost, and the inner harbour amended to accommodate a larger turning circle, at considerable expense and the loss of three berths.

Furthermore, if we go upstream we do not get the outer harbour, and I point out that the ships are getting larger. That is what the authorities tell us. If the ships have a greater length than 750ft., it will be essential to provide a larger turning circle or for the entrance of the harbour to be wider. The ships will not become smaller, but bigger. Even the tankers are twice the size they used to be. The engineers have promised us that if we go outside they can accommodate the largest ships afloat as they have everything there that is necessary for a perfect harbour. I come now to paragraph 135 which states—

The inner harbour (shown on Appendix 16) is constructed within the mouth of the Swan River, the banks of which are projected seawards in the form of two protecting breakwaters. These two breakwaters provide secondary sea protection to the inner harbour. The North or Main Mole or Breakwater, projecting south-westerly at the root and westerly at the seawards end, protects the inner harbour entrance from all heavy seas from north to north-west. The South or Lee Mole or Breakwater projects westward and protects the entrance from southerly

swell created by the ten mile fetch from Rockingham. The two Breakwaters also protect the inner harbour entrance from north and south coastal sand movement which experience since construction of the breakwater has indicated as small and local and creating no serious harbour problems. The secondary protection of the breakwaters and the primary protection of the outer reefs and islands offer complete inner harbour protection, except for westerly swell created by the six mile fetch from the reefs, and for north-west heavy waves deflected round the end of the main breakwater, which make a clear run up the inner harbour entrance and, by deflection again, up the main inner channel. This swell has the effect of preventing usage of berths A and B on the south bank adjacent to the inner harbour entrance for about two months of the year. Future seawards extension schemes could incorporate features to protect the existing entrance from these occasional adverse swells.

This is another reason for going seawards. Paragraph 164 has this to say—

If port extensions are ever undertaken seawards where there will be more space, special, more remote oil berths near the entrance can be allocated for tankers, without endangering port structures, cargoes, and shipping as at present.

I understand that although we will shortly have a refinery, tankers will still come into the harbour and be berthed in the same way as they are now. We need only have a bit of an accident with these tankers and up will go the port in smoke. Paragraph 166 has some bearing on the matter—

The use of one berth for the discharge of inflammable oils in an enclosed waterway and constructed port area, containing many ships and much valuable cargo and port property, as is now the practice at No. 1 berth, North Quay, is dangerous. There is no alternative except anchoring tankers in Gage Roads at buoys and pumping the oil ashore via submerged pipe lines. This is common practice elsewhere, but has disadvantages of fair weather operation, and of not having the more convenient use of an alongside berth. It is not suggested that this method should be adopted at Fremantle, except that such arrangement might prove to be a necessity for all-round safety of shipping, cargoes and port during any future war. One accident to a tanker just inside the entrance to the port might put the port out of commission for years.

Lower down the paragraph continues—

The use of No. 1 berth for inflammable oils will have to continue until distant future seaward extension of the port takes place, and a more remote and isolated berth can be allocated for the purpose. Until such time, other than the provision of special precautions such as exist, and proper fire-fighting equipment, no other arrangement seems practicable.

There we are told how dangerous this is. In paragraph 167 Col. Tydeman has this to say—

The close proximity of bulk storage installations to the port area where an enclosed waterway berths up to 18 ships, needs consideration in relation to war risk. Some of the tankage is on high ground. Damaged tanks and fire bunds under bombardment would constitute a grave hazard to the whole port and its contents. Large storage installations under war conditions would be better sited further away. Future policy on leasing adjacent areas should take this into account. The use of buoys and submerged pipe line in war time would remove tankers from the port area.

I am told that the No. 1 berth will still be available for the tankers which will be coming in, although not in such great numbers. Here is a newspaper report cabled from New York—

Four men were dead and ten were missing today after the Great Lakes cargo steamship *Penobscot* (6,500 tons) and an oil barge had collided in Buffalo harbour last night.

The barge, which was carrying 800,000 gallons of petrol, exploded, spewing flames over a tug which was towing it, and the *Penobscot*. All three vessels blazed from stern to stern.

The master of the *Penobscot* (Capt. Louis Guyette), who was 51, and his helmsman, Roy Richardson (56), were burnt to death in their flaming pilot house after backing the ship away from the barge. Of the other two known dead, one was on the barge and one on the tug.

I have read this newspaper cutting to point out the dangers in connection with this matter. We have only one boat, and it is looked on as "the pilot's nightmare." On one occasion the engines failed and the boat finished up 6ft. off a tanker. Had it hit the tanker, Fremantle might not be the place it is today. The whole town would have been alight had that ship gone up in the harbour.

Next, I wish to deal with the Gibb report of 1929. Members will recall that Sir Alexander Gibb came out here to report on the Stileman scheme. He agreed with Mr. Stileman about going up north

to Point Brown—what he called the up-river scheme—but he never mentioned anything about going to the bridges. Although there was some talk about it, he evidently had no time for the idea. Under the heading, "Proposed Extension to Seaward of Existing Harbour," he has this to say—

If all further extensions could be made in this direction, namely, on the north or south foreshores outside and seaward of the present harbour, it would avoid interference with the existing bridges over the harbour and the necessity of extensive alterations of railways. The ground on which the walls would be built is better than in the upper harbour, the railway connections can be provided at a minimum expense, and the whole working of the harbour would be centralised in a compact area, which is a consideration of the greatest importance.

Further on in the report we find this—

We propose that the railway bridge across the river should have spans of 80 feet between centres of piers, carried generally on piled foundations, with a clear waterway of about 70 feet, and a headway through the opening of 35 feet at highwater. An elevation of the type of bridge we suggest is shown on Drawing No. 4 attached hereto, the deck of which would be formed with plate girders on top of which the railway tracks would be carried.

They told us they did not know anything about it, but in 1929 Sir Alexander Gibb had evidently heard enough to make him believe that extra foundations would be required. The report goes on—

This type of construction is an economical one, but the bridge would of necessity be costly to construct owing to the depth to which the foundations would require to be carried.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Before the tea suspension I was pointing out that even as far back as 1929, Sir Alexander Gibb, who was then visiting this State to report on the Fremantle harbour extensions for the first time, told us the foundations would have to be deep. Paragraph 84 of Sir Alexander Gibb's 1929 report reads as follows:—

As regards the construction of the proposed outer harbour the experience gained in the construction and maintenance of the existing north mole shows that the necessary protection can be obtained with a rubble mound of relatively cheap type, formed with stone and granite obtained locally.

Some people seem to think that we must open up great quarries in the hills and bring down granite to Fremantle to

build the breakwaters. However, that is not so. The existing breakwaters were constructed of limestone taken from the Buckland Hill quarry with small granite tips on the side. That completes that phase.

In paragraph 181, page 85, vol. 2 of his report, Col. Tydeman says this—

Costs today of these schemes are roughly three times as originally estimated. This is due mainly to various important items apparently having been omitted in the original estimates, and to the considerable increase in cost of materials and labour over the last 25 years.

From these figures the following inferences may be drawn:—

- (a) Upstream development is more expensive than seawards development when the whole scheme is considered, but in initial stages is cheaper and therefore preferable.

It is just as well for members to realise that many statements are made to the effect that it is more expensive to proceed with extensions outside the harbour than inside, but this is not correct. We should not consider extending the harbour upstream merely because the work is going to be a little cheaper in the first place. We must look to the ultimate construction as a whole and plan well ahead. We should not consider only the near future merely for the sake of a few shillings or pounds. The paragraph continues—

- (b) There is virtually no difference in cost between major upstream development and major seawards development.

Economics of upstream versus seawards development will thus not weigh heavily in deciding on the location of development in the future, except that upstream development initially is the cheaper.

Later on, I will point out where Mr. Meyer stated that there was no difference.

Paragraph 292 of vol. 2 of the Tydeman report deals with defence planning and it reads—

No steps have been taken whatsoever in the proposed ultimate development scheme to incorporate any measure of defence.

A port is always vulnerable in wartime, either from land, sea or air. There are many lessons gained from the recent war, but their usefulness of incorporation is only apparent in wartime and they may serve to cause inefficiencies in peacetime port operation.

Obvious matters are those such as; having one narrow entrance, the blockage of which by peacetime accident or war accident could put the port out of action for months or years; or of encircling the port with

inflammable oil tank farms on high ground from which flaming oil could flow gravitationally to ships in the port. Other matters are the introduction of naval facilities into a commercial port, or siting a large target such as a dry-dock adjacent to commercial berths.

At least one of these points is under the purview of defence authorities. It is not known, however, how defence planning is likely to affect future port lay-out.

I will now quote paragraph 191 in vol. 2 of the Tydeman report which is fairly important. It reads—

If the existing railway bridge is removed and re-sited near the present road bridge, seven more berths only can be constructed (see Appendix 27). If both road and rail bridges are re-sited at Point Brown, 11 more berths are possible (see Appendix 23). This latter can be considered as a practical maximum of upriver development. On the other hand seawards extension is unlimited in area, as well as offering favourable land transport approaches.

Here, I wish to emphasise that Col. Tydeman has pointed out that if the existing railway bridge is removed and re-sited near the present road bridge, seven more berths only can be constructed; but the practical maximum of upriver development can be achieved if both road and rail bridges are re-sited at Point Brown. He has also pointed out that, on the other hand, seawards extension is unlimited in area. This paragraph continues as follows:—

Thus, disregarding capital cost, extension seawards in the vicinity of the Swan River mouth is the most rational, providing not only immediate needs, but unlimited adequate space for the port requirements of posterity.

When engineers who disregard capital cost consider that extension seaward is the most rational course to follow, which way do you think that we should go, Sir? I think that we should go in the direction which is considered the most rational.

Col. Tydeman has made an important point there. In paragraph 277, vol. 2 of his report, he says this—

Flexibility of Scheme:

The ultimate development scheme now proposed is flexible enough to take into consideration many important factors of policy including—

- (a) The need for improving the existing facilities before providing new berths, and requiring more land mainly for improved rail facilities. This necessitates the use of land

which, to avoid the dislocation and expense of resumption, is best created on undeveloped foreshore.

The undeveloped foreshore will not be up-river; it will be the foreshore south of the river entrance. Continuing—

- (b) The possibility that decision may be made in favour of seawards extension either before or after, or instead of, up-river extension.
- (c) The possibility of decision in favour of either seawards extension north or south of the river, or both together, or neither.
- (d) That although Railways consider the hinterland rail approach will be north of the river, it may in future be from the south, or both.

It is time we did something in regard to the south-of-the-river railway. We have talked about it long enough. Two or three proposals have been mooted, but all of them have been dropped. The concluding part of paragraph 277 reads—

Port development on the lines of the ultimate scheme, either separately north or south of the Swan River, or both together, is possible as dictated by considerations of trade centre, township development, municipal or political reasons.

There it is. We can have what we like. There is not much difference between either of them. Col. Tydeman thinks that they are very important points. I would emphasise that if the railway is taken south of the river, the trade centre is there already and the furthest the port would be from the Fremantle township would not be much more than a mile. We would certainly be in the middle of the trade centre at that point.

Mr. Meyer was commissioned to visit this State and report on the Tydeman scheme. I will now quote a few of his remarks. At page 4 of his report, Appendix "B," he said—

Briefly then, seawards development to the north of the existing entrance is not seen by me to have any advantages—

That was the proposal for the outer harbour to the north of the breakwaters. Continuing—

such as would warrant the creation of new interests and the sacrifice of existing ones to which it would no doubt have a tendency.

I have noticed, on reading through the history of the Fremantle harbour, that Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, the original engineer, used exactly the same words as those. Whether Mr. Meyer was aware of that

fact or not, I do not know, but it is coincidental that he used the same words as Mr. O'Connor. Continuing—

Certainly it would, as development extended northerly, create communication problems and introduce port operational difficulties that would not attend on development along the coast immediately to the south of the existing entrance.

That is where we want it. I will do all I can to see that it goes there. A man cannot do more than his best, and I promise that I will do my best. Continuing to quote from Mr. Meyer's report—

As already mentioned, the fact that the south side presents a relatively well sheltered area is the paramount consideration, but I have found that there are a number of attendant considerations. One such is the development of the south and south-west which is the only region in Western Australia south of the tropics of reasonably high rainfall capable of maintaining a high density of population. It has been estimated that this region, including the metropolitan area, has water resources sufficient for the needs of a population of approximately 3,750,000 and I have no doubt that some day the area will be peopled to this extent.

Hon. C. F. J. North: What is that? South of the river?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: No, he says—

This region, including the metropolitan area—

That is south and south-west.

—has water resources sufficient for the needs of a population of approximately 3,750,000—

That is, in the Great Southern and the South-West of the State.

—and I have no doubt that some day the area will be peopled to this extent. Certainly the Government's developmental undertakings in this southern region encourage the belief that its ultimate potentialities will, in the fullness of time, be realised, and each person settled can be expected, in an overall way, to lead to an increase in the State's maritime trade of five tons or more per annum. Presumably a good deal of this south-westerly region will continue to be served by the Port of Fremantle, and this and the metropolitan area are likely to be the parts of the port's hinterland which will contribute most to its future trade.

In the next column he goes on to say—

I certainly find myself in accord with those who believe that rail access to Fremantle alternative to that through Perth will be a future necessity, and I venture to suggest that it

would be very timely at this juncture for the Government to decide upon at least a future connection between Midland Junction and Fremantle by way of the south side.

I think most of us will agree with that statement. Continuing—

A possible route entering Fremantle from the direction of Robbs Jetty is contemplated in the plans "A" and "B" attached hereto, of a proposal for a south side Outer Harbour on lines that appeal to me, which I offer for consideration as a long-term project for the "Seaward" extension of the Port of Fremantle.

At the bottom of this same column, which appears on page 5, he said—

In any event, whether the pilot plan for the Outer Harbour development be that offered by me or some other, I strongly urge that Outer Harbour development should be on the south side rather than on the north. If this issue can be resolved now and in favour of south side development, any well balanced plan of development will involve a considerable work of reclamation between the Fish Haven and, say, Robbs Jetty and it appeals to me that that is a work that might advantageously be embarked upon in the comparatively near future.

Now that is the portion of the harbour that has been alluded to as the outer harbour. Fifteen miles south of Fremantle we get into the distant harbour, not, as it is usually referred to, the outer harbour. The report goes on—

I am loth to contemplate the persistence for all time of the sorry handicap that the existing railway yards in rear of Victoria Quay imposes upon the functioning of wharves on the south side of the existing Inner Harbour. All the area occupied by those yards is properly necessary for port purposes, and having regard to the enduring benefit that would accrue to the port by endowing its south side wharves with proper depth of wharf premises, I have no compunction whatever in recommending that the railway yards be moved elsewhere and that the land vacated, right back to Beach-st., be made over to the Harbour Trust for port purposes. Failing any other, my suggestion is that if reclamation south of the Fishermen's Jetty be decided upon and commenced more or less forthwith, the railway yards might be moved to the south side ocean frontage as soon as there is sufficient reclamation completed to accommodate them. If the removal of the railway yards could be contemplated within a reasonable period of years, there could be a much more advantageous arrangement of wharf

supporting elements at South Quay than is possible with the crippling restrictions of inadequate depth of wharf premises.

Further on, he says—

Such an outer harbour as I have proposed would be a good harbour. It would have a common entrance with the Inner Harbour which would be kept open and clear by the ebb flow of the river, and would be reasonably comfortable for vessels berthed therein from whatever quarter the weather might come. Whilst, on a rough estimate based on the unit figures employed by Mr. Tydeman (re p. 162, Vol. 11 of Tydeman Report) the cost—berth for berth—of an 11-berth instalment would compare quite favourably with the cost of upstream development.

Where does the £9,000,000 come in for the provisions of breakwaters, as mentioned by the Minister for Works, when Mr. Meyer tells us that the cost, berth for berth, of an 11-berth instalment would compare quite favourably with the cost of upstream development?

The Minister for Works: Where would we get the 11 berths?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN This engineer said we could get 11 berths, but later on we were told that only seven berths could be built. Today we have been told that the number is five, not the 11 or seven as previously mentioned. These berths will be built right up to the same spot at the traffic bridge.

Mr. May: What, in your opinion, is the number which can be constructed?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: No more than five berths can be built there. There is insufficient land and insufficient space for layout to enable more to be built. With the space available on the south side, there is sufficient accommodation for two berths; there is sufficient space on the other side for three, making a total of five. Mr. Meyer said that the cost of 11 berths would compare favourably with the cost of upstream development. We find that it is intended to go upstream instead of developing the outer harbour, and there is no sense in that at all.

I have a few words to say on pollution of the Swan River. I have left this subject till the last, but it is by no means the least important. The Swan River will be polluted if extension takes place upstream. In that river we have a wonderful heritage and we have a duty to preserve it. We should pass it on to posterity in a good condition. As a matter of fact, it has already been polluted to some extent. Our job is to see that it is polluted no further. We should see that the river is cleaned of existing pollution.

All Governments in the past have neglected to clean the Swan River and rid it of pollution. They have not bothered about the heritage we possess in the river. With the several ships carrying 1,500 passengers in each, berthed alongside the traffic bridge, all emptying their sewage into the river, a great deal of pollution will be caused. Lately shiploads of migrants have been berthed in the harbour, and the resultant sewage all emptied into it.

The time has arrived to deal with pollution of the river and to clean it up. If it is polluted any further, Freshwater Bay might be correctly named Stinker Bay, and the member for Claremont would represent Stinker Bay. Perhaps Nedlands will be called Smelly Nedlands. We must take steps to avoid this. I can just imagine what would happen in Freshwater Bay and Nedlands if upstream development takes place. I am also fearful of what would happen to people living at North Fremantle and what would happen to the Bicton swimming club.

I do not represent the territory in which that club is located, but many of my family swim there. I am justly entitled to protect them. The time has arrived when the authorities must be told by the public that they must lay their hands off the river and not permit more sewage to enter it. The Bicton pool would not be suitable for swimming if ships were to go upstream. It is amusing to hear people referring to these spots in the river as pools, where swimming clubs have been formed. They are portions of the Swan River.

It has been said that the under-water weir at the railway bridge is an obstruction which does not allow the river to be flushed out into the sea; but if it is removed before any steps have been taken to dredge the river out, I pity the Fremantle harbour, because all the sand will be discharged into that harbour.

Mr. Hearman: What would be the effect of pollution on the hot pool in Dalkeith?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It may be affected. Make no mistake about that. I do not know what effect the hot water would have on sewage. Perhaps it might kill some of the microbes. The railway bridge is said to be an obstruction which prevents the outward flow of water. By looking at an aerial photograph, one can see what lies in that area. Whilst it prevents the outflow of water, it will also prevent to a certain extent the inward flow of the river. Col. Tydeman referred to this in paragraph 103, page 39, vol. 2 of his report. He said—

River Pollution.—This report offers no contribution to this problem, which is outside its scope, except to state certain relevant facts.

Pollution of the Swan River occurs from many sources, including natural surface drainage, sullage, industrial waste, marine growths, sewage from ships and port labour at Fremantle, and sewage from river craft and other sources adjacent to the river.

Pollution may be caused by river flow transporting solids and depositing them on the banks, or by stagnation, which is an important factor and is indicative of minor or no river flow. It is a condition of affairs occurring for the greater part of the year, during the dry seasons.

Tidal flows in the river are small throughout the year (except at such local restrictions as the Fremantle road and rail bridges) and will remain as existing whether port extension works are created upstream or not, contributing thereby in passive manner to the stagnation factor. River flood flow would be improved in flushing value by river deepening and straightening works downstream at the port and by the bridge removals.

Port expansion might result in more sewage in the river from ships and port labour if more ships use the port. Sewage ex ships is always likely to be present and must be accepted if a major port is to remain in the vicinity, as also must be the possibility of floating coal dust, oil film, etc. Sewage from port labour might be eliminated. It is contended, however, that with the vast volume of water in the Inner Harbour existing sewage is comparatively small in quantity and is absorbed and diluted before being gradually carried upstream, if at all, by tidal influence or the trend of summer inland flow. Widening and deepening the river adjacently for port works would increase the existing huge volume of water.

He said the sewage might be diluted, but the health authorities express the opinion that it was not diluted and not so long ago they stopped people swimming in the river because of the sewage from ships.

Mr. Meyer had this to say on the subject—

The reasons for this inland trend of flow are interesting, but I have no occasion to treat of them here, except to say that, for their bearing on the question at issue, I have considered them carefully and conclude that throughout the dry season there is, and always has been since there has been a harbour, a continual drift through Freshwater Bay to more upstream compartments of the river, of sea-water that, in the course of a number of tidal oscillations, has made a passage through the harbour before finally

clearing for upstream, and has received a full share of all that is discharged into the harbour from ships.

This is predominantly sewage matter, and the amount of such matter that, in the course of a single tide, might be discharged into the harbour when it is fully occupied, is by no means inconsiderable when considered in terms of undiluted raw sewage.

It would be lovely for people who have to swim in raw, undiluted sewage from the harbour. Further on he says—

As to physical pollution by way of flotsam cast into the harbour in contravention of Harbour Trust regulations, the possibility of flood tidal current, as traced from the harbour, extending well into Freshwater Bay, introduces the possibility of floating material, holding to the thread of the stream, finding its way into the Bay and fetching up on the beaches thereof, so that if the harbour be extended upstream as proposed, there will be occasion for special precautions to ensure against this nuisance occurring. Physical pollution of this kind can be controlled by vigilant policing and drastic penalties for any and all who infringe the regulations prohibiting the casting of waste matter into the harbour, and I have no doubt that the Harbour Trust could be relied upon to take all such steps as may be necessary to ensure against any physical pollution accruing to Freshwater Bay as a result of the upstream extension of the harbour.

The special precautions to be taken if the harbour is extended upstream are to prevent sewage from entering the river, into Freshwater Bay, Nedlands and swimming pools. I do not think the Harbour Trust will be able to stop sewage from going upstream, once it is in the river. Further on, he said—

I have been informed by creditable citizens that Freshwater Bay was clean right up until 1926, since when there has been a gradual but persistent increase of the algae nuisance in that area. It might of course have been the case that it was in the normal course of events that algae should reach into Freshwater Bay in 1926, but on the other hand it might be no coincidence that the submerged weir at the railway bridge (which since I knew of its existence has been suspect by me as an ill-influence on upstream conditions) was placed in that year.

It might well be that prior to the placing of that obstruction, Freshwater Bay, by reason of current and better circulation generally, was not a favourable environment for algae.

Of course, it was not put there in 1926. Three lots of stonework were put there, the first 40 or more years ago, and another

lot between that and 1926. More might have been put there after the washaway at the railway bridge, so Mr. Meyer's information on that point was bad.

Recently we have had an epidemic of poliomyelitis. This complaint always occurs in the dry season and it is in the dry season that people go swimming. They do not go swimming in wintertime when the river is full of fresh water.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: People contract polio in places where there are no swimming facilities at all.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: That is so, and paralysis occurs inland, possibly carried there by some germ. What do the doctors say—

Swimming pools were always contaminated by bathers. This was the principal reason for the cancellation of swimming classes, Public Health Commissioner Dr. Linley Hensell said today. It had been definitely established that poliomyelitis was largely a faecal disease and every effort should be made to prevent any contamination from faeces, he said.

On looking up the dictionary, I find that "faeces" means excreta or dung. If dung gets into the river from swimmers and is so dangerous that the river should not be used for swimming, what would happen if the harbour were extended and thousands of people on boats were emptying their bowels into the river? It is of no use doctors telling us that swimmers might cause polio and that bacteria will not be present when the excreta from thousands of people on ships is being emptied into the river. I think that is an exaggeration on the part of the doctors. People who go swimming are not guilty of that sort of thing because it would be a danger to themselves as well as to others. On a ship, there might be as many as 1,500 passengers, to say nothing of the crew, from which excreta would be discharged into the river—this would apply both day and night—and doctors talk about bacteriological self-purification! The river should be kept clean and passed on to posterity as we received it. The newspaper item continued—

Examination over a period, both in this and other countries, had proved the presence of B-coli in pools and waters used by swimmers—especially in non-tidal waters.

I shall have something to say about B-coli presently.

This came partly from animals, but also to some extent from human contamination, and it was certain that some of the faeces of swimmers got into the water. When poliomyelitis was prevalent, this was a possible means of spreading the virus.

A secondary reason for cancelling the classes was that if a child was incubating polio, any strenuous exertion might cause severe paralysis.

A month later, Public Health Commissioner Henzell again warned people to be scrupulously clean while poliomyelitis was so prevalent. He went on to say—

The need for observance of even the simplest rules of hygiene could not be too strongly stressed. Inquiries made to the Public Health Department had shown that there was uncertainty in the minds of people concerning the meaning of the expression "faecal contamination." "Faeces" means excrement or the motion from the bowels. The following points were offered to make matters clearer:—

The virus which caused poliomyelitis was present in the bowel of the person infected. It was estimated that there could be up to 100 people infected for every case showing signs of the disease. The virus was excreted in the motions from the bowel.

The contamination of the hands and hence food could not be obvious or visible. The hands could appear to be clean and yet be contaminated. Similarly, it had been found that swimming pools were invariably contaminated with faeces by the bathers themselves.

Hence the warning to people that they must be scrupulously careful in washing hands after visiting the toilet and before handling food, and that they must avoid the use of swimming pools and non-tidal waters for bathing.

So it appears that doctors think that if people go swimming, say, in the Bletton Pool, they may suffer contamination through the presence of faeces from some of the swimmers. Yet thousands of people on a ship below the traffic bridge are not going to cause any trouble at all! This bacteriological self-purification is going to clean up everything! Another Press statement was at follows:—

Dr. J. A. R. Miles, a leading Adelaide specialist on poliomyelitis, said in Perth yesterday that he thought a high incidence of polio could be expected in this State for two or three months. This period will cover the Royal visit, which is only five weeks away.

It was not yet possible to say how many cases there would be or how long this epidemic would last, Dr. Miles said. During the two days he had been here, he had been able to discuss the polio outbreak with the medical officers concerned from both clinical and public aspects.

Poliomyelitis epidemics usually started in the later summer—

I should like members to take note of that. When there is no fresh water coming down the river, sewage is moving up the river and contamination is taking place. In the winter, the fresh water comes down and makes the river sweeter and cleaner by the time summer sets in—

Poliomyelitis epidemics usually started in the late summer, reached a peak in the early autumn and died away again in the winter although sometimes, as in the last Western Australian epidemic, there might be peaks at other times of the year.

The main difficulty in combating a polio epidemic arose because most people infected with the virus showed no symptoms of the disease. However, they could pass the infection to someone else without ever realising that they had had the disease.

I have here a picture published in "The West Australian" of the 22nd April, 1952, showing Point Walter as it was 30 years ago, and a picture taken in the previous week looking from the shore. The one picture shows the once clean sand covered with weed and the children replaced by seagulls finding a harvest of marine life. There we have the contrast. Thirty years ago Point Walter had a beautiful clean beach where people could go and enjoy themselves swimming, and now it is just a rotten stinking mess.

Here is a newspaper picture of portion of the harbour showing fruit and vegetable scraps, bottles, tins, pieces of wood, grease and oil scum seen floating beside a ship at Victoria Quay, Fremantle. This was one of a number of similar patches noticed by a staff photographer, who took the picture at 1 p.m. The condition of the water was unchanged at 3 p.m.

Hon. C. F. J. North: Is that coming from the harbour?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Of course! It was not there 30 or 25 years ago. I used to go crabbing there 25 years ago, and the beach was beautifully clean, but now it is a rotten stinking mess.

Now I come to Como which used to be a nice clean place, but nowadays is not anything like as clean. A picture I have shows that at low tide in the river one afternoon a thick bank of rotting algae was exposed on the beach near the jetty. Other patches of algae, stranded by the receding tide, partly covered the exposed sandbanks in shallow water.

Mr. Ackland: Would not that have been caused by the Burswood filter beds?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It may have been partly caused in that way, but we now have a Burswood at the other end of the river. There is no treatment of the sewage

at Fremantle as there was at Burswood. Undiluted sewage is tipped into the river from boats carrying thousands of people, thus causing a nuisance that ought to be stopped. I say that if we permit this to continue and an epidemic of polio occurs, members will be responsible, and so this serious aspect ought to be considered.

Another picture shows the member for Fremantle holding a dish containing an onion, tomatoes, celery, swede and peeled lemons collected from the river bank at Keane's Point. They are samples of refuse first seen floating in a large patch of oil off Preston Point bank at 9.30 a.m. and they reached Freshwater Bay, about three miles away, three hours later. If my memory serves me rightly, I rang the Minister for Works and told him to have a look at our beautiful river and see what he thought of it. I think he did look at it.

Here I have a photograph of the Claremont jetty with plenty of algae showing around it. If the member for Claremont wishes to see it, he may do so. We hear a lot about the Sydney harbour but that, too, is being similarly affected. A newspaper item states—

Without its harbour, Sydney would be just a sprawling, untidy and uncomfortable city. As things are, the foreshores give depressing evidence of civic indifference to the opportunities afforded by Providence.

In the last 50 years, the lawns and trees which were a delightful feature of the North Shore, have been removed. Their place has been taken by blocks of flats distinguished by a complete lack of architectural dignity. This is an offence which cannot be corrected now, but something can be done to check pollution of the harbour water—a problem which is worldwide and growing more menacing with the increasing use of oil by ships.

Harbour authorities are not indifferent to this danger. The master of a Swedish tanker was fined £60 and costs and £25 and costs respectively for two offences—for having allowed oil to escape into the waters of the port, and for having neglected to take all precautions to contain the oil in as small an area as possible and to collect and make it as harmless as possible in the circumstances.

In Woolloomooloo there are public baths which would make the miracle of walking on the water almost possible.

It must be pretty thick if it is now possible to do what was once considered to be an impossibility.

Fortunately, the clean surfing beaches on the ocean fronts provide alternatives for the thousands who dislike bathing in oil, cabbage stalks and other refuse from ships at berth.

I have shown that a lot of pollution is taking place and that something must be done to prevent any more of it going up the river.

I do not profess to be a chemist, but I wish to say something about B-coli. It is very difficult for me to reconcile certain statements that have been made. On the 27th November, 1951, in answer to a request by me, a report was laid on the Table of the House. The statement was in a covering letter from the director in which he stated that the traffic bridge was free from B-coli, but that 5,000 organisms had been found alongside the "Moreton Bay" at four feet and the same at the traffic bridge. I should like the Minister to explain what happened to the B-coli. How did they sort themselves out and remain in the harbour? The organisms went up, but the B-coli was absent at the traffic bridge. If any Minister can explain that matter to me, I shall be grateful. Page 5 of the report says—

It is evident from the results that the source of the organisms is from the effluent of ships.

Then as weed fertilising agents, on page 5 of the report, are mentioned chemicals such as ammonia and phosphorus. Did these all remain in the harbour? In "The West Australian" of the 12th September, 1951, there appeared the following:—

The motion on Fremantle harbour policy submitted by Mr. Sleeman warrants the Legislative Assembly's earnest and objective consideration. What is done at Fremantle will have an influence beyond the State's major port for perhaps a century. Fundamentally, the choice between river and ocean is not an engineering problem. Nearly every engineer who has looked at the harbour has envisaged seaward extensions at some stage and of the 62 new berths in Mr. Tydeman's ultimate scheme only 11 would be built on the Swan.

On the grounds that these 11 berths would be relatively cheap and easy to construct, the Government proposes to obliterate a "sizeable portion" of North Fremantle, to drive the harbour deeper into the Fremantle region, to jeopardise the efficiency and value of a southern railway approach to the port, to divert Stirling Highway and the Perth-Fremantle railway.

Further on it says—

If the Swan is to be made a cleaner and purer stream than it is today it would be safer not to put any more ships on its waters.

Yet again—

There is, of course, no immediate need for new berths. Extensive improvements to the existing harbour,

plus one new berth, will provide a respite for some years. The Government's need for haste arises because the present railway bridge has only a limited life and if the harbour is to go upstream the new bridge must provide room for expansion.

Then—

The Government has taken a too-narrow view of the harbour question and has failed to make allowance for the changes in world affairs since Mr. Tydeman's report was presented. It cannot be certain now that it could build 11 upstream berths more quickly than seaward extensions.

In "The West Australian" of the 18th June, 1951, appeared the following:—

The State Government could fairly claim that before the initial survey work for the Tydeman scheme of port development at Fremantle was started ample time was allowed for full public discussion of the arguments for and against up-river extensions. The opportunity was not ignored but, unfortunately, most of the criticism to date has been concerned with the likely effect of more river berths on an already polluted Swan River. Consequently, other implications of the scheme have been given less consideration. That is not to say that the pollution question is unimportant. It is supremely important and, rightly or wrongly, many citizens sincerely believe that more ships in the river will mean more pollution.

In his report Mr. Tydeman wrote: "Development seawards suffers from no restriction of land, would cause lesser problems of cross-river communication, and impose no restriction on the number of berths possible . . . From the engineering and navigational standpoints seawards development schemes are possible." He added that they would be more to the advantage of townplanners than upstream extensions in congested and developed areas.

Next we see—

So much is at stake that the Government would be well advised to think again before it commits itself irrevocably to a policy which will certainly make it more difficult to abate the railway nuisance in the metropolitan area, which will involve costly and probably very protracted bridge building, which will inevitably add to congestion in Fremantle and which will necessitate large-scale resumptions in the built-up areas of North Fremantle. An outbreak of war would immediately dry up all steel supplies and leave the State's major port in semi-chaos indefinitely. Seeing that the Government is willing

ultimately to go outside the harbour, are all the risks, including that of pollution, worth 11 river berths?

Then in "The Sunday Times" of the 1st August, 1954, we have the following:—

I am glad to note that North Fremantle ratepayers have registered their protest against any extension of big shipping up the river. During the past 50 years a number of attempts have been made to encroach on the Swan, but fortunately the good sense of the governments of the day have resisted them. I hope that good sense will still prevail. The river has not yet recovered from the unpleasant experience of the Burswood filter beds and anything that could cause even a small degree of pollution should be emphatically discouraged. Nothing can replace the asset nature has given us.

I think I have said sufficient, and I hope I have convinced members that this House should not agree to the harbour being expanded upstream or to the erection of a temporary wooden structure carrying three lines of rails over the river, as that would completely blockade the river if the proposal were agreed to. I assume that that is what the Government intends to do, and I think I have given good reasons for my assumption. In conclusion, I trust that the motion will be carried and that the harbour will never be allowed to extend any further up-river so that pollution of the river may be stopped for all time.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

MOTION—ELECTRICITY FROM SOLAR ENERGY.

As to Utilisation to Increase Amenities.

HON. C. F. J. NORTH (Claremont) [8.20]: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I desire to alter the last portion of the motion by striking out all words after the word "recommends" and inserting in lieu the words "that the Minister for Industrial Development should examine to what extent the sun's rays can be used to increase the amenities in this State."

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to allow the hon. member to alter his motion in the way suggested unless some member objects. As no member has raised any objection I advise the hon. member to move his motion in the altered form.

HON. C. F. J. NORTH: I move—

That this House records its conviction that the way to improve the standard of living will be best achieved by the fullest use of our power resources and towards this end recommends that the Minister for Industrial Development examine to what extent the sun's rays can be used to increase amenities in this State.

My reason for moving the motion in this form is that, as originally worded, it might have been said by some to conflict with the fact that at the present time the State Electricity Commission has a loan on the market, and the motion is not intended in any way to suggest rivalry with the S.E.C. This is largely a new subject in this House. It was raised only once before, many years ago, on an occasion when members sitting in their places, suddenly heard the voice of the Whip say, "Keep this going for another three-quarters of an hour." It was in those circumstances that I referred to this subject, but with perhaps more levity than will be the case tonight.

Times have moved on and our scientists have made great progress. The stage has been reached when there is a lot to be said in favour of investigating the possibilities of this new source of power for Western Australia. Years ago, long before the first atom bomb fell upon Japan, it was my duty and pleasure to advocate in this House a search for uranium in this State. Of course, we do not yet know whether the uranium present in this State is of sufficiently high grade to make it economically workable, but at all events, in the meantime the Premier of South Australia has been able to exploit the uranium resources of that State in quite a big way.

There is no reason why we, in Western Australia, where there is so much sunshine and such a vast expanse of territory, should not use this more novel method of obtaining the power we require. I will bring forward three or four matters to show the House what progress has already been made in this direction.

Hon. L. Thorn: Will this do away with the use of coal?

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH: No, it will be only an auxiliary method of producing power and will probably be used in areas far outside the reach of copper wires. The House might be interested to know that in the Pyrenees in the south of France there is an electricity generating plant deriving its power from the sun, but in that instance the older method is used, the sun's rays being concentrated by means of reflectors on to a boiler which produces the steam to drive the generators.

We read in the Press recently a report that the Bell Telephone Co. in America is now operating many of its country lines by means of an apparatus using silicon rods or strips which, under the influence of the sun's rays, produce the current, in lieu of batteries, to operate the telephones. That may be considered a small instance of the use of this source of power, and not worthy of the interest of this House, but at the end of the information given to the public at that time through the Press, we were told that the inventor of the ap-

paratus had stated that 30,000 kilowatts of current could be obtained from an installation covering about six acres of land.

Surely that is something which cannot be ignored in a State where the sun shines as constantly as it does here, and I am convinced that that information should be of interest to the Minister for Industrial Development. Before touching on a local matter, I might mention that I contacted Canberra, over the week-end, to obtain the opinion of Professor Oliphant, of the National University, a leading world expert on nuclear physics. I thought that from him I would get an unbiased opinion. In reply to my query, he said, "Sunshine may be used economically to cool houses in hot climates and to distil salt or brackish water." That opinion, as it stands, is worth millions of pounds to this State.

The whole of our territory, apart from the coastal fringe, experiences terrific heat during many months of the year and the consequent conditions in the homes of the people constitute a tremendous burden to women folk. If it is possible as Professor Oliphant said, to utilise the rays of the sun to cool the houses, that would be a great boon to this State, and something that this House should surely not ignore. Following Professor Oliphant's opinion I would quote the remarks of an Indian expert who was here the other day. I have here a Press cutting, which is headed "Sun's Rays Used to Cook Food." This refers to India and I know that at Rough Range they can cook eggs on the ground; they do not need to use a stone. This Press cutting, from "The West Australian" of the 21st August, 1954, reads—

Solar energy is being used for cooking at the National Physics Laboratory of India at New Delhi.

Professor H. J. Bhabha, world-famed physicist, told the Science Congress this yesterday.

Woman power was plentiful in India, said Professor Bhabha, and in the Indian villages cooking by the sun's rays would mean a substantial economic saving.

For cooking the women were using for fuel horse and cattle manure which would now be liberated for fertiliser.

Now we come to the point referred to by Professor Oliphant and supported by this report from India. The cutting goes on—

Power could be derived in India from the sun's rays to operate air conditioning plant for, say, a flat with a floor space of 100 square yards.

Next we come to the key part of the question, and this matches the story that we read in our history books about Mr. Watt looking at the steam coming out of a kettle. This cutting reads—

One kilowatt of energy was embodied in one square yard of tropical sunshine.

To air condition a flat of 100 square yards would require $7\frac{1}{2}$ kilowatts.

He then goes on to mention certain percentages, but I will not weary members with that information because we are not engineers. We have his statement that they can air-condition flats in India and that one kilowatt of energy is embodied in one square yard of tropical sunshine.

I will now refer back to the Bell Telephone Co. of America. I mentioned previously that that company was using the sun to carry out certain work in the country districts, and I said that the inventor concerned in that project worked out a larger plant of 30,000 kilowatts on the six acres of ground. In the uninhabited portions of our State, where there is plenty of sunshine every day, and where there are thousands of acres to spare, we could erect an enormous plant to supply electricity for this area. We could obtain it, if this inventor is correct, from the humble product of silicon, which is nothing else than glorified sand. It is one of the most common elements on earth.

Now I come to a local matter. When this question was announced in the Press I received some information from people in electorates on both sides of mine—one at Cottesloe and one in Nedlands. The person in the Cottesloe electorate pointed out that he holds the patents from the British Electricity Commission which operates enormous wind power machines, in addition to their coal plants, to raise current.

Members may also have read recently that the S.E.C. in South Australia has already adopted the use of windmills to increase their supply of electric power. We all realise that that State has not as much coal as we have here and it requires, if possible, some other means of producing electricity.

The fact remains that these matters can no longer be treated from the scientific angle alone; they are becoming practical. The person in Nedlands has, in co-operation with the C.S.I.R.O. at Melbourne, placed on the market a device for heating water by the rays of the sun. This article is now on sale in the metropolitan area and is in the hands of the architects of Western Australia. It is the same size as a 50-gallon copper and 75 per cent. of the hot water supplied is heated by the sun and, consequently, free.

Only 25 per cent. of the hot water used is heated by electric current. During the winter months when there is no sun, electricity has to be used. If a person purchases one of these machines, he has to pay for heating only a quarter of the hot water he uses. So we have a new power in our midst, and as yet it has not been used to any great extent. The question

now arises as to whether the Government should do anything about it, or whether we should leave it to private enterprise.

I thought the Department of Industrial Development was instituted for the purpose of starting new industries in Western Australia. If it is possible to make power available for an enormous area of the State—an area that will never see copper wires or electricity from the State Electricity Commission—by means of the sun, it would prove of enormous benefit to the State. The department should endeavour to find out if my assertions are true and should check with India, our local inventors, Professor Oliphant of the National University, and many other people who are interested in this subject, to see if it is possible to use the sun's rays for the provision of service and power. The Minister might encourage his staff to interest themselves in this matter and perhaps approach certain manufacturers to produce what might be necessary to start such a scheme moving in the outer parts of the State. People in these areas should be given an opportunity to obtain the same benefits that people in the metropolitan area already enjoy.

We have all read various authorities discussing the question of de-salting sea water and I asked a question about it last session. I was told that nothing of any practical significance had been achieved in this direction. We know that America is spending hundreds of millions of pounds on this project with the idea of opening up places like the Sahara Desert, and the wastes of America. Professor Oliphant has a practical proposition to distil water on an economical scale by means of the rays of the sun. We have large areas of undeveloped land in our North and only recently a motion was passed in this House dealing with that part of the State. We have nearly half a million square miles which are unused assets of this State, and so far little has been done about them. The former member for Swan, Mr. Grayden, has visited that area in his jeep, but, in my opinion, it is time something practical was done for this area.

The only way we can accomplish anything is to provide plenty of fresh water and the most economical way to do it is to de-salt the water from the ocean by means of the sun. We have no better Minister than the present Minister for Industrial Development to look into this question. Surely the day will come when it will be taken up, and we have definite proof that work on this question is proceeding in other countries. Men of great ability are tackling the problem. The present means of supplying electricity will not be affected because the use of the sun will be largely confined to parts of the State that are never likely to receive, over copper wires, good State Electricity Commission current.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

MOTION—BASIC WAGE.*As to Cost of Living Adjustments.*

Debate resumed from the 1st September on the following motion by Mr. Brady:—

That in the opinion of this House wage and salary-earners and their dependants, by being deprived of all "cost of living" adjustments are being called upon to bear more than their fair share of whatever burden it might be necessary for the community as a whole to carry to maintain economic stability.

to which Hon. Sir Ross McLarty had moved the following amendment:—

That all the words after the word "House" in line 1 be struck out with a view to inserting in lieu the words "the failure of the Government to accept the April 1954 proposition of the Legislative Council in connection with rents and tenancies legislation and its failure to ensure ample supplies of meat has resulted in an unnecessary increase in the cost of living."

MR. MOIR (Boulder—on amendment) [8.42]: I rise to support the original motion and to speak against the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I consider that salary-earners and their dependants, by being deprived of all cost of living adjustments, are being called upon to bear more than their fair share in an effort to stabilise the economy of the State. The freezing of the basic wage in 1953 has imposed a burden on a section of the people least able to bear it. That burden bears particularly heavily on workers in this State compared with workers in other States of the Commonwealth who are also called upon to shoulder this burden—but to a far lesser extent than workers in this State.

The Federal basic wage in the States of the Commonwealth is as follows:—

| | £ | s. | d. |
|-------------------|----|----|----|
| New South Wales | 12 | 13 | 0 |
| Victoria | 11 | 15 | 0 |
| South Australia | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| Queensland | 10 | 18 | 0 |
| Tasmania | 12 | 2 | 0 |
| Western Australia | 11 | 16 | 0 |

Since that action was taken by the Federal court and followed by the State court, we find various movements have taken place in the cost of living index in the different States, which leaves the workers in Western Australia at a very particular disadvantage when we realise that over the quarters September, 1953, December, 1953, March, 1954 and June, 1954, with the fluctuations in the cost of living in the various States, there has been an increase in Tasmania of 5s. per week, in Queensland 4s. per week, in South Australia 3s.

a week, in Victoria 1s. a week, in New South Wales 1s. a week and in Western Australia 19s. a week.

Accordingly we see that on a Federal basis the workers in this State are 18s. a week worse off than the workers in New South Wales; the same amount as compared with the workers of Victoria; 16s. a week worse off than the workers in South Australia; 15s. a week worse off than those in Queensland and 14s. a week worse off than the workers in Tasmania. In reverse, of course, that means that the workers in those States are that much better of than the workers in Western Australia. Through not receiving the quarterly adjustment to the basic wage, I consider that the workers in this State have been placed in a very bad position as compared with the workers in other States.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Did you refer to the Federal award or to the State award?

Mr. MOIR: I referred to the Federal award.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You are discussing the Federal award in Western Australia, are you?

Mr. MOIR: I am discussing the Federal basic wage.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: In Western Australia.

Mr. MOIR: I am speaking to the motion and am referring to the Federal basic wage at the moment. I am endeavouring to point out at just how great a disadvantage the worker in this State is, on a Federal basis, compared with the worker in each of the other States. It is true that quite a large number of the workers in this State work under State awards. Of course those awards are based on the State basic wage; and there is some difference between that and the Federal basic wage for the State. I was very interested in the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking to the motion. I was particularly interested in his reference to the goldmining industry. He implied that the goldmining industry could not bear any added cost by way of increases in the basic wage brought about by quarterly adjustments on account of the cost of living.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you think the Big Bell mine could?

Mr. MOIR: I do not wish to pick out an individual mine. The member for Mt. Lawley is picking out one particular mine; I wish to deal with the industry as a whole.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The Big Bell mine constitutes the whole of the town.

Mr. MOIR: I want to deal with the industry as a whole. After all, we do not shackle the workers of the State to a wage

that can be paid by the poorest run business in the State, or to the one that is in the most trouble. No doubt there must be quite a few industries from time to time that have their difficulties.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You would not say the Big Bell mine was badly run.

Mr. MOIR: Even if the evidence were put before it, the Arbitration Court would not base its findings on one or two industries that happened to be in trouble. We must look at industry as a whole. I have taken out some figures and I am sorry that the member for Moore is not in his seat.

The Premier: He will be back in a moment.

Mr. MOIR: I am sorry the hon. member is not in his seat because he seems to have a phobia about workers in general. He seems to think that they do not pull their weight in industry, and from his remarks one would conclude that the workers should receive very little consideration.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: That is not a fair construction, surely.

Mr. MOIR: Ever since I have been in this Chamber, I have listened to the member for Moore and he never fails, when he gets on to any industrial question, to throw into the discussion the fact that if workers would only produce more for the country, that would get us out of the trouble in no time at all.

Mr. May: He said from the Commissioner of Railways down to the office boy; he did not exclude anybody.

Mr. MOIR: Like everybody else, I know exactly what the views of the member for Moore are when he discusses the workers of this State. I am more thoroughly conversant with the workers in the gold-mining industry than with those elsewhere in the State. I feel I can speak with some authority on the goldmining industry, and for the people who work in that industry. The figures I am about to quote are very illuminating.

In 1939 when there were 14,961 men employed in the industry they produced 4,095,257 tons of ore, or 273 tons per man. The dividends paid amounted to £80 per man. In 1946 when 6,917 men were employed in the industry they produced 2,194,477 tons of ore which was 317 tons per man, the dividend per man being £103. In 1950 7,048 men employed in the industry produced 2,463,423 tons of ore or 349 tons per man, and the dividends disbursed represented £169 per man. In 1953, 6,329 men employed produced 3,169,875 tons of ore, equal to 500 tons per man and the dividends represented £227 per man employed. Thus in the course of a few years dividends increased from £80 to £227 per man employed and the production from 273 to 500 tons per man.

I think that indicates a pretty fair effort and is irrefutable evidence that the workers in the industry certainly pull their weight and do a thoroughly good job. It can be readily seen that the shareholders in those mining companies are doing very well indeed. These figures are not some that I have conjured up; they have been extracted from the annual report of the Chamber of Mines submitted at the meeting in June, 1954. The figures are available for any member who desires to peruse them. As far as the mining industry is concerned, the figures should silence for all time the question whether the workers have increased their production.

Now what is the reward those workers receive? A freezing of the basic wage! They are being called upon to bear a burden that other sections of the community are not being asked to carry. Consider commerce and industry: Has there ever been a time in the history of the State when the people have done half as well? They certainly have never done better. Whether we consider businesses, industries or primary producers—

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Some primary producers are not doing too well at present.

Mr. MOIR: They are probably not doing so well as they were two or three years ago, but it cannot be claimed that they are not doing well.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Their market is very doubtful.

Mr. MOIR: It is a matter of degree. I was talking to a primary producer the other day, a man who was a neighbour of mine when I was a primary producer, and was discussing the season with him. He said, "I am not greatly worried about the season. The good years we have had make things far different from the conditions when you were battling on the farm, because failure then was a serious matter, but today it is not of such great consequence. It does not mean that you are put right flat on the ground."

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: There was a good leading article in "The West Australian" this morning. Did you read it?

The Premier: Now the Leader of the Opposition will get it.

Mr. MOIR: It cannot be denied that we are enjoying a great era of prosperity. Difficulties may be experienced by the Government and by private individuals, but the overall picture shows that the State is prosperous. Why on earth a section of the people should be called upon to shoulder a burden which no other section of the community is asked to bear is beyond me.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do not a majority of the people today get the basic increases if they are available?

The Premier: No one is getting them.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I get them.

Mr. MOIR: Nobody is getting them.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: We all get them.

Mr. MOIR: The increases are not being made available. The basic wage is based on the cost of living—a fair and equitable amount to permit of a worker, his wife and two children, living in reasonable comfort. When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, he referred to the fact that the Commonwealth Government allowed certain taxation deductions, and asserted that this action on the part of the Commonwealth was going to be of great assistance to the workers.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: When I said that, I was replying to the member for Guildford-Midland.

Mr. MOIR: When we talk about the basic wage we speak largely about the man with a wife and two children. Let us see what relief has been given to him. Far more relief has been given—this may surprise the Leader of the Opposition—to the single man than has been given to the married man with dependants. Take the man on £600—and the basic wage is just a little more than £600. A single man on £600 has been given relief to the extent of £4 7s.

The Premier: For what period

Mr. MOIR: That is the decrease for the whole year. The married man on £600 has been given relief to the magnificent extent of £1 16s. a year.

The Premier: Fantastic!

Mr. MOIR: The single man on £800 has been given relief to the extent of £7 14s., and the married man to the extent of £3 12s., which is not half.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I think the increased allowances were given for increased responsibility in regard to wife and children.

Mr. MOIR: It is no different. The single man on £1,000 a year is given relief amounting to £11 1s., which is not even £1 a month, and the married man is given relief amounting to £6 14s. This sum would not buy many clothes for the children. The assertion by the Leader of the Opposition that relief has been given and that the basic wage earner is that much better off, just will not bear investigation. The basic wage in the metropolitan area is £12 6s. 6d., and on the Goldfields it is £12 9s. 4d. The basic wage in the metropolitan area includes an amount of £1 16s. for rent. I wonder where one could rent a fair average quality four to five-roomed house, as laid down in the regimen, for that amount. No such house in the metropolitan area would be available at that rental.

Mr. May: You would not get it for double that rent.

Mr. MOIR: Of course not. I know a person who is living in a substandard house—in normal times it would probably be condemned—and he is relieved to be charged

only £2 5s. a week. I would say that the average worker pays between £3 10s. to £4 5s. a week in rent. So we can easily realise that the £1 16s., which is allowed for this item, is not sufficient. Owing to legislative action taken in this State, price control no longer exists here so that there is no brake at all on prices, with the result that the retailer and the wholesaler can charge whatever they think they can get.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Do you think there has been any steep increase in these prices; or any increase at all?

Mr. MOIR: There has been an increase in the price of meat.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Yes.

Mr. MOIR: There was increase in other items.

Mr. Lawrence: What about the price of tea?

Mr. MOIR: We have not felt the impact of that as far as the basic wage or the "C" series figures are concerned. It will be felt at the end of this quarter. I know by the interjection of the Leader of the Opposition that he is implying that the increase in rents would be the major factor in the increased cost of living index. Last September there was an increase of 4s. per week, and another of 4s. in March before the impact of the rise in rents was felt. I want members to understand that I am quoting Federal figures. There have been increases in respects to various items, and not just rent and meat. One does not see increases in respect of various items, when price control is lifted in buoyant times such as we are passing through at present, the cost of living must increase because, as I have said, the retailer and the wholesaler can sell their goods to the public at whatever prices they consider they can get.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Clothing has not increased at all.

Mr. MOIR: I would say it has.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It has not, according to the statistics.

Mr. MOIR: I must bow to the statistics, but I do know that in purchasing clothing I have found some items are down a little while other necessary items, are up quite a lot.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: What is the proportion of the cost of labour in those things?

The Minister for Railways: It is about 8 per cent. on the average.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: No.

Mr. MOIR: I have not got those figures, but no doubt the hon. member has them.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Yes, I took the trouble to look them up.

Mr. MOIR: The member for Mt. Lawley, I expect, will supply us with them before the debate closes. One does not, however,

have to give oneself a headache delving into figures to realise that a grave injustice is being done the workers of this State.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you not think this is an economic problem?

Mr. MOIR: I suppose we always have economic problems. I have had one all my life, but I say that by the action we have taken we have done nothing to solve the economic problem or to ease the burden on the people.

Mr. Lawrence: Neither has the member for Mt. Lawley.

The Premier: It is an economic problem for the working-class families who have been deprived of the cost of living increase.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Are you sure it would have been of any great benefit to them.

The Premier: Of course it would.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Of course it might!

Mr. MOIR: I would say that the hon. member would be about the worst judge in Western Australia as to whether this was an economic problem.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The Premier and I agree on most things.

Mr. MOIR: I do not think the member for Mt. Lawley has ever had to live on the basic wage. I am sure that if he had to try to do that today he would prove a dismal failure and, if still in this Chamber, would probably soon have ideas different from those he at present holds. It is all very well just to take an academic interest and argue the pros and cons of a question such as this, but if one moves among the people who are endeavouring to rear their families on the basic wage, one sees at first-hand the severe difficulties with which they are confronted. If there is insufficient money to go round, somebody must go short. By that I do not mean that the butcher, baker or greengrocer does not get what is due to him, but that the members of the family concerned go short.

It is absolutely unjust that the workers should be called upon to bear the whole of this burden while other sections of the community shoulder none of it but are, in fact, even more prosperous today than they were in the past. We have only to peruse any newspaper at the end of a financial year in order to see the handsome profits made by the various companies, whether domiciled in this State or in some other part of the Commonwealth and selling their products here. Only the other day in "The West Australian" appeared a report relating to Hearn Industries, in which it was stated that the company had had a record year. There we read—

The net profit of Hearn Industries for the year ended June 30th, 1954, was a record £25,754 after tax provi-

sion of £12,613. This compares with the figure of £16,825 the year before after tax provision of £10,454.

We see there that something in the vicinity of £9,000 more profit was made by that company for the year ended the 30th June last than for the previous year—and so it goes on.

Hon. D. Brand: Does that not indicate that more furniture is being sold?

Mr. MOIR: Yes, and also that the worker is producing more, but is receiving a poor reward. We have heard time and time again in this House, from members opposite, that we would soon get out of our troubles if only the worker would produce more, but I say he is producing more—there is evidence of it on every side—but what reward does he get for that?

Mr. Hutchinson: To increase the basic wage would increase the inflationary trend.

Mr. MOIR: We could talk for a long time about that.

The Premier: Even the member for Nedlands could not swallow that one.

Mr. MOIR: I would point out to the hon. member that here we are dealing with people whose remuneration is fixed by the law.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you number yourself among them?

Mr. MOIR: Other sections of the community practically fix their own remuneration and do not have to go to the court to find out what profit they can make or what dividend or increase in salary they are to receive, yet the worker has to do that.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you classify yourself as a worker?

Mr. MOIR: I venture to suggest that I have done a lot more work than the hon. member has.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I doubt that.

Mr. MOIR: I would say also that the industry in which I worked and the production for which I was responsible, amounted to far more and were of far greater value to the economy of this State than any production for which the member for Mt. Lawley has ever been responsible.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I very much doubt that.

The Premier: The member for Mt. Lawley lied with his chin that time.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I would classify you as a worker and want to know whether you classify yourself as such.

Mr. MOIR: I would say I am a frustrated worker.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: All right, so long as you are a worker.

Mr. MOIR: I try to get things done in this House, but because there are other members with views similar to those of the member for Mt. Lawley, my time here is largely wasted.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Never say that!

Mr. MOIR: I am dealing with the plight of people who can do little to improve their position unless they break the law of the land and decide that they will not work and will not produce, for a period. Personally, I would not blame them if they did that.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Of course, it would be very foolish of them.

Mr. MOIR: It might be. I was never a believer in that type of action, although I can understand it. During my working life I tried always to achieve justice for the worker by other means because I realised that a cessation of work would probably hurt the worker more than anybody else. Surely members realise that the worker feels frustrated when he is called upon to bear a burden which other members of the community are able to evade, and a burden for which I gravely doubt there is any justification, particularly when we see other sections of the community prospering and living like decent human beings, while the worker has his nose to the grindstone all the time. I think the majority of men on the basic wage have to watch their budgets closely and are able to have little entertainment or enjoyment of life unless they are willing to do less than justice to their families. I do not think the worker is receiving sufficient reward for his labour or a fair share of what is produced in return for his efforts.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: How do you know?

Mr. MOIR: That is my opinion and I venture to suggest it is as good as that of the hon. member and perhaps even better, as I believe he does a lot of guessing. I am totally opposed to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and I am fully in accord with the motion as moved by the member for Guildford-Midland.

MR. WILD (Dale—on amendment) [9.20]: When he moved the motion the other evening, the member for Guildford-Midland said that he deplored the fact that salary-earners and their dependants were being deprived of all cost of living adjustments, and in endeavouring to bolster up his argument he travelled all over the place. When I looked through his speech, I must confess that I found it difficult to pin it down to any one particular point. I do not doubt the hon. member's sincerity. He is a socialist and he will

get up and admit it. I admire him for that. But the other evening—while he always does claim the attention of this House—he struck me as speaking as if he were down on the Esplanade on a Sunday afternoon, or, if we were in Sydney, as if he were on the Domain, because he went on with all the claptrap that we hear about companies making big profits at the expense of the downtrodden worker.

Mr. Brady: We will hear some sense from you in a minute.

Mr. WILD: The first thing about the hon. member's speech that struck me was that he talked about an industrial upheaval that would shortly take place. That is not the sort of thing the member for Guildford-Midland would have said if he had given it a little reasoned thought, because I am certain he does not believe in direct action. He is, I hope, a believer in industrial arbitration.

Mr. Lawrence: Did not the hon. member say it could happen? He did not say it would happen.

Mr. WILD: He discussed the Arbitration Court judgment and said he considered the workers were justly entitled to an increase. He instanced rent and meat price increases, among a multitude of other things.

Mr. Brady: Those are the two that President Jackson mentioned.

Mr. WILD: I want to confine my remarks to the rent side of the question. We have heard a lot in this House about what another place did at a conference in April, but I think it bears repetition. If the two representatives of the Government had been fair, and continued to be fair, in their utterances from their places on the other side of the Chamber, they would admit that in April last, at the all-day conference, if they had agreed to the wishes of the other members, and the wishes of the Deputy Premier—he begged his colleague over there to accept them—one of the major amendments passed this session would have been on the statute book in May of this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the hon. member to go on in that fashion. He cannot discuss a further amendment to the motion.

Mr. WILD: The member for Guildford-Midland, when moving his motion, indicated that rent was one of the items in dispute, so I wanted to tie up—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion has nothing to do with that. It is to the effect that in the opinion of this House wage and salary-earners and their dependants are bearing more than their due share of increased costs, whatever they may be.

Mr. WILD: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the member for Guildford-Midland in his argument—and it is in “Hansard”—referred to the failure of another place to allow rents to be controlled as being one of the causes of the hardship about which he is complaining. I am sorry if I have transgressed, but I wanted to discuss that point. What has the Government done to control rents?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member resume his seat. I cannot allow him to go on in this strain. He is now dealing with words which the Leader of the Opposition proposes to insert in lieu of those struck out, if the House agrees. But this motion deals with the fact that the worker and his dependants are called upon to bear an undue share of the cost of living increases, irrespective of their cause. If the hon. member cannot continue the debate on those lines, I shall have to prevent him from proceeding further with his remarks.

Mr. WILD: I take it that I am entitled to touch on the same points as the hon. member dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member wishes to do anything about it, he should move to disagree with my ruling. I will not allow him to go on in this strain. He cannot get around my ruling by arguing the point in that way.

Mr. WILD: Am I permitted to reply to the points raised by the member for Guildford-Midland?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot go on in that strain. He must either obey my instructions or move to disagree with my ruling. I will not allow him to enlarge on the rents and tenancies legislation in any form.

Mr. WILD: Very well, Mr. Speaker; I bow to your ruling. Might we for one moment touch on the profit angle which was raised by the hon. member? He discussed General Motors Holdens and the fact that that company had made a profit of £7,000,000, which he worked out at £120 a vehicle. This is an Australian industry. It is an industry in which a large amount of American capital is involved, and in the beginning a good deal of American machinery was flown to Victoria and South Australia. Because the company made a large profit this year—the hon. member said £120 a vehicle—does not mean that it all goes to shareholders. The company is doing a tremendous amount of good for this country and has provided work for about 5,000 or 6,000 people.

Mr. Brady: It has provided a lot of money for its shareholders.

Mr. WILD: I read the report to which the hon. member referred, and this company will plough back into the industry practically all the profits it made. This will increase employment and increase

prosperity for the good of everybody. The hon. member went on and named companies which were mentioned in “Rydge’s” journal, and he discussed one company in Western Australia. This was another occasion when I felt that the hon. member, if he had had time to think would not have spoken in the strain he did; he referred to Wunderlich’s and the products that firm was supposed to be sending to Western Australia. Last year, Wunderlich’s brought to Western Australia only £1,500 worth of goods, and they were of one type only—ornamental facades, such as we see in London Court.

He also touched on the question of married women being forced to go to work in order that their families could have a decent standard of living. We all know that married women go to work, but that is only a sign of the times. It is not a sign that families need extra money. We are living in the year 1954, and unfortunately—and I use the word advisedly—we are getting away from the old idea of family life which some of the members in this House knew. With the emancipation of women, they go out to work in the same way as do men. They earn 75 per cent. of the male basic wage, and in many instances get £10 and £12 a week. As a result, when they get married they do not like to give it up; they do not want to have children until they have been married for some years. In a way, I do not blame many of them for doing it because between the husband and wife £20 to £25 is coming into the home. The hon. member also said that people were putting money into ventures that are not reproductive. He got on to the question of oil and uranium speculation. He referred in the main to wheat and wool magnates and other wealthy people who subscribe all this money for the purchase of oil and uranium shares in Western Australia. I would suggest that he is making a big mistake. If he moved among the workers in this State he would find that many in the low income group are trying to buy oil and uranium shares in the same way as the wealthy wool and wheat men to whom he referred. Only recently I was travelling from Armadale to Kenwick and on the way I had a discussion with four people. I venture the opinion that every one of them, prior to the past twelve months, had never bought one share. One of them was a storekeeper, but the other three were working people, the same as myself. Members can laugh!

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Members on the other side are not the only people who work.

Mr. WILD: I have been on the basic wage in the same way as has the member for Boulder.

Mr. Moir: We are talking about now.

Mr. WILD: Like the hon. member, I rely on basic wage increases, too. It is the small people today who have this spare money which they are anxious to invest in something that will give them a profit.

Mr. May: To make up the shortage.

Mr. WILD: The hon. member also referred to oil company cartels and one or two other large companies. I think, for the first time in our lives, we have all come to realise the amount of money that must be invested in the discovery of oil before any return is gained. Although we know that only five or six of the oil companies virtually control all the oil in the world today, by the same token they have to get back a terrific amount of money in return for the capital they have ploughed into the industry. We know that in the north of our State hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent and possibly many more hundreds of thousands will be expended before the oil company will obtain any return. Are we to deny a fair return to these people who are prepared to invest their money in our State? It would be absolutely ridiculous if we did. There are members on both sides of this House who invest their money in various enterprises, and why do they do it?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Do not look at me!

Mr. WILD: They do so because they consider they might get a fair return for their outlay. The same applies to the oil companies. They have ploughed hundreds of thousands of pounds into this State in the hope that they will get a fair return. These things must start from somewhere, and before these companies strike oil, they will probably have expended an enormous amount of capital before they obtain any return. The member for Boulder has expressed his view on the question and I will now express mine, although I am not trying to tell the Arbitration Court what it should do. But if we continue as we have done in the past and do not call a halt, the day is very near when we will price ourselves completely out of court in regard to the sale of our primary products.

Mr. Moir: But why not spread the burden over everybody?

Mr. WILD: It is being spread over everybody. I will mention one or two building items in which the Minister for Housing will be interested. I obtained some figures in regard to two items today. I refer particularly to galvanised iron. The Minister knows that it is in short supply in this State at present. In March, 1955, we were able to land galvanised iron at Fremantle at a cost of £55 per ton.

The Minister for Housing: You are a little ahead with your dates.

Mr. WILD: I mean in March, 1953. At that time we were able to land it at £55 3s. 6d. a ton, but today it costs £85 2s.

a ton; an increase of 54½ per cent. In July, 1952, imported iron cost £192 10s. a ton, but today it has decreased to £125 a ton. So we find that the local product has risen from £55 a ton to £85 a ton, whereas imported iron has been reduced in price from £192 a ton to £125 a ton. The same thing applies to cement. The Minister for Housing knows that. The day is not far distant when we will price ourselves out of the market for the sale of these products and we will then be asking for a tariff wall to be imposed in order to keep out the imported article.

The Leader of the Opposition had the same thought when he referred to primary products. It is costing a great deal to produce our wheat, eggs, fruit and everything that we export. The primary producer is paying more and more for his commodities. We must still bear in mind that we are a primary producing State. When we cannot sell our wool and wheat, it will be time for us to shut up shop because the secondary industries that we have will not keep us going.

I suggest to members that it is time we took stock of the position. We have been gradually creating an upward spiral but have not had a corresponding upsurge in the sale of our products. Wool is an exception and the price of that now appears to be dropping. We have now reached the stage when we have difficulty in selling our primary products overseas. Therefore, it is impossible for primary production to carry any more burdens. When delivering his judgment in court the other day, Mr. Justice Jackson said that no evidence had been submitted by anyone—and he referred particularly to the Government's representative—to show that the economy of the State could stand this extra payment that was requested.

Housing is one activity that would be seriously affected by increased costs. If an increase in the basic wage had been granted, for every shilling rise allowed, £6 would be added to the cost of a house. I am sure that that information is correct, because I obtained it as a result of a question asked in this House. That means to say that if a rise of 13s. and some odd pence had been granted by the court the other day, the cost of a house would have risen by approximately £100. That, of course, would result in an increase in the rent charged, which would be followed in turn by another approach to the Arbitration Court for a further increase in the basic wage.

The Minister for Housing: Rents have risen in any case.

Mr. Jamieson: Rents have risen with the basic wage still pegged.

Mr. WILD: Unfortunately, Sir, I must bow to your ruling and refrain from referring to housing, but that is an aspect which I would have liked to have discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has had a great deal of latitude already.

Mr. WILD: I strongly support the amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition. I fail to understand the submissions of the member for Guildford-Midland, in that he considers the worker is being unjustly treated and that, in the opinion of this House, wage and salary-earners and their dependants, by being deprived of all cost of living adjustments, are being called upon to bear more than their fair share. As the member for Boulder has said, I submit that never before has this country enjoyed such prosperity. We are all prosperous. The hon. member mentioned Hearn Industries. He said that that concern had made greater profits than ever. Whom does the hon. member think bought the furniture? Does he imagine that Mr. Hearn bought it from Hearn Bros. and Stead?

Mr. Moir: It would not be the workers on the basic wage.

Mr. WILD: I would ask the hon. member to have a look at the savings banks accounts. Those accounts are not represented by the member for Collie, who has a wheat farm, or by the Minister for Health who has a store or two, or by members on this side who may have properties. Those savings banks accounts are representative of the small people and they have never had money like that before. I certainly oppose the motion submitted by the member for Guildford-Midland and support the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should inform the House that I have already notified the Leader of the Opposition that I am not prepared to accept the amendment which he proposes to insert. The amendment is irrelevant to the motion moved. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition has made up his mind or not as to what he desires. If he has not, we will have to wait upon his pleasure.

I would also advise the House at this stage that I have informed the Premier that the words he desires to insert in the next motion are, in my opinion, entirely irrelevant and that he will have to adopt some other means to obtain his desire.

On motion by Mr. O'Brien, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.43 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 9th September, 1954.

CONTENTS.

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Questions : Hospitals, as to nursing staff, York | 1521 |
| Railways, as to reorganisation of Perth-Wongan line services | 1521 |
| Road board areas, as to plans for local authorities | 1522 |
| Bills : Jury Act Amendment, 8r. | 1522 |
| Droving Act Amendment, 8r. | 1522 |
| Police Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r. | 1522 |
| Health Act Amendment, (No. 1) 1r. | 1524 |
| Land Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report | 1524 |
| State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2r., defeated | 1529 |
| Crown Suits Act Amendment, 2r. | 1537 |
| Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2r. | 1538 |

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

HOSPITALS.

As to Nursing Staff, York.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) What number of nursing staff are at present engaged at the York Hospital?

(2) What are the qualifications of each of the staff?

(3) Has there been any improvement in the qualifications of the staff since the reply given by the Minister to my questions on the 7th July?

(4) If the hospital is not staffed with the requisite qualified staff, will the Minister ensure that York is mentioned when calling for applications for staff additions to government hospitals?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) 8.

(2) 1 matron—double certificated; 7 nursing assistants—1 has 3½ years' experience, 1 has 3 years' experience, 1 has 18 months' experience, 4 have under 12 months' experience.

(3) No.

(4) York is always offered to applicants, and it will be mentioned in the next advertisement.

RAILWAYS.

As to Reorganisation of Perth-Wongan Line Services.

Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is it a fact that both bus and railway services from Perth, serving the Wongan-Mullewa line, have been, or are to be, reorganised?