

four male single-teachers) require accommodation this policy is not in any way restrictive. On those staffs where there are less than four females and/or four males then single teacher housing is going to be denied to either one or both groups. How many teachers this will affect only a detailed analysis of staffing in various schools would determine.

However, even if it affects only one school (and it does affect mine) it does not matter, because on a matter of principle it is an implied insult against the morals of single teachers.

The writer goes on to say that this policy by the housing authority in assuming the responsibility of dictating on the morals of teachers and passing judgment on them is a great inroad to the basic rights of teachers. It suggests that if men and women teachers are neighbours, then immorality will result.

I would like to ask the Minister: Am I correct in submitting that the Government housing authority is empowered by legislation from this Parliament to provide accommodation for teachers, but it has no mandate to nominate which teachers shall be the tenants, and it should have no mandate to pass judgment on the morals of teachers by providing that male and female shall not alternate in this proposed block of flats?

Finally, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Mitchell), I will touch on the question of the Commonwealth poultry levy and the proposed refunds which are expected to be made to growers. Before the coming into operation of this Act there were eight full-time poultry growers in the Kalgoorlie district. It is a fact that there are now only three growers.

This has been due to the imposition of the tax on people who were finding the continuance of this industry in a remote part of the State very difficult, even as it was, without having to pay the extra levy. The persons concerned, who are still continuing in the industry, have directed correspondence to the Egg Marketing Board and they have written to the Minister. So far they have received no satisfaction at all. Those people have been seeking details as to when refunds can be expected but, as I have said, they have received no satisfaction.

This afternoon I asked the Minister a question, but I did not receive any better answer than my constituents received. Tonight I heard the member for Pilbara say he had received an answer with which he was not satisfied, and that he did not know whether the Minister was satisfied or not. I cannot give the Minister that much credit, because I feel he was directly responsible. I understood the decision was to be arrived at from a discussion between the Minister and the Egg Marketing Board. If any decision was made the Minister

would have first-hand knowledge of it. My question to the Minister was as follows:—

- (1) Has a decision yet been made in regard to refunds to growers of Commonwealth poultry levy payments; if so, in what manner are refunds to be made?
- (2) If no decision has been made, when may this be reasonably expected?

The Minister replied—

- (1) No.
- (2) As soon as all relevant information has been collected.

I protest to the Minister on such a paltry reply—and I use the word "paltry" in this case. I would hope the Minister would treat a parliamentary question with dignity and on a much higher plane in future.

I do not wish to delay the House, but I would make brief comment on the position of my electorate in this year of 1967. Kalgoorlie is the centre of the goldmining industry in Western Australia and it looks to its past still with a great deal of pride. It looks to its future with optimism and confidence. However, we would like to feel that the Government of the day was as vigilant as ever in pressing for, and taking advantage of, any possibility of an increase in the price of gold. Nevertheless, we are enjoying a boom at the present time brought about by the discovery of nickel and we are certainly bathing in this glory. We feel that Kalgoorlie will be a bright spot on the map of Western Australia for many years to come.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

House adjourned at 10 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 10th August, 1967

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

QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE

EDUCATION

Kambalda: Provision of School

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that—
 - (a) forty children are attending Kalgoorlie schools from Kambalda, and it is expected that a further 60 will be of school age in 1968;
 - (b) a large housing programme is to be carried out, which will mean many more families arriving at Kambalda, and

- consequently many more children requiring schooling;
- (c) men to be employed at St. Ives may be residing at Kambalda;
 - (d) several international companies are searching for nickel, which, if successful, could mean further schooling requirements; and
 - (e) if a smelting plant is provided at Kambalda, a further large housing programme will be necessary with an increase of 150-250 men working there?

(2) If so, will the Minister—

- (a) give consideration to the provision of a school at Kambalda to be erected from the beginning of the 1968 school year, with adequate planning provided for playing and sporting activities, and provision made for the rapid expansion that can be expected in schooling facilities during the next few years; and
- (b) send a representative to Kambalda to meet the parents and discuss their problems, and ascertain all future requirements as can be seen at present for schooling of children in a rapidly growing town and district?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) Yes.
- (2) (a) The district superintendent is keeping in close touch with the project manager, Kambalda, on this matter. The situation is to be reviewed and a firm decision made before the end of 1967.
- (b) The district superintendent intends to visit Kambalda in the near future to discuss schooling problems with the parents.

2. *This question was postponed.*

ROADS

Kambalda-Kalgoorlie: Bituminising and School Bus Service

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Kambalda-Kalgoorlie road is in an extremely dangerous condition in many places owing to the very dusty nature of the road material and the very heavy volume of traffic using it, with visibility frequently at nil?

(2) Is he also aware that—

- (a) when 30 or more points of rain have fallen, the road is exceedingly slippery and soft, and has caused vehicles to slip off the road completely; others to become bogged; and some to overturn completely;
 - (b) the school bus conveying approximately 40 children to school has been bogged and near-bogged on numerous occasions;
 - (c) the bus has broken down on a number of occasions in the past two weeks, once arriving at Kambalda with the children after dark, and causing the parents very much concern;
 - (d) children arrive at school and return home in a filthy condition owing to the dust hazard in the bus due to faulty windows;
 - (e) the parents are worried and apprehensive of the coming months, and dread accidents occurring to their children whilst being conveyed to school owing to the very severe dust hazard that will exist, and the additional heavy traffic that will be using the road?
- (3) (a) As the safety of these school children is of paramount importance, does the Minister consider that the nature of the road surface complies with the school bus route conditions as required by the department?
- (b) If the replies to (1) and (2) are "Yes," will the Government—
- (i) give early and urgent consideration to the commencement of a bitumen sealing road programme on this road; and
 - (ii) insist that a school bus be provided of sufficient standard equipped to meet the extreme conditions that prevail in this area, and conform to the requirements of the Education Department's school bus service committee?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) to (3) (b) (i) It is a fact that sections of the Kambalda-Kalgoorlie road between Boulder and Wolluhar are in poor condition. The Main Roads Department has provided the local authority with funds for the maintenance of this section, but the running top has continued to deteriorate. How-

ever, the Main Roads Department has in hand firm proposals for the upgrading of this road. It is expected that this work will be commenced at an early date. Substantial improvement can be expected over the next few months.

- (3) (b) (ii) Following discussions in February with the management and parents at Kambalda, the Education Department agreed that a bus service should be operated for this year on a temporary basis only with buses supplied by the Eastern Goldfields Transport Board. The situation will be reviewed before the end of the year in the light of a decision as to whether a school is to be built at Kambalda for 1968.

SOUTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL *Additional Classrooms*

4. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the increase in home building in the vicinity of the South Kalgoorlie School?
- (2) Will the Government give consideration to the building of additional classrooms at this school to cope with the increasing number of children resulting from this development?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The position will be investigated and, if necessary, further classrooms provided.

NOISE IN INDUSTRY *Survey on Goldfields*

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

In relation to the reply to paragraph (f) of my question dated the 8th August, 1967, referring to the occupational noise and hearing loss survey in the goldfields, and as the information requested is available, will the Minister specifically state the decibel exposure or noise level that is available for the various occupations such as—

- (a) machine mining;
- (b) mechanical bogger driving;
- (c) scraper driving;
- (d) underground fans; and
- (e) various surface occupations?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) 115-123 decibels.
- (b) 99 decibels.
- (c) Not available.
- (d) 98-102 decibels.

- (e) Powerhouse—93-106 decibels.
Primary crusher—85-95 decibels.
Main crusher—94 decibels.
Machine shops—104-110 decibels.
Gold room furnace area—90 decibels.
Bore mills—92 decibels.
Drill grinding and sharpening shop—98 decibels.
Crushing mills general area—94 decibels.
These are levels from representative areas.

6. *This question was postponed.*

ROADS

Port Hedland-Broome; Expenditure and Maintenance

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

- (1) What is the amount of money proposed to be spent by the Main Roads Department on the main highway between Port Hedland and Broome in this financial year?
- (2) In the light of the serious condition of parts of this road—particularly the central section—which is causing serious hardship, inconvenience, and heavy costs to pastoralists, hauliers, and all users of the road, will the Minister take steps to ensure that—
 - (a) the road is put in good order as soon as possible; and
 - (b) adequate funds are made available this financial year to restore and maintain the road in reasonable condition?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) In the 1967-68 programme of works, the Main Roads Department has allocated \$282,000 for this road. This allocation includes \$40,000 for maintenance.
- (2) (a) Maintenance work will be carried out progressively during the year.
- (b) The funds allocated will generally be expended on the section between Tabba Tabba and Pardoo and between Wallal and Nita Downs. As part of this improvement work, major deviations are planned for both sections to make use of better road building country.

Wagin-Arthur; Reconstruction

8. The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Main Roads Department plans for completing the reconstruction of the Wagin-Arthur Road?

- (2) If so, when is this work likely to be completed?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) The Main Roads Department has no immediate plans for the full reconstruction of this road.

Although the sealed surface is only 16 ft. wide it is in reasonable condition and does not have a high priority in relation to the demand for road works in other parts of the State.

9. *This question was postponed.*

NOISE IN INDUSTRY

Survey among Farmers

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

With reference to my question on Tuesday, the 8th August, 1967, relating to a hearing survey among farmers—

- (1) Is the Minister aware of any survey being carried out by a private practitioner?
 (2) If so—
 (a) what is being done;
 (b) have any questionnaires been forwarded, or are such intended to be forwarded by the practitioner concerned; and

- (c) will priority be given to farmers in the Salmon Gums district?

- (3) If a questionnaire has been, or is being prepared for distribution, will the Minister table a copy for the information of the House?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (3) It is not appropriate that I should answer questions relating to the hearing survey conducted by a private practitioner, without first consulting him. This I am unable to do as at present he is abroad. To clarify the position, the Department of Public Health has been involved only in so far as help was sought in preparing the questionnaire.

HOUSING

Lower Central Province: Completions and Programme

11. The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many houses have been built by the State Housing Commission in each of the towns in the Lower Central Province during the period 1961-1967?
 (2) How many houses will be built during the present financial year, and in which towns?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Town	Built between 1/7/61 and 30/6/67						Under Construction 30/6/67			
	CSHA	WSH	SHA	GEHA	Other Depts.	Total	CSHA	GEHA	Other Depts.	Total
Broomehill	4				3	7	2			2
Collie					2	2				
Cuballing	2				2	2				
Darkan	2	1			6	9				
Duranillin				1		1				
Highbury			1			1				
Katanning	51	1		4	16	71				
Kojonup	22	1		2	5	30				
Narrogin	97	3	1	11	10	122			3	3
Pingelly	12	2			10	24	2	1	3	6
Popanyinning					1	1				
Wagin	39	1		3	10	53			3	3
Wickepin	6				2	8				
Williams	5	1		1	6	13	2		2	4
	240	10	2	22	70	344	6	1	11	18

- (2)
- | | |
|------------|---|
| Broomehill | 1 |
| Kojonup | 7 |
| Wagin | 8 |
| Wickepin | 2 |
| Williams | 2 |
- Includes 5 from 1966-67 programme.

VENEREAL DISEASES

Areas of Infection, and Notifications

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

With reference to the incidence of venereal disease in Western Australia—

- (1) Will the Minister indicate the pockets of infection of venereal disease, stating the various areas concerned for each of the previous five years?
- (2) Is it found that some medical practitioners fail to notify the Public Health Department forthwith about a person suffering from the infectious stage of venereal disease?
- (3) What is the average time lag from the infected person's first visit to a doctor to when the department is notified?
- (4) What follow-up methods are conducted by the department to find out the number of people who have had sexual intercourse with a venereal disease infected person?
- (5) Are the officers who do this follow-up work health inspectors or other classified persons in—
 - (a) the city area; and
 - (b) country areas?

The Hon. G. C. MACKINNON replied:

- (1) Notifications do not indicate any special "pockets of infection," but would not necessarily do so as different patients might attend different doctors.
- (2) It has not been "found" but it is possible that some infections are not reported.
- (3) Notifications testify that the practitioner has "this day attended for the first time . . ." the patient notified. The only apparent delay therefore is in the post.
- (4) When an infected person reports the names of his or her contacts, notices are served (either personally or by registered letter) on these contacts requiring them to seek medical examination and notify the outcome to the commissioner.
- (5) In the city area this work is—
 - (a) Carried out mainly by a "classified person" who is a qualified health inspector.
 - (b) In the nearer country towns the above also applies, but elsewhere notices are sent by registered letter.

RAPE AND ASSAULT CASES

Damages, and Evidence by Children

13. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What redress in law have women and children who may suffer mental or physical illness as a result of rape or assault by way of damages, compensation, or recovery of any costs?
- (2) Is it absolutely necessary for a child who is the victim of such an offence to personally appear in court to tender evidence—would not a signed affidavit be sufficient to meet the legal requirement?
- (3) If not, why not?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) They would have a remedy by action in a civil court against the offenders both for out-of-pocket expenses and for general damages. Actual recovery of amounts awarded by court judgments would depend upon the means of the offenders.
- (2) and (3) It would not be necessary for the child to appear in court where—
 - (a) the offender admits the offence; or
 - (b) the case against the offender (in a criminal court) or the case for the child (in a civil court) can be sufficiently proved by other witnesses without any evidence from the child.

Where the case is defended and cannot be sufficiently proved without evidence from the child, the child must personally attend the court and give evidence orally. An affidavit from the child would not be receivable in evidence. The reasons for the law in this regard are that the weight to be attached to the evidence of any witness is best assessed after seeing and hearing the witness and the testing of his evidence by cross-examination.

ROAD IN GRASS PATCH AREA

Improvement

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

As the road—a school bus route—that serves Fitzgerald location blocks numbered 1521 to 1526 in the Grass Patch area, becomes a quagmire after a rainfall of about 10 points, with the result that four school children are deprived of attending classes at Grass Patch, will the Government take the necessary action to ensure

that it is improved to the extent where other than tractor traffic may use the road?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The road to blocks numbered 1521 to 1526 is one of a system being developed by stage construction methods for access to new land settlement areas west of Grass Patch and Scaddan.

Since 1964, \$120,000 has been expended on roads in the area, much of it to provide for gravelling in heavy clay country.

On the current year's programme a further \$40,000 has been made available. Some of these funds will be expended on the connecting road between Grass Patch and blocks Nos. 1521 to 1526. The maintenance of these roads is essentially the responsibility of the local authority.

COOLGARDIE-ESPERANCE ROAD

Marking of Centre Line, and Widening of Crests

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

Further to my question on the 12th October, 1965, relating to the Coolgardie-Esperance road—

- (1) Has any further consideration been given by the Main Roads Department to the marking of white centre lines on this road?
- (2) If the reason for not doing so, as stated in the reply "that a hazard would be created" still prevails, is it not recognised by the department that a very serious hazard exists on this road, having only a 12 ft. wide seal, and which, in the opinion of motorists generally (particularly tourists from other areas), and interstate hauliers, would present an extremely less hazard if it had a white centre line?
- (3) Will the department give urgent consideration to the widening of all the crests on the road as a temporary measure to reduce the danger to some extent?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Main Roads Department is still firmly of the opinion that to centre line a 12 ft. wide seal would tend to create a hazardous situation.
- (3) Over the last few years a considerable number of crests and curves have been widened. On

the current year's programme further funds have been allocated to continue this work on the section north of Scaddan.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 9th August, on the following motion by the Hon. F. D. Willmott:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Speech he has been pleased to deliver to Parliament:—

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

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [2.53 p.m.]: Firstly, I wish to associate myself with the expressions which were so ably put forward by The Hon. F. D. Willmott in this House in moving the Address-in-Reply to the Speech made by His Excellency, the Governor. Also, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments which will be conveyed in a message to the Governor in appreciation of the Speech which he was pleased to deliver to this Parliament.

On the actual Speech I would like to make a few observations, but before doing so, as has been expressed by other members, I would also convey my regrets that our numbers at the opening of this session are not complete in that two of our members are absent through illness. I trust they will soon be restored to health and will be able to take their full and active part in the proceedings of this House.

I have heard it said that the Governor's Speech had nothing very inspiring in it. This was one comment which I noted. I think this just goes to show, perhaps, how difficult it is to hold people's interest for any length of time and how, perhaps, people can accept as mere commonplace some of the most mighty undertakings which the Commonwealth of Australia has witnessed in its entire history. It is difficult to hold their interest; and it is difficult for people to adjust their minds to these great happenings once that first flash of interest has, in fact, faded.

Certainly, I do appreciate that there are some who have a vested interest in belittling any of these activities for which this Government could justifiably claim some credit. Quite apart from that aspect, I believe it is a rather remarkable reflection on people that there are so many who are not prepared to be disturbed for too long from a somewhat cosy and placid existence, and who are content to see the

world go on about them without taking much of an active part in making contributions to what really are very mighty developments in this country.

In regard to all those others who do display some interest, I might also say that this surely speaks volumes for the mental capacity of the human mind that they are able to restore orderliness despite these mighty happenings and, at the same time, not become too emotional about them. In so doing, and while they are adjusting their minds and their mental capacities to these things, they are at least taking part in—and, in fact, are part of—something which is operating at a very high level of economic commercial activity.

What really was this Speech which the Governor was pleased to present? It was a Speech which was cast in what we might call terms of understatement, and I consider it certainly was a commentary and a progress report on some of the mighty enterprises in which I believe the Government of Western Australia, and in fact the people of Western Australia, have a great vested interest. It was, in effect, a report to the shareholders of what is, of course, the biggest business in Western Australia.

It is the biggest business in this State. I do not mean only in terms of commercial or manufacturing enterprise, but it is progress in every field of human endeavour from which we should all be able to derive satisfaction. I mention education, agriculture, technical training, health services, and also housing despite the criticisms we have heard in the last few days in connection with this latter item. In fact, progress is to be seen in every facet of life in which governments today are required to be involved. I would say that despite the very human frailties of this or any other government, it is a record which should be the pride of the Government and certainly also of those people who, for a great number of years, have voted consistently in order to keep this Government in office.

On this subject of human frailties, I would like to say a word or two more. Perhaps in a way this may be construed to denote the strength of a group, or the strength of a government. It proves that its decisions are essentially human ones. They are the decisions of the people and they are not just the product of some rigid and inflexible machine.

When speaking of flexibility, my mind of course immediately runs to a subject which has been referred to in this place already during the course of the debate; namely, the subject of the river. We all know which river I mean. Let me say it is a good government which is prepared to change its mind. It is a good government that can change its mind. I am sure the decision not to proceed with a certain piece of reclamation associated with the Narrows and the freeway interchange will be the cause of a great deal of satisfaction to very many people.

It indicates—and I think this is not unimportant—that the Government is not necessarily bound to accept and act upon the advice of its experts. I firmly believe that this is the way it should always be with a government.

I have said that this is not unimportant when I referred to advice. Likewise, the river itself, of course, is not unimportant. In a world that has changed so rapidly, and which is changing so rapidly, it is fairly significant that throughout history civilisations have developed as a result of rivers, or in association with river systems. These rivers and river systems are perhaps no less important today than they have been right throughout history, and certainly that is the case in Western Australia.

In fact I could say that despite everything which has happened so far in Western Australia, our future might well depend on the use, non-use, or misuse of these rivers which we are fortunate to have located within our boundaries. They are, perhaps, not great rivers by world standards, but certainly they are great enough to be utilised. I repeat that our future may well be bound up with the way that these rivers may or may not be utilised by the generations to come.

I do not want to confine these remarks simply to rivers but to water resources generally; and I bear in mind the comments made by Mr. Dolan last night and, in particular, the interjection by the Minister for Mines in relation to the water supplies of this country. I note with some satisfaction, and have done for some time, that this Government is co-operating, and has been co-operating, with the Commonwealth Department of National Development in the assessment of—that is in the exploration survey—and research into the water resources of this country.

Perhaps I should digress for a moment to say that the essential work in this field is being carried out by two organisations. One might be regarded as a private institution—the Water Research Foundation of Australia, which has as its director Professor C. H. Munro. Though it is mainly a private institution contributed to very largely by private resources, it is also in receipt of some contributions from State Governments, which of course include the Government of Western Australia.

Essentially however this foundation works along its own rather private path, and it is certainly gaining a good deal of useful information. But the institution in which I am more interested, and which perhaps may have a greater impact in this field, is the Australian Water Resources Council, established under the chairmanship of the Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn), and composed of the water supplies Ministers—in our case the Minister for Works.

This is a permanent body. It operates through its standing committees and the

appropriate department in each State. I am aware that a great deal of assessment has been carried out, and is being carried out. I understand the aim of this council is to assess the surface water resources of Western Australia within a 10-year period, and to assess the underground water resources, which is a far more complicated and difficult undertaking, over a much longer period—perhaps 20 or 25 years. To date, however, the figure is unknown.

I want to say that I can only endorse and compliment the interest shown in this particular field. The amount of money involved is considerable in its own right; it runs into some millions, with, firstly, the Commonwealth Government contributing to the activities of the council. I understand the Act which gives authority for the functioning of the council is to come up for review in the Budget session of the next Federal Parliament.

The Commonwealth is, in fact, contributing some millions of dollars to this fund. This seems to be a great deal of money, but surely it is pitifully small when compared with the problem which yet remains—firstly in connection with the assessment of these water resources, with an extension into the adoption of the reports and approvals for the most effective and greatest use of the known resources.

So I turn once again to the question of the water of the Swan River. To those people who have become so preoccupied with one particular river—and very often we find it is with a particular section of the river—I would like to say that they should spare just a little of their interest and enthusiasm for some of the rivers and water resources with which many people, including members in this House, are so greatly preoccupied. I admit, perhaps, that there may be in the Swan River, and in the work that goes on, room for some adjustment—I say advisedly, “some adjustment”—of the scenic view, or even to what is so very frequently called our heritage, to meet the demands of people who are in fact shaping our heritage—and I refer to the population of this State.

The work should meet the demand of today's population; but I would also ask the people to bear in mind the scenic beauty and heritage which the Government has created and developed in a great many other parts of the State, particularly in the country areas.

It may be recalled that on the 3rd August I asked the Minister some questions on the development of certain dams and water catchment areas in the south-west. My question did not refer to all of them by any means, but to those dams which are located in my immediate province, and which have been, if not totally constructed, at least developed during the life of this Government.

I would like to refer to these in some greater detail. I am aware that the dams

in question have been built essentially for water supply and irrigation purposes. But they have also been developed to present a wonderful attraction and scenic beauty with provision for boating and skiing. There are also facilities for some very excellent fishing. All these are within reasonable travelling distance of our main centres of population.

I want to emphasise this by referring again to the replies that were given. The four dams to which I referred were the Serpentine Dam, the Logue Brook Dam, the Waroona Dam, and the raising of the Wellington Dam. I was told that the total cost of constructing the dams was as follows:—

	\$
Serpentine Dam	4,045,232
Logue Brook Dam	1,521,782
Waroona Dam	1,323,738
Raising of Wellington Dam	2,552,958

Of the amount spent on the Serpentine Dam approximately 8 per cent., or \$300,000, was expended on landscaping and beautification, the provision of tourist amenities, and the like.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It was very worth while.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: There is no doubt about that. I was told that 1.5 per cent., or \$23,000 was spent on the Logue Brook Dam for similar facilities, and that 3.1 per cent., \$41,000 was spent on the Waroona Dam. To provide these facilities on the raising of the Wellington Dam, 2.4 per cent., or \$61,000 was spent, making a total for the four dams of approximately \$435,000.

Surely this effort which has been paid for out of the public purse is some compensation for what might be lost—I say might be lost—in certain other directions. The surface area of water of these dams constitutes about 8,000 acres. These dams are facilities which could well be utilised to much greater purpose and effect. To those people who become preoccupied with certain advantages and certain facilities, I would suggest that they give some thought occasionally to the creative work which is going on throughout the State. All this has been developed for the enjoyment of the people generally. While it is quite apart from the general theme of this speech, this does give effect to another claim by the Government in relation to decentralisation.

Here we have tourist attractions, waterways, and facilities being extended and supplied on a completely decentralised basis. I have given some credit to the Government for this matter and for the flexibility of its thinking and approach to some of the projects which are its concern.

There is a matter to which I wish to refer, even though I may be the only member to do so. I speak of the ground in close proximity to Parliament House bounded by Malcolm Street, King's Park

Road, Havelock Street, Parliament Place, and Harvest Terrace; and also fronting a Government reserve. The area comprises approximately 18 acres on which at present is situated that monstrous building of Government offices.

This area is one of the most highly valued pieces of real estate in Western Australia and I understand from information which has been provided on prior occasions that when it is fully developed it will contain four or five sets of buildings. There will be in the vicinity of 7,000 employees, and public parking space for somewhere in the vicinity of 1,700 or 1,800 service vehicles.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That has already been amended downwards.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The parking space?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The parking space and the number of buildings.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am pleased to hear that the plans have been amended downwards, but it does not alter the general principle which I wish to advocate. The fact remains that there will be a great concentration of a labour force in that immediate area, as there will be a collection of buildings housing Government departments and employees.

There will certainly be a greatly increased volume of traffic and I just wonder what its effect will be. No doubt this has been taken into consideration with the development of the Freeway system. I wonder if it is appropriate to have such a concentration so close to the city. Perhaps it might be better to have these buildings removed further from the city. I do not mean that they should be shifted too far away, but perhaps in the vicinity of the northern leg area—the northern side of the existing line.

When coming into the city I can see the present building from 20 miles away and I wonder what the reaction of people will be in the future when there is a greater number of buildings on this site. I ask members to bear in mind that the city will be dominated by Government offices. However, what is possibly more important, there will be the physical domination of this House. From the psychological point of view, I am not certain that that is necessarily a good thing. If there is physical domination, might it not be implied—I believe this is the real question—that there is also some other effective domination. I would not wish to have this thought extended, but I believe it is important.

There is another aspect to this concentration of buildings and employees. Just think what public transport will be required to bring these people to and from their place of employment. In addition to public transport, there will be the vehicles of employees all situated in a

locality zoned as a professional area, fronting one of our most scenic highways, and then on to what is one of our great heritages—King's Park itself. One might say that we will have lost a most valuable piece of country on strictly economic grounds. The area will be used for the fairly restricted purpose of Government offices.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That site was turned down by a Select Committee of both Houses.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Thank you, Mr. Wise. That area should be available for the use of a much wider range of Western Australian people. I do not necessarily desire to throw anything into the ring on this subject, but this site could be considered for the establishment of an auditorium, concert hall, and cultural centre. What better site could be found for these purposes?

I cannot help but wonder whether a more suitable site could be found for the Government buildings. I have felt this concern for some considerable time. In making my statement, I have no feelings against Government departments or Government officers; I have the greatest respect for them. However, I do not believe this is the appropriate area in the city on which the Government buildings should be located. I hope the general flexibility to which I have referred on the part of the Government will be brought into play so that further consideration will be given to the siting of these buildings.

I would now pass to another subject which received an airing in this House last night by Mr. Abbey. I refer to the veterinary services in Western Australia. Members are aware that in the last week I have asked questions on this subject because considerable concern has been expressed in country areas. I say at the outset I do not intend in any way to take the Government to task for any failings in this regard as I am very much aware that the Government has shown a great deal of concern and interest in this subject over a number of years. The Government has seen the present situation develop, but it is, to some extent, largely outside of its control.

I raise the subject now because I share the concern of the Australian Veterinary Association and that expressed by the farming community of Western Australia and their organisations, particularly those who are engaged in the livestock industries generally. I am not going over the ground which was so ably covered last night when reference was made to the numbers of livestock involved and the money which might be available from the Cattle Industry Compensation Fund and other similar funds.

I would refer to a question I asked on the 2nd August, and, more particularly, to the replies I received when the Minister

advised that 23 veterinarians were employed in the various sections of the animal division of the Department of Agriculture. It was also said that this number was not considered to be adequate to meet the demand for veterinary services in Western Australia. This is so correct. Of about 60 veterinarians serving the livestock needs of Western Australia approximately half are located in the metropolitan area. Certainly that number is not adequate to cope with the livestock population of this State.

As Mr. Abbey said last night, there are some 25,000,000 sheep and some 1,300,000 cattle in the State and it is difficult to know how to overcome the problem in a short time. There is an associated problem in that the Department of Agriculture cannot hold its veterinarians. Over the years the department has sponsored veterinary schools and the wastage of veterinarians over the last two years is six, with 23 remaining. That is a high degree of wastage.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Many of the 23 are operating on cats and dogs.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: These officers who have resigned have probably gone on to better things. Indeed, one has become a university professor in the United States of America. I would be the last person to suggest that any restriction should be placed on the activities of officers such as these. We do not want to prevent them from seeking a greater fulfilment of their abilities. However, I believe the position must be regarded seriously.

I am aware that there is always wastage and there are always opportunities to attract a person somewhere else. However, I would like to refer to the fact that two of these people went into private practice but, more important, two left to undertake post-graduate courses at the Melbourne and the Queensland Universities. One wonders: Is there no provision within departmental services which would have enabled those two men to remain on the staff and be given study leave to enable them to take post-graduate courses? The Queensland University has a veterinary training school and one can assume that those people will be lost to us forever.

I had hoped that as the result of a question on the notice paper I would have had some replies from the Minister today to amplify this situation. I realise this information is not available at the moment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am very sorry but the answer I gave on the 2nd August conflicted with the answer I had today. I wanted an opportunity to check to see what was wrong with either one or the other.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Thank you. I do not take exception to the fact that there has been a delay. I noticed there was some discrepancy between the Press report, which apparently was an official report, and the advice given to me in reply

to a question. However, what I was concerned about, and hoped to get some information on, was a question asked by the member for Murray in another place last year. The question asked was as follows:—

- (1) What progress has been made towards establishing a veterinary school in Western Australia?
- (2) Is the delay due to the Commonwealth Government's reluctance to assist the project?

To that question the Minister for Agriculture replied—

- (1) A proposal to establish a veterinary school in Western Australia was submitted to the Australian Universities Commission in October, 1965, by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, but finance was not approved during the 1967-69 triennium. It is believed, however, that when finance is available, the next veterinary school will be established in Western Australia.
- (2) No further progress can be made until finance can be provided by the Australian Universities Commission.

One might well ask: What is the nature of the finance which would be required to establish such a school? On advice I have received I believe this might run into something in excess of \$1,000,000. I recall the suggestion by Mr. Abbey that we could utilise certain industry funds, but it is clear that those funds alone would not be sufficient to provide for the establishment of such a veterinary school.

A State like Western Australia, with its livestock population—and which livestock population is potentially equal to, if not greater than, most of the other States in Australia—should have its own veterinary training facilities. Perhaps this is recognised and Western Australia will be the venue for the next veterinary school. But that time has well and truly arrived. It has arrived from the point of view of the livestock industry.

I have great concern for those students of veterinary science who have undertaken courses, well aware of the shortage in this field, and who have proceeded so far through the course and then found themselves in the position of being denied the opportunity to continue. The Government puts some stress on and emphasises the creation of career opportunities for our young people. This may well be regarded as one avenue which, if not neglected, perhaps has not achieved as much prominence as it might have done. I hope that some thought might be given to the establishment of training facilities for veterinarians. This hope was expressed last night by Mr. Abbey. There is scope here for the creation of career opportunities for young people, and also for servicing the livestock industry in Western Australia.

With all due respect to the great development that is taking place in the mineral fields of Western Australia—the magnificent events which have occurred—and having in mind the value of the development in manufacturing and secondary industries, the livestock industry and the primary industries will remain the backbone of the Western Australian economy for many, many years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Nobody denies that, or asserts in any other direction.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am pleased to have the affirmation of the Minister on this subject. However, in making that statement I would not like it to be thought that I am in any way advocating a crash programme.

I am not a believer in crash programmes, but I believe we have a serious situation. However, it is one which can be overcome. I do not want to see a crash programme because I feel that sound, mature thought and judgment should be applied to this matter, and those activities which are promoted on the basis of crash programmes can be fraught with disaster at every turn.

Passing on from veterinary interests, I will turn to something which is closely related, and which has been before us for some time. This matter has certainly held the interests of farming institutions and associations for a long period and has been the subject of approaches both to the Government and to the Minister concerned. I refer to the institution of a beef cattle research station in the South-West Land Division.

I limit my comments to the South-West Land Division although I might well have extended them to other parts of the State and to the Kimberleys. I have commented in the past on the activities in the Kimberleys and the contribution made to the beef export trade. For two obvious reasons, I will confine my present remarks to the South-West Land Division. Firstly, because it is my immediate area; and, secondly, because some 80 per cent. of the present cattle population is within that area.

I would like to refer to some of the correspondence on this subject when approaches were first made by the Pastoralists and Graziers Association of Western Australia to the Minister. I will refer to some of the association's contentions and arguments when requesting that such a station be established. However, before putting its case I will refer to the replies given by the Minister to the association as a result of the request. Part of the reply reads as follows:—

The facilities for the carrying out of beef cattle research in Western Australia are under continuous review, but the matter of priorities is important in our overall programme.

So we are faced with the situation of priorities. To continue—

Thus we feel that a large amount of information is already available in Australia and elsewhere which should be extended through existing Departmental channels to the cattlemen.

I make this comment: Does this mean that the service for disseminating this information is inadequate? To continue—

This information is being added to by the small herds already established on Departmental Research Stations at Esperance, Wongan Hills and at the Muresk Agricultural College.

Admittedly these herds are not ideal from the point of view of breed, and facilities are not advanced, but they do represent a real start towards the objectives we all recognise as important.

I had occasion to mention this aspect in the House last year, particularly in respect of the Kimberleys. When we have had an industry which has been established in Western Australia for some 80 to 100 years, and, despite the numbers of livestock, a beef cattle research station adequate to meet the demands of cattle husbandry in Western Australia has not been provided, it is time something was done about the position.

I should like to refer to some questions I asked on the subject last year. The questions were asked to bring the matter into prominence and they refer to priorities. The questions I asked on Wednesday, the 23rd November, 1966, were as follows:—

- (4) What is considered to be the percentage wastage in the beef producing herds of the South-West Land Division due to either one or all of the following—
 - (a) low reproductive rate;
 - (b) inadequate management; or
 - (c) insufficient breeding stock of adequate quality?
- (5) What is the estimated total cost of such wastage to the beef industry of Western Australia?

The Minister for Local Government replied—

- (4) Reproduction rates of beef herds are not recorded in the official statistics.

It is estimated that, excluding the Kimberleys, the reproduction rate for the State is about 70 per cent. The 30 per cent. includes cows which fail to calve and calves which die.

No estimates of the total losses due to management, or shortage of breeding stock, have been made. It is known that improved management would result in big increases in production. The availability of better breeding stock and more intense culling could also increase production. It is considered that the shortage of stock is a passing phase asso-

ciated with the increase of the industry.

- (5) Estimates have not been made as the assumptions necessary determine the final answer.

I must confess I am not quite sure what that means. However, it does convey the point that obviously a great deal of information has yet to be evaluated, and one might well wonder what is the best way to obtain this type of information.

On this subject the pastoralists and graziers in their submission claim—

A conservative estimate shows that approximately \$100 million is invested in the State's beef industry (calculated on a basis of \$40 per animal plus the value of the land). Well over half of this is invested in the South West, where too little research is being conducted.

To go on with their submission—

The estimated gross value of cattle slaughtered in W.A. in 1964 was \$20.7 million.

The figure for 1964 was the last available. These people claim, in regard to problems affecting profits—

There is an economic necessity for research to be conducted into many problems harmful to the beef industry, including those related to:

- (i) Reproduction.
- (ii) Growth.
- (iii) Management.
- (iv) Nutrition.

On this subject of wastage, about which I have endeavoured to obtain some information, the pastoralists and graziers, in appendix A of their submission, claim that the source of their information is the annual report of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. Column v, which is listed, shows that approximately 20 per cent. of the cattle produced in Western Australia are lost, and this represents a major problem requiring research.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The Commonwealth did research on growth about eight to 10 years ago, did it not?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes. I am aware that some research was undertaken and I would not for a moment suggest that no work has been done in this field. I am well aware that a good deal of work has been done, and some work is going on at the Kimberley Research Station. This is being done in conjunction with the C.S.I.R.O. Work is being, and for some years has been, carried out at the Wokalup Research Station, the Bramley Research Station, Muresk, and Esperance; and also, of course, a certain amount of work is being carried out in conjunction with farmers on small field trials.

However, the contention is that the industry has achieved such prominence and its value is so great to Western Australia that the problems are not lessening but

increasing, and with the greater cattle population and the greater return to the industry, and because of its economic value to this country, it warrants something a little more than is at present being undertaken.

In the view of the pastoralists and graziers—and the Minister himself complimented them upon their submissions—the problems may best be overcome by the early establishment of a beef cattle research station, and this is closely related to the problem of veterinary services.

I repeat: I do not wish to convey the impression that I feel there has been any neglect. I am one who believes that the greatest progress in the livestock industry has been the result of the enterprise of those who are engaged in the industry; and I believe that the greatest progress yet will come from this same source. There has been some recognition of the problems in official quarters and I would like to indicate the support of the pastoralists and graziers for any move the Government might care to make, and which it might be in a position to make, to help the industry. There is no doubt that Government assistance must come in the provision of services which the farming community, for good and obvious reasons, are not able to provide for themselves.

If it is support the Government needs in its efforts to have this industry placed on a sound basis, in exactly the same way as our manufacturing and mining industries are now placed owing to the great developments in Western Australia, I can assure it that that support will be given wholeheartedly; because I know the people in the farming areas are justifiably concerned at the present situation. It is understood, of course, that most things have small beginnings and all that is asked for at this stage is a recognition that problems exist; a recognition that there is a need for something to be done. The problem is one that has come close to our doorstep now and it is something which is not insurmountable.

I believe the industry itself, as Mr. Abbey has suggested, would be prepared to come to the party and make great contributions in the hope that something will be achieved for the beef industry because this will mean vastly increased production and certainly more efficient production. All of this will surely add up to making this State a little more solvent and will contribute far more to its export income and meet the ever-increasing demand from its own domestic markets. I support the motion.

THE HON. C. E. GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [3.39 p.m.]: I wish to support the motion so capably moved by Mr. Willmott on opening day, and while the opportunity presents itself I would like to make one or two comments.

Last year I spoke on the work that the Minister for Health and the officers of his department had performed over the years he had been in charge of that department, and also the work that had been done in this field since Western Australia was established.

I went on to mention I was pleased that it would not be long before the hospital would be opened within the boundaries of the province I represent; that is, the hospital at Bentley. I am extremely pleased to report to the House that the hospital has now been opened and patients who have been there and those who have worked at the hospital have reported it is certainly fulfilling the need I suggested it would at this time last year.

This brings me to something which is causing concern to people living in the district. I am pleased to note the Canning Shire Council has taken action to refuse to grant a license for an offensive trade to be established near the hospital, because concern was felt not only by the residents who live in the vicinity of the site where the offensive trade was to operate, but also by the patients and the men working in the new Bentley Hospital. I trust the shire will continue to refuse to grant such a license.

Since Parliament reassembled I have asked a few questions on the activities of the Builders' Registration Board. Whilst I do not intend to spend much time speaking on the matter at this stage, I would point out it concerns me a little to discover that over the past three years the board has received 1,283 complaints, of which 1,087 were found to be justified by the board's inspectors. This indicates that many people are taking advantage of the facilities and services provided by the board, by reporting their worries and troubles to ensure that the homes they are having built are being constructed in a workmanlike manner.

What perturbs me a little is to discover that many young people who are building homes today are not aware of the existence of the Builders' Registration Board, or that this avenue is available to them for information or for the lodging of complaints when they are having their houses built. I am also concerned at the lack of publicity given to the activities of the board. I did not know whether publicity was to be given to the board's activities, and the answer I received to my question was that some thought would be given to it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Was that in the answer?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The answer was given in words to that effect. I think the answer was: It would be considered at the board's next meeting. The Builders' Registration Board is doing a very good job in regard to apprentices within the industry, and during the last

few years in particular it has been responsible for improving the standard of conditions for apprentices in the various classifications of the building trade. It has also cleaned up a part of the apprenticeship system which badly needed some review. Later in the session I intend to have something more to say on other aspects of the board's activities, but at this point I will let the matter rest.

There has been a great deal of talk in the last week or two about the State Housing Commission and some suggestions made on what it should or should not do. One aspect of the policy of the State Housing Commission absolutely horrifies me. It has been suggested that all those who become eligible to enjoy the benefits granted by the State Housing Commission will be told how they shall live. In other words, if one is unfortunate enough to be in the situation that one has to approach the commission for housing assistance, apparently the commission will, in the future, suggest the type of house and accommodation one shall have. I refer to the high-density housing development that is apparently becoming the order of the day with the commission.

Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.3 p.m.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I spent a fair amount of time discussing this question with the officers, the planners, and the General Manager of the State Housing Commission. The general manager told me that this was the basis for all future commission development, and I read accounts in the newspapers which confirmed the fact that the commission had made application to build this type of project at Kwinana, Cockburn, Bentley, Hilton Park, and Forrestfield. These newspaper accounts bear out the statement of the general manager that high-density development would be the trend for all future State Housing Commission developments.

Over the years the Australian people, and in particular the Western Australian people, have enjoyed a way of life which they regard as desirable; that is, to live in separate homes divided from their neighbours by a fence. In this way of life the people are close to the neighbours, but once they go into their houses or yards they have privacy.

The idea that Western Australians like to live in multi-storied units, in cluster houses, and in similar types of accommodation is ridiculous. The average Australian child likes to keep a dog as a pet, but in high-density development projects the child could not have one. I spoke to the planners in the commission about this aspect. I asked what would happen if a tenant wanted to keep a dog, when there was no fence. He replied that he had not thought about the keeping of dogs in those developments.

Some people say that Australian people like to live in that type of accommodation. Another statement is that our people like to live in closely settled communities, because they are so friendly. I realise that the applicants on the waiting list of the commission will flock to this kind of accommodation, because they have no alternative. I am sure that if the commission built houses on stilts in the Swan River the applicants would flock into those houses! The applicants whose income comes within the range of those eligible for housing through the commission will certainly live in such premises, but in my opinion they do not like it, although a few might.

I am not suggesting that this type of development is not suitable in some cases, and minor schemes of this nature have been developed in the metropolitan area. The point is that every tenant who has chosen to live in this accommodation has done so of his own free will, but the applicants on the waiting list of the State Housing Commission have no choice.

We all realise the poor circumstances which cause distress to people in the closely settled high-density Housing Commission settlements in the metropolitan area. I know of dozens of such cases. I inquired how many people in my province who live in this type of accommodation had applied for transfers to other districts, but I was not given the information. A number of people in my province have written to me asking for my assistance to get them away from the closely populated districts.

I am an ordinary Australian who knows the way in which the Australian people want to live; I am not a town planner; but I certainly know the way my fellow Australians wish to live if they have a choice. I am given to understand that the average regional density in the metropolitan area is 12 to 16 people per acre. I have taken a great interest in the development at Bentley, because it is in my province, and the density will be in the order of 50 to 65 people to the acre. I have been told by some of the officers that this is not a high density. It might not be, but if some other word can be supplied to me to describe the term I shall be pleased to hear it. The normal density is 12 to 16 per acre in the metropolitan area, but in the Bentley development it will be 50 to 65 to the acre. This is certainly higher density.

The Bentley development contains 60 acres of land. Every newspaper and every report that I have read seems to disagree on the amount of public open space that will be provided. The open space will be in the vicinity of 50 per cent. of the total area, and that leaves 30 acres of accommodation. Ultimately 2,500 people will live on those 30 acres. If the 30 acres of open space are taken into consideration, it can be said that 2,500 people will live on 60 acres. However, as I pointed out, there will be no fences and no privacy. I sup-

pose if a tenant decides to hang a picture on the wall and hammers in a nail he will knock the plaster off his neighbour's wall. There are all sorts of social problems attached to this.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is a question of share and share alike.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: It would not get to that stage. I was exaggerating when I said that the tenant would knock the plaster off his neighbour's wall, but I am sure members know what I mean. The people are to be asked to live in clustered accommodation, while there are millions of acres of land available in this State. This type of development will be provided throughout the metropolitan area.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You cannot paint the house in the colour you desire, unless you have the approval of your neighbour.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Probably the building will not be painted, except initially—if I know anything about the set-up. The conservation of land in terms of reducing the urban sprawl, and the economic use of pipe services and electricity are admirable objectives; but the big difference is that the ordinary type of duplex house provides some private open space. Such houses would be preferable to the developments contemplated by the commission.

The development at Bentley is basically an amalgamation of the private open space for communal use. A minimum amount of private open space will be provided. This is a very questionable method of designing a community's way of life. The average Australian enjoys an outdoor way of life, where he has some privacy.

I have read every piece of literature I could find on high-density development. Although the reports were written by experts, not many of them agreed with each other. Therefore I had to try to sift out some sort of pattern. Most of the reading I have done indicates that high-density development has taken place where the authorities concerned have endeavoured to do away with existing slums. Where a certain number of people were living in a slum area, the authorities bulldozed the buildings and developed high-density accommodation of the type I have mentioned, which is a little better than a slum.

I suppose it is better than a slum as slums generally occur because of the growth of a particular area which is near some sort of transport, such as a railway. At least in these other areas there is some access to the residents' places of employment.

I have had a look at all of the areas in which the Housing Commission is contemplating building and I believe that absolutely no thought has gone into planning how the people in these areas will get to wherever they desire to go. In this

60 acres in Bentley there will be 2,500 people many of whom will have to get to work in the morning. However, there are no major highways. There is Manning Road, which is already overloaded, and both Mr. Dolan and I have mentioned at various times the situation in regard to it. Nevertheless Manning Road is one of the roads which these 2,500 people will have to use.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The 2,500 will not use it. It will be only a percentage of them.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: A very big percentage, though. Apparently there are to be no children amongst these 2,500 people because the area does not, in my opinion, cater for children.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They might be going to supply the people with the pill.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not think there will be an inducement for them to have a large family because there are to be no fences in this area. I do not know whether this point is being kept in mind by those concerned at the State Housing Commission. However I would not like to live there with three or four children because I would have absolutely no control whatsoever over them. They could wander around and it would be impossible to know where they were.

It is advocated that the area is safe because there are no crossings or roads, and there are lots of parklands and many lovely trees. The model looks wonderful—fantastic even—and anyone who looks at it will immediately fall in love with it. However the only thing missing from the model is the 2,500 people. So I ask you: Have a look at this model and decide whether it is such a fantastic scheme!

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is another Coronation Street.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not know about that. I could not agree more that in certain places this would be a wonderful idea; but I will not go along with the thought that to provide a safe road system such as is envisaged in this type of development, everyone has to live in three-storied flats, row houses, and what have you, without any fences. I will not go along with that because I believe if the same road system and plan I have here were used, but individual houses were built, the same situation would occur as far as the roads are concerned. There would be no crossings and so on.

Getting back to the children, there would be no control over them whatever and if a person's child has a three-wheeler bike, or one of the little motorcars, or whatever children play with these days, and the kiddy next door is a bit bigger, he picks it up and before we know where we are two or three children are having a decent old argument. Now there is

nothing which creates strife among neighbours more than the children fighting. Of course, five minutes later the kiddies have made it up, but the parents go on and on and on. This happens. We have all seen it. The kiddies are all out playing together again and wondering what their parents are fighting about. What they are fighting about is the punch that one of the children received. I have mentioned the dogs.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No dogs.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The suggestion is that suddenly 2,500 people will not want to have dogs. Frankly, I could not care less about dogs; but this does not mean to say that because I do not like them, and would not have one, the average Australian boy would not want to have one. He does, and we have to live with this.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you like dogs?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I like them on a farm or in the next man's house; but not at my place.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I am with you there.

The Hon. R. Thompson: A person who does not like a dog does not like himself.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Oh, get out!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am not arguing about the rights and wrongs of keeping a dog. The average Australian wants to keep one so he should be entitled to do so. However in this sort of development he cannot.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Quite right.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: We have not finally decided whether this development will allow for any children to start with, and therefore we do not know whether any children will want a dog. However, supposing that children come along and they want to keep pets of some description. Where do they put them?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: In the open space.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: In the public open space. I am appalled to think that we in Western Australia have reached the stage where we have to fall for this. Before I read of the project in the paper, I had already been made aware of it some two years previously when the State Housing Commission was endeavouring to obtain permission from a local authority to institute such a scheme. However when I read of it in the paper I thought I would be able to look forward to reading the opinions of those people who write letters to the editor of the newspaper. However I was horrified when the only letters which were published applauded the scheme.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Including the leading article.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You were horrified because no one else agreed with your viewpoint. That is something to get horrified about!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: It is indeed. The leading article in *The West Australian* said the State Housing Commission should be applauded for taking this long-sighted progressive viewpoint. Well then, I thought that at least the *Daily News* would stick with me. I have the newspaper cutting here and it was about three times as long as the article in *The West Australian*. It also stated what a refreshing approach it was. In fact, that was the actual heading although I do not intend to read the article.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Some of the shire councils agree with you though.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you not think for one fleeting second that they might have something?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I did try to. On the 26th April the first article appeared and it concerned the new trend in State Housing Commission housing. I read a column and a half and was just about staggering when at the conclusion I read "more on page 14." I thought it could not be any worse, so I turned to page 14 where it showed this fantastic plan.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Was there more on page 14?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: There was more, but it was in the same vein. It also contained the plan and that is how I think people are taken in. Looking at this plan it is beautiful; it shows all the lovely little diagrams, and arrows, and doo-das, or whatever they are.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Any Red Indians with the arrows?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: They all make the plan look reasonably attractive. However I repeat what I said earlier that with all the models and plans, the main ingredient has been omitted and that is the people and their habits. I was hoping the State Housing Commission would have another think about this but I have been unsuccessful in my attempts to persuade it to do so. The only reason I am speaking about this today is because I want it on record that I certainly never agreed with any part of this plan because I believe we will live to see the day when we will regret the introduction of this type of housing for S.H.C. rental accommodation.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: We surely shall.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: There is fantastic reading in this article and it goes on to say there will be 528 homes in the area. Actually in this paper the acreage has been increased to 61. Intermingled in this are a few single-unit separate houses with fences around them, so I ascertained how many of the 528 were, in fact, single home units. I am given to understand there will be about 90. They will be spread around the outside so that there will be a ring around the outside and everyone else will live in the middle. We can work out roughly how many people

out of the 2,500 will live in the 90 houses; the balance will live in these row houses, three-storied flats, six-storied and the tall 13-storied blocks of flats. I will be fair. The article does go on to say that the 13-storied blocks will have to be looked at again before it is finally decided whether or not to erect them.

I can assure members there will be no turning back and the 13-storied blocks will be erected. I have already mentioned the plan for Bentley but the same scheme is to be adopted in Forrestfield, Hilton Park—

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not if I have anything to say about it.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Then I hope the honourable member is more persuasive than I am.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Other towns to be affected are Kwinana, Cockburn, and so on, in keeping with the general manager's statement to me that this is the trend for all future State Housing Commission developments.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is the trend which is now being bulldozed in other countries.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. Thompson: Cockburn has rejected this plan.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Some authorities have rejected it and I am very pleased indeed because it indicates I am not the only one who thinks this way. I know of several local authorities which have rejected the plan, and therefore it is reasonable to assume that the majority of councillors in these shires think at least partly along the lines I do.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you think of the Wandana flats in Subiaco?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I maintain that that is an entirely different kettle of fish.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The same people agreeing with you now agreed with that.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That is an entirely different set-up altogether, and that is the big mistake. It shows me how little people understand this particular set-up when they try to compare it with Wandana flats because it is absolutely different and is in no way related to it.

I found a very interesting newspaper cutting in which a very eminent fellow—or at least allegedly he is—is reported as follows:—

Melbourne had slums as mean and ugly as any in the poverty-stricken areas of North America and Europe, Canadian town planning expert Humphrey Carver said today.

This article appeared in *The West Australian* of the 29th June, 1967.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He said a lot more than what has been mentioned. That is only a part of his speech.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: He said—

The State Government was building such accommodation—

and I mention that he was referring to the Victorian State Government and also to multi-unit houses. He continued—

—at high cost—

I will mention the cost factor in a moment. To continue—

—without understanding the consequences.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That was complete flat development.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: It does not matter. The article goes on to say—

I cannot believe that this so-called solution has come from a deep and compassionate understanding of parents and children and their rights to have such aspirations for the space and beauty that Australia can give.

This is a Canadian who is telling us these facts.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Don't you believe in cluster housing?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not say I disagree with cluster housing. I disagree that it is foisted on to people who find they have no option as to whether they can accept it or not. I believe in cluster housing if people choose it of their own free will. It would appeal to some people. I personally would prefer it, because I do not like a garden or a big block of land. However, the point I am making is that every Australian should have the right to decide whether or not he has a block of land.

There are multitudes of home units in South Perth, and I know most of the people like living there. However, they went there of their own free will. They went there because this was the way they chose to live.

However, the people who are on the waiting list of the State Housing Commission are offered a house, but if they do not want to take it their application is deferred for six months before they are offered another one. The second house they are offered could be the same one or it could be next door to the house they did not accept initially. The view taken by the commission is, "If you do not want this, then you must fend for yourself."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think you are over-exaggerating the position. The State Housing Commission does not take that attitude.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have had a lot of experience in 2½ years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have not had as much experience as I have had, in that I was Minister for Housing. As I

have said, you are over-exaggerating the situation.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Minister must have missed a little here and there.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am like every member and can miss a little occasionally. What Mr. Griffiths is suggesting is that a man who works in Midland Junction is offered a house in Fremantle and the commission says, "Take it or leave it." The commission makes every endeavour to provide a man with a house near to where he works.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am not talking about that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No; you are just over-exaggerating the situation.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have mentioned the very sizable traffic generator which this type of development would become. In these particular localities, there are not any major highways, there are not any railways, and there are no means of transporting 2,500 people. As I have mentioned, the roads in the Bentley area are overloaded now. Do we close our eyes and suddenly say that these people do not have motorcars? I cannot recall the percentage of motorcar owners in Western Australia but I know it is very high. I think it is one in every three or four.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is 2.7.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The Minister has said the figure is one car to 2.7 people, and members can work out the number of cars which would be involved with 2,500 people. There will be a lot of motorcars coming out of this place.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can't you work it out?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have not the time.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Where are they going to put their clothes lines?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That is a very good question and probably one which everyone has forgotten.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There are spin driers so they do not use clothes lines.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Obviously the people will hang their clothes over trees in the wide open spaces! I believe the sites which are chosen for these developments are selected on no other basis than the fact that it is where the Housing Commission owns land. That is the only reason; the decision is based on nothing else. No consideration is given to whether it is desirable to build in this locality or whether it is not. No consideration is given to whether the road systems are capable of carrying the traffic. The only criterion is that this is where the State Housing Commission owns a block of land, accordingly, this is where the scheme will be situated.

A member in this Chamber has mentioned—and, indeed, I have, too—that

some of the local authorities have opposed this type of scheme. In fact I believe that sometimes the opposition has been very strong and persistent, but the time will probably come when local authorities will go along with the idea because of more and more pressure, and these schemes will be proceeded with. I certainly am opposed to them.

In connection with the cost, firstly I will make the statement that the cost of each individual unit of housing is greater in this type of development than it is with the orthodox, average Australian way of living. It is definitely greater and, obviously, it will only be possible to build fewer units for the same cost. I do not know whether that is desirable. However, if a Government has a certain number of dollars, and if this type of development costs more, this is the obvious conclusion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If it costs more.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am suggesting it does cost more, and that the Government will only be able to build fewer units. I would say that there is at least some sort of housing pressure. The Minister mentioned this the other night and I think the word he used was—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: "Crisis."

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I disagree with that expression, but at least the Minister did concede there was a slight pressure for houses. Yet we are going to build fewer and fewer, and force people into a way of life they do not want.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Listen to the echo.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are getting some support at least.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: In addition, it will cost just as much to rent these units. It is not going to cost any less. It is going to cost the same amount of money for rent every week. Therefore a man who is living with 2,500 other people crammed on top of him is going to pay the same amount of rent as the chap in the other estate at Bentley who has a quarter of an acre, or more, of land. This latter person has a normal sized block with a separate house, and yet they both pay the same rent. I say quite definitely that I would want to be paid to live there.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think you are aspiring to too great an extent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would you like to live in a flat?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Not particularly.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would you therefore condemn all flats?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: No, I would not. The Minister has missed the best part of my speech.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. Dolan: It is all good.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have spoken to town planners from Western Australia, and to several from the Eastern States; I have spoken to architects and to people who at least have some knowledge of how to plan a town or a city. One very interesting observation which I make is that those people who come out in favour of this do not live up to what they advocate. I made it my business to find out where they lived and what sort of houses they lived in. I have not been able to find one of these fellows who does not live on at least a quarter of an acre of land and, in the main, they live on bigger areas than this. Of course, there may be some who live in units, but I was not able to find them. They say that this is a wonderful scheme for everybody else, but not for them. They say, "We will live on an acre of ground or half an acre of ground with a fence around it while everybody else lives in units."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: With dogs barking around the door!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I find it incredible that these people are the ones who come out and say that this is the way the ordinary Australian wants to live. Their attitude is, "I will live in my house and I do not want to be put into a unit, but everybody else wants a unit." This speaks volumes as far as I am concerned. As I have said, I have not been able to find one of them who lives in a flat, a duplex house, or a row house. I am not suggesting that there may not be some who do, but I am saying that I have not been able to discover any.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: We are not short of space.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: There are some favourable arguments in this connection and the Minister will probably give us these later on. I mention a well-known town planner in this city and not very many people have not heard of this gentleman. He went on record as saying—

I congratulate the State Housing Commission on the fine concept of the scheme to be built in Bentley and illustrated in *The West Australian* on Wednesday. Here we have at long last the concept of planning which takes into account the three age groups that spend most of their time in housing areas—the very young, the mothers, and the very old.

I just digress a little to say that apparently there are to be some children allowed. He went on to say—

Now one will be able perhaps to keep a dog—

That is what he says—

—without it being run over.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Are we housing dogs now?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I think I established very early in the piece that one would have absolutely no chance of keeping a dog in these places.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There is not room to swing a cat.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Lap dogs.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I find it incredible that a well-known town planner should say that one will be able to keep a dog without any fear of its being run over.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He does not live in a home unit.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: No. I wrote a letter to an architect friend of mine who is the principal of one of the big consulting engineer, architectural, and town planning organisations in New South Wales. This company operates in New South Wales at Sydney and Newcastle, in Melbourne, in Kuala Lumpur, and Singapore, and in Western Australia and South Australia. I mention this to illustrate that he is the principal of a reasonably-sized organisation.

I wrote him a personal letter in which I asked what he could find out for me about this row housing *cum* development such as the one which is under discussion. I wrote last year, and long before this subject reached the newspapers, in order to obtain some opinions on this subject. He subsequently got someone to write to the South Australian Housing Trust in order to inquire what its views were on this subject. I have a copy of a letter which he wrote to his associate in Perth and this is what it says—

In response to the request to establish what the S.A.H.T.'s policy is regarding housing development, I met the Chief Architectural Planner, Mr. H. P. Smith—a personal friend—who made several observations which may be of use.

I assume his information is factual, because he has said in the letter that he does not have the information himself, but is supplying what Mr. Smith said during the course of the conversation. I would like to read some extracts from it. The first one reads—

Present Trust policy is to accelerate development of rental purchase of medium price and size houses on their own block of land . . .

The letter then says—

They—

That is the Housing Trust—

—will continue construction of low cost housing for rental in industrial areas and higher cost housing in new areas for purchase by people able to provide their own finance. All these are on separate blocks of land.

They will not construct multi-storey flats at present and are severely limit-

ing 3 storey flats because of lack of demand. These latter are available only to families whose children are over 16 years.

Small number of double unit houses for low rental are still being built in country areas but row housing although discussed has not been developed at all and is unlikely to be adopted.

This is what H. P. Smith, the Chief Architectural Planner of the South Australian Housing Trust, has said in relation to our problems. I took some extracts from report No. 29 of the South Australian Housing Trust, the first of which reads—

Two and three storey flats. These were the first type built by the trust and are designed specially for couples without young children and people who live alone.

As far as that Housing Trust is concerned the two- or three-storied flats are for people who have no children. This strengthens the argument I used a moment ago that this particular type of development is not conducive to people having families. The report continues—

The Trust is convinced that most Australian families prefer to own their own homes. Single-unit houses were first built for sale in 1946 by the Trust and the House Sales Section of the Trust is becoming more important each year.

In other words it is becoming increasingly evident that the people in South Australia want to buy single-unit houses. I have looked through quite a few reports, and I have found some interesting information in them. One point that interested me is contained in the 1965 report of the New South Wales Housing Commission which states—

The commission's programme is framed to meet the wishes and requirements of applicants as to the type of accommodation required.

I cannot recall any questionnaire being circularised in this State, or any investigation being made here as to whether the people in Western Australia would prefer this type of living. However I have done a personal survey of something like 70 people, whom I selected at random. I was as fair as I could be. I showed them the report, and as far as I could see they were not prepared to live in accommodation such as that to which I have been referring. Out of the 70 people I asked seven or eight suggested that they would prefer to live like that, and the other 60 said they would do so under extreme protest.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you happen to know how many huge blocks of flats are built in New South Wales by the Housing Commission?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: There are a great number, but I do not know how many.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why let that go when the Housing Commission is building thousands of flats?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The point I am making is that in New South Wales the commission is prepared to frame its programme to meet the wishes of the people who are to be housed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In that case many of them would seem to prefer to live in flats.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That may be so; but we have not followed the example of the New South Wales Housing Commission. We seem to be taking the word of people who have been here for five minutes and have said, "This is the way the people of Western Australia would dearly like to live." Perhaps this is right, but I have not found any evidence of it.

Notwithstanding the multi-storied blocks of flats about which the Minister spoke, and notwithstanding the number of people in New South Wales who apparently prefer to live in flats, the report states—

It is of interest that the majority of applicants prefer cottage accommodation even if in more distant localities.

So the majority of the applicants prefer to live in cottages. The report continues—

The capital cost of family cottages with all charges included is less than walk-up flats and considerably below the cost of comparable accommodation in high-rise, or elevator flats.

So it would seem that so far as New South Wales is concerned the cost is greater. I cannot see any reason to believe that we would get these built at a cheaper rate in Western Australia. But the Housing Commission in New South Wales is convinced that these buildings cost more, and they have been built.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: It is quite correct that they do.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Of course they do. The honourable member and I have been in the industry and we know what it costs. To continue with the report—

It must, of course, continue to provide cottage accommodation, which, in major estates such as Green Valley, nearing completion, and Mount Druitt, where building construction is about to commence, is in considerable demand by applicants in the Sydney Metropolitan area and which, with all project costs provided for, can be built more cheaply than flats. Under existing conditions any greater concentration on higher density housing in inner-city rehabilitation schemes—

This gets back to the point I mentioned earlier that everything I have read in an attempt to seek information on this matter shows these buildings to be a rehabilita-

tion of some broken-down slum area. This is borne out from the books I have been able to obtain from our own parliamentary library. In every instance it is a case of redevelopment rather than creation in virgin country. To continue with the report—

—or inner suburban areas can only result in a reduction in the volume of cottage construction and in the overall number of new buildings being provided by the Commission and of many applicants being forced into accepting a type of accommodation they do not favour.

That is what the New South Wales Housing Commission thought in 1965. It would seem that the people in New South Wales have views similar to mine. We cannot foresee what will arise out of this type of development, but the New South Wales Housing Commission has foreseen it, and has said in its annual report that if high-density flats continue to be built many applicants will be forced to accept a type of accommodation they do not favour. The 1966 report of the New South Wales Housing Commission states—

That, of course, is the real and fundamental purpose of the Commission's operations, to provide the means of making a home, a basic right of every family, for those who can look only to Government housing for this opportunity. To ensure that no genuine person with a housing need and eligibility for assistance will be at a disadvantage because of being financially underprivileged, policies are inherent in our public housing which give them equal rights to consideration.

We go back to the point I made earlier, that because somebody happens to be in a position where his only means of obtaining a house is through the Housing Commission it says, "You will live as we tell you, or you will go without." It is as brutal as that. The Minister has heard me on this before, so I am probably boring him.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He does not look very happy.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I cannot let this situation go by without recording my objections to it. Another interesting piece of information in the 1966 report reads as follows:—

The general level of economic rents rose accordingly and while cottage rents were generally held below \$12 per week, the highest being \$11.80, the rents of flats, more costly in capital outlay and services, etc., charges, were as high as \$12.50.

In other words, the rents for flats were higher than those for cottages, which is understandable because they cost more to build. The report continues—

As the great majority of applicants prefer, or, because of the accommodation necessary, require cottages, even

though located in what are presently regarded as the outer suburban areas, and because flat accommodation, although predominantly in the inner City or suburban areas, does not satisfy the needs of many, there is early necessity to re-establish an appropriate balance between the two types of accommodation by immediate concentration on a larger cottage programme.

This bears out what the Minister was saying—that in New South Wales they build dozens of flats of this type. But that State has now seen the folly of its ways, and it is now necessary for it to make a better balance between these two types of accommodation. The report continues—

An interesting project completed during the year was a project of 39 patio houses at Riverwood. Despite the smaller blocks of land occupied, capital cost is greater than brick veneer cottages or walk-up flats, with consequently higher rentals. However, they provide comfortable and satisfactory accommodation in a favourable location especially for families who do not wish to live in flats and for whom the Commission cannot provide cottages in a near City locality. However, there appears to be limited scope for this type of housing in the Commission's programme.

The New South Wales Housing Commission produced a document on row housing. It runs into many pages, but I have taken a few extracts from it, the first of which states—

First Experiment.

The cost of these units, however, was considerably higher than those applying to standard cottages or for normal flat construction. This question of cost has continued to be the biggest deterrent to row housing so far as the Commission is concerned.

Second Experiment.

A second attempt at row housing was launched in the mid 1950's when the Commission's Architects evolved new designs. Projects of this type of dwelling were sited at Maroubra and at Warwick Farm. When tenders were called it was found that the prices submitted were substantially in excess of those received for standard cottages yielding the same area.

I think I have quite successfully established that this type of development will, in fact, cost more dollars for each unit of housing. I could quote further, but I think I have fairly established in the mind of everybody what I was trying to point out. These buildings cost more money and people prefer not to live in them.

The report on row housing concludes as follows:—

The Commission's experience in respect of row housing—other than aged

persons' projects—has still been extremely limited. Whereas reaction to the first experiment at Botany was very satisfactory, public reaction to the later projects was not particularly good, whilst the costs involved meant that standard cottages and standard flats were a much better proposition.

Therefore they concluded that row houses were a dead loss; yet we intend to build them and everybody says this is a wonderfully refreshing approach to our housing problem.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Not everybody.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Many people have written to the paper and made statements to that effect. Despite the overwhelming evidence that this type of building costs more money, the Minister, by way of interjection, suggested that may not be the case.

I will read what Mr. MacKenzie, the General Manager of the State Housing Commission, had to say in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 16th June, 1967. Under the heading, "12,850 On S.H.C. List For Homes," he said—

The State Housing Commission had a waiting list of 12,850 people last month and the list is expected to grow to 13,500 this month.

Manager R. B. MacKenzie said yesterday that the list contained duplications between people applying for both rent and purchase homes.

I will digress and point out that the Government has at least given evidence of the fact that this is a very inflated figure indeed. Continuing—

The commission's present emphasis on flats and small homes would not necessarily speed reduction of the waiting list.

In other words, this type of building does not speed up the reduction of the waiting list. An applicant has to wait just the same. So there is no advantage to be gained from erecting this type of building. Continuing—

Flats took a long time to plan and negotiate with local authorities.

He said building costs of flats could be slightly higher per unit than homes, but savings on land could make the total cost less.

I do not know anything about that. Continuing to quote—

Rents of flats and homes were similar. Flat dwellers had to pay for parking and for a share of landscaping costs.

In my opinion, there is absolutely nothing, except the price of the land, to suggest that we should have this type of development. We will not get the accommodation quicker or cheaper. So, in my opinion, there is nothing to commend this type of development and it cuts right

across the accepted way of life of ordinary Western Australians. I bitterly oppose it and will continue to do so unless, at some time in the future, it proves to be a success. In that case, I will retract what I have said; but I do not believe I will ever have to make that retraction because, as I mentioned before, we will live to regret the development of housing units such as these.

I think I have made the point that I am not favourably inclined towards this type of development and trust that the State Housing Commission will have another look at it and take some notice of the fact that many local authorities, when asked for their permission, will be opposed to it. Some units will be built, because a few local authorities will and have agreed; but the majority have not. People do not want to live in these buildings and, as far as I am concerned, there is no justification for erecting them. In my opinion we should build the type of houses that people want.

I am not a great believer in the idea that every house should be built on a quarter-acre of land. I know I could get into an argument about this but I suggest that blocks of land could be cut down—certainly as far as I am concerned—to one-eighth of an acre. A block of this size with a fence around it would make for far happier living than one of the buildings of which I have just been speaking. Therefore, I hope the Government can prevail on the State Housing Commission's planners to look at this matter in the light of what the average Australian person would want and think about whether erecting those buildings will provide suitable accommodation in which to bring children up as decent citizens of Western Australia. I support the motion.

THE HON. H. R. ROBINSON (North Metropolitan) [5.7 p.m.]: I support the motion so ably moved by Mr. Willmott and join with others in wishing Mr. Jones and Mr. Lavery a speedy return to health. I hope they are soon back in the Chamber with regained health.

Last session I was approached by several members, and I mentioned to you, Mr. President, that there was a request for improved lighting in the Chamber. This year we certainly have it and I am sure all members desire to thank you for attending to that matter. The lighting now is much better than it has been in other years.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is very good now.

The Hon. H. R. ROBINSON: Yes; there is a very big improvement. There are a few matters to which I wish to refer, but it is not my intention to delay the House. One has reference to the Osborne Park Hospital. At the present time something like 26 beds are being added to the hospital and they will be ready in the near future.

However, I feel the Minister should give consideration to further extensions to this regional hospital. There is plenty of ground as the area comprises some 30 to 40 acres; and with the extension of Karrinyup and Balga, and the area in the northern districts, I feel sure that before long additional beds will be required. I hope the Minister will take this into consideration for the future.

Last year I asked several questions in regard to amber sodium lighting on crosswalks. In the meantime, I took the matter up with the Minister and I was pleased to hear that equipment has been ordered; a survey has been taken of the most important crosswalks on the major highways; and a priority list has been prepared. I understand there has been some delay in obtaining the equipment as it has to come from Holland and the units are fairly expensive, costing somewhere in the vicinity of \$600 or \$700.

It is most important that the major highways be fitted with this improved lighting system because in the winter time it is difficult for motorists to see pedestrians on a crosswalk. I have taken particular notice of the crosswalks in the Fremantle area, and along Stirling Highway, and regard this lighting as a great improvement. I hope that this year a number of crosswalks on Scarborough Beach Road, Guildford Road, and other main highways will be equipped with this lighting.

There has been an announcement in the Press recently that extensions will be made to the sewerage main in the Wembley Downs area. This work is essential because a number of flats are being built in that area, particularly on the coast road. Unless deep sewerage is provided it will be difficult to carry on any major development by way of building flats so I hope a start will be made on this work during this financial year.

I would like to say a few words on the question of housing. Quite a lot has been said during the Address-in-Reply about a housing shortage; and I think all speakers have emphasised the fact that the shortage is on the Government side of building operations. However, no mention has been made of the work that has been carried out by the private sector. The private sector has carried out a lot of work in the last year or so. At the present time the major building companies are constructing hundreds of homes; and wherever one looks throughout the metropolitan area one can see large numbers of buildings in course of construction.

In the North Metropolitan Province, which is represented by the Minister for Mines and myself—this area includes the Perth City Council and the Shire of Perth—a large number of flats are at present being built. Last year I checked as to the number of flats in the Perth City Council

area and found that 17 permits had been issued and 471 were under construction. The Perth Shire Council issued permits for 786 buildings, which are under construction. These include home units and flats, a major number being two-storied. Many of the buildings provide 18 to 25 units. All this is taking place in the areas I happen to represent.

As far as the State generally is concerned, the number of flats commenced in the year ended December, 1965, was Government 89 and private 1,298. For the year ended December, 1966, the private figure was 2,038. For the quarter ended March, 1967, there were 10 Government and 745 private. The number of flats completed for the year ended December, 1965, was Government nil and private 1,574. For the year ended December, 1966, it was Government 89 and private 1,694. For the quarter ended March, 1967, it was Government nil, private 387; while for flats under construction for the March quarter, 1967, it was Government 10 and private 1,408. These figures are for the whole of the State, but the majority are being built in the metropolitan area.

For example, for the year ended December, 1966, only 79 flats were completed in the rest of the State. So it is quite apparent that most of these flats are being erected in the metropolitan area.

One has only to look around any part of the metropolitan area to see evidence of the building boom, particularly with regard to flats and houses. This building is being carried out by the private sector which shows that that sector has confidence in the State, and in the Government of the State.

Mention has been made of a housing shortage. However, we have to remember we were faced with severe shortages only a few months ago when over 100 persons returned to the metropolitan area from Wittenoom. Also, we have had an influx of migrants, and there is also the natural increase in population. We have to bear in mind that the post-war babies—born in 1945-46—are now of marriageable age and they are the ones who are looking for homes. This, of course, is getting away from the matter on which I was speaking.

I was speaking of the part being played by the private sector in building in Western Australia. I think it has played a most important part and I am sure it will continue to do so for the benefit of the State. I support the motion.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.17 p.m.]: I would like to take up the time of the House for a few minutes, if I may, to reply to one or two matters raised by Dr. Hislop and other members. May I start with the last matter first. Replying to Mr. Robinson, I think that shortly, perhaps in another month, we will be opening new additions at the Osborne Park Hospital. Of course, we are very much

aware of the rapid growth of Perth, and especially that particular area.

I think it was last night that I said a long-range plan was envisaged for Osborne Park as a high rise construction area. It is an excellent area of land and, in time, there will be a major hospital established there. But that is not the only area in Perth which is showing rapid progress. We all know of the rapid increase in the population of Western Australia generally. In about 1960 a rather imaginative piece of planning was undertaken which positioned certain hospitals to cater for future districts of the metropolitan area. Many people at that time, considered this a little ambitious but it looks as though the Bulls Creek, Kwinana, and Rockingham plans may have to be brought forward five years. Probably the rest of the plan will have to be stepped up also because of the rapid development that is taking place.

Money, of course, is always the great handicap. There is not much point in saying that something ought to be done, and that money ought to be found, because money is not that easily obtained. Every Government is subjected to very grave criticism if it raises taxation in any form. Of course, this sort of building is not constructed from taxation returns, but from loan funds and we have a limited amount of those funds all the time. Whether they are always spent to the maximum advantage, I gravely doubt. I do not think any of us, as individuals, have ever spent our money to the maximum economic advantage. Therefore, I am doubtful whether any association—whether it is a football club or the Government—is able to achieve this.

We do reach a high degree of efficiency in the handling of money, mainly because we have to do so. It has to be watched closely, but that does not alter the fact that mistakes are made. Most of the mistakes which have been made are fairly well known. Dr. Hislop suggested we should have an immediate inquiry into the department and the medical services in Western Australia. I do not know that an inquiry would reveal any more than is already known. I think we know the shortcomings; in fact I would go further and say that probably every State is very much aware of its shortcomings.

Some mistakes are inbred; and some are hereditary because of what has gone on before. It is difficult to change or modify a system which was worked out in the days when 25 miles was a fair journey in any one day, and adapt it to a period when 25 miles is half an hour's trip. This has occurred in the lifetime of Dr. Hislop, and this difficulty is found everywhere in the world. Prior to the mid 1930s the medical institutions could treat symptoms, but since that time they have been able to treat specific diseases.

We all know of the hackneyed examples of pneumonia and, prior to the discovery

of penicillin, a person with that complaint was lucky to live. We all know from statistics what a killer this disease was, but we know also that today it is cured as easily as the common cold. I know from my own personal experience the difference in treatment between the time when my father had pneumonia back in 1928, and when my son developed it about 12 years ago. I know the difference in the treatment and the residual results of these things.

It is very difficult to transpose a system which grew up, to some extent, in the days about which I have been speaking, and modify it to fit in with the development which is taking place in this rapidly changing and technological age. Today, of course, we have specific cures for specific complaints. The important aspect is always to be able to determine what the specific complaint is.

To determine the complaints it is necessary to have pathological services and a lot of diagnostic material. In this regard Dr. Hislop is perfectly right when he says that the whole hospital system has to be revised. Indeed, a great deal of thought has gone into this. We have all heard of the regional system of hospitals. One of the main problems is to persuade the people that they can get better medicine by having fewer hospitals.

Every little community likes to have its hospital and its resident doctor, but this does not always mean the community will get better medicine. It is necessary to have a graduated scale of hospitals. The scale which we envisage starts with a local nursing centre with accommodation for a double-certificated nurse, a treatment room, overnight accommodation for one patient, a room for a travelling nurse, and a waiting room. Also, unless there is another building, accommodation to house an ambulance. If a complaint is a minor one which the nurse can look after, she handles it. The sisters in these positions do a wonderful job and I think most members have heard about the sister at Shark Bay who was decorated a short time ago. Last month I opened another two centres of this type, one at Koorda and one at Dowerin.

If a patient needs further attention he will travel on to a district hospital, which is a little bigger. Then there is the sub-regional hospital which is a little bigger still, and slightly more complex. Then there is the regional hospital, and in some cases the patients will go direct to the major hospitals.

Today, medicine demands very complex equipment. The equipment is invaluable when handled by the right people. However, the best of equipment is so much junk unless one has the right person to handle it and who knows when to use it and how to use it. This type of equipment calls for a 24-hour three-shift operation.

Staff is not easily found to operate these pieces of equipment. You, sir, are fairly well informed on this because at the openings of the centres at both Koorda and Dowerin, we discussed this matter, as you will recall.

I can understand a community which has a small hospital, and which gets the services of a doctor intermittently, striving to retain the services of that doctor. However, this is becoming very difficult. The doctor is on call seven days a week. If there is a call he cannot refuse to go out. Yet, the slightest slip and he faces the very grave risk of being responsible for an incomplete cure of a person. This is a humanitarian risk of course but he could perhaps even cause some damage if he were very tired at the time. There is even the risk of legal action being taken against him. This problem is becoming very grave and serious, so much so that it is thought by the department—and many people in the medical field—that the time will come when the single doctor practice will, indeed, disappear.

It may be that in time we will centralise doctors into at least two-man practices or, if they are separated, at least to have a very close inter-connection so that one can support the other. This would enable them to get the normal time off. Indeed, planning at the present envisages going further than this and perhaps arranging some relief periodically so that country doctors can return to the city for post-graduate study or refresher courses. A great deal of thought has been put into this, and it is probable that it touches the hearts of the people.

Many members here have taken the trouble to attend openings of hospitals. Those members will agree that even for the opening of the smaller nursing posts a number of people attend because everyone is interested in hospitals. The bigger hospitals attract crowds at their openings. The day one hospital was opened for inspection some 3,000 or 4,000 people turned up. This is not usual, but it does demonstrate that hospitals are an integral part of the community.

Dr. Hislop mentioned the difficulties when facing epidemics. This, of course, is realised because I would point out we are in the midst of two grave and serious epidemics. One is longevity, and the other is the sickness of violence. As the doctor told us, 50 per cent. of the beds in the Royal Perth Hospital are occupied by geriatrics. Some 40 per cent. of the State's beds are so occupied. I would ask: If a person is sick, just because that person happens to be old, should he be sent to some hospital other than the best in the State?

Elderly people almost invariably demand fairly heavy nursing. This is the belief of those who study this problem—and I might point out that we have

two very good men in this field in Western Australia in Dr. Lefroy and Dr. Dougan. Dr. Dougan has just completed a world trip on a scholarship studying this particular problem.

The department does not believe that there should be separate and distinct geriatric hospitals; each hospital should have a geriatric section and, indeed, we have started on this idea. There is a building at Albany and we are currently giving consideration to one at Bunbury.

One of the first stages of the construction of the Perth Medical Centre will be a low-level building so that these elderly people can be taken easily out into the sun and fresh air, but it will be adjacent to the major hospital so that the staff can be rotated through the different services. By this means a nurse is not engaged on the one type of work for 12 months, for instance, handling elderly people with the heavy work which is involved. The nurses will be able to work in the different sections such as geriatrics for six weeks, then general medical for six weeks, radiological for six weeks, and through whatever services the hospital happens to have within its framework. We think this is the best solution. However, there is more to the problem than this.

The department is trying to enlarge the domiciliary services to keep people out of hospitals. We are doing everything possible to establish frail-aged homes, which are an innovation in this State, and the project is being carefully studied by other States. Our endeavour is to keep these people out of hospital and we are currently working on the matter. However, it is a problem.

That brings me to another matter—one of the major sections of Dr. Hislop's comments. I refer to the matter of payments to pensioners. I am sure nobody would wish to see the present arrangements, with regard to pensioners and their medical payments, upset, but the position does present some great difficulties so far as the State is concerned.

As Dr. Hislop mentioned, the Federal Government pays \$5 a day towards the hospital care of a pensioner and the State Government, therefore, is automatically faced with paying the difference in the case of every pensioner to whom the Federal Government gives a medical entitlement. However, the matter goes a little further than this. Under the Federal scheme pensioners receive free hospital treatment and are still able to retain the whole of their pension. Also they are looked after at general practitioner level but, so far as I know, no provision is made for specialist treatment, and if it were not for the fact that doctors realise this, and give a tremendous amount of free treatment to pensioner patients, the Royal Perth Hospital would be even

more inundated with medically-entitled pensioners than it is today.

Automatically these pensioners must go through a State hospital, and when I say "a State hospital," I mean a hospital of the type of Royal Perth which operates under the honorary system; because these pensioners are encouraged not to insure. They cannot afford to pay out of their own pockets for the sort of surgery with which at times they are faced, and also the specialised service that is needed. Therefore, they go through to the major hospitals to have this work done. However, the private medical practitioners in this State undertake a tremendous amount of work—work which is within their capacity—and thus relieve the situation to a great extent. The regional hospitals, too, are relieving the position and the more specialists we are able to secure for the country areas—and we are having some success in this—the more we will be able to relieve the situation in this regard.

This problem, for which we can see no solution, is the result of the very nature of the Federal system, and the same position applies in every State. Talk as we might, there is little or nothing we can do about it. We have had conferences about it and, quite frankly, I do not know what the answer is. At present we are facing a very serious epidemic, because medical science, the general standard of living, food, and everything else, is increasing the general longevity of people: and it follows, almost automatically I suppose, that as one gets older one automatically falls heir to a number of maladies which require an increasing amount of care.

This is a real epidemic and perhaps it is not being handled ideally, or perfectly, because the solution is, as in so many other instances, a matter of opinion. Nobody can say that this is the answer or that is the answer. People who are highly qualified in this field will debate, in a friendly way, whether one should take this course or that course. So it is quite a problem.

The day hospital at Fremantle is an excellent institution but I do not think credit is due to it entirely for the lower percentage of geriatrics there. The Fremantle Hospital is different from the Royal Perth Hospital. Indeed the Fremantle Hospital is one in which a fair percentage of general practitioner work is done: whereas very little of this work is done at Royal Perth. However, the day hospital at Fremantle is an excellent institution and the general attitude of the community, and the attitude of the hospital itself towards its community responsibility is something to be admired. The authorities there are making certain plans and I hope we will be able to help them in all that they do.

The other major epidemic, to which I have already made some slight reference, is the sickness of violence, if I can refer to it as such—I am talking of accidents with motorcars and injuries caused by accidents in the home, such as burns etc.

I am not sure of the exact figures, but I think 100,000 bed days were taken up with these cases last year, and I would be surprised if they were responsible for much less than 20 per cent. of our hospital occupancy. I was not able to check the figures accurately, but I think they are about right. Again, this is something for which I do not know the answer. It is something which is not under my control and it is not the responsibility of the department which I currently represent. It is largely a matter of care on the roads and in the home.

Members may have seen a report from Mrs. Devlin in regard to home accidents. This is one section which does come under the Department of Health and it has been something of a shock to people to think that in the home, which is considered to be such a haven and a place of safety, there can be so many disasters for young people. When anyone sees the statistical reports concerning home accidents he is quite shocked.

The department is spending a fair amount of money on this work and so highly regarded is our programme in this State that Mrs. Devlin was asked to go to both South Australia and Victoria to advise on what was being done here. Naturally we permitted her to go and I believe she was a great help to the authorities in those States.

However, those are the two epidemics with which we are faced and they are matters of grave concern to all of us. We all drive motorcars and we all hope to grow old, and anything that any of us can do to ease the problems or add to the knowledge we already have would be welcomed by all concerned.

Referring again to Dr. Hislop's remarks, I have serious doubts whether an inquiry, by whatever expert we may be able to get from the Eastern States, would justify the expenditure involved. I doubt whether we would find out anything which we do not already know or have not had drawn to our attention. We have visits from authorities in the other States and we visit other States in return. We have talks with these people and we discuss our problems with them. In short, our problems are common.

It is the popular thing to say that we would have no problems that could not be solved if we had another \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000; but in the field about which I am talking that is not altogether proved; because one can never be sure that what one intends to do is the real solution to the problem.

I will give a small illustration. Many years ago Denmark, I think, was considered

to be most prominent in the field of the care of the elderly. The authorities in that country established a village and, currently, it is the home of 1,800 people over the age of 85 years. The average waiting time to get into a home in that village, when it was first started, was 18 months. However, now even the country which originated the idea does not like it because there are 1,800 people over the age of 85 years living together in a closed community. They are being looked after by a team of highly-qualified physicians and they are searching for ways to alter the system. Yet this plan was highlighted as the absolute ultimate in the way to handle geriatric problems.

I would not like to be tucked away in a village like this and I do not think it is the answer. I think one needs a certain amount of money to try to experiment with different ideas and in that way we might be able to hit on a solution to the problem. There must be a great degree of flexibility and that is not possible in the instance I have just quoted.

I think I might give one other small example before I finish. One of our officers went overseas and reported to us on alcoholism and about a city which I have heard quoted as having a wonderful hospital for alcoholics. In this hospital the recovery rate is about 90 per cent., which is absolutely fantastic. However, when this officer visited the hospital in question he found it to be a beautiful institution but it looks after only 40 people.

He asked the authorities there what was the current alcoholic problem in that State in the way of numbers, and they told him 14,000. So they have established a reputation in a hospital which treats 40 hand-picked patients of a total of 14,000, and of that 40 they expect a 90 per cent. recovery rate. However, it is only when one makes a study of that hospital that one finds it is not the answer to the problem. So in this situation it is not right to say, "If you advance us another \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 we will overcome the problem," because one is never quite sure of a solution. One cannot be sure that in 10 or 15 years that will be the answer to the problem.

This should not be taken to mean, of course, that no action should be taken in an endeavour to solve the question, but the action that is taken has to be taken with care, and that is why we collaborate closely with other authorities in the Eastern States. Various set-ups in the Eastern States—particularly the one at Newcastle—were studied in order to compare one with the other and to make the best progress possible, always with consideration of the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Heitman.

House adjourned at 5.43 p.m.