

rowing power is limited to shorter terms than 45 or 53 years, but at the end of the period of the shorter loan, the shire council can raise another loan to pay for the balance of the existing loan and to continue the loan on. Therefore, virtually the amount is covered from the amortisation of the Government housing authority over the full period of the time of 53 years. This obviates any need of subsidy by the shire council.

The only difference between this proposition and the first one is that the council is responsible for the maintenance and the rent. Many shire councils have passed the responsibility to a committee from the parents and citizens' association which acts as the rent collector and insists on a deposit when the teacher goes into the accommodation. This deposit is required against any excess damage which may occur in the year. The system has worked very well. Where shire councils wish to provide accommodation for all single people, who are not necessarily school teachers, they have to raise their own loans on their own amortisation. The Superannuation Board has been about the only source which offers a term of 30 years, which does cut the rent down considerably. Once again, the parents and citizens' association acts as the rent collector and first preference is given to teachers. The rents in these cases must be kept at about \$6; otherwise it does not seem to work.

The fourth point is to try to encourage the private builders to build flats in the towns. I have questioned some of the builders who have done this and they are charging about \$6 a week per person for four units which accommodate eight people. They say they are making 10 per cent. to 12 per cent. on their outlay of capital, which is quite a good return, and it serves a dual purpose in that the builder properly obtains other contracts in the town, because people know he is trying to help the area in which he is living. There really should be no problem with this single-teacher accommodation. It should be solved very quickly with a little co-operation on all sides.

Finally, I would very quickly like to emphasise, as I think has been done before in this House, the need for some better means of providing housing on conditional purchase blocks. In one little group alone, we have 33 occupants on the blocks and only two have houses. These people have young families, because it is mostly young people who are allocated these blocks today, and it will be many years before they are able to build accommodation in their own right as their funds naturally are limited. They borrow as much as they possibly can in order to proceed with the development of their properties.

I would suggest it will be many years before they can get around to providing the actual capital on a short-term basis for a house. With the price of land the

way it is there seems to be no reason why initially the interest and sinking fund on a loan for a house could not be incorporated into the conditional purchase rental over the acreage of the block itself.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: A very good suggestion.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: It is most important in any project today that the wives are treated with as much consideration as possible, because they play equally as important a part as they always have done in helping to develop a farm. Without that support and a general feeling of security and comfort, it does not make for harmony in the household.

I do not think I will say any more on that subject. We are not happy with the inability of people on conditional purchase blocks to borrow money for housing from practically any source at all. One only has to go around amongst the people who are working this land to see them living in sheds with their very young families in order to realise what they are putting up with in their keenness and desire to own a plot of farming land. There seems to be no good or just reason why finance could not be provided in some way in order to allow them to have a modest kind of unit. It could be one which is pre-cut and which simply could be erected on the site and removed if necessary.

The people themselves are very happy to have this land. They are doing a good job, but it would be an added consideration and help to them to get on with their work if they had better living accommodation. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. H. C. Strickland.

House adjourned at 9.24 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 15th August, 1967

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

QUESTIONS (36): ON NOTICE POLICE

Antique Firearms: Amending Legislation

1. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Police:

Is it intended to introduce legislation this session for the purpose of amending the Firearms and Guns Act in order to provide for the issue of licenses to *bona fide* collectors of antique firearms?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

This matter is at present under review.

LAND

*Noggerup: Tabling of Lands
Department Papers*

2. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Lands:

Will he lay on the Table of the House all Department of Lands and Surveys, and Crown Lands Tribunal papers relating to an application for a small area of vacant Crown land adjoining the southern boundary of Noggerup townsite?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

Yes, for one week.

The file was tabled for one week.

FORESTS

*Noggerup: Tabling of Forests
Department Papers*

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Forests:

Will he lay on the Table of the House all Forests Department papers relating to an application for a small area of vacant Crown land adjoining the southern boundary of Noggerup townsite?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

Yes, for one week.

The file was tabled for one week.

CAUSEWAY AND NARROWS
BRIDGE*Traffic Density*

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

What density of traffic has been revealed by counts taken of vehicular flow over the Causeway during each of the last 10 years, and over the Narrows Bridge since it was brought into use?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Morning peak hour flows towards the city are as follows:—

| | Causeway | Narrows Bridge |
|------|----------|----------------|
| 1957 | 3,492 | |
| 1958 | 3,681 | |
| 1959 | 3,847 | Opened |
| 1960 | 3,319 | November, 1959 |
| 1961 | 3,483 | 1,809 |
| 1962 | 3,536 | 2,357 |
| 1963 | 3,715 | 3,178 |
| 1964 | 3,945 | 3,383 |
| 1965 | 4,038 | 3,574 |
| 1966 | 4,032 | 3,703 |
| 1967 | 4,096 | 4,182 |
| | | 4,632 |

Evening peak hour flows from the city—

| | Causeway | Narrows Bridge |
|------|----------|----------------|
| 1957 | 3,904 | |
| 1958 | 4,070 | |
| 1959 | 4,073 | |
| 1960 | 2,650 | 1,770 |
| 1961 | 3,310 | 2,925 |
| 1962 | 3,750 | 3,027 |
| 1963 | 3,749 | 3,455 |
| 1964 | 3,772 | 3,517 |
| 1965 | 3,880 | 3,868 |
| 1966 | 4,035 | 4,052 |
| 1967 | 4,030 | 4,062 |

7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Total flows both directions—

| | Causeway | Narrows Bridge |
|------|----------|----------------|
| 1957 | 37,482 | |
| 1959 | 42,040 | |
| 1960 | | 13,610 |
| 1965 | 43,820 | 29,430 |
| 1967 | 50,980 | 34,220 |

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES'
HOUSING AUTHORITY*Expenditure and Houses Allocated*

5. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Premier:

(1) What is the total sum of money spent by the Government Employees' Housing Authority since its inception?

(2) How was this money spent?

(3) Which departments were allotted the additional accommodation, where, and in what number?

Mr. BRAND replied:

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------|-------------|
| (1) | \$1,151,635. | \$ | \$ |
| (2) | (a) New houses (including land and fees) | 874,096 | |
| | (b) Additions (including provision of hot water systems, flywire screening and garages) | 158,231 | |
| | (c) Furniture (including floor coverings and window treatments provided to existing houses) | 69,308 | 1,101,635 |
| | (d) Maintenance | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| | | | \$1,151,635 |

| (3) | Department | No. of Houses | Location |
|-----|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Education | 5 | Albany |
| | | 5 | Bunbury |
| | | 1 | Busselton |
| | | 1 | Collie |
| | | 1 | Dowerin |
| | | 1 | Durandlin |
| | | 4 | Esperance |
| | | 4 | Geraldton |
| | | 1 | Jerdacuttup |
| | | 1 | Katanning |
| | | 1 | Koolyanobbing |
| | | 2 | Merredin |
| | | 1 | Meekatharra |
| | | 1 | Mt. Barker |
| | | 1 | Mukinbudin |
| | | 6 | Narrogin |
| | | 1 | Needilup |
| | | 1 | Paynes Find |
| | | 1 | Pinjarra |
| | | 1 | Port Hedland |
| | | 1 | Waroona |
| | | 1 | Wyndham |
| | | 42 | |
| | Agriculture | 1 | Bridgetown |
| | | 1 | Northam |
| | | 1 | Derby |
| | | 1 | Lake Grace |
| | | 1 | Moora |
| | | 1 | Narrogin |
| | | 1 | Three Springs |
| | | 7 | |
| | Public Works | 3 | Bunbury |
| | | 1 | Busselton |
| | | 1 | Carnarvon |
| | | 3 | Port Hedland |
| | | 8 | |

| Department | No. of Houses | Location |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Public Health | 1 | Broome |
| | 1 | Merredin |
| | 1 | Port Hedland |
| | 3 | |
| Native Welfare | 1 | Derby |
| | 1 | Esperance |
| | 1 | Geraldton |
| | 1 | Moora |
| | 1 | Port Hedland |
| | 1 | Warburton Mission |
| | 6 | |
| Fisheries | 2 | Geraldton |
| | 2 | |
| Crown Law | 1 | Boulder |
| | 1 | Merredin |
| | 1 | Wyndham |
| | 3 | |
| North West | 1 | Derby |
| | 1 | |
| Child Welfare | 1 | Albany |
| | 1 | |

TRAFFIC

Motor Vehicle Registrations

6. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Police:

What was the yearly increase in motor vehicle registrations over the past five years in the metropolitan area?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

For the 12 months ended the 30th June—

1963—15,583.
1964—23,969.
1965— 8,986.
1966—17,524.
1967—18,462.

RING ROAD SYSTEM

Mitchell Freeway: Opening

7. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Works:

How long will it be before the ring road system of the Mitchell Freeway is open for traffic?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

No timetable has been set for the completion of the inner ring road system.

It is expected that part of the Mitchell Freeway which forms the western leg of the ring road will be open to traffic in 1970.

IRRIGATION

Benger Swamp

8. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the extent of the investigation work undertaken by the department to assess the

practicability of irrigating Benger Swamp?

- (2) What conclusions have been drawn from the experiments conducted to date?
(3) Is it the intention of the department to continue with the investigation?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) A co-operative programme of experimentation aimed at assessing the value of sprinkler irrigation on potatoes in Benger Swamp has been carried out by my department and the Public Works Department over the past three years. Initial experiments were very exploratory, but last year the area involved in experimentation was in the order of eight acres.
(2) The initial experiments involved rate and frequency of irrigation. Some of the frequencies used, while giving excellent top growth, resulted in reduced soil aeration, causing poor tuber development and in some cases rotting.

Experimentation was subsequently modified and last year involved irrigation at intervals ranging from 10 days to 28 days with variable planting distances. Yield increases resulted from irrigation, but the economic assessment of these increases cannot be made until data concerning tuber weights in relation to quality has been analysed. Subject to the availability of laboratory data a comprehensive report will be compiled in about another month.

- (3) Most probably.

POTATOES

Research into Export Varieties

9. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What research has taken place in the State for the purpose of evolving a suitable potato for South-East Asia market?
(2) How long has this research been going on?
(3) What results have been accomplished to date?
(4) Is this research continuing?
(5) Is the soil at the Manjimup Research Station suitable for the above research?
(6) If not, is it the intention of the department to establish a research station in the Manjimup area on soil that is suitable for research into the various types of farming activities in the area?
(7) When will this station be established?

- (8) Is it possible to evolve a type of yellow flesh potato in soils in the Manjimup area, or any other potato growing area in the State?
- (9) What are the difficulties against Western Australia competing against European countries in the sale of potatoes in the South-East Asia market?
- (10) Have any efforts been made to assess this market?
- (11) If so, what are the results of such efforts?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Varieties and seedlings, including yellow fleshed varieties from overseas and Australian sources, have been grown and assessed for yield, quality, and market potential.
- (2) Five years.
- (3) Three yellow fleshed varieties with yields comparable with standard varieties have been selected.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) to (7) An area of 647 acres has recently been acquired for a new research station 13 miles south-east of Manjimup. It contains a variety of soil types and situations suitable for research into the various agricultural crops of the region together with studies of some animal problems. Paddocks are in the course of preparation and are being fenced for sheep disease investigations and spring plantings of potatoes. Plans for the further development of the station are now proceeding.
- (8) Yes.
- (9) The main difficulties relate to competition on a price and quality basis.
- (10) Yes.
- (11) Results have indicated that there is a market for the varieties which have been selected. These results have been achieved with trial consignments from small experimental plantings.

WHOLE MILK AND BUTTER

Reduced Production

10. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that in the 11 months to May this year the whole milk production in Western Australia fell by 11.3 per cent. compared with the corresponding period in the previous year, though there was an increase of 6.2 per cent. for the whole of Australia for that period?
- (2) Is he aware that butter production fell by 21.4 per cent. in Western Australia compared with a 7 per cent. rise for the whole

of Australia during the above period?

- (3) What were the causes for the fall in production?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) An extremely bad season and some movement to other forms of production.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Collie Shire: Tabling of File

11. Mr. MAY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Will he lay on the Table of the House Local Government File 25764 relating to Shire of Collie administration?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Yes, for 14 days.

The file was tabled for two weeks.

POULTRY FARMING

Commonwealth Levy: Refund to Growers

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Apropos his reply to my question of the 9th August, 1967 re refunds of poultry levy payments, would he please indicate the nature of the information that has yet to be collected?
- (2) In what other States of Australia have such refunds not yet been made?
- (3) On what date was the Egg Marketing Board authorised by the Commonwealth to make such refunds available to growers?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The relative profitability of egg production in different outlying areas has not yet been determined.
- (2) The only State which has made refunds to producers of the hen levy is Queensland in respect of the northern part of that State.
- (3) Amendment to the Commonwealth Poultry Industry Assistance Act made it possible, as from the 26th November, 1966, for refunds to be made to growers as considered necessary.

CHILD WELFARE

Reception Home for Country Children

13. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

Is there a reception home in the metropolitan area for delinquent

children sent from country areas and awaiting allocation to homes?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

Yes. Longmore at Bentley for children over 13 years. The Child Welfare Reception Home at Mt. Lawley for children under 13 years.

14. *This question was postponed.*

THIRD PARTY AND COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE *Policies, Premiums, and Claims*

15. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has there been any alterations made to—
 - (a) Third party policy insurance, and
 - (b) Comprehensive motor vehicle insurance policies?
- (2) If "Yes," what changes have been made?
- (3) Have changes been made in premiums in one or both cases, how were they made and to what extent?
- (4) When claiming for personal injury or death under a third party insurance policy, is it necessary for a claim to be successful that the driver of the vehicle had been first found guilty of negligence in a court of law?
- (5) What would be the position of a passenger in a car in respect of claiming for any injury he might have received in collision with an animal on a road and no negligence could be proved?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) There are almost 150 insurance companies issuing comprehensive motor vehicle insurance policies in Western Australia. It is not known whether or not any alterations have been made.
- (2) (a) Limitations in respect of claims by passengers have been removed following the amendment to the Act last year. Spouse v spouse allowed under certain circumstances, and Third Party Claims Tribunal appointed.
- (b) See answer to 1 (b).
- (3) (a) Changes in motor vehicle third party premiums were made applicable from the 1st January, 1967, following a recommendation of the pre-

miums committee which was tabled in Parliament. The increase was 50 per cent.

- (b) It is known that some insurance companies have varied their premiums but the details are not known, nor is there any person authorised to answer on behalf of all the insurance companies.

(4) No.

- (5) It depends upon circumstances, but generally where no negligence can be proved there would be no claim against the trust.

GOVERNOR'S ESTABLISHMENT

Cost of Upkeep

16. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

- (1) What are the details of—
 - (a) salary;
 - (b) allowances;
 - (c) travelling expenses; paid to the Governor for the year ended the 30th June, 1967?
- (2) What staff is employed and what are their salaries?
- (3) How many gardeners are employed?
- (4) What was the cost of upkeep of the gardens?
- (5) What incidental expenses were incurred for the period mentioned?
- (6) What expense, if any, was incurred for motor transport and/or driver?
- (7) What other labour, if any, was employed and by whom were the relevant expenses paid?
- (8) What was the aggregate cost to the Government for the upkeep of the establishment for the year ended the 30th June, 1967?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) (a) \$14,500.
- (b) (i) \$17,127—actual cost of wages and keep for 11 domestic staff (includes cleaner) employed at Government House.
- (ii) \$200—to cover yearly requirement of uniforms for domestic staff.
- (iii) \$1,698—for employment of a private secretary or A.D.C.
- (c) Nil.
- (2) Official secretary—\$5,423.
Typist—\$2,438.
Telephonist—\$1,985.
Orderly—\$3,627.
- (3) Eight.
- (4) \$22,762.

| | \$ |
|--|---------|
| (5) (a) Telephones | 2,116 |
| (b) Newspapers | 525 |
| (c) Postages and cables | 532 |
| (d) Ballroom | 143 |
| (e) Travelling expenses, staff | 119 |
| (f) Rail and air transport, Governor and staff | 966 |
| (g) Printing | 670 |
| (h) Sundries | 303 |
| Total cost, incidentals | \$5,379 |

| | |
|------------------------------|---------|
| (6) (a) Motorcar costs | 461 |
| (b) Wages, chauffeur | 3,522 |
| Total cost | \$3,983 |

- (7) Tradesmen and labourers required to carry out maintenance and upkeep on the Governor's establishment are employed by the Public Works Department. The cost of this work for the year ended the 30th June, 1967, was \$15,234.

| | \$ |
|--|----------|
| (8) All items | 64,622 |
| Governor's salary | 14,500 |
| Other labour (as in answer to (7)) | 15,234 |
| Aggregate cost to Government | \$94,356 |

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mayors, Presidents, and Councillors: Number

17. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

What is the total number of—

- (a) mayors;
 - (b) presidents;
 - (c) councillors;
- at present holding office in the local government districts under the provisions of the Local Government Act?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (a) mayors 18, including one lord mayor.
- (b) presidents 123.
- (c) councillors including presidents, 1,319.

Note: These figures apply to the 30th June, 1967. There are three shires administered by commissioners.

NATIVES

Employment in the Country

18. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Is he aware that a problem exists in many country districts for the employment of young people of aboriginal descent, particularly school leavers?

- (2) Are any steps taken by the department to encourage native families to move from one district to another or from the country to the city in the interest of greater educational and employment opportunities for their children?
- (3) What is the policy and what steps are taken by the department to ensure that young people of aboriginal descent are suitably employed?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, in individual cases where this course appears justified.
- (3) It is the policy and practice of the department to give native children every possible encouragement and assistance to continue their education to the stage where they can obtain satisfying and rewarding employment and to assist them to obtain such employment.

HEALTH

Asthma: Use of Hormone Drug

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

- (1) Is he aware of *The West Australian*, the 3rd April, 1967, comment regarding—
 - (a) a hormone drug used to help women to have babies and being at the same time suitable to cure boys suffering from asthma; and
 - (b) further that a cure rate of 33 out of 37 cases is claimed for asthmatics?
- (2) Is the drug being administered in Western Australia?
- (3) If not, will he ensure that inquiries are undertaken to—
 - (a) investigate the alleged cures mentioned; and
 - (b) if found beneficial ensure the availability of the drug for use in Western Australia?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Yes.
- (2) Ovulation stimulating hormone drugs are administered in Western Australia.
- (3) Not applicable.

HAMERSLEY IRON PTY. LTD.

Royalties: Undercharge

20. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Treasurer:

- (1) In view of *The West Australian*, the 15th February, 1967, comment of \$553,348 profit for a five-month operating period by Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd., does he not consider the Government was over generous to the company in relation to original negotiations regarding royalties?

(2) Is the State irrevocably committed to the present apparently unrealistic level of royalty?

(3) If not, or in any case, does he intend to attempt to prevail upon the company to consider paying a royalty more consistent with profits?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) No. The honourable member apparently overlooks the fact that—

(a) Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. has a huge sum of money in excess of \$160,000,000 invested in this project which initially would have been regarded as a risk venture.

(b) The company provided—at no cost to the State—its own railway, rollingstock, locomotives, towns at mine and port (including housing, schools, hospitals, police stations, and other services such as water and power), wharves, and harbour development.

(c) The company is still spending large sums on the construction of processing plant. Presumably it includes a pelletising plant and a desalination plant.

(d) The company is committed to further large sums involving more than \$50,000,000 for more development including additional processing.

(2) The royalties are set out in the agreements ratified by Parliament. They are considered fair and equitable, having regard for charges in other parts of Australia and overseas and the company's commitments for town, railway and port development, etc.

There is an automatic increase in charges of 25c per ton after the 15th year from commencement of exports with a minimum increase of \$300,000 per year (see clause 9 (1) (b) of agreement). Royalties on overseas shipments of ore are tied to an *ad valorem* calculation (with specified minimums) which means that royalties increase automatically with higher sales prices but without any danger of falling below the prescribed minimums.

(3) See (1) and (2). Also, it would be a serious reflection on the State's business stability and integrity if we were not prepared to honour agreements made in good faith and on a sound basis with full regard for the responsibilities and risks of both parties.

HEIRISSON ISLAND

Cultural Centre Subcommittee

21. Mr. DAVIES asked the Premier:

(1) Did any Government committee, other than a Cabinet subcommittee, examine the proposal to build a cultural centre on Heirisson Island?

(2) If so—

(a) on how many occasions did the committee meet;

(b) from whom did they seek evidence?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) and (2) Upon further inquiry I find that no Government committee other than the Cabinet subcommittee was set up to examine the Heirisson Island proposals.

However, the Central Area Committee of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority considered reports on Heirisson Island and cultural facilities for Perth at its meeting on the 28th September, 1966.

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority endorsed the reports at its meeting on the 5th October, 1966.

I wish to explain to the House that I might have misled the honourable member, which resulted in a second question on this subject being asked by him. I thought there was another committee which had been set up separately. However, it was arranged under the Cabinet subcommittee, and it was not a committee of the sort that I believed it was.

SHEEP THEFTS

Number from 1965 to 1967

22. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Police:

How many sheep have been reported stolen in Western Australia during the years 1965, 1966, and 1967?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

| Year | Reported stolen | Subsequently believed not stolen |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| 1964-1965 | 10,307 | 1,500 |
| 1965-1966 | 5,946 | 1,940 |
| 1966-1967 | 2,200 | 1,111 |

BRANDS ACT

Revision

23. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Will the Brands Act be revised during this session of Parliament?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Amendments to the Brands Act are receiving consideration.

ROADS

Kambalda-Boulder: Bituminising

24. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Adverting to his answer to question 8 on Thursday, the 10th August, 1967, re Kambalda-Boulder road, will he be more specific regarding the proposed upgrading of this road by the department; i.e., does this mean that additional gravelling only will be undertaken?
- (2) Did his reply signify that the department has no plans for the sealing of this road in the near future?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Negotiations with the mining company for upgrading and sealing of the Boulder-Kambalda road have been completed. The work will be extended from Kambalda to Emu Rocks, and it is expected that priming over the whole length will be completed in about 12 to 14 months' time, with sealing to follow in the next year.
- (2) Answered by (1).

SCHOOL TEACHERS

Trainee Intake, and Retirements

25. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What was the annual intake of trainee teachers in each of the last five years?
- (2) What was the total wastage of teachers, including age retirement, in each of the last five years?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

| | | | | |
|-----|------|-------|-------|-----|
| (1) | 1962 | | | 594 |
| | 1963 | | | 547 |
| | 1964 | | | 535 |
| | 1965 | | | 636 |
| | 1966 | | | 739 |
| | 1967 | | | 777 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------|-------|--------|-------|
| (2) | | Male | Female | Total |
| | 1962 | | | 61 |
| | 1963 | | | 87 |
| | 1964 | | | 88 |
| | 1965 | | | 101 |
| | 1966 | | | 119 |

* Excludes 54 teachers under bond continuing under regulation 85 (1) (b) who would formerly have been counted as resigned.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Underground Channelling, Costs, and Consumption

26. Mr. WILLIAMS asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What is considered to be a justifiable load to enable the commission to place electricity supplies underground in—
 - (a) industrial;
 - (b) commercial;
 - (c) residential;
 areas?

(2) How many houses could be supplied by—

- (a) 100 KVA transformer;
 - (b) 200 KVA transformer;
- in each of the following areas—
- (i) Scarborough (no gas supply);
 - (ii) Hilton Park (no gas supply);
 - (iii) Victoria Park (with gas supply);
 - (iv) Dalkeith (with gas supply);
 - (v) Bunbury (S.H.C. area);
 - (vi) Bunbury (private residential area)?

(3) What would be the cost of electricity mains and services to each of the areas mentioned?

(4) What would the average residential dwelling contribute to the substation peak load in—

- (a) residential areas without a gas supply in metropolitan area;
- (b) residential areas with a gas supply in metropolitan area;
- (c) private residential area in Bunbury, Albany, and Northam;
- (d) S.H.C. residential area in Bunbury, Albany, and Northam?

(5) What is the typical average energy consumption per residential consumer in KWH per annum for—

- (a) residential areas without a gas supply in metropolitan area;
- (b) residential areas with a gas supply in metropolitan area;
- (c) private residential area in Bunbury, Albany, and Northam;
- (d) S.H.C. residential area in Bunbury, Albany, and Northam?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) The decision as to when and where it pays to change from overhead street mains to underground mains depends on many factors, technical and otherwise, and it is impossible to lay down a fixed rule.

(a) Industrial areas: In general, it has not been justified to underground street mains in the industrial areas so far served by the commission.

(b) Commercial areas: In commercial areas where there is a close grouping of many multi-storied buildings, it generally becomes desirable to underground the street mains when the load density of the whole

area reaches the order of 100 to 200 KVA per quarter-acre block.

- (c) Residential areas: It is impossible to justify economically the undergrounding of street mains in normal residential areas. Occasionally a residential area becomes a closely grouped area of multi-storied flats; if in these cases the load density is equal to that referred to in (b) above, the undergrounding of mains may be considered.

- (2) (a) 100 KVA transformer.
- | | |
|-------|----------------------|
| (i) | 70. |
| (ii) | 165 (Fremantle Gas). |
| (iii) | 180. |
| (iv) | 100. |
| (v) | 175. |
| (vi) | 150. |
- (b) 200 KVA transformer.
- | | |
|-------|----------------------|
| (i) | 140. |
| (ii) | 330 (Fremantle Gas). |
| (iii) | 360. |
| (iv) | 200. |
| (v) | 350. |
| (vi) | 300. |
- (3) Separate costs are not available for each area.
- (4) (a) Without gas 1.12 KVA;
(b) With gas .75 KVA;
(c) Bunbury, .84 KVA; Albany, .70 KVA; Northam, .91 KVA;
(d) Bunbury, .69 KVA; Albany, .55 KVA; Northam, .83 KVA.
- | | | |
|---------|-------------|-------|
| | | Kwh. |
| (5) (a) | Without gas | 3,600 |
| (b) | With gas | 2,400 |
| (c) | Bunbury | 1,700 |
| | Albany | 1,770 |
| | Northam | 2,030 |
| (d) | Bunbury | 1,500 |
| | Albany | 1,400 |
| | Northam | 1,450 |

Low Voltage Lines: Underground Channelling and Costs

27. Mr. WILLIAMS asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What types of cables are acceptable for low voltage undergrounding in residential areas, sizes, and cost per chain?
- (2) What is the estimated cost per chain for laying in a dry sand, virgin, subdivision area?
- (3) What is the cost per chain of overhead low voltage aerial mains in the following sizes—
0.1 sq. in. copper; 0.06 sq. in. copper; 0.04 sq. in. copper; 0.025 sq. in. copper?
- (4) What is the total average cost of erecting one bay of low tension residential main services including two poles in—
(a) metropolitan area;
(b) large country town?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Paper insulated lead covered steel wired armoured; .12 sq. inch; \$280.00 per chain of street.
- (2) \$52.00 per chain of street.
\$
- (3) .1 sq. inch—50.00.
.06 sq. inch—35.00.
.04 sq. inch—20.00.
.025 sq. inch—14.00.
\$
- (4) (a) 60.00.
(b) 70.00.

MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSES

Pensioners' Concessions

28. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Following the review by Cabinet of the concessional vehicle licenses for pensioners, how many applications have been made by—
(a) (i) civilian invalid pensioners;
(ii) service pensioners as defined by section 85 (2) of the Repatriation Act;
(b) totally and permanently incapacitated ex-servicemen?
- (2) What has been the amount saved by pensioners in each of the above categories?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) (i) Civilian invalid pensioners—111;
(ii) service pensioners—22;
(b) totally and permanently incapacitated ex-servicemen—18.
- (2) Civilian invalid pensioners—\$2,664.
Service pensioners—\$504.
T.P.I. pensioners—\$408.

ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Appointment of Administrator

29. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health: Adverting to his answer to question 18 of the 10th August, 1967, what was the procedure of selection of—
(a) overseas applicants;
(b) Eastern Australian and States applicants;
(c) Western Australian applicants;
for the vacancy created by the retirement of Royal Perth Hospital Administrator Griffiths?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

I would refer the honourable member to section 19 of the Hospitals Act, in which it states: "A board may from time to time appoint and remove a secretary, a treasurer, and such other medical and other officers, matrons

nurses, attendants, and servants as it thinks requisite to assist in the management of any public hospital under the control of the board, or otherwise in the execution of this Act".

It will be seen from Part III—Local Administration, that there is no reference in this section to any control of the board by the Minister. The procedures adopted are therefore a matter for the board. In this connection there is no statutory requirement for the Minister to be advised of such procedures or appointment.

However, in an endeavour to reply to the query of the honourable member, I have sought and obtained certain detail from the board which indicates that a selection committee was appointed by the board to examine all applications and to make a recommendation.

United Kingdom applicants firstly were assessed and short listed by a panel in the United Kingdom, which included the Official Secretary, Agent-General's Office.

Selected Eastern States' applicants were interviewed by the chairman of the board, who was also chairman of the selection committee, whilst he was in the Eastern States.

All Western Australian applicants were interviewed by the selection committee.

Finally, after noting all references, etc., the committee short listed applicants to four, from whom Mr. Driscoll was recommended by the committee, following which the board approved his appointment.

TRAFFIC OFFICE

Hours of Business

30. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) What is the daily commencing time for traffic officers in traffic offices?
- (2) From what time is service available in the traffic offices each day for public to license vehicles, etc.?
- (3) Is it a fact that a full hour is taken for meals and that offices are closed to the public during that time?
- (4) Prior to the change to the present office hours for public, what was the number of vehicles licensed per day and what is the number of vehicles now licensed?
- (5) Could meal hours for staff be staggered to avoid queues of people having to wait a full hour?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- | | Police Staff | Public Service Staff |
|--|----------------------|--|
| (1) Perth, Fremantle, Victoria Park, Subiaco, Rockingham | 8.00 a.m. | 8.30 a.m. |
| Midland and Armadale | 8.30 a.m. | 8.30 a.m. |
| R. & I. Bank | | 8.30 a.m. |
| (2) Perth and Midland (except lunch hour) | 9.00 a.m.—4.00 p.m. | |
| Fremantle, Victoria Park, Subiaco and Armadale | 9.30 a.m.—3.30 p.m. | |
| Rockingham (except lunch hour) | 10.00 a.m.—3.30 p.m. | |
| R. & I. Bank | | Normal banking hours as observed by the R. & I. Bank |
| (3) The only offices closed for luncheon are Midland (12.30 p.m.—1.30 p.m.) and Rockingham (12.00 noon to 1.00 p.m.) | | |
| (4) Statistical information of this nature is not kept. | | |
| (5) Answered by (3). | | |

RAILWAYS

Employees: Light Jobs and Workers' Compensation Payments

31. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) How many employees have been discharged from the Railways Department during the year to the 31st July, 1967, for requiring a "light job" as per doctor's certificate?
- (2) Are any "light jobs" available if recommended by doctor?
- (3) How many cases of workers' compensation payments are held up because of advice from the S.G.I.O.?
- (4) Have the employees concerned been advised?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Apart from compensation cases, no specific record is kept of this information. There have been three instances of workers injured on duty who could not be placed in light work as recommended by medical practitioners.
- (2) Yes. Special positions are reserved for employees who, because of injuries received on duty, are unable to carry out their normal occupation.
When these reserved positions are filled, or where due to language or other difficulties the employee cannot be placed, it is necessary to terminate his services.
- (3) Three.
- (4) No.

JUSTICES ACT*Multiple Fines: Clarification*

32. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Is it the Government's intention to amend the Justices Act to clarify position of multiple fines?

Mr. COURT replied:

Yes. A Bill will be introduced for this purpose during the present parliamentary session.

ESPERANCE LAND AGREEMENT*Compliance and Activities*

33. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has the committee referred to in clause 12 (c) of the Esperance Land Agreement, 1960, conferred with the company in every instance where the company disposed of land?
- (2) On how many occasions and on what dates have they conferred for this purpose?
- (3) How many blocks and what area has been allocated as a result of these consultations?
- (4) What was the number of applicants for the blocks?
- (5) Can he furnish a list of the successful applicants?
- (6) Has the provision contained in clause 12 (b) been complied with in these allocations?
- (7) Has the intention contained in clause 12 (c) been complied with in each case?
- (8) Is there a residential qualification applicable to the allottees prior to receiving a Crown grant?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) The procedure followed under clause 12 (c) of the agreement Act is for the company to forward details of proposed purchasers of lots to the State committee. This has been followed in all instances with the exception of one in June, 1964. On this occasion, however, the purchasers were of Australian nationality and the committee offered no objection.

The first proposed sales were referred to the committee in January, 1963, and details of all other projected sales—except for the one occasion mentioned above—have been furnished at varying times each year since then. The latest referred is under date the 31st July, 1967.

- (3) The blocks referred and allocated are shown on the plans which it is requested be tabled for one week.

(4) Multiple applications were not involved, and the committee dealt with cases where the names of individual purchasers only were referred—that is, it was not necessary to adjudge the merits of one applicant against another.

(5) The names of the various purchasers are indicated on the plan provided.

(6) Yes.

(7) Yes, except for the case mentioned and explained in (1).

(8) The committee has advised the company that in the selection of settlers under clause 12 (c) of the agreement Act, residence on the property is desirable.

The plans were tabled for one week.

METROPOLITAN REGION PLANNING AUTHORITY*Housing Accommodation Acquired, and Evictions*

34. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) How many houses or other units of living accommodation have been taken over by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority?
- (2) How many of these have been—
 - (a) demolished;
 - (b) used for purposes other than residential;
 - (c) left unoccupied;
 - (d) continued to be used for living purposes?
- (3) How many tenants have been evicted from such premises?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) About 193. (Records do not disclose the division of some old houses into accommodation units).
- (2) (a) 91.
(b) 9.
(c) 12 (9 of these boarded up pending demolition).
(d) 81.
- (3) 9.

GRAVEL*Reserve Areas*

35. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Government any areas reserved for the recovery of gravel suited to road use?
- (2) If so, where located and what area is involved?
- (3) What action is necessary in obtaining an area from which to supply gravel to persons requiring same?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) See statement below.
- (3) The Main Roads Department acquires these gravel reserves either by negotiated purchase or resumption under the Public Works Act.

**Gravel Reserves Acquired by
Main Roads Department**

| | Approximate Area Acres |
|--|------------------------------|
| Metropolitan Area | |
| Toodyay Road (16m.) | 400 |
| Herne Hill (corner Bisdee and Moore Roads) | 15 |
| Bayswater (Widgee Road) | 10 |
| Greenmount (Glen For- rest) | 400 |
| Boya | 25 |
| Kalamunda (Lesmurdie) | 100 |
| Bickley (west of Carmel) | 40 |
| Carilla (immediately east of townsite) | 5 |
| Great Northern Highway (67.5m.) | 100 |
| Keysbrook (near South West Highway) | 10 |
| Muchea (1 mile east of 33m. Great Northern Highway) | 60 |
| Bullsbrook (1½ miles east of 28m. Great North- ern Highway) | 21 |
| South Bullsbrook (¼m. east of railway) | 20 |
| Byford (3m. east of highway) | 50 |
| Mundijong—various small areas | 20 |
| Serpentine—various small areas | 20 |
| Kalgoorlie Area | |
| 10m. south west of Kal- goorlie | 16 |
| Carnarvon Area | |
| 16m. E.S.E. of Port Hed- land | 450 |
| Northam Area | |
| 18m. north of Southern Cross | 40 |
| Geraldton Area | |
| Geraldton-Carnarvon road (356m.) (approx- imately 12m. north of Northampton) | 150 |
| Geraldton-Carnarvon road (3m. east of 319 peg) | 25 |
| Geraldton-Carnarvon road (2¼m. east of 328 mile peg) | 25 |
| Howatharra (2.9m. west of townsite) | 6 |
| Kimberley Area | |
| Duncan Highway (Wyndham-E. Kimber- ley Shire) | 100 |

LAND AT KUNUNURRA

*Releases, and Value of Cattle
Industry*

36. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What total area of land has been released at Kununurra since irrigation water has been available?
- (2) How many farms does this acreage represent?
- (3) What area remains unallocated?
- (4) What is the total area that will be brought under cultivation at the completion of the Ord dam system?
- (5) In the general conception of the total scheme, what is the estimated value to the cattle industry of a fully developed area comprising the total available irrigable land?

Mr. COURT replied:

This question has a bearing on two other portfolios. I have referred it to the Ministers concerned and the following are the answers to the several questions:—

- (1) 22,500 acres.
- (2) 31 farms including the pilot farm.
- (3) Nil, except for some minor areas. All diversion dam stored water is committed to the point considered desirable at this stage pending a decision on the main dam.
- (4) 178,000 acres will be irrigated. In addition it is expected there will be substantial dry land farming in the general area.
- (5) It is estimated that with the use of the products of the irrigation area where needed, in conjunction with improved station practices, the cattle outturn would be at least doubled and possibly tripled. In addition there would be a marked improvement in the weight and quality of cattle.

It is difficult to place a precise figure on the economic value of such improvement in the cattle industry, because of the beneficial economic side effects of an expanding industry producing more cattle of improved weight and quality. However, it is not unreasonable to assume that the direct increase in return to the cattle industry in the East Kimberley region would be to the order of \$3,000,000 per year.

This estimate is intended to be conservative. There are a number of other factors which could, in due course, favourably influence the impact of this development on

the cattle industry, as such. I am, of course, referring to the impact on the pastoral industry as distinct from the actual irrigated areas.

QUESTIONS (5): WITHOUT NOTICE **ROADS**

Kambalda-Boulder: Bituminising

1. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Works:

In relation to the answer to question 24 on today's notice paper, and bearing in mind that the information contained in the answer appeared in the Press this morning and also on the radio last night—

- (1) Does the Minister not consider that his answer to my question 8 on the same subject last Thursday was rather misleading?
- (2) Why could not the information have been given in the Minister's reply to the question last Thursday?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The short answer to this question is, "No." I was not aware then that the negotiations between the Main Roads Department and the company involved were at a stage where the advice could have been given. This advice came to me subsequently, when I requested that this should be moved along to a point when I could give some information. Therefore, there was no attempt whatsoever to mislead the honourable member.

MIDLAND RAPID TRANSIT **TERMINAL**

Cost

2. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Railways:

Could he advise the House—

- (1) How much has been spent on preparation of Midland rapid transit terminal?
- (2) What has this been spent on?
- (3) How much more is to be expended on this terminal?
- (4) On what is this money to be spent?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question. The answers are as follows:—

- (1) \$307,488.
- (2) Signalling and interlocking, per way work, site clearance, architect's fees, land resumption, and sundry items.

- (3) Approximately \$440,000.
- (4) Terminal building
Platform and coverings
Car park and bus park
Roadways
M.T.T. bus area
Signalling and per way work

FARM HOUSING *Newspaper Article*

3. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Lands:

Did he read the article in the last edition of *The Sunday Times* regarding farm housing and, if so, has he any comments relative to the cases mentioned?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

The member for Dale informed me this afternoon that he intended to ask this question. I have not had the opportunity to thoroughly examine the position, but I would like to say that in making available Crown land for agricultural development, the applicants are under the firm knowledge that the development requirements are their responsibility. There is no doubt about this. The demand for Crown land today is such that there are many more applicants than can be satisfied, despite the fact that a consistent area of 1,000,000 acres a year has been released for the last eight or nine years.

In addition, of course, one of the conditions is that the successful applicant shall take up residence within two years. Therefore, it is quite clear that the obligation is on the successful applicant to provide a residence for himself and his family within that time. I would like to say that in the 8½ years during which I have been Minister for Lands, no increase in the price of conditional purchase land for agricultural development has been made. The prices which rule today are the same prices which ruled eight or nine years ago. Of course, this is done for a purpose; that is, to enable successful applicants to proceed with development and be able to provide suitable living quarters for themselves. Relatively speaking, the small charge for Crown land repayment is spread over a period of 25 years. The report in *The Sunday Times* is not entirely correct. I never said to the reporter that the Government was not concerned with this problem. As a matter of fact for a number of years, and in consultation with the Minister for

Housing, we have been trying to devise a way whereby some funds can be made available through the development bank or some other source. Admittedly, I did not convey this information to the reporter.

The State Government has no funds for this purpose; that is, to allow houses to be built on new farm properties. I emphasise that the State Government's contribution to this exercise is that it has kept the price of conditional purchase land for agricultural development down to a degree which should enable the successful applicants to proceed.

The matter is, of course, of great concern to the Government and will continue to be so. However, I think it might be interesting for the House to know of at least one case which was featured rather widely. There was a photograph of a woman who purported to be Mrs. Pat Eves and she referred to her husband as Keith. Presumably, this is Bryan Keith Eves, and I give the details of the circumstances which have been provided to me from the records within the Lands Department. These are—

- (a) Conditional purchase lease 347/9181—Kent Location 380—1,000 acres—lease commenced the 1st April, 1953.
- (b) Conditional purchase lease 347/11354—Kent Location 1315—361 acres—lease commenced the 1st April, 1956.
- (c) Conditional purchase lease 347/13571—Kent Location 1318—2,753 acres—lease commenced the 1st April, 1961.

Then it goes on to enumerate the standard requirements, which are as follows:—

Leases (a) and (b) fenced and improved beyond Crown grant standards; Lease (c) improved beyond Crown Grant standards, but boundary fencing to be completed.

Lessee residing on Location 380.

The following is a most interesting aspect:—

Lessee has been granted permission to sell the 3 leases provided consideration does not exceed \$67,500 and purchaser undertakes to complete fencing of boundaries of Location 1318.

Lessee was originally from Badgebup, and acquired leases (a) and (b) by transfer in 1959 and was allotted lease (c) in 1960.

If a conditional purchase lessee has a property to a value of \$67,500 admitted by the Lands Department, there is something wrong with his own administration if he cannot provide an adequate house for his own family on that property.

Farmers' Indebtedness

4. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Lands:

Relative to the reply which has just been given to the member for Dale, could the Minister tell me the amount of the indebtedness to banks and other institutions which these farmers are incurring at the present moment? Possibly this has some bearing on the fact that they are selling for a figure of \$67,000. This also would have a bearing on whether or not they could build a house.

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I do not have that knowledge. However, as members know, I was an executive for some years of the first bank in Australia; and, from my knowledge of finance, if a person were to have an asset valued at \$67,500, he should be in a position to arrange finance at least to adequately house himself and his family.

APPLES

Prohibition of Sale

5. Mr. NALDER (Minister for Agriculture): On Thursday last the member for Merredin-Yilgarn raised the matter of poor quality apples which were being offered for sale to the public in Western Australia. The honourable member brought a sample of the apples to the House and he also mentioned Mr. Speaker, as no doubt you will recall, that these apples came from your electorate.

Mr. Craig: From Georgia!

Mr. NALDER: We will not go that far. Inquiries have shown that this case of apples was purchased by the honourable member direct from the grower, and at no time did they pass through departmental inspection.

This is a method of distribution which is not altogether common in this State. It has some advantages, of course. It is a direct sale from the producer to the consumer and there are some benefits, perhaps, in regard to commissions and so on. It makes the fruit available direct to the public at a lower price in case lots.

However, I might point out that if fruit is sold in this manner, it must still comply with the regulations promulgated by the Minister for Agriculture in consultation with the Apple Sales Advisory Committee. The only available way whereby the Department of Agriculture can police this method of distribution is to prosecute for breaches of the regulations after complaints have been made to the Department of Agriculture.

Therefore, I would suggest to the member for Merredin-Yilgarn that if he follows up this complaint and makes it available to the officers of the Department of Agriculture, they will take the appropriate action.

Mr. Kelly: Does not the advisory board have any jurisdiction over the fruit which is put into cool storage?

Mr. NALDER: Yes, as long as it comes into the metropolitan area. I might also add that I have been informed that through your intervention, Mr. Speaker, you have made available to the honourable member a case of apples which come up to the quality that would be expected under these conditions. I presume this case has been made available from the same source. However, I do not have any doubt that these apples are of good quality. Perhaps the honourable member might show members of the House the type of apple which can be expected to come, and which does come, from your electorate.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from the 10th August, on the following motion by Mr. Elliott:—

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 Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

To which Mr. Davies had moved an amendment to add the following words:—

However, we, the members of the Legislative Assembly wish to inform Your Excellency of our great concern that in connection with the Mitchell Freeway project, the Government in-

tends to proceed with the construction of the Narrows interchange according to the existing design, and refuses to halt construction of any portion, particularly of that which is intended to connect with the proposed southern link of the ring road system.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.15 p.m.]: After hearing speeches by the member for Victoria Park and the Leader of the Opposition on the rather weak amendment that was moved to the Address-in-Reply, and then reading the speeches over again, and looking for what substance was in them, I could not help but wonder why the amendment was moved at all. I cannot help but remember the story of Disraeli and the young member who approached this eminent statesman and said, "Sir, I am down to speak in the Commons next week, and I wondered if you would advise me on what subject I should talk." Disraeli is alleged to have replied to this young man, "It is far better for the members to wonder why you do not speak than to wonder why you did."

As regards this amendment, I believe the Opposition might well have taken Disraeli's advice.

Referring particularly to the speech by the member for Victoria Park, it is agreed that something will have to be done about another river crossing—

Mr. Davies: Hooray! Six years later!

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —to relieve the congestion which is already occurring at the Causeway and the Narrows Bridge.

Mr. Davies: I am aware of that. Did your officers write this speech?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member does not have to try to be offensive; he does that quite well without trying.

Mr. Davies: I think you set the standard.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The answers which I gave to the questions asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this afternoon give some idea of how traffic figures on the Causeway and the Narrows Bridge have built up. It is because the Government has appreciated this growing need for relieving the congestion that the consulting firm of De Leuw Cather and Company was commissioned in 1964 to examine the planning and preliminary design requirements for a river crossing at Burswood Island, which, as the honourable member himself pointed out, had been regarded by the Commissioner of Main Roads in 1963 as having first priority.

The investigation by De Leuw Cather & Company showed, however, that the growth of population and traffic south of the river was taking place predominantly west of Albany Highway, and therefore relief should be applied by another bridge crossing somewhat close to, but just south of,

the Causeway. Once this point was appreciated by the Government, De Leuw Cather's briefing was altered, and the company was asked to examine the planning requirements for the entire inner ring road system, together with the first three miles of radials approaching it. To this end detailed traffic surveys were carried out and processed through computers as part of the De Leuw Cather assignment. This assignment is now drawing rapidly to a close and a report is expected very shortly.

After that an examination will have to be made of the report by the Main Roads Department, which will then submit the report to the Minister—that is to myself. Subsequently I will convey to Cabinet and the Government what I feel are the particular steps that should be taken and what facets of the report should be implemented. It is therefore correct to say that within six months the Government will have more detailed plans, although still not to ultimate, final detail, of the inner ring road system, future river crossings, and their approaches. Perhaps when the member for Victoria Park begins to appreciate something of the scope and magnitude of detailed plans and designs, such as are required for an exercise of this type, and when he matures a little more, he will understand the work that is involved.

Mr. Davies: You are being particularly insulting. We want a plan after 6½ years.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: But the honourable member wants to delay it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will speak about the matter later if the honourable member will only sit back and try to learn a little.

Mr. Davies: Right, grandfather!

Mr. Rowberry: He used to be a schoolmaster.

Mr. Graham: And now he is a professor.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The member for Victoria Park also criticised the amount of time that has been taken on the production of the final plans for the Mitchell Freeway and the ring road, and expressed impatience, as he is doing at the present time, with what he regards as long delays in getting on with the project; yet both he and the Leader of the Opposition want all work on the project stopped while a reappraisal of this section is made.

Mr. Davies: We want a Royal Commission into the Main Roads Department.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Those two members ought to get together on exactly what they do want. It would appear that members opposite want it both ways. They are endeavouring to criticise the Government by claiming that long delays have occurred and yet they now wish to delay the project themselves. One has only to read the amendment to see that this is so. They wish to delay the project by demanding that all work be stopped while a reappraisal is made of this section.

Mr. Graham: Yes; stopped on one section.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member ought to read the amendment.

Mr. Jamieson: Have you read it? I read it again because I thought you were talking about something altogether different.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let me talk about the position in other parts of the Commonwealth—other cities—where anxiety is felt by communities that Governments are not pressing forward and getting on with town plans and the solution to traffic problems. I have taken out two extracts from papers which prove what I have just said. The first is from Brisbane, where there was a good deal of criticism because of the delay in tackling traffic and town planning problems. A Mr. Arthur Richards, who visited all capital cities in turn to compare them with Brisbane in regard to the treatment of the problems to which I have just referred, wrote an article for a Brisbane paper and it was headed, "Perth building freeways now." I have this article with me if anybody would like to see it. It makes interesting reading. Under the heading I have just quoted Mr. Richards said—

Perth is not talking but building freeways and highways.

That was the first sentence of the article.

In *The Australian* of the 26th July, 1967, a Melbourne architect, Mr. R. Grouse, was featured under the heading of "Gigantic ugliness in City, says Planner." The architect referred to the fact that ugliness had reached gigantic proportions in Melbourne, and he then went on to talk of the position in Sydney, Adelaide, and Brisbane. He said Perth was the only city tackling the problem and stated—

Perth has recognised the problem. It has a programme for the development of the city.

I submit we must press on as quickly as we can with the Mitchell Freeway project and the western leg of the inner ring road system as a whole.

Mr. Graham: As a whole, you say? So that it is all cut and dried before this inquiry.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No. The ultimate detail is not yet completed, and the strength of the southern leg of the inner ring road system has been downgraded by virtue of the Government's decision made some time ago. However, I will develop what I have to say in that regard in the course of my speech.

Mr. Bickerton: How would the carrying of the amendment delay the construction of the freeway? Why don't you have a look at it and read it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Just try to read it again and appreciate it.

Mr. Bickerton: I have read it again.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Then try to appreciate it. There is no need to stop all work on the Mitchell Freeway project while a reappraisal is being made of the southern leg of the inner ring road. Provided Riverside Drive is widened to a four lane, or perhaps a six lane, road, it is estimated that this road and adjacent streets will provide sufficient capacity to handle the traffic satisfactorily until about 1980. Therefore, it is unrealistic to expect that all work on more important sections of the project—and urgent sections of the project—to which large sums of money are already committed, should be stopped while a reappraisal is being made—

Mr. Graham: No; only stop the southern leg.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —of the eventual requirements of the southern leg of the ring road. Members will probably recall that towards the conclusion of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition on Thursday last, I and several other members tried to elicit from him what he felt about the southern leg of the inner ring road. He admitted there had to be a connection. When I tried to press him on how big it should be, he would not say a word, and this is where many of the critics fall down. There must be a connection there. Those people who do not think there should be an adequate connection just do not appreciate the problem, in my view. That is my own view—they do not understand the situation at all.

Mr. Bickerton: You do not know how big it should be, yet you have all the experts on your side.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I know a great deal more than the honourable member does! The Mitchell Freeway and the ring road concept are part of the Metropolitan Region Plan, which was accepted by Parliament in 1963, and which was based on the much publicised Stephenson report of 1955. The region plan follows the Stephenson concept of a strong city centre—and who would deny that—and the acceptance of the geographic fact that there are limited opportunities for crossing the Swan River between the Causeway and Fremantle.

The plan for a ring road has not just been sprung upon the people of Perth. The present concept of the central city ring road with the Mitchell Freeway as a component part is a result of more than 10 years' intensive study and refinement and is regarded as a sound basis for proceeding with the construction of early stages of the project.

I think it pertinent to point out that Riverside Drive, or the southern section of the ring road, has not the same urgency as the Mitchell Freeway section of the interchange; and when the Government announced last month that there would

be no reclamation of a strip of the river between Union Jack Square and the Causeway, it rightly ordered that a reappraisal should be made of the requirements of this section of the ring road. I will say more about this. Members opposite know what I am leading up to about the decision which was made and the thought that was in the mind of the Labor Government when it held office.

Mr. Davies: Here we go again!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am only speaking historically. When this Government makes a decision not to reclaim a certain section of the river, pique—or at least disappointment—is shown by members opposite. However, more of that anon.

As the Premier pointed out at the time the decision was made, the reappraisal does not mean that all existing plans are being scrapped or that work on urgent parts of the project should be held up. The Government is simply making sure that the plans are properly adapted to the people's needs and feelings. I cannot help but feel, as I said a moment ago, that the Opposition, or some members of it, are bitterly disappointed at the Government's recent decision regarding reclamation; perhaps not so much because of the actual decision—I must be careful here—but because they are not able to put some teeth into the amendment which was so weakly moved last week.

Mr. J. Hegney: Public opinion stopped you from going on with the reclamation.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That may be the honourable member's idea.

Mr. J. Hegney: It is not only my idea.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Government supports the overall concept of a ring road to service the central city area.

Let us have a look at what a ring road does. It enables traffic serving and using the city to move smoothly in and out; it provides for inflowing and outflowing traffic to move freely without intersections by means of overpasses and underpasses, thereby eliminating traffic conflicts which cause bottlenecks. Overseas experience has shown that an efficient ring road will substantially reduce traffic congestion and traffic accidents, and to accomplish this is to accomplish a great deal. I strongly urge members to read the text of the Main Roads Department booklet on the Mitchell Freeway.

The necessity for retaining the southern leg of the ring road is shown by the fact that half the urban population of Perth resides south of the river. At present a distinctive trend in the development of the central city area is the concentration of new buildings with high density occupancy along the eastern sector of St. George's Terrace and along Adelaide Terrace—in other words, along the southern flank of the city. Thus the distribution of most city bound traffic originating from the southern suburbs will tend to be on the

southern flank between the Narrows and the Causeway. It would not be convenient or efficient to route this city-bound traffic *via* the north-eastern section of the ring road over a bridge, say, across at Burswood Island. Therefore, if growth in the central city area is to continue along the present lines, the southern leg of the ring road is necessary for the distribution of this traffic.

I do not want to pursue to any great extent the question of limiting the city's growth in its eastern section, but if members will only pause for a moment to try to appreciate some of the problems that would become involved by stopping progress there, they will be amazed.

While the pattern for the growth of buildings in the central city area is not determined by the Main Roads Department, or the consultants with whom it co-operates, nevertheless the department would not be facing up to its responsibilities if it did not endeavour to provide a road system to service the city's building trends, and the city's needs. The really astonishing feature is that there has not been more praise for the department's forward thinking.

The member for Victoria Park spoke of increases in the staff of the Main Roads Department and of the Town Planning Department—I think he did, anyway—and endeavoured to relate these increases to the Mitchell Freeway and the ring road project.

Mr. Davies: I never attempted to.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There have been increases in the staff of the Main Roads Department and, presumably, of the Town Planning Department, but these increases have been brought about not only by this project but by the demands which centre around the necessity for good roads all over the 976,000 square miles of our State. I think the great majority of the people in this State feel that the department is doing a good job.

I regret that the Leader of the Opposition is not in the Chamber. He did tell me he had to leave; but he questioned, in essence, the value of the inner ring road; and members will see the point of my remarks as I develop my speech. As already stated, the ring road proposal was set out in the Stephenson-Hepburn report of 1955, and he and all other members of Parliament have had 12 years to consider it and appreciate its implications. The value of the scheme was further emphasised in the Metropolitan Region Scheme report in 1962, which was accepted by Parliament. I am not sure, however, whether it was in that year, or in 1963.

In full confidence, therefore—and mark these words—the region scheme, based on the Stephenson-Hepburn report was acceptable to the majority of the community, and two Governments have proceeded with the design and construction of the Narrows interchange and the Mitchell

Freeway northward of it. Not one Government but two Governments proceeded with its design and construction. But one Government has bowed out by virtue of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, not once, but on many occasions. However, more of that anon.

This work is now well advanced, and millions of dollars have been spent. These are thus historical facts for any future reappraisal of the city centre, just as much as are the large buildings and new development along the southern flank of the city where both the Government and the private sector have invested large sums of money. No reappraisal can set back the clock to the extent expected by the Leader of the Opposition—and I speak of him and not of the Opposition generally—and it is surprising that the honourable member should suggest, at this stage, that the construction of the south-west interchange should be halted.

At this point it is relevant to repeat that the Narrows Bridge is an accomplished fact and that the Leader of the Opposition, when Minister for Works, approved of it and caused it to be built. Now he denies the most important public work he carried out as Minister for Works; and this after causing it to be built. Indeed, he again confessed that the Narrows Bridge was a mistake. In recent times he has continually said that if he had his time over again he would not proceed with the project. Many people now feel that this sacrificial attitude is more than faintly sickening, and I am rather inclined to agree with them.

Mr. Toms: It takes a man to admit a mistake.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: So now we have the honourable member crying over spilt milk.

Mr. Toms: That is not the case at all.

Mr. Kelly: It is merely being honest.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will let members appreciate the value of what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying. It is well to remember that not so very long ago the Leader of the Opposition viewed this bridge with great pride and claimed that the Narrows Bridge was a great work and that he could not understand how it could be criticised. Indeed, we surely all remember what he wished, and what his Government wished: that it be called not the Narrows Bridge but the Golden West Bridge.

Mr. Kelly: I can remember a bridge falling over not so long ago.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I was waiting for an interjection. I had hoped the Leader of the Opposition would have been here and would have denied that he said anything like this, because I have here a photostat copy of notes of a deputation from the Melville Town Council and the

Cockburn Shire Council to the Minister for Works (The Hon. G. P. Wild) at the Public Works Department, on the 28th May, 1963.

The members of the delegation are mentioned, among them being, The Hon. J. T. Tonkin, Mr. D. O'Neil, as he was then, the Mayor of Melville, and a number of the town councillors of the Cockburn Shire. Also present was the Commissioner of Main Roads (Mr. J. D. Leach). It is interesting to note that the subject matter of the discussion was, "Bridge on the Swan River between Point Resolution and Point Walter." According to the photostat copy of the notes this is what transpired—

Hon. Mr. Tonkin introduced the deputation and said the Member for East Melville (Mr. O'Neil) was jointly associated with him in introducing the deputation because they both held the same opinion about the necessity for this bridge, and he thanked the Hon. Minister for his ready response to discuss the matter of such great importance to the two districts.

The Hon. Mr. Tonkin recalled that when the decision was made to commence the Narrows Bridge there had been some who had said it was before its time, but experience has proved that it was completely justified and indicated that in these matters it was essential to look well ahead.

Mr. Court: Brave words!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Rather interesting words, indeed. The note from which I have just quoted continues with the rest of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about the necessity for a bridge over the Swan River between Point Walter and Point Resolution. But this is another subject, and I know that you, Mr. Speaker, will not allow me to develop it to any great extent.

Mr. Davies: Oh; I think so.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member seems rather in favour of it.

Mr. Davies: No; but the officers have read it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I had to listen to it. In any case the rest of these notes of the deputation might serve for another occasion.

To support his arguments for procrastination and delay, the Leader of the Opposition has quoted statements made by the steering group to the Buchanan report under the chairmanship of Sir Geoffrey Crowther. He spent a good deal of time quoting extracts from Sir Geoffrey Crowther's reports. However, in using these sources it appears that the Leader of the Opposition is quoting Sir Geoffrey out of context.

In the report of the steering group, Crowther distinguishes between the trans-

port problems of some of the older and more tightly-packed English cities, and states that, with regard to some cities where freeways have been constructed, there has at times been a brutal disregard for the appearance and amenity of these cities. With that, I think we all agree.

However, Perth would rank as one of the more modern cities of the world, and here we have the clear advantage of benefiting from the mistakes which have been made with some overseas cities. The British cities are having swathes cut through them to build roads to try to make the centres of those cities live and be vital factors in the life of the country that surrounds them. We should not let anybody say anything to the contrary, because I saw this myself while I was in England, particularly in cities like Birmingham, Liverpool, Glasgow, and London.

Perth has an opportunity to benefit from the experience of these cities, and that is why we are trying to get something done now. It is because the road builders and town planners of some of the cities I have mentioned have had little regard for their appearance that we have taken great care to ensure that by means of layout and landscaping our future freeways will not conflict with the appearance and amenities of our city.

Of course, there are some who will point to the great ditch in front of Parliament House, and it is an ugly sight. The only ones who can find beauty in such things would be those artists who can see beauty in anything. There is a certain beauty in almost anything, but to most of us it appears an ugly sight. An engineering complex of any consequence is not a very pretty sight in the early developmental stages, but I believe that when the ring-road has been built; and, indeed, when this Narrows interchange begins to function and the layout and landscaping are accomplished, it will win world-wide administration.

Mr. Graham: Don't you believe it!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will measure my remarks against those of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Graham: It is a blot on the city and always will be.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let us remember this; because I believe it will win admiration, not only for its obvious usefulness, but for the aesthetic features about it.

Mr. Graham: I think you are dreaming.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: An important point which was not mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition is that Sir Geoffrey Crowther was very much in favour of constructing freeways to remove traffic congestion from many English cities. I would like to quote Sir Geoffrey Crowther from context, because these are pretty powerful words from the man who was

quoted by the Leader of the Opposition; and one has to read the latter's speech to understand what he was trying to get at. I quote—

Beyond any question, there will have to be a great deal of urban road-building in British cities. The scale on which this will be necessary can be clearly seen from the practical studies in Chapter Three of the Buchanan Report.

I have already referred to that. Continuing—

Moreover, if these new roads are to perform their function of carrying the very heavy volumes of traffic that will arise in the future, many of them will have to be free of such obstructions as cross-roads and roundabouts. Some of them indeed, in the larger cities will have to be built to motor-way standards.

The Leader of the Opposition appeared to advocate that the construction of free-ways should be suspended in favour of developing a rapid rail public transport system as carried out in San Francisco and Stockholm; but it should be noted that San Francisco is not a typical American city as it has special problems in regard to traffic conditions due to its being confined on three sides by the sea.

Both San Francisco and Stockholm are cities with very high density populations, making them as suitable as possible for public transport systems. However, because of the heavy losses incurred in operating rapid rail transit systems the world over, there has been serious criticism of the economics of this mode of transport, even in areas of high population densities. These things have been considered. Such solutions should therefore be regarded with caution in Perth, which has a very low density of population.

Sir Geoffrey Crowther reiterates the point that for the overall transport system of a city to function effectively there must be a balance between the roles played by public and private transport; and this is exactly what is being planned for Perth.

The Leader of the Opposition also appeared to favour the regimentation of the city-bound working population into using a system of public transport—and this is a view expressed to extremes by certain groups of which we hear from time to time. Working out the manner of regimentation is a subject which should make an interesting exercise for this Parliament! However, Perth workers have already expressed a strong preference for using their motorcars for travelling to and from work.

As the Leader of the Opposition is so fond of quoting Sir Geoffrey Crowther, and as he built a lot of his case on quotations from that source, he may wish to ponder over the following words from

this English economist on this point. I quote—

One particular result of the growth of car-ownership deserves to be singled out, both because it might be overlooked and also because it has a direct bearing on much that we shall have to say in the paragraphs that follow. Before very long a majority of the electors in the country will be car owners. What is more, it is reasonable to suppose that they will be very conscious of their interests as car owners and will give them a high priority. It does not need any gift of prophecy to foresee that the Governments of the future will be increasingly pre-occupied with the wishes of car owners.

Finally, on the demand by the Opposition that work on the much-needed Mitchell Freeway project should be stopped and the project delayed while a reappraisal is made of the less urgent southern leg of the ring road, one cannot do better than again quote to the Leader of the Opposition the concluding remarks of the Crowther steering group on the problem of traffic in towns. I quote further—

The task it sets us is no greater, and perhaps less, than was presented to the rural England of two centuries ago by the Industrial Revolution followed by the railway. If we are to meet our challenge with a greater balance of gain over loss than our great-grandfathers met theirs, we must meet it without confusion over purpose, without timidity over means, and, above all, without delay.

The Leader of the Opposition's quotes from the Crowther report are limited, loaded, and out of context. An appreciation of the total problem can only be obtained by reading the report of the Crowther steering group and the technical report that was prepared by Professor Buchanan, who was supported by an adequate staff. This Government has been aware of these things for a long time.

It should be appreciated that a detailed study of the origins and destinations of traffic and of the growth of population in all suburbs has indicated that there will be no need on the southern flank for anything more than an improved street system before 1980; and in this interim period the electorate will have ample opportunities to consider the problem in a rational atmosphere and without any sense of haste, and on the basis of a reappraisal of the city centre growth, to which the figures of the 1966 census will contribute material facts when they are available.

The trouble with some members of the Opposition is that they think small. They appear not to be able to think big enough to cope with governmental matters concerning a rapidly developing country. They are confused and circumscribed by petty political thinking.

Mr. Kelly: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. Graham: The Reverend Hutchinson delivers a sermon!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Of course in this State today we are faced with many problems.

Mr. Graham: The Minister for Works and others!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: They are problems of progress and development and are indeed, at times, quite acute problems; but they are infinitely to be preferred to problems associated with a static or receding economy.

Mr. Kelly: Really profound!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This Government has faced up to this type of problem with a good deal of success so far; and in regard to future problems, in the face of some ill-advised criticism, the Government will continue to show patience, restraint, and understanding, as well as all the wisdom, strength, and courage it can muster in the best interests of our State and its people. The Government opposes the amendment.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [5.55 p.m.]: Unlike the Minister I will address myself to what is on the notice paper, and I will know what I am talking about.

Mr. O'Neil: It will be the first time.

Mr. JAMIESON: I intend to read the amendment proposed to be added to the Address-in-Reply, because I am sure the Minister has not read it even once. This will also be for the information of the Minister for Housing.

I was attentive when the Minister for Works was reading the third last page of his speech, possibly prepared by his department. The Minister's notes referred to a halt to the whole procedure, but this addendum does not do that at all. It reads as follows:—

However, we the members of the Legislative Assembly wish to inform Your Excellency of our great concern that in connection with the Mitchell Freeway project, the Government intends to proceed with the construction of the Narrows interchange according to the existing design, and refuses to halt construction of any portion,—which is rather important—

—particularly of that which is intended to connect with the proposed southern link of the ring-road system.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Particularly!

Mr. JAMIESON: We are entitled to be very concerned with this proposal, particularly the southern leg. There are certain features about this proposal that must proceed because of the geographical change of the traffic pattern. When the Narrows Bridge was completed, it would

be only a fool who would not have assumed that a by-pass road to get traffic from the Narrows Bridge to the northern part of the city and the northern suburbs, because of the industrial development that has occurred there, would be essential and must be provided.

We might disagree as to what style the road formation should take, but, in the ultimate, provision must be made for it as it is a first essential. Therefore I cannot see there is any justification for anyone to say that a bypass road, in a project such as this, should be halted.

There have been numerous questions answered by various Ministers indicating that the Government is having second thoughts on the matter; and I refer to one question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday, the 1st August. The questions and answers were as follows:—

- (1) Did the Central Area Committee of the M.R.P.A. have before it in July a recommendation from the Town Planning Department that there should be a reconsideration of the inner ring road system?
- (2) If "Yes", will he state if any supporting reasons were given and what they were?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A reappraisal of the inner ring road system was considered to be a necessary part of the current general review of the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

It appears to me to be a shocking waste of the taxpayers' money if there is to be a reappraisal of any section. Of course, to my mind, the section under reappraisal is the southern leg of the system.

Mr. Rushton: Wouldn't it be a greater waste of the taxpayers' money to take the sand out?

Mr. JAMIESON: It could well be used for water drainage in Dale, the need for which is very extensive; and it may have to be done to save the member for Dale from sinking in his own slimes in his district.

We heard the Minister refer to the rather grandiose piece of literature printed by Imperial Printing Co. Pty. Ltd. I see the Government Printer has again been bypassed. I would like to draw attention to the centrepiece to show how the department likes paying attention to detail that has no connection with the road system. Why it was ever put there I would not know. Only one building is featured on it, that of Parliament House. Never has the correct shape of Parliament House been as shown in the freeway plan. The plan is entirely out of context with the true shape of Parliament House itself.

Therefore half of the designs of the roads could be out of shape compared to the way they were designed.

One of the basic essentials as I understand it, from the point of view of planning road systems, is that one should not feed into the interchange or a freeway more lanes than are available on the freeway. On examination of the plan and the model, I find that there are only four lanes available for north-bound traffic, but there are no less than six lanes feeding into them. If the traffic continues to increase as it has done over the last few years—and we have just about reached saturation point on the Narrows Bridge and the Causeway—it is, for sure, that the lanes being provided for traffic will be used to capacity. Trying to fit six lanes of traffic into four lanes will cause one hell of a mess in the traffic situation in Perth.

Mr. Brand: Wouldn't that be obvious to the planners?

Mr. JAMIESON: One would think that it would be obvious to the planners, and this is where we take the Government to task. Evidently it has not become obvious to the planners. At least, five outlet roads will be provided for traffic going south; but the whole complex will have to be examined from the start.

It seems that the limiting factor, which the Minister should appreciate, is the cutting through the hill. At its maximum that section will take eight lanes of traffic; but how can it ever be widened to cope with the traffic at a later stage? It will be almost impossible. The other features could be improved. If the Minister intends to go ahead with the southern leg of the ring road system, more traffic will be poured onto the freeway than can possibly be handled.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Is that why you wanted us to halt?

Mr. JAMIESON: I suggested this section should be halted. It is not necessary to have the traffic which is surging to the north directed through the city. There will be a long concrete bridge with through traffic sorting itself out through a complex system of roads which did not need to be provided initially.

The Minister is always crying out about the need for more money. All the Minister will do is direct additional traffic onto what is now known as Riverside Drive. The Minister said, in part, that we might not have to upgrade that; it can be downgraded to an ordinary road. However, we find that the Government is buying land in South Perth at wondrous prices to make provision for another bridge to feed traffic on to the freeway. It cannot be downgraded.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Yes it can; it will be upgraded from what it is now.

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes, but if it is upgraded it will become a freeway. It is practically a freeway now. It has very limited access, and vehicles using the Causeway have direct access to Mounts Bay Road.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have already said there should be an improvement; don't you believe in through roads at all?

Mr. JAMIESON: Naturally, there should be some degree of service roads through the area. But I do not believe one should encourage any more through traffic in or about the city than is absolutely necessary. We did not have this situation until the Narrows Bridge was built. No doubt that is why the Leader of the Opposition said that on reflection it was probably an unwise decision, although there was a demand for it and the bridge is used to its maximum capacity. Of course, no matter where the bridge was built it would be used to its maximum capacity.

Mr. Brand: What would have been an alternative to having the Narrows Bridge? Another bridge?

Mr. JAMIESON: That is the point; another bridge. I think that perhaps the traffic is directed wrongly.

Mr. J. Hegney: The traffic could have been directed through King's Park.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Brand: Yes; underneath King's Park.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. Hegney: It could come out behind King's Park.

The SPEAKER: Order! We can have one speaker, and only one, at a time. The member for Beeloo may resume.

Mr. JAMIESON: I can remember being a new member in this House many years ago and having grandiose ideas and putting forward suggestions. Long before the bridge was built, I put forward a proposal that we should have a tunnel. Of course, I was accused of being a person with a champagne taste being backed by a Government with a beer purse. This, too, is right, but we have come to the stage where everything is champagne that is associated with the planning that is taking place. In the champagne class we come to the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company.

I have never ceased to be amazed, because over the past few years every time we ran into a problem the answer always was that De Leuw Cather & Company were conducting a survey. The problem of the marshalling yards got too hard for De Leuw Cather & Company and it came back to our own planners, and got lost. I wonder which firm it is with a million dollar name and a million dollar fee. What is it doing? It appears to me the firm is doing extra planning and drafting on behalf of the department, which tells the company what it wants, and what the company should draft. If this is not hap-

pening, perhaps one of the Ministers can tell me what the firm is doing.

The traffic counts are taken by the Main Roads Department by machines, and by students at various times. I take it the Government has the use of its computers, and this information can be fed into them. I would like to see the whole Ministry fed through a computer to find out whether it really knows what De Leuw Cather & Company is employed for. Nobody seems to know, unless it is for the purpose of collecting fees. The firm certainly collects some substantial fees, as we saw recently. It has already received \$192,724 and 9 cents. Nine cents, mind you; it made sure of that.

We have sent planners overseas. If we are getting into strife with this complex—as it would appear, otherwise we would not have De Leuw Cather & Company hounding us—then perhaps we should do some plagiarising to see if our planners cannot come up with a road design. Surely these fellows who are fully trained and who have a full knowledge of the details could put forward a sound proposal. I do not know what else they are doing. After all is said and done, it is vital to have local knowledge, rather than just an ordinary knowledge of traffic and other matters.

That knowledge would be essential before one could effectively design and produce a scheme that would be satisfactory for a city such as Perth. We were fortunate in the first place in that we had the capital with the lowest density of through traffic. We have probably still not got to the highest, but have reached a degree higher than previously. We have seen the traffic attempting to use the service roads at Mill Street and St. George's Terrace when trying to get to the northern suburbs; and we have seen the hub-bub which occurs at the West Perth subway with the traffic that is trying to get to the south.

Mr. Rowberry: You are talking about through traffic.

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes, through traffic; not about the traffic in or out of the city. I am not saying that we should not provide for heavy traffic, but it should be completely prevented from using the central city streets. It should not use St. George's Terrace and Hay Street. Melbourne is an example where, because of the gravitation of traffic towards the centre, trucks were hauling logs through Swanston Street.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member should confine himself to the amendment. I do not think Swanston Street in Melbourne is covered by the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes; it is a little wide of the amendment. However, I am indicating a parallel case of what could occur if Perth does not design its traffic ways—particularly this ring road complex—to keep heavy traffic out of the centre

of the city. All our system seems to do is bring the traffic into the city. For what reason, I do not know; but I would suggest the most vital and urgent necessity is to develop some alternative northern road where traffic from the expanding eastern and south-eastern suburbs—those which I think are alluded to geographically by the Minister as being west of Albany Highway—requires this particular servicing. Quite a lot of this traffic is, even now, going over the Narrows Bridge and through the interchange complex to get to the northern suburbs. The only other way is for the traffic to filter its way from the Causeway to the north of the city.

I am sure that if there were a further bridge north of the city, where it was earlier contemplated at Burswood Island, a lot of the problem would be solved. This is vital. We should not have traffic separation on three different levels as proposed by the Minister and his merry men. The river should be bridged in another place to try to get rid of the traffic rather than concentrate it in the city.

The Minister mentioned the building which is going on in the southern end of Adelaide Terrace, and which has to be serviced. I agree that it has to be serviced but not to the degree that it conglomerates vehicular traffic any more than is necessary. We want to make it easy to get to the northern part of the city. The southern part of the city has always had geographic limitations. If the traffic is brought to a section nearer to the city centre, we will have the problem of not being able to do very much.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Beeloo continues I would draw the attention of members to the wording of this amendment. The amendment does deal with the Mitchell Freeway and the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of the Narrows interchange according to the existing design, and refusal to halt construction of any portion, particularly of that which it is intended to connect with the proposed southern link of the ring road system.

I am afraid this debate has been ranging a little wide of the mark. I think the last two speakers have been too general, and the present speech looks like being one on town planning, generally, rather than on the Narrows interchange. I must warn members that they will have to keep to the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, you have reminded members of the text of the amendment, and probably it would have been advisable to make the reminder earlier, because a reference to other speeches already made will indicate that a generalisation and summary of the

whole situation has been made. However, I will now return to the true subject matter; namely, the southern leg of the inner ring road and the possibility of the Government halting the construction of that section.

It is evident that the Government, even though it has some misgivings in regard to the situation, is continuing with the work, as is apparent from the answers that have been given to the questions asked on the subject in this House. Judging by the way the earthmoving equipment is operating at present on the off ramps leading to the southern leg of the inner ring road system it is not hard to realise what the position will be in the future. Therefore I would like to know from the Government whether it is a fact that this work is still continuing in accordance with the road plan as envisaged in the brochure that has been issued by the department. If it is a fact, and if there is to be a reappraisal of the work being done on this section of the interchange, obviously it will be a waste of money, and the continuance of the work should not be countenanced any longer.

The work on this particular section should be brought to a halt, and future construction held in abeyance until a reappraisal is made, but it is my impression that this has not been done at this stage. Further, no doubt a considerable amount of work has been done on the approach associated with the southern leg of the inner ring road system, and if this work is to proceed, or even if the foundations are to be made ready in any way, it will mean that such work will be wasted and the final cost of the whole freeway will be increased unnecessarily.

There is no doubt in my mind that the most expensive section of this construction will be the fly-over piece which will feed the traffic coming from Mounts Bay Road over this expensive superstructure and round Riverside Drive. This will mean that in some places the traffic will be divided at three different levels. So if there is any thought of a change in plans—and obviously there must be, because the Minister has admitted that thought is now being directed to the establishment of another bridge—consideration must be given to the grading of the road along Riverside Drive. Even on the Minister's conservative idea of lowering the grading of this road from, perhaps, eight lanes to six lanes, we must expect that a considerable area of land will ultimately be used.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It may be only four lanes.

Mr. JAMIESON: If it is reduced to four lanes, it will probably not be much bigger than it is now.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We may be able to use Terrace Drive.

Mr. JAMIESON: One of the problems—and I am sure you will allow me to stray this far, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister has made mention of it—is that of dealing with the number of people who are using the centre of the city; mainly shoppers with cars. Despite the Minister's reference to the fact that he is waiting for the census figures taken in 1966 to indicate the situation—these figures are still not available—the indications from retail sources, which are usually pretty reliable, are that the central city has stagnated, and has been in this state for possibly the past 12 years. This would indicate to me that more cars than people are using the centre of the city.

I would not like to say whether this is an advantage to the city, but according to the plans I would say it is not, and we should devise some means, whether it be by the southern perimeter of this road system, or by some other road, to make sure that cars do not enter the city.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We believe at this point of time there will be an adequate connection between the two roads.

Mr. JAMIESON: This is very interesting, because if there is to be an adequate connection, one would envisage there should be an adequate connection another way. I refer again to our map on local planning to indicate very clearly that anybody travelling along Mounts Bay Road will have no earthly chance of proceeding to the north of the city by any means proposed at the moment. So there again it would appear it is indicated by the planners that this traffic should use Thomas Street or some other street in that area.

I admit that this is getting away from the subject matter again, Mr. Speaker, but one cannot describe the complete Narrows interchange and the southern leg of the inner ring road system without considering possible alternatives to the present proposal. If this is what is in the minds of the planners in regard to motorists coming from the west, then those coming from the east should be entitled to equal consideration and should not be routed through the centre of the city, as is obviously proposed by the present plan.

To me the present set-up appears to have reached a hopeless situation because the expense will be far in excess of the estimated figure. I believe that more careful planning should have been made of the initial stages of this construction, and I reiterate that a bypass road should have been commenced with greater expedition than has been shown up until now. The Government should have solved the main problem first and then proceeded to sort out any differences at a later stage.

When architects and town planners visit Perth to look at our city, and, from a vantage point on one of our high buildings, query what we have done in regard to the situation up until now, it indicates to me we have gone too far in our en-

deavours to consider the problem from the motorist's point of view instead of giving a little consideration to the matter from an aesthetic point of view and as to what the future will require from the proposed work.

I took issue with the Premier on this matter several years ago when he said the automobile is with us and will always be with us. That is a statement made without much thought; because we had no automobiles 100 years ago, and 100 years from now we do not know what mode of transport will be used. If we construct something of the nature and size of the pyramids of Egypt we will not be able to shift it and it will be there for ever-more. So, in regard to transportation by motor vehicles, we must project our thoughts into the future for at least the next 10 years, because the damage that will be done in the ultimate we will not be able to undo.

My advice to the Government—for what it is worth, because the Government does not take my advice any more than it does the advice of any other member of the Opposition, but at least we can always have our say—is that a halt should be called to the work that is being done on the southern leg of the inner ring road system. As an alternative, steps should be taken immediately for the construction of a bridge across the river in the vicinity of Burswood Island with a view to re-routing a considerable volume of the excess traffic that is now coming into the city from the Belmont area and surrounding suburbs, and also the traffic that is coming from the industrial complex being built up in the eastern suburbs. This will be greatly intensified as the railway marshalling yards develop.

I admit that those remarks are also getting away from the subject of the inner ring road system and the Narrows interchange, but the greater part of this traffic will be using the inner ring road system. If we can make proper plans for the development of these roads—particularly with the expensive type of development and the construction of connections leading to and away from the interchange and around the car park, as is now proposed—a great deal of the expense will be prevented, and probably we will be able to construct most of the northern road system with the amount of money that will then be available for the work.

Returning finally to the feasibility study and report by De Leuw Cather & Company and the procedures associated with this planning, I feel, having read several points of view on how the company fits into the situation, that these views definitely conflict. The Minister's view gives me the impression that this company is somewhat similar to the organisation known as the Wells group, which raises finance. The procedure followed in regard to the services rendered by these people is that information is fed to them and they sup-

ply a final plan after all the work is done for them.

This is the impression the Minister has given me concerning De Leuw Cather & Company; and the other impression I gained earlier is that it is only an elaborate type of drafting organisation, and that the Town Planning Department, or the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, illustrates to the company the plan that has been approved by Parliament and says, "Now we want advanced geometrical designs so that we can go ahead with the development of this work as is proposed."

If this is all the company is being asked to do, in my opinion the Government is being charged excessively for the services rendered, and we do not need these outside organisations to carry out the planning of such works; because I think it can be done far cheaper by capable architects and designers who could be made available for the work. I would also remind members that, very clearly, the company has submitted a price for its services on a cost-plus basis. It is being paid wages, plus a percentage, plus another percentage for head office consideration, whatever that means.

That is the fee that is to be paid by the Government for the services of the company. It is an excessive fee for the kind of development that is involved. A reappraisal by somebody would be desirable, and the departmental planning officers would be most suitable to make the reappraisal because of their knowledge of the traffic flow in and around Perth, of the geographical set-up, of the possible movement of population in the environs of Perth, and of all the other matters associated with the further development of the ring road system. They would have the required knowledge to make an on-the-spot decision.

Rather than proceed with the expensive section of the ring road system, we should adopt a wait-and-see policy, proceed with the northern bypass road, and then see what happens in the future when several crossings are built over the river to alleviate the traffic congestion. We should adopt such a policy rather than bring the traffic through the City of Perth. We should enable traffic to flow freely through the existing arterial roads, if they are upgraded. We should not bring an excessive amount of traffic through the city on a limited section of a bypass road system. I have indicated enough to suggest that I support the amendment, and particularly do I support it with regard to further development of the southern leg of the ring road system.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.47 p.m.]: The amendment we are considering is, in my view, timely not only because of the specific matter with which it deals, but because of the increasing evidence to show that

the public is becoming more and more disturbed as work proceeds on the inner ring road system and the freeway scheme generally. I say that, because it is so easy to present, by way of plan and diagram, a scheme which appears quite inoffensive, but which, when what is actually involved in the project is seen, brings about a totally different reaction.

All of us have had the experience, particularly in recent times, of hearing people give expression to the sentiments that it would appear every amenity, every aesthetic feature, and every point of natural beauty that this city possesses, is being sacrificed, and must be sacrificed, on the altar of bigger and better roads. In other words, the only thing that will matter to the capital city of Perth is the motor vehicle, and everything else must be subjected to the demands of it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You know you are being extravagant.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Minister will bide his time I will endeavour to show that what I am stating from my own experience is by no means an exaggeration. It is based on the fear—and a feeling—of very many people, including some very highly qualified professional and technical men in the city, the majority of whom, I guess, would be politically opposed to the Opposition party. It seems to be an extraordinary state of affairs that the Mitchell Freeway, which is being constructed a few yards from where we are speaking, will have, in bisecting our city in a north-south line, a far greater effect on it than has the east-west railway line. At this very time the Government is negotiating with companies to get rid of the east-west obstacle which, I suppose, is a feature that is objectionable to everybody.

It does not make sense to create another obstacle for the orderly and progressive development of the city by erecting a barrier to be known as the Mitchell Freeway, in respect of which there will be far less ability to cross than there is to cross the railway line which bisects the city from east to west.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It will have adequate crossings, and they are being built now.

Mr. GRAHAM: There will be fewer, and far more disadvantageous crossings to permit of communication between one side of the city and the other than the railway line has—and this line has blighted the City of Perth since it was constructed in the place where it is. I have always maintained that the Mitchell Freeway should not be built here. I realise it is not easy for one, particularly when he has been abroad on only one occasion, to come back with an answer to every problem; but my very definite experience is that freeways are designed and built to go around towns and cities, and not through them.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You did not look very carefully.

Mr. GRAHAM: I anticipated that remark from the Minister, and that was why—with your permission, Mr. Speaker—I caused a map of the north of Italy to be placed in this Chamber. If the Minister or any other member cares to study it he will see the freeways, or autostrade, as they are known, deliberately designed to go around the cities and not through them. I travelled through and around practically all the cities in the northern part of Italy just over 12 months ago.

In Perth we are facing the experience of a man-made obstacle—the Mitchell Freeway—being constructed in the heart of the city; and, worse still, the building of a funnel to channel vehicles into the heart of the city, including the tens of thousands which have no business to be in the city. This is not a recent discovery of mine, because I referred to the matter in 1964.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will get on to the question of the interchange which is mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: Very definitely, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that the amendment makes reference to the Mitchell Freeway and to the refusal of the Government to halt construction of any portion. Then it goes on to particularise.

The SPEAKER: It particularises the interchange.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. Surely it is necessary to establish certain premises to show what is being done will have an impact on the very doorstep of Parliament House, and on the city. Unless one is permitted to produce evidence and argument to show what will occur, then one might just as well not speak to it.

It is my intention to show without a shadow of doubt the enormity of the error made by the Government. At page 992 of the *Parliamentary Debates* for 1964 the member for Balcatta is reported as having said—

However, I have racked my brains, conferred with other people, and asked questions in many places, but not yet have I been able to ascertain from anybody the necessity for providing a speedway from the direction of Mt. Hawthorn and Osborne Park to skirt the inner portion of the city in order to proceed eastward along what is now known as Riverside Drive and so on to the Causeway.

Why should a vehicle from Mt. Hawthorn or Osborne Park, seeking to travel to Victoria Park, skirt the city between Parliament House and the Perth Town Hall, and between the river foreshore and St. George's Ter-

race? Why should not such a vehicle travel a couple of miles north of the city in order to reach its destination? Because of the limited access to the freeway, and the high speed limit that is permitted, these vehicles will be encouraged to enter the City of Perth, instead of travelling several miles away from it.

That is basic to the whole argument.

I well remember that in Stockholm and in other places the planning authorities considered there was nothing wrong in traffic slowly percolating its way through the narrow and winding streets of the city proper, while several miles away there was a freeway. It was possible within a fraction of the time taken to drive through the city for vehicles which had no business in the city to drive around it without causing congestion or chaos to the traffic through the city.

I do not want to deny that in many cities in Britain and elsewhere the roads are being upgraded, as has been done in this State on roads such as Guildford Road, Stirling Highway, and Albany Highway, in recent years; but that is a different matter altogether from putting arterial roads through the very heart of the capital city.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I have seen major highways going through cities.

Mr. GRAHAM: We must have travelled in different centres.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: In cities such as Glasgow, Birmingham, and Manchester.

Mr. GRAHAM: I visited those cities, and many similar ones, but I certainly did not encounter anything that could be regarded as being parallel to the exercise which is being implemented only a few yards from this Chamber. The effect of this will not be to keep the city alive, as some of those who support the Government in this matter contend; it will have the effect of choking the city. The city will very definitely be choked if the Government proceeds with the southern leg of the inner ring road system.

It is fatuous for the Minister to talk about a road being downgraded with, perhaps, only a couple of lanes in each direction. If it is not to create bottlenecks elsewhere, the size of such a road will be determined by the volume of traffic over it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you wish to stop any connections to the freeway?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do. I go a step further than my Leader. If we have regard for the original concept of town planning, contained in the 1955 report of Professor Stephenson, a cursory glance will show that he made no provision whatsoever for traffic coming from the north along the Mitchell Freeway to obtain access to, and to travel along, the river front; neither was there any link from

Riverside Drive to enable traffic to get onto the freeway to the north of the city. Other roads had to be taken, and so there is nothing novel in what I am proposing.

I will elaborate a little. Surely someone from Osborne Park, to use that point of the compass again, will choose to travel along this 50 miles per hour speedway with no intersections, no traffic lights, no hold-ups, and no impediments whatever. Even if it is an extra mile or two, he will not be deterred. He will use the road because of the benefits it bestows on him as a traveller.

He will then continue along Riverside Drive because it, too, is protected, having no intersections whatever. If vehicles descend in their tens of thousands from the north and south, proceeding in opposite directions, there will be chaos in those roads unless the Government upgrades them in order that they might take two, three, or four lanes of traffic in each direction.

Then, of course, we have this terrible proposition which was mentioned by the member for Beeloo. Primarily this freeway system was devised, because of the geography of Perth, to enable traffic from the southern suburbs to pass the city with a minimum of interference to the city in order to get north, and *vice versa*. Well, because of the concept of the Government, if all that traffic between north and south is going to travel, as it will, *via* the Narrows Bridge—and at peak periods this has already reached saturation point—and it is to be joined by thousands of vehicles which are taking the easy route created by this Government along Riverside Drive, and they converge just a little south of Parliament House, where there are only four lanes in each direction, incapable, of course, of carrying the load, it means one of two or three things—that there will be terrific blockages of traffic as it is gradually coming down from the total of six or seven lanes and trying to fit into four lanes, thus creating terrible chaos and hold-ups; or the Government will have to make further intrusions into Parliament House grounds for the purpose of widening the existing freeway which passes Parliament House; or the Government will have to do, as has been done in the United States to the dismay of those concerned, that is, create storey after storey, one above the other.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are being extravagant.

Mr. GRAHAM: Nothing of the sort. It is surely elementary to the back benchers, if not to the Minister, that if it is necessary for six or seven lanes of traffic to compress in the heart of the city into four lanes in each direction, something has to give. In the course of my remarks in 1964 I sought some explanation or justification from the Minister for this road to run along Riverside Drive, and the necessity

to connect the Narrows Bridge with the Causeway.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to tell me now what person on what sort of journey would want to travel from the Causeway to the Narrows Bridge or from the Narrows Bridge to the Causeway.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: People do it all the time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why should they want to do it? Motorists are doing all sorts of things all the time. If a motorist is going to East Perth, let him skirt the city *via* the north. If he is going to Victoria Park let him go over the Narrows Bridge and then east to Victoria Park. Why bring him to the heart of the city and accentuate the situation which exists at present?

Additionally, the most expensive portion of the scheme, probably involving two-thirds of the entire cost of what is going on at the foreshore at present, is involved in this decision to link the Causeway directly with the Mitchell Freeway; in other words, the southern link of the inner ring road. Because of that decision, the road system there is to be three storeys high instead of two storeys; because of that decision one can imagine what it means in the way of bridges, embankments, and the rest of it; because of that decision there is to be one bridge constructed for a length of 1,200 feet. I do not know how many millions of dollars that will cost. However, it is because the Government is wedded to this proposition that this expense will be involved. It is not only an amateur speaking like this, because there is authority upon authority; and some of the leading citizens from a technical, professional, and practical point of view are maintaining that there is no necessity for this link between the two.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There are more who do.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are there?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will examine that in a moment and also test the *bona fides* of the Government in connection with this matter. There is one thing which no doubt would have impressed other members as much as it has impressed or depressed me, and that is the secrecy of the Government in connection with this matter. As a general rule we do not know what is going on until after the events have occurred.

I well remember the time when the present Minister's predecessor in the dying hours of Parliament introduced some plans dealing with further river reclamation, and it was only at the eleventh hour that there was an appreciation of what was meant by the reclamation. The Minister spent about two minutes in introducing the plans and they were something which, when analysed, would have involved the resumption of 40 or 50 acres of the Swan River in the heart of the city.

You, Mr. Speaker, do not know at this moment, notwithstanding a Road Closure Bill, a Reserves Bill, a meeting of all members of both Houses of this Parliament, the carrying of a unanimous resolution, a further meeting with some of the principal public servants of this State—and I still have the very vivid picture in my mind of their being at this end of this Chamber and quivering and quaking in their shoes—who could see no impediment whatever to the closure of Harvest Terrace, whether—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not properly phrased either. It is unfairly phrased.

Mr. GRAHAM: What I said just covers a period of years, but even at this stage the Minister will not tell us fairly and squarely that all the undertakings given and the understandings both official when Parliament was sitting and elsewhere will be put into effect.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What are you talking about?

Mr. GRAHAM: The closure of Harvest Terrace. Is the Minister prepared to say, so that *Hansard* can report it, that Harvest Terrace, south of Parliament Place as far as Malcolm Street, will definitely be closed?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: All I have—

Mr. GRAHAM: "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: In a reply to the Chairman of the House Committee, whom I suppose you are representing tonight—

Mr. GRAHAM: I am representing myself.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: —I said that I would ask the Government to consider the sentiments he expressed up to that time. I said it was premature to close Harvest Terrace and that in the public interest it should not be closed at this time.

Mr. GRAHAM: No-one is suggesting it should be closed at this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think we had better return to the subject of the amendment.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was suggested to me in forthright terms.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Don't you worry about that!

Mr. GRAHAM: This is all right on the public platform, but not here.

The SPEAKER: Order! We had better return to the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will you permit me one more sentence, Mr. Speaker? The House Committee asked that the Act be proclaimed.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What is the good of proclaiming the Act without closing the road?

Mr. GRAHAM: It asked for the proclamation of the Act. It did not ask or expect that the road would be closed to

traffic; and that is known to everyone. I appreciate that the Minister refuses to give a direct answer.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I have given a very direct answer.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister has refused to give a direct answer to the proposition that has been in the Government's lap for some years. That is why I say, apart from all other factors, that this Government is proceeding by stealth. It was my impression, following questions asked in this House, that down at "Mt. Hutchinson," as it has been named, the highest bank was to be approximately 30 feet. However I found by asking questions in the House last week that the banks are to be as high as 45 feet.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: So what?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely the public is entitled to be told. It is only by asking questions and twisting wrists that sometimes we are able to get information.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is why this was produced.

Mr. GRAHAM: What does that tell us about the height of the banks?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It does not, but when you asked a question I gave the information to you. I listed the facts and gave you the information. I cannot win with you.

Mr. GRAHAM: Someone today took the trouble to count no fewer than 15 bulldozers operating there on the top of the sandpile. They are continuing with the work which the Government says is to be the subject of review and reappraisal. In other words, if the work has been completed or has proceeded to a certain distance, then obviously it becomes too late to do anything about it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I explained this in the course of the speech I made.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was here all the time and did not hear it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is a reappraisal of the southern leg. Instead of its being up to the freeway standard which was envisaged by your Government, and in the early stages by ours, in the form of planning that went on, this Government determined there would be no reclamation of the river.

Mr. GRAHAM: First of all, it has apparently made a decision—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It has.

Mr. GRAHAM:—that there is to be a southern link road.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not matter what the reappraisers think about it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Because it cannot be. The details of it are to be forthcoming in a few months' time.

Mr. GRAHAM: As to whether there are to be two lanes or six lanes in each direction? That is the only factor, is it?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is an over-simplification of it, but it is part of the thing.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think it is an over-simplification.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know—and that word is spelt K-N-O-W—that this firm of De Leuw Cather and Company is not engaged by the Government for the purpose of reappraising the road system. I know—and I emphasise that word again—that this firm has been engaged to do some handmaiden work for the Main Roads Department; to do drafting work. We were led to believe, and I am certain the public was too, that this world-renowned firm was engaged for the purpose of going thoroughly into the merits of this scheme to see whether it was warranted or whether it could be amended to meet some of the objections. It was to decide whether there was merit in the proposals that had been submitted by other professional people and so on; but that is not the fact of the situation.

The decision has been made and this firm and its employees are being used by the Main Roads Department to do some of the work of the Main Roads Department in conformity with the policy, principles, and decisions already made by that department. It is not a reappraisal at all.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The consultants have given advice on these matters right throughout, and they were also asked to give on the handling of the southern section of the ring road.

Mr. GRAHAM: Notice how carefully the Minister chooses his words. He is not prepared to deny my statement—because he cannot deny it—that this firm has not been engaged for the purpose of reappraising the southern link of the inner ring road.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: In my speech I said the company had given advice, because it felt the pressure was not on the northern bridge but on a bridge south of the Causeway. This was becoming evident in the advice that flowed between the consultants and the Main Roads Department. I tried to convey this to you.

Mr. GRAHAM: The problem is in connection with that heap of sand, etc., immediately south of this House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There are none so blind as they that will not see.

Mr. Bickerton: There are none so dumb as those that do not understand.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is obvious that what I have said is a fact. As a matter of fact, I know it to be a fact.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: How do you know it to be a fact?

Mr. GRAHAM: That might be an entirely different story. The responsibility is on the Minister to deny it, and I challenge him to do that.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I have already given you the information in the speech and by way of interjection.

Mr. GRAHAM: Through your good offices, Mr. Speaker, that large plan has been placed again upon the wall of this Chamber. Perhaps you, Sir, and other members might have wondered why it has been placed there. It happens to be a plan of the western portion of my electorate, that is, the Balcatta electorate. The pink colour surrounded by the darker red is the outline of the road system for four to eight miles from where we are.

St. George's Terrace is $1\frac{1}{2}$ chains wide. There are six traffic lanes in it. As there are no footpaths along freeways, if the present wide footpaths were removed one could say that St. George's Terrace is, or could be, a roadway of eight lanes. As I have said, St. George's Terrace is $1\frac{1}{2}$ chains wide. Going as far as eight miles from the city of Perth, none of the roads through my electorate is less than six chains in width.

Mr. Toms: That is what I have said all along.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are four times wider than St. George's Terrace. Four by eight is 32. Thirty-two lanes of traffic could be accommodated on these roads which are six to eight miles from Perth.

Members can easily see that the northern intersection is not the one-tenth of an acre which we see on roadways in the city, but it is in excess of 100 acres. That is for a road intersection eight miles from Perth. Indeed, two miles further north there is an even larger intersection than the one that is proposed in my electorate.

My point is that these are roads which are leading into the Mitchell Freeway. It is called Stephenson Avenue in my electorate, but the lower right corner leg comes into the Mitchell Freeway. I mention this is one, and only one road which is leading into this freeway. People from Wanneroo, Osborne Park, and the rest will be coming at 50 miles per hour along that speedway over the freeway and around the foreshore. The whole situation is preposterous and utterly incapable of accommodating the traffic which will be coming into Perth when it has no business in Perth whatever.

I do not care whether at this stage the Government talks about two or three lanes in each direction along the foreshore or whether the Government makes a decision that there will be no further reclamation of the river. The fact remains that, if the Government persists, there will have to be a multi-lane roadway along Riverside Drive.

If the river is not to be reclaimed in order to make provision for it, then it will be cutting into the playing fields along the Esplanade. There will be no alternative; unless, of course, the

Government likes to put a block on the road. If it does that, then, as I said before, two-thirds of the entire expenditure on the sandworks and the rest of it will have been to no avail. The work will have been done in order to create something that cannot be used. This is not imaginary or farfetched; it is applied common sense.

If the Government provides an attractive road and a high speedway, of course traffic will use it. This is the experience everywhere. I would like the Minister somewhere and some time to provide justification for the roadway along Riverside Drive to run onto, and off, the Mitchell Freeway somewhere between Parliament House and the Swan River.

These days unless one goes to the top of a tall building, the Swan River is gone; one cannot see it. I am reminded of a friend who mentioned Riverside Lodge to me the other day. Apparently this site was selected and the residential hotel built on the banks of the Swan River. From every bedroom there were views across the river. He described it and said that now it could be known as "Death Valley" because there is 50 feet of sand immediately in front of the place.

Mr. Jamieson: Now you can see the snow on top of "Mt. Hutchinson."

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You do not seem to realise that the City of Perth is going to grow larger than it is at the present time. In another decade there will be 200,000 more people in this city.

Mr. Jamieson: All in Perth.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There will be changes to the face of the city and to the suburbs.

Mr. Craig: And the member for Balcatta, too.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the Minister suggest that there will be a change in me or in my face? Unconsciously the Ministers are giving point to what I am endeavouring to say. As the State and the city grow in population, and presumably in motor vehicles, surely the task will be to so arrange our traffic affairs that the only vehicles which enter the city are those which have occasion to go there on business.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I talked about the balance between public and private transport.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not concerned with regard to this subject; my concern is with regard to moving vehicles on the road. Whether an individual is driving a truck, a station sedan, or an M.T.T. vehicle, it is further cluttering up our public highways and our street system. Because there is the necessity to move from place to place in the heart of the city itself, the whole policy should be designed to keep people out of Perth unless they have real occasion to be there. That

is what is wrong with Perth at the present moment; so many people are travelling up St. George's Terrace and Hay Street who have no business in the heart of the City of Perth, but who are merely seeking to get from one place to another.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The ring road will accomplish this fact. You start on a different basis and work on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The ring road brings people to Perth. I had some conversation today with a gentleman who has a considerable knowledge, internationally, of road systems, and he deplores the whole concept of this Mitchell Freeway, let alone the southern link of it. He said he supposed it is one of the things that must be faced because of the topography. In other words, downstream from the Causeway there are difficulties and certain terrific expenses involved in making additional river crossings. I think everyone will agree with him. In other words, the Narrows Bridge is where it is, not because it is an ideal site so far as the traffic flow is concerned, but because of convenience, the formation of the land mass, the water body, etc.

He said that in other parts of the world, even where there is expense concerned, this would be there because it was unavoidable and it would be put under the city. Of course, it would not be seen, because it has no business there. It is not to feed people into the city, but to move them from one side to the other. I entirely agree with him. What have we done? Because we are tying it in with our domestic—if I could use the word—road system, it has been necessary to fill in far more of the Swan River than otherwise would have been the case.

More than three acres of the valuable reserve which belonged to the people—the little open space in front of Parliament House—is now gone. The delightful little oasis in the centre of an industrial area known as Hamilton Square will be completely decimated as the cancer spreads its arms further and further northwards. There will be a noise which will only be appreciated when the elevated roadways and those that are contained in the sounding boards—as, for instance, immediately in front of Parliament House—are in operation. There will be eight lanes of traffic plus some traffic running on and running off at respective places at 50 miles per hour. There will be laden trucks, motor buses, cars, and all sorts and types of vehicles hustling along at 50 miles per hour. Members should be able to get some idea of what will be the position, particularly at peak periods. It will be a nightmare.

In addition to this, surely from the little they have heard and read in connection with the United States of America, members will be aware that when a city has these freeways, one does not know

where to stop. One gets to within six miles or eight miles of the city and hurtling traffic is disgorging itself at the end. There is a problem in this connection. This is overcome by the roads stretching further in all directions both to take people off and—equally and in opposite fashion—to bring people on to it. Therefore, as night follows day, because of what the member for Beeloo and I have endeavoured to convey there will be a bottleneck here in front of Parliament House accentuated because of the Government's decision in respect of the southern link and the inner ring road.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has another five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM: It will be inevitable that there will be expansions or further platforms placed one upon another. That, of course, has been the experience in the United States of America.

This amendment has been moved because the members of the Opposition are perturbed at what they see; they are disturbed because of what they consider, on the grounds of logic, will be the case—that is, this will prove to be a fiasco.

This amendment to the Address-in-Reply has been moved, too, because of the growing body of opinion which has expressed its disagreement with the concept. I stated earlier when the Minister for Works was interjecting, and when he told me that there was a gathering weight of opinion in support of the proposition, that I would make some comment on his remark. Of course, I have already made it because I have debunked this story of the Government that the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company is undertaking a re-appraisal of the scheme. I repeat that it is doing nothing of the sort.

I suggest that the Government is procrastinating, the Government is marking time, and the Government is fearful of the onset of the State elections; it is in a dilemma. It has gone so far it feels it cannot retract without bringing some discredit upon itself. It is afraid to announce to the public that it is proceeding, and for that reason it has cooked up this hotchpotch and has made up all sorts of things in connection with this firm of consultants when, in fact, it has a most limited charter.

The work is proceeding—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You want to stop—

Mr. GRAHAM: —but the Government is endeavouring to give the impression that it is reviewing the entire situation so far as the southern link road is concerned. However, the Government is not doing that and the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company has not been engaged for that purpose either. I have heard people in committees in outside organisations, as I have heard members of Parliament, some

years after an event when a debate is taking place and a vote has been taken, deplore the fact that they did not display a little courage and vote the way their consciences told them they should vote.

I, myself, am as certain as I stand here that what we have endeavoured to convey as laymen is a picture based on information which we have gained personally. It has been conveyed to us by experts in their own right who maintain that what we have said will come to pass.

Without a doubt the Government is making a mistake, and all we are asking it to do is merely to reconsider the whole matter. However, the Government refuses to do that, carries on with the work, and, at the same time, engages in a subterfuge for the purpose of hoodwinking the public, and making the public believe that it is in fact reappraising the entire set-up.

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

Ayes—18

| | |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. Jamieson |
| Mr. Brady | Mr. Kelly |
| Mr. Evans | Mr. Molr |
| Mr. Fletcher | Mr. Norton |
| Mr. Graham | Mr. Rhatigan |
| Mr. Hall | Mr. Rowberry |
| Mr. Hawke | Mr. Sewell |
| Mr. J. Hegney | Mr. Toms |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. May |

(Teller)

Noes—23

| | |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Bovell | Mr. Lewis |
| Mr. Burt | Mr. W. A. Manning |
| Mr. Craig | Mr. Marshall |
| Mr. Crommelin | Mr. Mitchell |
| Mr. Dunn | Mr. Nimmo |
| Mr. Durack | Mr. O'Connor |
| Mr. Elliott | Mr. O'Neill |
| Mr. Gayler | Mr. Runciman |
| Mr. Grayden | Mr. Rushton |
| Mr. Guthrie | Mr. Williams |
| Dr. Henn | Mr. I. W. Manning |
| Mr. Hutchinson | |

(Teller)

Pairs

| Ayes | Noes |
|------------|------------|
| Mr. Curran | Mr. Brand |
| Mr. Davies | Mr. Nalder |
| Mr. Tonkin | Mr. Court |

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [8.35 p.m.]: Before in any way becoming provocative or aggressive, let me make some laudatory comments regarding some of those within the precincts of Parliament House. I am not necessarily alluding to Government members, or even to Opposition members, or even to any members of Parliament; I am referring to members of the staff. All of the staff give members splendid service and assistance, but there are two members of the staff in particular who render a splendid public service—I refer to Mr. Dave Carrick, of the Legislative Council, and Mr. Bert Churchill, of the Legislative Assembly. I commend them for the assistance they render in explaining the workings of Parliament not only to adults, but to children, in particular, and to students, gen-

erally—the sons and daughters of our constituents. In view of the apathy of the general public towards Parliament, and what goes on in Parliament, I commend the two gentlemen mentioned.

Many people in the Public Service do just what they are paid to do; and my reason for selecting these two gentlemen for special recognition is because I believe they do more than is required of them. I am pleased to see that tonight there are several members of the public in attendance in our gallery, but this is very seldom the case. The two gentlemen I have mentioned take crowds of young children on tours of inspection of the building; they bring them into the Chambers and show them the workings of Parliament and, as a consequence, they do much to instil in our younger generation a greater respect for this institution.

When we on this side of the House, and indeed those on the other side of the House, are making our contributions to debates in the early hours of the morning, we sometimes wonder why we are being so conscientious in speaking to empty galleries. However, the work being done by Mr. Carrick and Mr. Churchill will give the coming generation a greater respect for Parliament and make them aware of what goes on in this building. When school children from my electorate have been shown around the building, I have listened to what the two gentlemen have said to them. It must be of considerable help with social studies; and I am sure the children would learn more in respect of the workings of Parliament from the two men to whom I have referred than they would from many of their own teachers. I thought the matter worthy of mention and I would like to pay a tribute to those two men for the work they do.

The Address-in-Reply debate gives each of us an opportunity to touch on subjects that affect not only his own electorate but also the rest of Western Australia. There are many matters upon which I could take the Government to task; however, on this occasion I shall confine my remarks, firstly, to a subject affecting a very important section of my electors. I regret the need to read correspondence in this regard, but I like to let my constituents speak for themselves. I shall not read the correspondence in its entirety, but it is necessary for me to let my constituents present their own cases to Parliament, through me.

This question relates to clubs, not only in the Fremantle area, but in other electorates also; and, as a preamble, let me say that I do not mind revenue being raised from royalties on iron ore, or from industry generally, but I do object when discriminatory taxation is imposed on Fremantle clubs in particular. I would suggest that these clubs are having to pay

taxation which should not be imposed upon them, as figures I will presently quote will reveal. I received this letter from the Fremantle R.S.L. Club, "Wyola" Incorporated. It was addressed to me and was signed on behalf of the president, committee and 1,100 members of the "Wyola" Club Incorporated. The letter reads—

On behalf of the President, Committee and 1,100 members of the Fremantle R.S.L. Club "Wyola" Inc. I am appealing to you to enter a strong protest to the Government about the imposition of the Stamp Act 1912-66, which was enforced upon us. We as a club protest about the tax as a whole, but we are most concerned about having to pay 3 cents in \$10 on membership fees and donations to the club by members.

I hope country members who have clubs in their districts are listening. To continue—

We are of the opinion that any monies received apart from bar takings should not be taxed at 3 cents, when all personnel in part C of the Stamp Act which includes medical, dental and business people are only asked to pay 1 cent in the \$10.

Hoping you can convince your co-members also the Government that some relief should be given in this matter.

So these clubs are being called upon to pay 3c in the \$10 as compared with 1c being paid by business people. Therefore, am I justified in reading that letter to the House? I submit I am, because this is discriminatory taxation and it is being levied against the clubs. There is a postscript to this letter which reads—

For your own information we have paid \$32.37 in February and for March, April, May, \$98.97. So you can see it is some considerable amount of money that should not have to be paid to keep a lousy government.

That is the expression used—a lousy Government.

Mr. Dunn: No wonder you read the postscript.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is why I allow my constituents to speak for themselves. Had I said the same thing, the Speaker may have said my language was objectionable. The person who wrote the letter will not mind if I mention his name; the letter was signed "Con O'Sullivan, Secretary."

Another letter written to me on the same subject reads as follows:—

The members of the Fremantle Workers Social & Leisure Club in association with other clubs throughout Western Australia desire to acquaint you with their feelings concerning the application of the "Re-

ceipts Tax" to the income of the club and to seek your support in a review of the legislation directed towards some relief from this tax.

That rather amused me—asking me to do what I could about reviewing the legislation when, I am pleased to say, I do not belong to the Government side. I do not know what people think I can do in Opposition, other than protest. The letter goes on—

The Committee of Management and members are greatly concerned because the club is at present required to bear more than a fair share of providing revenue for both the Federal and State Treasuries.

At the present time clubs are paying excise on all liquor, cigarettes and tobacco purchased, furthermore they are paying license fees that are assessed on the amount of liquor that they purchase throughout the year and in addition are now obliged to pay (3) three cents in every ten dollars Receipts Tax, whilst most trading concerns are paying (1) one cent in every ten dollars of their income for this purpose.

Part of the club's income is derived from membership and nomination fees, which are charged for the use of the facilities that the club provides and for the maintenance of these facilities.

If there is a need for the continuance of this "Receipts Tax," surely the clubs should pay the lesser amount of (1) one cent in every ten dollars, in view of their current contributions to revenue and surely the amount received in nomination fees and membership fees together with other funds raised within a club for the benefit of members should be exempt from this tax.

We trust you will examine the situation and we confidently look forward to your support towards the amending of the Act in such a way that clubs will obtain some measure of relief.

Here we have members of a club asking me to repeal legislation, and I, in turn, am asking the Government to do something on behalf of the people I represent. I am pleased to see the member for Balcatta taking notice of this, because he is very keenly interested in clubs. I wish other members would do likewise and would, on behalf of their own constituents support the member for Fremantle in any approach that might be made in this regard.

Mr. Bovell: Give us some more information on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's interest in clubs.

Mr. FLETCHER: I have noticed this tactic before by members on the front bench opposite who happen to take advantage of their proximity to *Hansard*. They say things which you, Mr. Speaker,

can hear, but which I cannot hear. Subsequently when I am correcting my speech I find that someone on the front bench has attempted to negate, by interjection, the entire substance of my remarks. I can only say that some day members on this side will be in an identical position.

Mr. Graham: In about six months.

Mr. FLETCHER: We will then be in the position of being able to interject and negate speeches that are made by members opposite. I wrote to both the clubs concerned. Let me read one of the letters, because I can explain the position more concisely by the manner in which I wrote than I can, perhaps, by over-elaboration. This will not make the Premier or the Government members happy, but I wrote as follows to the secretary of the Fremantle Workers' Social and Leisure Club:—

Dear Mr. Pigdon,

I thank you for your letter of 4th July, 1967, expressing opposition to the detrimental impact of Receipts Tax upon your own and other Clubs.

Fremantle R.S.L. Wyola Club wrote me, to also express concern regarding the matter above. I forwarded their letter, with covering advice, to the Hon. Premier and received the reply contained in photostat attached—the original was forwarded to the Club mentioned.

I draw your attention to the last paragraph of the Hon. Premier's letter, in relation to your comment that a 1 cent in \$10 tax would be more reasonable in view of other tax contributions to State and Federal revenue. Like yourself and members, I cannot see the justice or equity in taxing membership fees and other funds.

You say you confidently look forward to my support in amending the Act to Club advantage.

I ask members to listen to this—

Being a member of a Party which is in opposition precludes me or my Party from introducing legislation to that end. Only the Government enjoys that right.

I regret that all I can do is what I have already done—protest to the Hon. Premier as Treasurer.

You have my assurance, however, that when legislation is introduced, as promised, I shall make known to Parliament the attitude of Fremantle Clubs to the present unfair taxation, and encourage my Labor colleagues to do likewise in support of clubs in their various electorates.

Please find also attached a Press cutting revealing evidence that Stamp Duty receipts are well in excess of amounts anticipated.

You will note the attached critical comment of the Hon. J. T. Tonkin, Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

I can again assure you that I shall do all I can to help when the opportunity arises.

That is why I am here, doing precisely what I undertook to do.

Mr. Lewis: You are trying to be a bad influence on members on this side.

Mr. FLETCHER: Let me now read the Premier's letter, in all fairness. He wrote to me as follows:—

The views of the Fremantle R.S.L. Club in relation to stamp duty as expressed in an attachment to your letter of the 9th June have been noted.

A review of the legislation is being made in the light of experience to date and several matters have been listed as requiring remedial action.

As the result of this review it is proposed to bring down legislation in the forthcoming Parliamentary Session with the intention of placing holders of Liquor Licenses in a more equitable position than obtains under the existing law.

When I received the Premier's undertaking I knew it would be ambiguous. Like the present Leader of the Opposition and the previous Leader of the Opposition, I do not think that undertakings from the other side of the House mean a great deal. We have heard a considerable amount on that aspect. Having that in mind I propose to give the House a nudge on the subject. The Premier having given me that assurance, members can imagine my consternation when I saw headlines in the paper to this effect, "No Repeal for Tax Measures." It then went on—

The government would not repeal its legislation on stamp duty or road maintenance tax, Mines Minister Griffith told the Legislative Council yesterday.

He was replying to Mr. Strickland (Lab.), who said the measures had caused steep rises in the prices of food and all essential commodities in rural areas.

But the headline says the Government will not repeal the legislation dealing with stamp duty or road maintenance tax. Here we have the Leader of the House in another place totally at variance with what the Premier has said.

Mr. Bovell: He is not at variance with the Premier. The Premier said he would revise it. He did not say he would repeal it. You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes I do.

Mr. Bovell: The Premier said he would review the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER: He said a review of the legislation is being made. What sort of a review is it if nothing is going to be done?

Mr. Bovell: I think you are a little mixed.

Mr. FLETCHER: No fear, I am not! He says that as a result of this review it is proposed to bring down legislation.

Mr. Bovell: He did not say he was going to repeal legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER: He said legislation would be brought down to advantage the clubs to which I have been referring. I interpreted that to mean that there would be an amendment to the legislation to ease the burden about which I am complaining. So there we have two members of the same Government at variance with each other.

Let me get on to the third ground to show that there is no justification for this tax; that it should be repealed entirely in accordance with the figures quoted on the 7th July, 1967. The heading is, "Receipt Tax Estimates Exceeded," and the article reads—

The State balance sheet for the financial year just ended gives the first real evidence of what some people had suspected—that the new scale of stamp duty on receipts will return the Treasury much more than originally forecast.

The estimated yield from receipt duty in the budget was \$600,000 for five months. The actual collections came to \$930,000.

Because of the periodical-returns system and because the new scale has been operating only five months, it is difficult to assess the yield over a full year.

However, it seems that it will be at least \$2.2 million—or about 50 per cent. higher than early Treasury predictions of \$1.45 million.

The underestimate is not wholly a miscalculation by the Treasury. Other tax revenues have exceeded expectations, including those for which the rate has not changed.

In view of those almost astronomical figures in excess of what was estimated, am I or am I not justified in complaining on behalf of my suffering constituents? As a consequence of my writing to the Premier the R.S.L. "Wyola" Club wrote to me and said—

The President, Committee, Members and myself thank you very much for your effort on our behalf.

I hope they read in *Hansard* what I have done this evening and that they are grateful as a result. I also hope that other members will do the same for clubs in their electorates.

There is another matter touching my area with which I am concerned, and it is inherent in a question I asked the Minister for Electricity on the 8th August, 1967, as follows:—

Will he, as an alternative to the Blackwall Reach site, have investigated the feasibility of carrying

power mains across the river—on a temporary basis—at the site of the proposed new traffic bridge from East Fremantle to Point Brown, North Fremantle, with a view to subsequently installing the cables under the decking of—

(a) that bridge, or

(b) the replacement bridge

to be built adjacent to the existing traffic bridge?

The Minister replied—

No final decision has been reached and all possible alternatives are being considered.

It is my opinion that my proposition to install power lines across the river in the manner suggested would not be to the detriment of the beauty of the river, or cause antagonism among yachtsmen and other people who use the river for pleasure.

Every opportunity should be explored to prevent the permanent carrying of these mains across the river at any point.

Like the member for Balcatta and the member for Avon I, too, was recently overseas. Those honourable members no doubt also saw electric cables going down to the water's edge, even at the edge of the sea, and in places travelling miles under the sea and coming up on another shore some distance away. The same could be done in the metropolitan area. The cable could be sunk into the river mud. It would not be an impediment to boats which use the river, because it would be in the mud at the bottom of the river and it would not be likely to foul anchors and so on. I put forward that suggestion, and I hope the Minister and the officers of the State Electricity Commission will read it and take cognisance of it as a worthy suggestion.

Another matter which concerns me is in relation to the Minister for Immigration in this State; and he would now be justified in taking an interest in what I am saying. It concerns the difficulty some people have in gaining admission to Australia. I usually make submissions to my Federal counterpart, Mr. K. Beazley, M.H.R., and I frequently get back a reply something like this—

Mr. Bovell: That is a Federal matter, of course.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am aware of that. I do not doubt the ability of the State Minister, but I believe in going to the top and asking the Federal Minister to take up my submissions and consider them.

On the 19th July, 1967, Mr. Kim Beazley, M.H.R., who frequently writes back to me along these lines, wrote as follows:—

I regret to enclose the reply received from Mr. Freeth, stating the grant of a visa for Mr. Menga has not been approved.

On the 11th July, 1967 the Acting Minister for Immigration (Gordon Freeth) wrote to Mr. Beazley as follows:—

In the absence overseas of my colleague, the Hon. B. M. Snedden, I refer to your representations concerning the admission to Australia from Italy of Mr. Giuseppe Menga. Mr. Antonio Menga of 67 John Street Cottesloe, has approached Mr. Harry Fletcher, M.L.A., in this matter.

In view of your interest in this case, the overseas reports, on which the previous decision was based, have been carefully re-examined. I regret, however, that Mr. Menga is unable to meet the normal requirements for entry into Australia and I am therefore unable to approve the grant of a visa to him.

I regret to say I receive this type of correspondence very frequently. I have another case here in regard to which I received an identical reply. I will not read my correspondence, but will say this: In the correspondence on behalf of another constituent, and in the light of the ambiguity inherent in the correspondence where it is said the applicant does not meet the normal requirements, I would think a more satisfactory answer than that should be given. I want to know whether the applicant is mentally ill, physically ill, or politically ill. I use the words "politically ill" as a consequence of a discussion with a family of one of the applicants. In the full consciousness of what I am saying, I suspect that the politics of some applicants are unacceptable to those who have the say in regard to whether those persons shall be admitted to Australia.

I say at the outset that these people should come here irrespective of their politics; they are subject to the laws of this land and should not be unacceptable as a consequence of their politics. To justify the lines along which I am speaking, I will tell the House of my experience in relation to one family. There were three sons of a certain family in Fremantle. They were very desirable sons—splendid citizens—and naturally they wanted to get their father out here. Was it not a natural ambition for them to have the family reunited in their new land? Their father was unacceptable—just the same ambiguous remark. I asked if their father had ever been associated with a resistance movement in Greece.

They admitted quite frankly that he had. He fought against the Germans during the last war and I was told that in doing so he had been associated with Communists. That is what they were termed, but whether they actually were, I do not know. Anyway, they fought side by side with the Allies. Because of that, this man was *persona non grata*

to the Government in Australia and was unacceptable. Whether he still was interested in politics I do not know; but because of a past association he was unacceptable. I suspect as do the members of his family and other people, too, that if he had been conservatively inclined he would have been *persona grata* in Australia. As a result I wrote to my Federal counterpart asking him to tell the Federal Minister that I wanted a more satisfactory reply than the statement that this person did not meet normal requirements.

I have another subject here that concerns me. I wrote an article for our newspaper *The Western Sun*. I will not read this article in its entirety.

Mr. Gayfer: *The West Australian*?

Mr. FLETCHER: No, *The Western Sun*, a Labor paper. I subscribe to this paper, and I wish a lot more people would, too. I do not only subscribe to it financially, but also by way of an occasional article, when asked. The one to which I now refer is headed "A Labor Politician's Problems(?)" and I elaborate the diversity of problems that the member for Fremantle has to face in his electorate. In one part I say—

Ample evidence exists in the Fremantle area that the much vaunted affluent society does not apply, to all.

Further down I say—

The call might come from the owner of a home or property resumed by Government action at a price not related to replacement value or then again the call might come from a Union, a businessmen's organisation, a local authority, or from sources too numerous to enumerate.

Further down I say—

After a knock on my door I became involved in an insoluble problem: a fine-looking man, just released from 55 days gaol—

I ask members to listen to this as there is valuable substance in it. It is something of which this House should take cognisance.

Dr. Henn: I have been.

Mr. FLETCHER: I think the honourable member has been very attentive.

Mr. Graham: Can't you find another adjective?

Mr. FLETCHER: Continuing to quote—
—for non-payment of maintenance sought my help for reasons as follows:— His maintenance had been established on high earnings in the North of our State. His return to the South on medical grounds caused him to seek local employment. I assisted in this respect, but his weekly wage was only \$2 in excess of his maintenance obligation. He had, before seeing me, sought assistance from many of the legal profession in Perth

and Fremantle, in an attempt to obtain a review of maintenance in the light of changing economic circumstances. Not having the requested fee, his promise to pay later was apparently unacceptable. I rang Crown Law on his behalf but free legal aid was not available in Supreme Court matters.

I hope this is of vital interest to the House. I saw the clerk of the local court on this person's behalf, and here again there was no assistance from this quarter in a Supreme Court matter. Continuing—

During all this time his maintenance indebtedness was accumulating, as was his fear of a further gaol term among unfortunate convicted criminals. When last seen, his physical health had further deteriorated, as had his mental condition. He expressed concern that he would finish in Heathcote. As his parents are reticent as to his whereabouts, it is possible that he is at that address, or in hiding at an unknown address, perhaps in the Eastern States.

The story behind this case is not an isolated one. Simply because that man did not have the requisite fee to seek a review of the maintenance which he found impossible to pay, he was likely to go back to gaol unless he disappeared to an address unknown. He came down from the north a sick man in order to join his children in the metropolitan area; but where he is now, I do not know. What sort of a democracy is it that we live in which permits such a rotten injustice that a man cannot seek redress at law because he cannot afford it? That is what made me say in my initial remarks in the article to the paper that our much vaunted society does not apply to all.

It is necessary that this Government find the finance from somewhere to establish a fund upon which the legal profession can draw for remuneration associated with assisting unfortunate cases such as the one I have just mentioned. There must be hundreds seeking relief from an unhappy marriage. I do not wish to paint a black picture, but I must be realistic. I want to help those who need help. Therefore, I must bring cases such as this to the notice of the House.

Mr. Hawke: This man is not divorced?

Mr. FLETCHER: He was legally separated. I said he was seeking relief from maintenance. I thank the member for Northam for reminding me of another facet as to how people cannot obtain relief because they cannot afford the legal fees associated with a divorce. I have quoted the earlier example from the newspaper which I mentioned, and now I quote another case referred to in the Press article, as follows:—

The other example relates to an unfortunate mother of two illegitimate

children—illegitimate because she could not and still cannot afford the legal costs associated with a divorce from a man whose whereabouts have been unknown since 1952. She met somebody else, loved, and lived on a de facto basis, had two kiddies, shifted to Tasmania to make a fresh start, was again deserted, and later returned to this State to live with a son of her first union. This son is now married, and the unfortunate mother and little ones are endeavouring to live and pay rent on \$15.6 per week, plus child endowment. I am currently trying to obtain a widow's pension to ensure protection for the family in the event of sickness.

These two cases do not make happy reading, but do, I hope, demonstrate that, under present Government policy, misery is inflicted on those unable to pay for goods and services including legal services.

That illustrates my point. Here is an unfortunate woman who could not afford legal costs associated with a divorce, and two innocent, illegitimate children are suffering because of a Government that believes in freedom of private enterprise; believes that the legal profession can charge what it likes for any services it gives to assist people such as I have just mentioned.

Mr. Burt: Are you sure?

Mr. FLETCHER: I would not have made the statements I have made unless I had inquired at Crown Law and was sure.

Mr. Bovell: There is some legal aid.

Mr. FLETCHER: Legal aid is not available in a Supreme Court matter such as divorce. As I said in my article, I contacted the clerk of courts at Fremantle, and he gave me a form. It could have had S.R.2 on top of it. I thought my constituent was going to get a review of his commitments, but subsequently it was found that because of Government policy, the local court could not interfere in Supreme Court matters. So the gentleman concerned was frustrated, as was the member for Fremantle.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. FLETCHER: It would take me in excess of five minutes to elaborate on the other subject to which I wished to refer. It is an important matter which touches on children; and what more important matter can there be than children, who are our future citizens. I undertake later to elaborate on the subject of day nurseries in Western Australia and the day nurseries I saw during my recent tour overseas.

I attended, and I submitted a report relating to, the 12th Parliamentary Conference, and in view of the fact that I visited other countries subsequent to the

conference and, saw a lot of mistakes which had been made in relation to highways, I could have contributed considerably to the debate this evening. I also have a lot of information regarding education and other matters which may be of interest to members of the House and I might give an assessment of those things on a future occasion.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [9.16 p.m.]: Like all other electorates in Western Australia, we are feeling the housing pinch in Carnarvon. There may be one or two places such as Narrogin which do not feel it so much. I am very sorry to see members of the Government side moving gradually out of the Chamber as I start to speak. It does not look the best to see the members of the Government side leaving. As a matter of fact, there appears to be just six members left in their seats. I know what members are called when they get up to speak, and members on the other side of the House move out. However, that will not deter me and I will discuss housing. As a matter of fact, there appears to be just six members left in their seats. I know what members are called when they get up to speak, and members on the other side of the House move out. However, that will not deter me and I will discuss housing. What I wish to say will appear in *Hansard*. Despite the fact that there are only two Ministers in their seats, I will still make my speech.

First of all I will quote from an article in the *Northern Times* which was published on the 19th November, 1964. This statement was made by the Minister for the North-West and whilst it is short it is very much to the point. I read it in the way in which I think all nor'westers would read it. In part, it reads as follows:—

"We must have total development in the north, and that means people," he says. "We can be challenged in international affairs over the lack of development in our north."

"What the north needs is people, and they must be well housed, well clothed and well fed. This will make the country safe."

I think the Minister could have gone a little bit further and said that adequate education and other social services should also be provided. The point I wish to deal with is housing. Whilst the Minister made that statement, I think he has probably forgotten just what he said, because over the past few years the housing position in Carnarvon has very definitely slipped. This will be shown from the figures which I will quote in a few minutes.

The number of families waiting for housing, according to the Minister's statement the other day, is 92. One might ask where these people are living at the moment. The answer is that the majority are living—and have lived for some considerable time—in caravans in one of the four caravan parks in the district. If we look for the number of people who are actually waiting—which I have calculated by classing the families as four units—it can be seen that there are virtually 368. I think my calculation of a four-unit

family is fair enough, as will be shown from the various application forms. The average number is four in each family.

If we use figures published from the last census, we will find that one person in every eight in the Shire of Carnarvon is waiting for a house. That is not a very creditable performance at all and I would think there is no other town in this State which has the same proportion of persons waiting for accommodation.

A large number of the people in the north go there for short-term employment. By that I mean, two, three, or perhaps four years. A large percentage are Government employees in certain categories, and others are employed in transport, earthmoving, etc. Those workers are there for a short period only. It would not pay them to build, because they do not intend to stay.

This particular set-up may change in the future with the stabilising of the population. At the present time people are attempting to purchase their own homes. If people are to be happy and contented, and willing to work in the north-west, we must house them properly as the Minister has already said.

There was a statement by another Minister this year. He is not here tonight; I understand he has gone home sick. I refer to the Minister for Housing. We find he has a totally different concept of housing, not only for the north-west, but for the whole State. I think that is clearly set out in a statement published in *The West Australian* in a leading article, portion of which I will quote as follows:—

However, the significant point of Mr. O'Neil's address to the Canning division of the Liberal and Country League is his statement that the housing commission is, to a degree, an instrument of social welfare.

I do not know how he reaches the conclusion that the Housing Commission is an instrument of social service, unless he is referring to the rebates which it gives to unfortunate people such as pensioners. If by giving that rebate the Housing Commission becomes a social service unit, I could agree to a certain extent. However, we must have some organisation in every State in Australia which is willing to build houses for the people of Australia. By so doing, control is kept on rents.

I am told that round the city at the present time certain agents are asking for key money. It is not called key money but a deposit, and it is a considerable amount. Whether the tenants get that deposit back is, perhaps, a debatable point. However, we cannot debate it at present because the people concerned have not yet left those houses.

The Minister claimed that one of the reasons for a shortage of housing is migration. I cannot see how migration, to any extent, is causing a shortage of housing.

It is not the cause at Carnarvon, anyway. To show what I mean by that I will go back over the years and give the number of houses built at Carnarvon during the time of the Hawke Government, and in the first six years of this present Government.

First of all, I will quote the figures which were supplied by the State Housing Commission in its annual report. The figures go back to 1945. Taking the figures for the six years of the Hawke Labor Government, we find that the Government built a total of 17,120 units. In the first six years of the present Government, 11,376 units were built, which is 5,744 less.

In the case of Carnarvon, we find that in the six years of the Labor Government 60 houses were built. Incidentally, the figure which I gave was the total number of units built in the State. Those built under the State Housing Act and the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act, are somewhat fewer, but bear the same proportion, in the average, as did the previous figures. Whilst slightly lower, the figure bears the same proportion, which shows that the migration policy has not affected the number of houses built in the metropolitan area. In fact, as migration has increased the number of houses built has decreased. That is, units built by the Housing Commission.

Mr. O'Connor: You are disregarding building society money.

Mr. NORTON: Over a long period, the building society money has been 30 per cent. of the amount allocated by the Commonwealth, and 5 per cent. of the balance can be allocated for servicemen's homes in the State.

Mr. O'Connor: Is that amount included in your figures?

Mr. NORTON: These are actual units built by the State Housing Commission, and if the Minister would like to know the headings under which they appear, they are: the State Housing Act; the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement; War Service Homes; Other Departments; Mc Ness Housing Trust; Kwinana Refinery Act; Charitable Organisations; and Other Schemes. Does that clear up the matter for the Minister?

As far as Carnarvon is concerned, 60 houses were built during the six years of the Labor Government. That is an average of 10 houses a year. For the first six years of the present Government, 48 houses were built at Carnarvon, which is an average of eight each year.

Over the past five years the population in Carnarvon has increased by 13.45 per cent. Those figures are taken from the statistical report which all members received just recently. So it can be seen that housing in Carnarvon has not increased with the population of the town. The Carnarvon Shire Council has built houses but they have been occupied by members of the tracking station.

When people come into a district, we have not only to provide for them, but we have to provide for the people who supply the services. I am not certain of the number of people required to service one person, but I believe it is in the vicinity of two for one.

It can be seen that with 150-odd employees at the tracking station and the Overseas Telecommunications centre, there is a big influx of people to service. Likewise, when Texada Mines Pty. Limited starts to develop the salt project, it will fall to the Government to supply houses equal in number to those provided by the company.

The article in *The West Australian* to which I have referred contains quite a deal of comment one way and another and, on the whole, is very interesting. It is an article which members should read, because it will give them a good idea of what is going on. One of the statements in it is very pertinent and the Minister for Transport could not argue about it. It reads as follows:—

Despite Mr. O'Neill's statement that the amount of money available to the S.H.C. has increased each year, the commission's capital income last year was only 9.6 per cent. higher than it was five years ago, while the government's total loan raisings had increased by 22.9 per cent.

There is great disparity between those two increases; one is very small when compared to the other. The part of the article which intrigues me is that which mentions that the commission's capital income last year was 9.6 per cent. higher than it was five years ago. That does not indicate that it was loan moneys granted from the General Loan Fund to the State Housing Commission. This capital income might have been obtained from the sale of land or from repayment of interest on the purchase of homes, and so on.

It is quite evident, therefore, that the State Housing Commission is not receiving the percentage of loan funds it should be and as a result the people in this State are suffering from a lack of adequate housing. In fact, I believe the Minister did tell one person in Carnarvon, "What could you expect when the Government has underestimated very substantially the cost of construction of the standard gauge railway, and loan funds have to be found for that purpose? Therefore somebody had to go short and unfortunately it was the Housing Commission." I will leave it to the House to make its own assessment on how true that statement is, but I believe the Minister did make it and that it is quite true.

Mr. O'Connor: That was the Minister for Housing?

Mr. NORTON: Yes. As the year progressed other statements were published in

the newspapers, which are more or less a blind to cover up the true housing position. On the 15th March, 1967, the following headline appeared in *The West Australian*.—

Millions To Be Spent on Housing

One would wonder what was behind that headline, because it seems fantastic that millions are to be spent on housing. However, when reading the article it was discovered that \$2,500,000 is to be spent in Bunbury over a period of time and \$1,850,000 is to be spent in the north-west. But, the headlines would make it appear that all the housing requirements are to be met.

On the 2nd June, 1967, another article appeared in *The West Australian* announcing that the State Housing Commission would be asked to build 300 houses for airmen at the Pearce aerodrome. Apparently, under the State Housing Act the Government, after making the allocation of 30 per cent. of the funds to building societies, has to spend 5 per cent. of the balance representing approximately 3½ per cent. of the total loan moneys made available for housing—on the construction of homes for servicemen in and around the metropolitan area.

If the Government is to build 300 homes within a very short period for the 1,400 increase in personnel at the Pearce aerodrome over the next 18 months or two years, other people will have to go short. In my opinion the provision of homes at the Pearce aerodrome is part and parcel of a defence project in much the same way as the Exmouth project is, and all moneys for defence, including homes for servicemen, should come from defence funds, especially when one realises what is being spent on defence in accordance with the Budget figures announced this evening.

I would not like to hazard a guess as to what the houses at the Pearce aerodrome will cost because apparently they are to be a special type.

I congratulate the Minister for Housing on making the statement that he is not keen on building houses in that area, because should the personnel at the aerodrome decrease in number at any time, the houses that will become vacant would not be of much use to anyone, because the Pearce aerodrome is far distant from those areas in which houses are sought by the general community. Therefore, in the future, they would be more or less redundant.

On Wednesday, the 2nd August last, I asked the Minister a question on the number of resignations by teachers, and I followed this up by asking if he considered this could be related in any way to the shortage of housing. The Minister replied by saying he did not consider the resignations were related to the shortage of housing. Further to that answer I would like

the Minister for Housing and the Minister for Education to know that this year Carnarvon lost two teachers owing to lack of housing.

Although a Government Employees' Housing Authority house in Carnarvon was vacated by the Public Works Department, and it had no intention of using it again, the Education Department could not obtain it to house a married teacher. His wife was also serving as a teacher at the same time. This man had three young children and the whole family was living in a caravan. Rather than continue to live under these conditions he decided to resign.

Single teachers in Carnarvon are in a similar position. There are three female teachers sharing caravan accommodation in Carnarvon. It is my belief that persons working in a group in the same establishment should be entitled to have independent accommodation if they so desire, because each is in the other's company all day and every day and therefore, when not on duty, they do not desire to continue in the same company all the time.

For some time now many pages of our daily newspapers have contained numerous articles relating to the lack of accommodation for teachers and the figures quoted are astounding. On the 8th August, 1967, an article appeared in *The West Australian* referring to a claim on housing for teachers by the W.A. teachers' union. The union's general secretary, Mr. R. Darragh, had made a statement to the Press which I thought was much to the point. He stated quite clearly the present situation in regard to housing accommodation for teachers.

In the north, housing for teachers must keep pace with the rapid development of schools. Teachers cannot be expected to stay in those areas unless they are provided with adequate housing, when they have been living in modern homes in the city. As I have said, some of them are living in caravans.

Mr. Lewis: Some people would prefer to live in that type of accommodation rather than pay higher rent for a house.

Mr. NORTON: If the Minister had been listening he would have heard me saying that in Carnarvon we lost two teachers through the lack of suitable housing.

Mr. Lewis: I am not referring to teachers; I am talking about people generally.

Mr. NORTON: I have read this statement published in the Press and I have read what the Minister had to say and I realise what the position is. Another point I wish to deal with in relation to housing—I do not know whether other members have had similar problems—concerns those tenants who wish to purchase the homes in which they live at present. At Carnarvon many inquiries have been made by the present tenants for houses under the purchase scheme. A number of them have decided to purchase these homes, but there

have also been quite a few who have rejected the offers.

It is rather interesting to see just what the State Housing Commission is doing in respect of purchase homes. In 1966 there were two houses which were practically side by side. One was sold at a price of \$7,000, and the other, which was very close by, was applied for—admittedly seven or eight months later—and the price was \$9,500. This for a house which was identical with the first one mentioned; it was built by the same contractor and contained the same number of squares.

Mr. Toms: The same plan and the same number of squares?

Mr. NORTON: Exactly the same, and built by the same contractor. Since then another house has been sold across the road for \$8,000. In other words, there was a decrease of \$1,500 for exactly the same house in the same street, with the same number of squares, and so on. One was offered for \$9,500 and the other for \$8,000.

Two other houses were applied for; one was sold at \$6,800, and six months later the second house was valued for the applicant at \$9,500. Members will see just how steep the price rise is. It is this type of thing which gives the applicant no incentive to purchase a house. The applicants to whom I am referring were original tenants; some of them had been in their houses for 10 or 12 years. If we want people to buy houses and settle down in them we should provide these houses for them at a reasonable price.

I understand that the Housing Commission's method of assessing the value of a house is to approach the Taxation Department and ask for the value of that house at number so-and-so, such-and-such street. The valuation is obtained without the departmental officers going to Carnarvon. The valuation is carried out by the person who sets the valuation for the shire. In between his valuing he is kept abreast of values as he receives reports on the individual land sales in the district.

Due to the development of the tracking station and the influx of people to Carnarvon a severe shortage of land has arisen. The position there is synonymous with that in the city inasmuch as when there is no land available prices rise sky high. This is what has happened at Carnarvon, in spite of repeated requests to the Minister, by myself, and by the shire council for more land to be thrown open.

One of the Government departments wanted a block of land urgently to house one of its top people in Carnarvon. It was a particularly nice corner block with a sea frontage, and the department paid the price asked. The price was exorbitant, but that price became the ruling price for the valuations which are now being made. That is indicated to me very clearly in the jump that was made in the prices asked for the various State houses I have quoted;

it is only because of the very steep increase in the cost of land that the prices for houses have gone up.

It is interesting to see what the commission's story is on this. I do not propose to read the full text of a letter I have here; I will merely read the all-important centre paragraph. It is a letter written on the 11th May and reads, in part—

It has been indicated that during the period in excess of 1½ years the values in Carnarvon had increased considerably due to

- (a) increase in land values,
- (b) increase in building costs,
- (c) greater demand resulting from major activity in the north-west.

If a person wishes to buy a house from the Housing Commission, he should be able to do so at a reasonable price. Every house the commission sells is one less for it to maintain; it is one less on which it must pay rates and taxes; and it is one more which is being looked after properly. When the Housing Commission sells a house it means that another tenant is off its books, and it can build another house for some other needy person. I do not know why houses cannot be sold at a reasonable price when they are 10 years, 12 years, or 14 years old, because houses which are built of jarrah and asbestos, particularly, lose their value fairly rapidly. The houses in question were originally built for about \$6,000.

It is evident from the letter I have quoted that it is the peak demand which is causing the price of houses to be put up. It is also the Government's purchase of land at exorbitant prices that puts up the value of the land. Then we have the Housing Commission coming in and charging these high prices. If we wish people to settle down in a district and rear their families we should make available to them houses at a reasonable cost. They would then be in a position to live in them and look after them properly.

I want now to deal with the question of water and water conservation. Since last year I have done quite a bit of research into this matter, and particularly into desalination. In going through the various articles and publications I have come across some really astounding facts. At least that is how they struck me, and I am sure members will agree if they read some of these publications. Our northern rivers with their mighty potential can be as big an asset as our minerals. That might be saying a tremendous lot, but I believe it to be so, and I hope to be able to indicate the truth of that remark. I have here one pamphlet which was sent to me by a firm called Burns and Roe. There are one or two interesting facts in this publication, though not in an advertising

sense. It deals with a conference held in America and states—

70 Nations Meet at Washington to Find Ways of Alleviating a Worldwide Shortage of Fresh Water

At the International Conference on Water for Peace held at Sheraton Park Hotel Washington, D.C. from May 23 to May 31, 70 nations shared their experiences and ideas in identifying, defining and solving the problems of obtaining fresh water.

Further on this is stated—

California State Water Project

This \$2.5 billion project includes 15 earth-fill dams, 10 aqueduct systems totalling 600 miles in length, nine hydroelectric generating plants, and 18 pumping plants with an aggregate demand of 2,500 Mw.

Within five years these man-made canals and dams are to make northern California's excess water supplies available to the state's more populous southern half.

That could happen in Western Australia. We have seven or eight very big rivers in the north, in so far as the volume of water they carry is concerned. I shall not enumerate the volume, because most members have seen them from the air or from the land, and they have been told of the amount of water these rivers carry in flood periods. We should realise that the water that can flow from those rivers can be a godsend to the State.

With the big development in mining in the State, unless the water resources of the north are developed and the big companies are persuaded to discontinue the use of underground supplies, the north of Western Australia will experience a drought in underground water supplies.

With that thought in mind I undertook some study of desalination and the various types of plants that are available. To give members some idea of what takes place in other parts of the world, numbers of towns have desalination plants with a capacity of 1,000,000 gallons per day, and some have plants with a capacity up to 2,500,000 gallons per day. To quote again from the pamphlet I have just been referring to—

This paper describes a method being used by Nassau county to augment its fresh water needs. Normally, the fresh water supply for the county's 1,500,000 population comes from wells. However, estimates show that by 1977, the rate of underground aquifer recharge to the wells will be insufficient for water needs.

One method of increasing the aquifer water supply is to reinject renovated waste water.

That was what I mentioned in respect of the north of the State and its under-

ground water supplies. We might have to build up the rivers to retain the water supplies in that area.

I am quoting from these pamphlets to let members know what has taken place in other countries. One states as follows:—

Man and water are inseparable. Approximately 70 per cent. of the human being consists of water. And without water, life is lost in seven to ten days.

Yet scientists predict that an alarming world wide water shortage will overtake us within the next 20 years. In the United States alone, it is estimated that by 1980 we will have a deficit of 85 billion gallons of water a day.

In the U.S.A. the water problem is being tackled right now, and I believe Western Australia should similarly attack the problem. On examining the pamphlets and advertising material which are available we find there is a number of desalination plants on the market.

Mr. Lewis: What is the cost of the unit which desalinates up to 2,500,000 gallons a day?

Mr. NORTON: I understand that in the case of the high-volume units, the cost is about 21c American per thousand gallons. I will deal with the cost as I go along. Up till recently there were four main types of desalination plants: flash type evaporators, vapour compression, spray flash evaporators, and electrodialysis. Each one of these types requires a considerable amount of heat and power to operate, therefore they are not the most economical methods.

Now a new type of plant known as reverse osmosis is available. It is very simple and very economical to operate. This small type of plant with a capacity of three American gallons a day is used for obtaining drinking water for a small household, and other plants can be obtained to supply hospitals and factories. I understand the larger type is now produced with a capacity of approximately 100,000 gallons a day, and is supplied throughout the world quite extensively.

I am advised that the companies producing this type of plant are willing to install it on a money back guarantee. This Government should obtain some of the reverse osmosis units for use in this State. The method of desalination by reverse osmosis will bring the water back to a stage where it is almost too pure, and where it becomes necessary to reintroduce salt, because without a certain amount of salt the water is of little use.

The small units capable of producing three to four gallons per day measure 19in. in length, 19in. in width, and 19in. in height. The total weight is 65 lb., and the unit works off a single phase, 110 volt, 60 cycle electric supply. It is contained in an

aluminium box, and all the instruments and controls are placed outside. The unit is in essence a pump with various tubes which contain the membranes; and the membranes are the important parts.

In the case of the 10,000 gallon per day unit, of which I have a diagram before me, the dimensions are 12 ft. 6 in. in length, 3 ft. 9 in. in height, and 3 ft. 2 in. in width. It is 6,000 lb. wet weight; that is, when it contains water. The reason the weight is given as wet weight is that once the membranes are installed in the unit they must be kept in water. This plant requires only a 6 kilowatt, 440 volt, 3 phase, 60 cycle power requirement to operate.

Mr. Lewis: That is not included in the unit?

Mr. NORTON: It is not. That power drives a small pump which forces the water through at up to 100 lb. per square inch, which is not a very high pressure. This could be extended readily to 100,000 gallons.

Mr. Lewis: What would be the capital cost?

Mr. NORTON: The 100,000 gallon per day class would be expected to cost in a year or so—not at the moment—\$100,000, American. The cost could actually come down as things go on.

Mr. Kelly: A dollar a gallon.

Mr. NORTON: The interesting thing about these plants is that they recover 75 per cent., or thereabouts, of the water induced into them. With the other methods it is possible to recover approximately only 50 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: This would depend on the quality of the water.

Mr. NORTON: They work better from brackish water or water from deep bores than seawater, because the concentration of chemicals is greater in seawater. With the ordinary bore water one gets from artesian bores at 3,000 p.p.m. they would work well. The water would have to be cold because the water through these desalination plants is used at normal atmospheric temperature. No heating is required. It is a simple plant to operate.

The main trouble at the present time is servicing the membranes. I could not get much information as to the life of the membranes, but, once made, they have to be kept in water the whole time. The only place where they are made at the present time is America, but a representative of a firm told me that if a few plants could be sold in Australia, it would not take very much to set up a factory to develop and manufacture these membranes. He told me that normally it takes only one girl to operate the plant which makes the membranes. There is nothing difficult in them; the main difficulty is keeping them wet and transporting them after manufacture. I think the life is approximately six months.

The changing of them presents no problem. They simply pull out the old tubes and push in fresh ones. They are made from a type of polythene and rolled, and they fit the various receptacles.

The main features of the reverse osmosis set-up are these—

Low Energy Costs—Systems require only a fraction of the energy needed for distillation, freezing or hydrate processes.

Low Operation Costs—Reverse osmosis plants operate at ambient temperatures. Corrosion and scaling are not major factors. Simplicity makes the system suitable for unattended plant operation.

Flexibility in Operation—System will respond to rapid changes in load demands, and can be started up or shut down in seconds.

Compact Plant Size—Because no phase change is necessary, reverse osmosis plants are inherently compact. With the Roga spiral module design, membrane pressure vessel volume is minimized with thousands of gallons per day capacity per cubic foot of volume.

High Quality Water—Excellent salt rejection. Barrier to viruses, inorganics and refractory organics. Unlike electrodialysis, reverse osmosis removes un-ionized as well as ionized materials.

I feel this is a system which must be developed. I understand that one person in particular at the Public Works Department is taking a big interest in it. I have supplied two or three chaps there with literature I have been getting and have been generally discussing the whole situation with them. This is something which has considerable appeal to them.

There are quite a few things I would like to deal with, but most of them can be attended to when discussing the various items in the Estimates. However, there is one I would like to deal with now. I refer to secondary education in the north-west and the remote parts of the State. The Minister will remember I asked a few questions this session in regard to first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year education in the north and in remote areas such as the Murchison. These areas are served with a junior high school or a high school; but these schools cannot and will never become fourth and fifth year high schools unless the department breaks down the number of pupils required to build up the fourth year.

Using Carnarvon as an example, this year 25 children left the town, 15 from the State school and 10 from others, in order to do their fourth and fifth years.

Mr. Lewis: How many?

Mr. NORTON: There were 25. I am not going to suggest that all of the 25 would

have stayed at Carnarvon. I am not foolish enough to say that, but the position is that once a school is established as a fourth or fifth year school the people get to know about it and, as a result, send their children there. However, if it is advertised that there are not sufficient children at Carnarvon to establish the fourth year, the parents will make early preparation to send their children away.

Mr. Lewis: Suppose 20 do stay there.

Mr. NORTON: It would not have been sufficient. The minister told me the number was 30.

Mr. Lewis: Out of the 20, not all would go on to the fifth year.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister knows very well from the figures supplied recently that the classes in these areas in the lower grades are gradually developing into higher numbers. If the schools have a fourth year, the children will stay on. The same will happen at Exmouth and other places in the north. The situation is similar to that of a hostel; if the accommodation is available it will be filled. Has the Minister ever taken into consideration the cost to the State of these children being sent away to school?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. NORTON: I will deal with that particular point. The Minister said the Education Department requires 30 children. I will not deal with 30, but with a lesser number, which is factual. Once a child goes away to school to complete the fourth and fifth years, the parent of that child is entitled to \$200 a year living-away-from-home allowance.

Mr. Lewis: In some areas, yes.

Mr. NORTON: I am talking about remote areas. I mentioned the north-west and the Murchison. I will not refer to the near-city areas or the South-West Land Division.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. A. Manning): The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. NORTON: That will be plenty of time, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The living away from home allowance plus the return fare for each child will cost the department approximately \$500 for the two years of that child's schooling.

There are two lots of \$200 plus two lots of return air fares. I am a little bit ahead there so far as Carnarvon is concerned, but there is greater expense involved further north in towns such as Exmouth. The living away from home allowance per year for these 25 children is approximately \$5,000. Therefore it would pay to have the extra teacher there to carry on the teaching of that class.

Mr. Lewis: But you do not appreciate that we would have to find the teachers, and we are short of these specialist teachers.

Mr. NORTON: That is quite an interesting point again; but I do not wish to

deal with it now because I will have an opportunity to do so later on. The Education Department lost a number of teachers in the first six months of this year, but we do not know why. Why is it losing the teachers?

Mr. Lewis: The greatest number consists of those who leave to get married.

Mr. NORTON: Apart from the cost to the Government and to the parents, we must consider the fact that the children must be taken away from their homes if they are to finish their schooling, and goodness knows they get away quickly enough as it is! I believe that cognisance should be taken of this situation in the north and that numbers should not mean a thing so far as education is concerned. The education should be made available to the children on the spot so that they can remain in the district.

Mr. Lewis: But the point is—

Mr. NORTON: My time is getting short. The Minister can answer these matters when he speaks. The fact that Carnarvon has been made a high school has not altered its status one iota, but I will deal with this matter later on, and I will also discuss the various teaching aids the children cannot get because the school is still only a junior high school.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Burt.

House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 16th August, 1967

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (12): ON NOTICE

ROADS

South-East Province: Works in Conjunction with Local Authorities

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

- (1) What road works are to be carried out by the Main Roads Department in its own right, or in conjunction with the towns of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and the Shires of Merredin, Bruce Rock, Westonia, Yilgarn, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Dundas, and Esperance?
- (2) What will be the cost of each project?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) The allocations made by the Main Roads Department in the 1967-68 programme of works to the several municipalities and shires referred to in this question are shown in the following statement:—