

The document states further—

The Education Department must be congratulated on its recent moves to upgrade the entry qualifications of people into this profession and the resulting improvement in services provided.

In 1976 there are sufficient qualified people available in Western Australia to fill the ratio of guidance officers to students that I have talked about. Unfortunately, as the Minister is well aware, there is not enough finance to employ these people. I think they are most necessary in our community.

Mrs Vaughan made reference to ministers of religion, and asked why they are to be exempted under the provisions of the Bill. Ministers of religion are people who are permitted to celebrate marriages. That is the standard procedure for recognising ministers of religion. The spiritual counselling which a person gets from a minister of religion is a matter which concerns only the minister and that person. The method of counselling is through the church.

In the United Kingdom and certain parts of Australia a religious organisation known as the Uniting Churches have clergymen who are theologically qualified as well as psychologically qualified, in that they have taken a degree in psychology. They offer psychological counselling at the clinics or rooms attached to the churches. One of the most famous is the Temple at Aldwych, London. The counselling service is advertised alongside the church services.

If we do not want to expose our community to charlatans, quacks, and frauds, then it is high time we brought in a Bill in relation to the registration of psychologists, because the practice of psychology could alter the course of a person's life; that is, the patient can receive benefit or improvement from whatever help is offered to him.

I wonder how the teacher, the nurse, the physiotherapist, the social worker, etc., attempt to solve the problem of the people before such time as an expert has evaluated just what the people involved are capable of doing mentally, and possibly physically.

We must have some yardsticks; and psychology as an exacting science, and becoming more exacting every day with greater research, offers certain yardsticks to gauge and decide what course could or could not be beneficial.

There is one great myth which it gives me great pleasure to explode in the House tonight; that is, the IQ myth. The IQ myth is that because a person has a certain IQ he will perform in a certain way. So he will, in a given set of certain conditions. To many parents the only evaluation a child ever had was a test of his IQ. Many of those parents were distressed because

of the showing of their child's IQ. However, the measurement is no longer shown in this State—nor has it been since 1965. The measurement is not even shown to teachers because it is only one of a multiplicity of factors that decides how one can adjudicate and help a child.

When one looks at the degrees which are required in order to become a psychologist, and then compares that syllabus with the social worker, or social psychologist, one becomes more and more sure that there are many "dabblers" in the field of psychology. I say "dabblers" in the kindest possible way, but they forget one important matter; social psychology—to take one example in particular—is only one aspect of the total field of psychology.

I do not wish to detain members any longer except to say I think it is high time this Bill was introduced. I am sure every member in this House will support the fact that such a Bill is necessary where a person is to be put in such a position that he can influence or mind bend—as some people call it—or brainwash people in our community.

I am sure the psychologists in the State will welcome the introduction of this measure. I have been assured by the Minister that the guidance branch, of which I was once a member, will surely welcome it. The people in the guidance branch, knowing that they themselves can be registered as psychologists, will welcome the fact that other people will be able to evaluate their work. At the moment, guidance officers are regarded as nothing more than career advisers. By testing people, psychologists sometimes do guide them into a better future. I support the Bill, and welcome its introduction.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

*House adjourned at 8.03 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 12th October, 1976

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

### PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

#### Tabling

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I have for tabling the report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations for the year ended the 30th June, 1976.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 473).

## TOWN PLANNING

### *Review of Freeways Plan: Petition*

**MR HARMAN** (Maylands) [4.32 p.m.]: I present a petition from 221 residents of Western Australia praying that a review of the Stephenson-Hepburn plan which places freeways on the river shore should take place immediately, as it no longer has public approval.

The petition conforms with Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly and I have certified accordingly.

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

*The petition was tabled (see paper No. 475.)*

## QUESTIONS (14): ON NOTICE

1.

### TRAFFIC

#### *Pedestrian Overway: Stock Road-Fanstone Avenue*

**Mr TAYLOR**, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With respect to the present construction of the joint carriageway of Stock Road in the South Coogee area, has consideration been given to providing either an overhead bridge or a pedestrian underpass at or near its junction with Fanstone Avenue to cater for those children who now attend, and those likely to attend, the South Coogee school and those children and adults who will need to cross both carriageways to catch buses to church schools, high schools and/or to do shopping?
- (2) If "Yes" will he give details?
- (3) If "No" to (1), will he give consideration to the provision of some such structure to assist the increasing number of residents who live to the east of Stock Road?

**Mr O'CONNOR** replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) This section of Stock Road will be included in the general review now being carried out of sites in the metropolitan area where special pedestrian crossing facilities are desirable. Such factors as traffic density and speed and pedestrian volumes and alternative crossing opportunities are being used to assess the merits of each situation.

2.

### MARGARINE

#### *Red Palm and Seed Oils*

**Mrs CRAIG**, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What amount of red palm oil is used in the manufacture of margarine in Western Australia?

- (2) (a) What is the cost per tonne to the manufacturer;  
(b) from whence is it imported?
- (3) What is the cost per tonne of Western Australian produced seed oil suitable for margarine manufacture?

**Mr OLD** replied:

- (1) Information supplied by local margarine companies indicates that no red palm oil is used in the manufacture of margarine in Western Australia.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No oil currently produced in Western Australia is suitable for the production of margarine without further treatment.

3.

### PORT OF WYNDHAM

#### *Stevedoring Arrangements*

**Mr H. D. EVANS**, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it proposed that the existing stevedoring arrangements at the port of Wyndham are to be changed?
- (2) If "Yes" what changes are proposed?

**Mr O'NEIL** replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

4.

### MIDDLE SWAN SCHOOL

#### *Teachers*

**Mr SKIDMORE**, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Would the Minister advise as follows regarding the teacher appointment at the Middle Swan Primary School:

- (1) (a) Were the grade 3 children being taught by an exchange teacher from America; and  
(b) was he obliged to return to America in August of this year?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), did the principal of the school make an approach to the Minister's department for the purpose of having a permanent teacher allocated to the staff to replace the exchange teacher?
- (3) If no permanent teacher was appointed to the position, would the Minister explain the reason why such appointment was not made?
- (4) What is the present position regarding the teaching staff for the grade 3 children at

this school and will the Minister ensure that a permanent teacher is allocated to this class?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) No, the teacher chose to return to America in August.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The school's enrolment fell by 31 students from 1st March 1976 to 1st August 1976 and on its lower enrolment its staff entitlement was one less.
- (4) The school organisation has been adjusted to take into account the loss of 31 students and 1 teacher and there are no plans to appoint an additional staff member.

## 5. HEALTH

### *Cancer: Treatment*

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) To what extent, if any, is the Health Department interesting itself in the treatment of patients with the Tronado cancer machine either alone, or in conjunction with other therapies?
- (2) Is any attempt being made to compare the survival rates of patients afflicted with various forms of cancer who have been treated with radiotherapy, chemotherapy or with the Tronado either alone or in conjunction with any other therapy?
- (3) In the year ended December 1975 how many deaths in Western Australia were recorded as being due to cancer?
- (4) Of the total number of these patients who died from cancer how many had been treated with the Tronado machine?
- (5) If no records are being kept in relation to the treatment of persons by the Tronado will the Minister have consideration given to the advisability of having this done?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) to (5) A cancer register is maintained which records all patients in Western Australia. The first five-year report is now in preparation and should be available by the end of this year. The information required by the member will be included in the report.

## 6. GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

### *Deferment*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Premier:

Further to my question 28 of 18th August, 1976 concerning deferment of Government projects, is he now able to answer the question as a result of the Government's decision and policies contained in the budget?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

The capital works programme presented to Parliament provided for expenditure of \$375 million on capital works in 1976-77 which is almost 19 per cent higher than last year. This is a very satisfactory lift in works to be undertaken this year even allowing for increased costs.

As I pointed out in my reply to the member's earlier question, the work that can be done in a year depends on the total funds available from all sources, and individual projects are not necessarily identified with a particular source of funds.

Moreover, the cut-back in Commonwealth funding in some areas and the restriction on Loan Council allocations have been more than offset by the State Government's own efforts to channel funds from Consolidated Revenue in support of the capital works programme. That we have been able to do this and provide a boost to private sector employment, is a direct result of the careful husbanding of our financial resources during our term of office.

In every year some works have to be left off the list because there is never enough money available to any Government to finance all the works for which funds are sought. What is important is to pay careful attention to priorities and to try to ensure steady growth in the programme from year to year, avoiding sharp ups and downs which can have harmful effects on business activity and employment.

It should be apparent from the financial strategy outlined in both the Consolidated Revenue and Capital budgets that the Government is very conscious of its responsibilities in this regard, and has, I believe, been most successful in producing a financial plan for the year ahead which will give a substantial lift to business activity in this State.

## 7. POLICE AND ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

### Personnel: Number

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

Will he please advise—

- (a) the total strength of the police force for years 1970 to 1976 inclusive, excluding the Road Traffic Authority;
- (b) the number of police cadets brought into the force for the same years;
- (c) the strength of the Road Traffic Authority when it was first introduced and the strength as at 30th September, 1976?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) 1970—1529  
1971—1616  
1972—1686  
1973—1807  
1974—1984  
1975—1790  
1976—1788;
- (b) (Excluding Replacements)  
1970—Nil  
1971—10  
1972—Nil  
1973—  
1974—  
1975—  
1976—  
The Road Traffic Authority came into being on the 1st June 1975;
- (c) 1st June 1975—389  
30th September 1976—508.

It must be realised the transfer of traffic to the RTA has lifted considerable work load from the Police Department.

## 8. ROADS

### Grants: Sources and Allocation

Mr STEPHENS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) With regard to road finance what are the various sources, both State and Commonwealth, from which funds are made available?
- (2) Of these funds, what were the allocations to each of the following areas:
  - (a) metropolitan local government;
  - (b) other local government areas south of the 26th parallel;
  - (c) local government areas north of the 26th parallel,
 for the year ended 1976 and proposed allocation for the year ended 1977?

Mr O'Neill (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

(1) State:

Road Traffic Act 1974-1976  
Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act 1965  
Main Roads Act 1930-1976  
Transport Commission Act 1966-1976  
Commonwealth:  
National Roads Act 1974  
Roads Grants Act 1974  
Transport (Planning and Research) Act 1974  
States Grants (Urban Public Transport) Act 1974  
Special Grants—  
Access to Commonwealth properties  
Restoration of State assets.

(2)	Year Ended 30th June 1976	Proposed for Year Ending 30th June 1977
(a)	\$31 850 600	\$33 456 400
(b)	\$34 249 145	\$35 802 313
(c)	\$25 983 255	\$27 532 287

## 9. LOCKYER, YAKAMIA, AND SPENCER PARK SCHOOL

### Enrolments

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

(1) With respect to—

Lockyer;  
Yakamia; and  
Spencer Park

Junior Primary Schools—

- (a) what was the enrolment at 30th September, 1975 and 1976;
  - (b) what is the anticipated enrolment for the school year commencing 1977;
  - (c) what is the optimum enrolment of each school?
- (2) What is the policy with regard to the maximum size of primary schools?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) (a) Enrolments at the official census date, 1st August 1975 and 1976 were:
 

Mount Lockyer Primary School—503 and 507  
Yakamia Primary School—405 and 406  
Spencer Park Primary School—684 and 677
- (b) Mount Lockyer Primary School—530  
Yakamia Primary School—435  
Spencer Park Primary School—730

(c) The optimum enrolment for any primary school is dependent upon a number of factors, including population density, age distribution, and the distance which children may have to travel.

- (2) The maximum size of any primary school is related to the factors mentioned above, plus the possibility of a new school being built in the vicinity. At present, large primary schools are designed to stabilize over a period of time at sixteen permanent teaching areas. Peak enrolments necessitating teaching spaces in excess of that figure would require temporary accommodation for varying periods of time in some schools.

# 10. ALCOHOL AND DRUG AUTHORITY

## Ord Street Centre: Admissions and Discharges

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

What were the admissions and discharges at the Alcohol and Drug Authority, Ord Street hospital for the months of June 1976 to September 1976 inclusive?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Admissions and discharges at the Ord Street hospital:

	Admissions	Discharges
June 1976	25	21
July 1976	28	29
August 1976	28	26
September 1976	49	48

# 11. ALCOHOL AND DRUG AUTHORITY

## Staff: Resignations

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What number of staff left the Alcohol and Drug Authority, Ord Street clinic and hospital for any reason, during the 20 months to 31st July, 1976?

(2) How many have left since?

(3) How many are on leave without pay?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) 24.

(2) 2. (This number does not include the five notices of resignation given but not effective as at this date.)

(3) As at this day, 12th October, 1976, 3 people on leave without pay (approved) (2 for 5 working days each, 1 for 15 working days). (One other to commence leave without pay on 13th October 1976.)

# 12. ALCOHOL AND DRUG AUTHORITY

## Staff: Categories

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

What numbers of each staff category does the Alcohol and Drug Authority employ at—

- (a) Ord Street clinic;  
(b) Ord Street hospital;  
(c) Quo Vadis;  
(d) elsewhere?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(a) Ord Street Clinic "Carrellis"	
Medical Officers	4
Social Workers	2
Welfare Officers	4
Psychiatric Nurses	2
Administrative and Clerical	3
Wages Staff	2
	17

(b) Ord Street Hospital	
Social Workers	2
Clinical Psychologist	1
Psychiatric Nurses	11
General Nurse	1
General Nurse Aides	2
Psychiatric Nurse Aides	2
Clerical	1
Domestic	10
	30

(c) Quo Vadis Centre	
Social Assistants	9
Welfare Officers	2
Administrative and Clerical	3
Wages Staff (Domestic)	11
General Nurses	7
Psychiatric Nurses	1
Nursing Aides	1
Farm Manager	1
	35

(d) Elsewhere

At head office—25 Richardson Street, West Perth—

Administrative and Clerical

Grand Total—88\*

\* This number represents actual persons working full and part time.

# 13. MEDIBANK

## Agreement with Commonwealth: Correspondence

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Since the Premier says it was the fault of the Australian Government that this State lost \$3.9 million under Medibank and I

have information to the contrary, will he table all correspondence and communications between the Australian Government and the Western Australian Government leading up to the signing of the Medibank agreement between this State and the Australian Government?

(2) If "No", why?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) and (2) The information given by the Premier in answer to Question No. 32 of 4th August, 1976, was correct.

As the member is questioning this and states that he has information to the contrary, the member is asked to disclose to the Minister for Health the source and precise detail of this information.

As correspondence and communications between the Commonwealth and State Governments leading up to signing of the Hospitals Agreement were on a confidential basis, I am not prepared to table documents and other information.

#### 14. NEW LAND FARMERS

##### *Budget: Financial Assistance*

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is there any provision in the current Budget to assist new land farmers in Western Australia in 1977?
- (2) If "Yes" how much and in what ways will such finance be used?
- (3) If "No" to (1), does the Government propose to take any action regarding the Industries Assistance Commission recommendations concerning new land farmers, and if so, in what way and to what extent?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Government has set aside \$300 000 for carry-on loans at a concessional rate of interest (6½ per cent). Loans will be repayable over a period of up to five years. The carry-on loan scheme will help new land farmers to plant crops and further develop their farms. The scheme will be administered by the Rural and Industries Bank.
- (3) Not applicable.

#### QUESTIONS (5): WITHOUT NOTICE

##### 1. PERTH

##### *Population and Growth: Policy*

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Does the Government have a policy with regard to—
  - (a) desirable growth rates for Perth;
  - (b) the eventual optimum population of Perth?
- (2) If "Yes", will the Minister please state the Government's policy?
- (3) Will the Minister please detail any measures embarked upon by the Government to limit the size of Perth?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (3) Although the honourable member gave some notice of the question it was not adequate for me to reply. I would suggest he either ask the question without notice again tomorrow or put it on the notice paper.

##### 2. HOUSING

##### *West Swan: Accommodation for Mr Bropho*

Mr NANOVIČ, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has a tender been let by the State Housing Commission to build a house in Saunders Street, West Swan?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", what type of house is to be built and what is the cost?
- (3) Is the house to be built for a Mr Bropho?
- (4) At what address is Mr Bropho currently residing?
- (5) Has Mr Bropho previously been a tenant of the State Housing Commission?
- (6) If the answer to (5) is "Yes", why did he cease being a tenant?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The State Housing Commission is acting as construction and financing agent for the Aboriginal Advancement Council for the provision of a special prototype house. Tenders have been called but a contract has not yet been awarded.
- (2) Tenders ranged from \$71 889 to \$79 324 and the commission is currently negotiating in an endeavour to obtain a lower price.
- (3) The house is being built for the Aboriginal Advancement Council, and it is understood it will be occupied by Mr Bropho.

- (4) Mr Bropho is believed to be living on the Saunders Street property owned by the Aboriginal Lands Trust.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Breach of tenancy agreement.

### 3. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRES *Bungaree and Safety Bay*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In a question without notice last Thursday I requested certain information relating to valuations of the Bungaree Pre-primary Centre and the Safety Bay Kindergarten. I was informed that the information was not available to me on that day, and I asked a further question without notice as to why the information had been made available in the other Chamber and not in this Chamber. The Minister said he would endeavour to ascertain the reason. Has anything been done about that matter?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I have had the opportunity to make inquiries and the situation is that the answer I gave on Thursday was correct. The reply in another place was given by the Attorney-General on behalf of the Minister for Education, and it was that the shire clerk had advised that the buildings cost \$31 900 and \$18 000 respectively. The point is those figures were not valuation figures; they were merely cost figures provided by the local authority at the request of the Attorney-General.

### 4. HEALTH *Women's Centre and Nardine Centre: Funding*

Mr YOUNG, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What provision has been made in the Estimates of expenditure on both the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the Loan Fund in respect of—
  - (a) the Women's Centre in Glendower Street; and
  - (b) the Nardine centre in Vincent Street?
- (2) On what conditions, if any, will the Government resume funding in respect of (1) (a)?
- (3) What accountability will be imposed on those administering Nardine to justify any public funds being made available?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) No loan funds have been provided but there is provision in the Consolidated Revenue Fund for grants of \$134 200 to the Women's Health Centre and \$87 760 to Nardine Women's Refuge. In both cases the funding is based on a full year's operating expenses.
- (2) The Government will not consider further funding unless the management of the organisation is in responsible hands and it is possessed of adequate expertise to provide a bona fide health service.
- (3) The operations of the centre are subject to departmental inspections and the expenditure is audited by a Government officer.

### 5. HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE *Future Use*

Mr DAVIES, to the Deputy Premier: Some time ago the Government appointed a committee of inquiry into the future use of Her Majesty's Theatre. I have not been able to ascertain whether the report of that committee has been released. Has it been released officially?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

I cannot be of great assistance to the honourable member. I know the Minister for Recreation was charged by the Cabinet to enter into negotiations about the theatre, if possible.

Mr Davies: There was an inquiry before negotiations were entered into. I am sorry, it was unfair of me to ask.

Mr O'NEIL: It is not unfair of the honourable member to ask. It is unfair that I am unable to give him the answer.

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

1. Fish Farming (Lake Argyle) Development Agreement Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife), and read a first time.
2. Waterways Conservation Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Conservation and the Environment), and read a first time.

### LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL *Further Report*

Further report of Committee adopted.

## RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Minister for Works) [4.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is to enable the R & I Bank to open branches outside Western Australia.

The rapid expansion of the bank's international business has created a need for the establishment of representation in London. Gross revenues earned in its international business have more than doubled in the last four years from \$422 776 to \$1 088 694.

Other major State banks already have establishments in London and the R & I proposes to obtain accommodation in one of their buildings.

The London office would—

Act as a banking contact for Western Australian businessmen and travellers in Europe.

Assist in inquiries on banking and directly related matters originating from Western Australia.

Enable attention to be given to travel and currency problems of bank customers encountered in the UK.

Help maintain contact with correspondent banks within the UK with a view to increasing the R & I's share of available business.

Promote the R & I with businessmen and travellers in Europe.

Establish early contact with intending migrants to Western Australia.

Maintain a close liaison with Western Australia House.

Initially a suitably skilled international banker, probably recently retired from one of the big four British clearing banks, would be selected as the representative.

By seeking to use expertise available in London and sharing office accommodation and teller facilities the bank will be able to establish representation on a low-cost budget. In due course it will be necessary to ensure that overseas experience is gained for local officers of the bank by a judicious selection of people for attachment and eventual posting when opportunity.

The proposal is a necessary step in enabling the bank to extend the service facilities which its customers look for outside Australia.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## IRON ORE (HAMERSLEY RANGE) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

**MR MENSAROS** (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill before the House is to ratify an agreement between the Government and Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited which will pave the way for the company to spend \$250 million on establishing at Mt. Tom Price a concentration plant to process previously unsalable low-grade iron ore.

The Government has considered and agreed to a proposal from Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited and a related company, Mount Bruce Mining Pty. Limited, to restructure their processing obligations under the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act, 1963-1972, and the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act, 1972, thereby making it possible for the above-mentioned project to proceed. The project is a very significant step in the development of the Pilbara, not only for Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited but for all companies which have iron ore agreements with the State.

The first point of significance is that the development will lift Hamersley's production to 46 million tons per annum of salable ore. This makes it the largest producer in Western Australia and confirms its position in the forefront of the world's iron ore industry. The remarkable performance of Hamersley is underlined by comparing this level of production with the obligation imposed on the company in the first agreement which was for one million tons of iron ore per annum only.

It is even more significant that the current proposal to install a heavy media concentration plant will allow the sale of lower grade iron ore for which to date there has been no use. This will have the effect of greatly increasing the reserves of usable ore thus prolonging the life of the industry. In particular it will mean that ore deposits, previously discarded as being of too low a grade to be commercially attractive, will now come back into consideration. It will also act as a stimulus to further exploration for additional similar ore bodies.

The new commitment requires that the concentrator's capacity will be at least 6.5 million tonnes per year of concentrated high-grade iron ore. In fact, Hamersley intends commencing at a higher rate than the minimum required by initially treating and concentrating 13.5 million tonnes per annum of low-grade ore which would otherwise be discarded as



waste. This will result in a net increase of 7.7 million tonnes of salable high-grade ore.

The capital programme of \$250 million will involve expenditure on the concentrator, associated infrastructure and capital works and a series of operational improvements to enhance the overall efficiency of the company's operation. Hamersley is prepared to commit itself immediately to this expansion.

It is expected that at the peak of the construction phase, 875 people will be employed and permanent employment for 270 people will be provided when the concentrator plant begins operation. This will require additional housing at Karratha and Tom Price.

The expansion programme will satisfy part of the processing commitments to the State by the companies and marks the beginning of a new era of iron ore development in Western Australia involving an important new form of secondary processing on a large scale for the first time.

I will now explain, in general terms, the effect of the Bill which is now being considered by this Chamber. As previously mentioned, the matters covered by this Bill are closely related to a further Bill, to be introduced shortly, which sets out to amend the agreement which is scheduled to the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act, 1972. In particular, certain of the provisions of the Mt. Bruce Agreement relating to the production of iron ore concentrates, metallised agglomerates and iron and steel are set aside or deferred in a manner which is complementary to the changes to the Hamersley agreement which is the subject of the Bill now before the House.

Before describing the Bill, it would be appropriate for me to touch briefly on the evolution of the Hamersley agreement. Members would be aware that the iron ore developments, which have been undertaken in the Pilbara by Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited, arise out of agreements set out in the first, second, third and fourth schedules to the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963-1972.

The original development at Mt. Tom Price was made possible by the agreement which was set out in the first and second schedules to what was then the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963-64 which I will refer to as the "principal Act".

Subsequently it was found desirable to make provisions for the grant of additional rights to, and the undertaking of additional obligations by, the company. This was given effect by an agreement which became the third schedule, added by the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Act, 1968, which I will refer to as the "Paraburdoo amendment" because it resulted in the development of the Paraburdoo mine.

In 1972, the Hanwright agreement—the agreement forming the second schedule to the Iron Ore (Hanwright) Agreement Act, 1967-68—was determined by mutual consent of the parties. At the same time, the agreement which was scheduled to the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act, 1972, came into force thereby conferring on Mount Bruce Mining Pty. Limited, a company related to Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited, certain rights and obligations. As a consequence of these actions, it was desired to alter the rights and obligations of Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited and this was effected by an agreement which became the fourth schedule, added by the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Act, 1972.

To assist members in their understanding of this quite complex matter, with your permission, Mr Speaker, I will table and distribute to members a chart which shows in very general terms the existing situation under present agreements and the changes which are brought about by the legislation before the House. I must stress to members that the diagram is illustrative only, and for clarity certain simplifications have had to be made. Nevertheless, I think it is a useful aid in understanding this legislation.

Turning firstly to the requirements of the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963-64—the principal Act—which related to the first and second schedules one finds—and one must look at the first beige and second blue bars on the chart—that it contained obligations for both secondary processing of iron ore and also iron and steel. Under that agreement—clause 12—the company was required to produce half a million tons per annum of secondary processed ore by 1979 increasing to two million tons per year by 1983. In fact, the company fulfilled this obligation well ahead of schedule by producing firstly 2.5 million tons increasing to three million tons of oxide pellets at its plant at Dampier. It continues to produce at this level, as shown in the first beige bar.

Under the same agreement—clause 13—and one now looks at the second blue bar, the company was obliged to produce half a million tons per annum of pig iron or steel by 1992 increasing to one million tons per annum by 1996. This obligation is subject to suspension under the provisions of the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Act, 1972, which refer to the fourth schedule and relate to the steel obligations incorporated in the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act, 1972.

I turn now to the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Act, 1968—the Paraburdoo amendment. This had the effect of adding to the secondary processing obligations of the abovementioned principal Act, additional requirements in respect of the production of

metallised agglomerates. The Paraburdoo amendment—as members can see on the third pink bar—obliged the company to produce one million tons per annum of metallised agglomerates by 1974, increasing to two million tons per annum by 1979, and to three million tons per annum by 1982. Over the years, the company has been able to substantiate with the State the impracticability of proceeding in accordance with this programme for the production of metallised agglomerates. Thus, the State had agreed to extend the time for the fulfilment of these obligations to 1978, 1983, and 1986 respectively, which status quo is shown on the third pink bar.

The provisions of the Bill now before the House have the effect of deferring the obligations under the Paraburdoo amendment—clause 9—to produce metallised agglomerates so that it is now only necessary for a plant to be established capable of producing one million tons per annum of metallised agglomerates by the 13th August, 1982, with the increase to two million tons per annum deferred until the 13th August, 1985. The obligation to expand to three million tons per annum has been waived. The arrows and cross above the third pink bar show the deferment and cancellation respectively.

In my early remarks in this address I mentioned the significant development which is now going to be undertaken by the company in the form of a plant to produce iron ore concentrates using low-grade ore associated with the Mt. Tom Price ore body. In this respect, the obligations under the Paraburdoo amendment, which is shown on the fifth beige bar, have been extended to include a requirement to submit proposals for the establishment of a plant for the production of 6.5 million tons per annum of iron ore concentrates by the 31st December, 1976. The plant is to cost not less than \$80 million and is to be in production not later than the 13th August, 1979. Members should refer to new clause 8A.

I have mentioned a complementary Bill to be brought before the House shortly which is intended to amend the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act, 1972. In essence it sets out, firstly, to waive the obligation under the Mt. Bruce agreement to produce two million tons of iron ore concentrates by 1981 or one million tons of metallised agglomerates by 1980—clauses 8 and 10—as shown with the fifth and sixth beige and pink bars; and, secondly, to defer for some years the requirement to produce one increasing to two increasing to three million tons of metallised agglomerates, as shown in the seventh pink bar.

In view of the situation which confronts the iron and steel industry world wide, particularly the recent history of direct reduction of iron ore as is the production of metallised agglomerates, even without any other consideration it is only realistic

that the State should agree to the deferment of the company's obligations as set out in the Bill before the House and also the proposed Mt. Bruce amendment. This will permit the company to carry forward its intensive research and investigations which it is presently undertaking, and I am certain that there will be technological and marketing breakthroughs which will enable this fine concept to become reality in the years ahead.

This means that the obligation in the Bill before the Chamber for the company to produce immediately 6.5 million tons per year of concentrates in effect may be regarded as a discharge of the obligation under the Paraburdoo amendment to produce a third million tons of metallised agglomerates at some time in the future coupled with a bringing forward of the obligations under the Mt. Bruce Agreement to produce two million tons of concentrates and increasing this obligation to 6.5 million tons.

It is considered that this arrangement is equitable to both State and company and this principle has formed the basis of the negotiation of the agreement which is the subject of the Bill before the House. I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. D. Evans.

### IRON ORE (MOUNT BRUCE) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL *Second Reading*

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.14 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill before us is to ratify an agreement between the Government and Mount Bruce Mining Pty. Limited which is a company related to Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited. This Bill is inter-related with the Bill to amend the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act, 1963-1972, about which I have just spoken.

In my second reading speech to that Bill I referred to the request from Hamersley and Mt. Bruce for their secondary processing obligations to be restructured so that a project to produce iron ore concentrates could proceed immediately. I went on to point out the importance of this project to the overall development of the Pilbara iron ore industry in addition to the immediate impact it will have on investment and job opportunities. In all these respects my previous observations are equally pertinent to the Bill now before the House.

I will now explain, in general terms, the effect of the proposed amendments to the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement and in this regard I would direct the attention of members to the chart which I

tabled in connection with the Hamersley Bill, and also to my comments on the evolution of the Hamersley and Mt. Bruce agreements.

The Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act of 1972 in respect of secondary processing obligations requires the company to undertake certain operations in addition to those which are specified in the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963-64—the principal Act—and the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Act 1968—the Paraburdoo amendment. Firstly, the company was obliged to produce iron ore concentrates or metallised agglomerates, as shown in the second half of the chart in the beige and pink colour bars.

In the case of iron ore concentrates, it was two million tons per annum by 1981, and in the case of the alternative—metallised agglomerates—it was one million tons by 1980. The legislation before us in new clause 10A waives the company's obligation in this respect and it is now no longer obliged to proceed with either of the alternatives.

However, if Hamersley Iron defaults in its obligations under new clause 8A of the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Amendment Agreement, 1976—in other words, if it does not for any reason start to produce the 6.5 million tons of concentrate—then the provisions of clauses 8 and 10 of the Mt. Bruce agreement are revived with a postponement of obligations for four years.

The Mt. Bruce agreement also placed a further obligation on the company in respect of the production of metallised agglomerates—clause 32—or iron and steel, the latter alternative being at the choice of the company—clause 34—or in other circumstances at the choice of the Minister—clause 35. The date upon which the company must elect whether to produce metallised agglomerates or steel has been extended by about five years to 1983 to be compatible with the restructuring of other obligations.

If the choice is metallised agglomerates, the Mt. Bruce agreement obliges the company to produce one million tons per annum by 1980 increasing to two million tons per annum by 1982 and three million tons per annum by 1984. The legislation now before the House has the effect of deferring this obligation—we can see this at the bottom of the pink bar on the chart—so that it is now required to establish a plant capable of producing one, two, and three million tons per annum by 1985, 1987, and 1989 respectively. The arrows on the chart signify this.

The abovementioned alternative of the company by its choice or by that of the Minister proceeding to produce iron and steel initially at the rate of half a million tons per year by 1994 increasing to one million tons per year some years later,

has been unaltered by the legislation before us. This is shown by the last two blue bars on the chart before members.

In my second reading speech on the Hamersley Bill I pointed out how the changes in Hamersley's obligations under that Bill and the changes in Mt. Bruce's under this Bill are interrelated and comprise certain deferments and waivers which must be weighed up against Hamersley's proposal to proceed immediately with a 6.5 million tons per annum iron ore concentrator.

I believe that the arrangement made with the company is equitable to both parties, and, I thus commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned for one week, on motion by Mr T. D. Evans.

## BILLS (4): MESSAGES

### *Appropriations*

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Bill.
2. Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act Amendment Bill.
3. Royal Visit Holiday Bill.
4. Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

## JOONDALUP CENTRE BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

**MR TAYLOR** (Cockburn) [5.22 p.m.]: The measure before us has the general support of the Opposition. It is one of the more important measures which have come before this Parliament in the last three years; and, one of the more important measures that have come before the House during the time I have been a member. It is important, not so much because of its magnitude as it does not seek to do very much at all, but because it is one of the few measures under which Parliament can take an initiative.

On looking through the number of Bills which come before us, we find that most of them are devoted to amending existing legislation. In fact, we seem to spend most of our time in changing the word "may" to the word "shall", dotting the "i's", or crossing the "t's".

Furthermore most pieces of legislation which come before this Parliament tend to qualify; that is, they tend to make things a little more difficult, to close up loopholes, and to redefine ways in which action can be taken. Generally they make it more difficult for one to make one's way in the community.

The Bill before us is one of the unique pieces of legislation under which the Government of the day has the chance to

introduce something new, to do something a little progressive and somewhat out of the ordinary, and to take the initiative in a real sense, so as to be able to plan something entirely new and at least to put the foundations of that plan before Parliament. This does not happen very often, but the Bill before us presents an occasion for a Government to do all that.

The idea of establishing a corporation to deal in land is not a new tool of government, but it is one which is not very often applied in this State. In the past it was used very rarely; and to my recollection only in the instance of developing the Kwinana area was a similar measure introduced in this Parliament. On that occasion the Bill was passed.

Subsequently efforts were made by the Tonkin Government, in a worth-while series of three Bills, to establish an area of land at Salvado and to develop a large section in the northern corridor. Again that was a similar type of proposition put before Parliament, but on that occasion the move was defeated.

Mr Nanovich: There is a big difference in this case.

Mr TAYLOR: There is a difference only in scale. No doubt, in due course we will hear from the honourable member in respect of the difference in scale between the two measures. If he compares the two pieces of legislation he will find very little difference in their purport. In fact, I suggest it would need only a very small amendment to the schedule to enable it to deal with an area as large as that contained in the Salvado proposal. I have digressed a little from the point on which I started.

The Bill before us will create a very worth-while piece of machinery. It is almost unique within this State, and it is a very progressive move. It seeks to fulfil a function that is approved by the Government, and certainly it has the support of the Opposition at least in general principle, although there are some points of detail at which we would like to look.

Governments in other parts of the world have found it necessary to develop a similar type of legislative procedure—that is, in a sense, to establish a supra-organisation to carry out certain functions—and that is just what the corporation proposed in the Bill will do.

The United Kingdom has been the world leader in the development of new towns, and the Parliament at Westminster has given wide-ranging powers to corporate bodies which are able, within their broad limits, to carry out all the same functions as those envisaged in the Bill before us, with the co-operation of the local authorities. However, very often such corporations have the power to carry out their functions without the co-operation of the

local authorities. In this way new communities housing tens of thousands of people have been established.

The new town concept has spread from the United Kingdom to the USA, Canada, Western Europe as far as Bulgaria and Israel, and now to Western Australia. We have an example of that in the Bill before us.

Members who have not read the legislation may be interested to know that the Bill sets out to establish a corporation; that is, it will provide power to five persons to be appointed by the Minister, and such power will be of assistance in developing regions. In this case the corporation will have the power to establish the Joondalup centre.

The Joondalup centre is to be the node for major shopping centres, housing areas, educational institutions, and medical centres in the northern corridor. I understand that an area of 1 425 hectares is involved; this is information which the Minister did not provide, but we were able to ascertain the area.

The corporation of five members will be able to appoint a general manager who, of course, will be the key figure in the development of the area. The general manager of the corporation which is under the control of the Minister will be able to employ staff, and basically that staff will be involved in planning. The staff of the corporation, in conjunction with Government departments such as the Main Roads, Health, Public Works, Water Supply, Sewerage, and Education Departments will develop the Joondalup centre. In order to do this the general manager under the corporation will be able to raise finance, resume land, enter into all sorts of agreements, and do most things which the Government itself can do.

The Bill provides that not only must the corporation report to the Minister, but also to Parliament; and furthermore its accounts must be audited by the Auditor-General. These are the two major points which, in the main, make the legislation acceptable to the Opposition: the fact that the report of the activities of the corporation will be presented to Parliament, and that its accounts will be checked by the Auditor-General.

A further point in the legislation which is acceptable to the Opposition is the definition of the area concerned. Although it comprises 1 425 hectares, almost all of it is at present owned by the Government.

The area was part of State forest reserve No. 69. I understand that almost 1 060 of the 1 400 hectares were State forests, and the remaining 327 hectares is privately owned land. Again, I understand that a fair proportion of the privately owned land is, in fact, already reserved for public open space within the region scheme. Perhaps the Minister may be able to tell us in more

detail whether that is so, although I do not think it is so important because the Bill still is likely to be accepted by Parliament.

A scheme is already in operation for the use of the land bordering Lake Joondalup. Much of the privately owned land has been earmarked for public open space and will be purchased by the Government in any case. However, it would be of interest to know what proportion is already earmarked for public open space. By deducting that area from the total we would then know whether 100 or 200 hectares remain under private ownership, which will be subject to resumption.

Governments do not like to resume land, and Oppositions like the opportunity to attack Governments if they are likely to impose hardship on individuals. Again, I do not see any major problem with reference to that matter in this legislation.

In his second reading speech the Minister said that those few hectares of privately owned land which are not already reserved for public open space, and come within the confines of the scheme, may be disposed of privately. Once the scheme is developed, and the project outlines are established, some owners may be able to keep their land and may not have it resumed. That was my understanding of the Minister's remarks and I think what I have ascertained is correct. In any case, one can appreciate that in a scheme involving 1425 hectares the resumption of 100 or 200 hectares is not a large area. Certainly, Parliament will have an opportunity to keep an eye on any resumptions which may take place.

Another area which will need to be watched by Parliament—and again the Minister may be able to comment on this point—is part of that land owned by the Government. For example, the land adjacent to Lake Joondalup is already classified as an "A"-class reserve. The Bill provides for the revocation of that area from its present classification so that the land can be treated as part of the overall plan for the purposes of development.

The normal procedure for the revocation of an "A"-class reserve is for it to be brought before Parliament. Parliament is then able to investigate the reasons for the revocation. One can understand that with the establishment of a new centre, such as that envisaged, additional "A"-class reserves will be established. Presumably, there will be reserves within the city itself, and new parks and recreation areas will be established. Those areas will become "A"-class reserves. Again, I ask the Minister to comment on the use of the "A"-class reserves which Parliament is being asked to allow to revert to use by the corporation, and whether we are likely to see similar areas re-created.

All the reservations one has with respect to this measure lie very much with its concept. One wonders, first of all, why the

Government has set up this particular form of corporation. As I have already mentioned, it is an unusual method of establishing a city centre. As far as I am aware, this method has been followed previously only in the case of Kwinana. It was not followed in the development of Karratha or in the development of the new areas around Port Hedland. Is it considered that in the case of the small area now under discussion the Wanneroo Shire Council would not be able to carry out this work? Would it not be possible for the Wanneroo Shire Council to be able to do the job with Government assistance?

I have had an opportunity to observe the work done by RDC in the Edgewater area, and I suppose other members have observed that work also. It seems to be a worth-while development. I am not sure that I am happy about seeing houses valued at around \$100 000 being built on the edge of the quarries. However, I do not intend to knock on any of those doors to solicit votes, if I happen to be in the area, and I will not be competing for the purchase of one of those houses. Nevertheless, the work seems to have been carried out in a worth-while manner. The quarries are being rehabilitated, and the lake foreshore has been improved. That work has already been done with the encouragement of the Wanneroo Shire Council.

Mr Coyne: Is this taking place in Edgewater?

Mr TAYLOR: Yes. Perhaps the member who has interjected is buying one of the houses?

Mr Coyne: No, I thought I would like to have a look at the development.

Mr TAYLOR: If the Wanneroo Shire Council is able to do that sort of work, why is the new development to be left to an outside group?

Mr Thompson: Was not the Kewdale development the same sort of thing?

Mr TAYLOR: No, I understand it was quite different. That development concerned an industrial area, not unlike the Canning industrial area. The development of Kwinana was a completely new concept. An area was taken from the Cockburn Shire Council, and an area was taken from the Rockingham Shire Council, and a new local authority was established. The development now under discussion is different again, and I will be asking the Minister a question about that aspect very soon.

A second point I want to raise is that if the Wanneroo Shire Council is to have only one representative on the five-member committee which is to be responsible for the planning of the new centre, why is the centre to be established in the situation proposed? Why have the centre just there?

The Minister referred to regional sub-centres as being part of the corridor scheme adopted by both sides in this Parliament, and implemented in part by both sides in this Parliament. When one considers the already established sub-centres such as Rockingham, Armadale, Fremantle, and Midland, one wonders why Joondalup is to be established in the situation proposed.

The northern corridor appears to be developing at a faster rate than any other section within the corridors. It has been put to me by professional planners—and I do not say that I subscribe to their theory because I do not know the area well enough—that the northern corridor is advancing at too fast a rate, and becoming a corridor of little boxes. The suburbs are proliferating one after the other to the extent that the corridor is becoming one continuous row of houses which one has to pass through in order to reach areas of work or recreation. No attempt was made to break up the areas of development and it is now a problem. I do not put forward those thoughts as my own, but the proposition has been put to me by professional planners; those who have no allegiance to politics in any way but who suggest that for the well-being of the metropolitan area in general, and because of the way in which we choose to live, the development has not been good.

The growth of the corridor has brought about a situation where the more people who move into it, the greater is the desire of others to follow them. It would appear that the proposal to establish the Joondalup centre will only help to further that movement in the corridor. I hope the Minister will comment. With the establishment of the Joondalup centre it seems the corridor will have traffic problems because the number of people entering the central business area will increase. The new Joondalup centre will be the core of further development, and the whole area probably will be linked up with the main metropolitan area. The new centre must also become a springboard for further development to the north.

It will not be possible to develop a centre for something like 350 000 people without developing at least one additional corridor to the north.

Mr Bertram: Does the Bill give protection to people whose land will be taken over for the centre?

Mr TAYLOR: No, the Bill does not provide adequate protection, unless one accepts that the Public Works Act will provide protection. With my experience of the Kwinana resumptions I have never considered the provisions of the Public Works Act are adequate. However, I did make the point earlier that one of the reasons one cannot have too great an objection is that only 247 hectares are privately owned, and a fair area of that

land has been earmarked for public open space. So, the area to be resumed will be very small indeed.

I believe the Minister mentioned a figure of 350 000 people to be catered for by the establishment of the new centre. He has not contradicted me so I take it the figure is right.

Mr Rushton: That is right; through the north-west corridor.

Mr TAYLOR: It will be the centre of a region having a population of 350 000?

Mr Rushton: That is the predicted region of the north-west corridor.

Mr TAYLOR: That is as I read the Minister's comments. It would appear that a considerable proportion of that population is likely to reside to the north; that is, having established a very worthwhile and large centre, with all the associated modern amenities, the corridor will spread further to the north. That leads to a number of questions which the Bill just does not answer.

The measure provides for the establishment of a corporation consisting of a group of five men, and the appointment of a general manager and staff, in order to plan a centre covering an area of some 3 000 acres. The development will include a high school, a hospital, and so on. However, that is where the matter seems to end. The Wanneroo Shire Council will control the land surrounding the new centre. I cast no aspersions on the Wanneroo Shire Council; in fact, I am more than happy with it. I would like to speak to the people involved to find out how they will handle this situation.

Mr Rushton: They will still administer the 3 000 acres.

Mr TAYLOR: The Wanneroo Shire Council will have the new centre planned for it, and one of its representatives will be on the committee, but the shire will not have a majority say. It will have to accept whatever is established because the corporation has power to raise finance, and do other things.

Mr Rushton: If I can help the honourable member again, the area will still be subject to the Wanneroo town planning scheme.

Mr TAYLOR: The Minister will need to help the House by supplying additional information.

Mr Rushton: You needed the help, and I supplied it. The new centre will still be part of the Wanneroo town planning scheme.

Mr TAYLOR: I accept that, but I put it to members that the centre is to be established—and it will be a very large centre—within a narrow boundary. In the development of 3 000 acres of land someone has to do the planning for the natural demands which will follow that

development. For example, there will be an increased use of the coastline. Whereas parts of the coastline are not readily accessible now, and not popular at the present time because of their distance from services, it will be found that instead of those areas being some distance from a hospital, a high school or a shopping centre, they will suddenly be close to those facilities.

There will be considerable pressure for development of the coastline for many miles to the north and south and this, in turn, will put a great deal of pressure on the Shire of Wanneroo. I can well believe that the Wanneroo Shire Council will be able to cope with the pressure, but I suggest also that many decisions will be made in a hurry. Many people will submit plans to the council and there will be speculation in order to capitalise on the demand created.

Let us picture what we are talking about in this particular development. We are talking about something like Cockburn Sound without Rockingham and Kwinana. It is an ideal spot with some beach shacks and some nice beach homes on the shore. Suddenly we will be faced with the planning of a large centre; and those planning the centre will have the capacity to raise money. The planners must be ready to build a fairly substantial centre, in fact a centre which will be larger than anything else outside central Perth except Fremantle. If that does not put a great deal of pressure on the shire in respect of the land to the north and south of the area I will be very surprised.

There is nothing within this legislation to indicate how those pressures will be met. Again, I am not saying that the pressures will not be met, but I am saying that the legislation does not appear to be thought out as thoroughly as it should be, and that is a point I will come to at the conclusion of my speech.

Another point of interest in respect of the centre is the question of what is likely to happen in the actual town centre. We are to have a corporation of five persons and a general manager. This corporation will have power to raise money, and it will have at its disposal over 1 000 hectares—2 500 acres—of State-owned land, which, particularly in the middle of the Joondalup centre, will be prime land. Bearing in mind the early days of the establishment of Canberra, one wonders who will acquire the land on the four major corners of the main square? Historically, as in Canberra, it is invariably the large banks and the insurance companies which acquire these sites. In fact, this principle goes back for tens of years, if not over 100 years, in cities such as Melbourne and Sydney.

The plan is to create a very large centre, but it will not be developed in the way that Fremantle and Armadale have developed; that is, a reasonably slow development with land at low prices. The

situation will be that the corporation and those with land in the vicinity will know that this is a magnet to attract people. Already the corridor has attracted people even though the price of land is high.

The legislation will establish a ready-made honey pot right in the middle of the area, and yet it gives no indication as to how the development is to be worked out. I would like to know who will make the decisions about the allocation of prime areas. Will these sites be allocated on a competitive basis so that the highest bidder will be able to obtain the key spots around the residential square? If this land is to go to the highest bidder, will this be determined by tender or by some other method? Will the Minister have any say in this matter or will decisions be made by the corporation or the general manager?

Mr Rushton: If you read the Bill you will see the Minister has total power.

Mr TAYLOR: The Minister has the total power in almost every Bill, as the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning well knows.

Mr Rushton: You read this one.

Mr TAYLOR: I have read the Bill, but it is laughable to read that the Minister is chairman of the committee.

Mr Rushton: He has the direction of the corporation.

Mr TAYLOR: If one looks at the names of the people who have been involved already in the planning, one has to ask the question: who will make up the membership of the corporation? I realise I am digressing a little but I will come back to my other point in a moment. Those who have been associated with the planning so far are all very busy people. They are all capable and able people, but already they hold positions on innumerable committees. The Minister told us that he is the chairman of the steering committee, and that other members of the committee are: Mr Aitken, Commissioner of Main Roads—Mr Aitken is a member of very many committees—Mr Hawkins, and Mr Keil. These are the people who are to establish the broad outlines to be followed. I have said already that these are all busy people, and, excluding the councillor of the Shire of Wanneroo who obviously will have some other interests, the committee members are involved already to a large extent with other activities.

Membership of this committee is really a full-time job if its members are to do it properly. This statement is also applicable to the general manager and the staff under him.

Mr Rushton: Would you like to name five people you would like appointed?

Mr TAYLOR: A little later I would like to suggest a sixth member. This corporation must be composed of people who are not committed elsewhere. We do not wish this corporation to comprise heads of Government departments who are already on

many committees looking at such places as the Pilbara, Esperance, the goldfields, Kwinana, and Vasse. Frequently the heads of Government departments send nominees to represent them on committees, and this means that some committees do not necessarily function as planned.

The corporation will determine who may purchase the original lots, and this decision will have to be made at an early stage. In order to get the development off the ground, the corporation will need a turn-over of funds. One would assume that very early in the piece the general manager of the corporation will draw up guidelines, and that it will be necessary to dispose of some of the land fairly quickly to bring in funds to continue the planning and to build roads for the next stage. The lots then developed will be sold so that the corporation can move on to the third stage. The decision as to who will be king pin within that centre will have to be made fairly quickly, and I cannot see any details about this aspect in the legislation.

There are two major points I would like the Minister to consider. Firstly, I would like to know the reason that such a relatively small area so close to the centre of Wanneroo is to be set aside and put under the control of the corporation, so that decisions will be out of the effective control of the Wanneroo Shire Council.

Why was such a small area set aside for this purpose? One could understand the setting aside of a much larger area as envisaged in the old Salvado scheme.

Secondly, what plans are afoot or what discussions have taken place to enable the Wanneroo Shire Council to cope with a large influx of people seeking to develop homes? What steps will be taken to control speculation, which I believe will develop on a fairly wide scale along the beach front and in the more advantageous areas.

Without strong Government support in the way of manpower and finance it is difficult to see how the Wanneroo Shire Council will be able to keep ahead of developers and do its job thoroughly in order to make this area a good and happy place in which to live.

I have some other minor reservations about the legislation, but I will comment on these during the Committee debate.

There is one other section to which I will refer while I have the time. The Opposition approves of this form of legislation, and when we return to government in a few months' time, I trust sincerely that it will appear more frequently. The establishment of a body such as this corporation under the control of a Minister, but nonetheless able to second experts and to establish sub-committees, is very refreshing.

There is a great deal of merit in the attempt to assist the development of sub-regions. Fremantle is a major subregion,

and it seems to me that part of the problem in that area is that its boundaries are so inflexible that there are insufficient financial resources to develop the centre as it should be developed. The legislation before us provides for the establishment of a body corporate, and such a body may be able to assist in the redevelopment of the older areas to the south and east of Fremantle. This same principle could be applied in the Rockingham-Kwinana area where two local authorities, side by side, are endeavouring to develop the one centre between them. These local authorities have found considerable difficulty in marshalling their resources to obtain the expertise necessary for the establishment of a worth-while centre between the two units.

A body such as this corporation, with its powers of raising finance and so on, could well be of advantage to the Shires of Rockingham and Kwinana. A similar idea could extend to the Armadale area, and certainly such a step is desirable in the Midland area where suburbs such as Kalamunda are developing at such a rate that the Midland area is unable to keep pace. There may be a need for Government assistance to establish other corporations with the same wide powers as are set out in this Bill. A corporation would then be available to a group of local authorities in the area so that the Shire of Swan would be able to cope with the responsibilities thrust upon it to service the suburbs to the north and east.

The legislation in this form has considerable merit, and the Opposition approves of the principle contained in it. We hope that one day the Opposition will be able to use the legislation.

In conclusion I would like to make one other point about the membership of the corporation. Although at this stage I do not want to intimate that an amendment will be moved, I would like the Minister to give consideration to the suggestion that the membership of the corporation should be enlarged. Apart from the representative from the Wanneroo Shire Council all the other members of the committee will be experts in a technical field. Of course the Minister has the ultimate responsibility, but the corporation itself has tremendous powers to establish a centre which will be used by something like 350 000 people.

I wonder whether a body composed of technical experts is the right body to establish such a centre. Certainly technical experts must be involved, particularly in financing and the provision of services, but it seems to me that we could gain tremendously from appointing to this corporation people who are expert in social engineering as distinct from civil engineering. This corporation needs members who are knowledgeable in the ways of people and knowledgeable in the ways of society rather than confining membership to those who know how to



spend dollars and cents, how deep sewerage should be, how wide roads should be, and how far schools should be from the nearest bus stop. I suggest, therefore, that membership of the corporation should be enlarged to allow for at least two other members, one of whom should be a woman. With some temerity I will put forward the proposal that one member of the corporation should be a nominee of the Leader of the Opposition.

I do this for a reason which would be obvious to members who listened to the earlier part of my speech. This centre is something new, and this form of legislation has not been used for a considerable time. Many eyes will be upon it, and there will be moves in the speculation of land in all those areas around the 1400 hectares designated in the Bill.

Mr Coyne: They are speculating already.

Mr TAYLOR: Then the honourable member is confirming my point. This practice will occur and, as activity increases, so must speculation increase. There will be great pressure on the commissioners, the manager and his staff for key positions within that area; there must be, there can be no other way.

Members no doubt would know that a theme I have advanced from time to time in this House has been that of good government. I do not think I have used the political whip as much as some others, and the following statement should be taken in that light: There could well be some real value in having on the corporation a nominee of the Leader of the Opposition, if only so that the public at large could feel some sense of security, and some sense that fair play was occurring.

I am not saying it may or will be necessary for such a person to be on the authority, nor am I casting aspersions at those who may be named to serve on that body. However, as the member for Toodyay would know only too well from his dealings with his own council, there can be no doubt that nothing suits ratepayers so well as to see a fair cross section of the community serving on any decision-making council.

Mr Bertram: Does this Bill require the members to declare their interests?

Mr TAYLOR: Yes, they must declare their interests, and those interests must be written into the minutes.

Mr Bertram: That is a little unfair—we do not do it in the Parliament.

Mr TAYLOR: The point is well taken, Mr Speaker. However, there will always be friends, and friends of friends, and none of us here is naive enough to think this will not be so; I note the point only in the interests of this legislation.

Much in this Bill is worth while; what it aims to do is worth while. If such legislation is to be used again in the future

in regard to some other subregional centre, or even for the Perth regional district, the legislation must be seen to work properly the first time, without there being any undue innuendo or suggestion that something is not right.

I hope the Minister will give every consideration to my suggestion that the body should be enlarged. Certainly, let it contain the four technical experts, if that is what the Minister wishes; also a representative of the Shire of Wanneroo is essential. But I believe two additional members should be appointed, at least one of whom should be a woman, the other being a nominee of the current Leader of the Opposition. If my suggestion is accepted, it will mean that in a few short months, a member from the Government side of the House would be nominated to replace the representative from this side of the House serving on that corporation.

Mr O'Neill: That is speculation, too!

Mr TAYLOR: Not as great as is likely to occur when this scheme gets under way.

There are a few minor points on which members of the Opposition will be questioning the Minister, particularly during the Committee stage. I repeat that the Opposition gives qualified support to this measure; we would appreciate a fairly comprehensive summary from the Minister in answer to the queries which have been raised.

MR CARR (Geraldton) [6.03 p.m.]: I should like to make a brief comment on this Bill. At the outset, I indicate I am not opposed to most of the specific measures contained therein. In fact, I am a very keen supporter of planning in development. I believe that one of the criticisms of so much of the development in this State in the past has been that it has been on too much of a *laissez faire*, *ad hoc* basis, with insufficient planning. I am pleased to see that a statutory body will be established to control development in this area, and I believe this will go a long way towards avoiding some of the criticism.

The reason I rise to speak is that I am concerned at what appears to be the underlying attitude of this Government towards urban development. The Government appears to be prepared to accept the unrestricted growth of the Perth metropolitan area and that the expansion of Perth will continue inevitably. I for one hope such unrestricted expansion is not inevitable.

Mr Nanovich: What about the Salvado proposal advanced by your Government?

Mr CARR: The question of great importance is the extent to which expansion will take place. It appears to me the Government is prepared to concede and accept an indefinite, unrestricted expansion of the

metropolitan area. There has been no deliberate attempt by the Government to discourage the growth of Perth.

Mr Laurance: Do you plan for people, or despite people?

Mr CARR: Earlier this afternoon, I directed a question without notice at the Minister; unfortunately, I was not able to provide him with sufficient time to prepare an answer. I was hoping he may have been able to state the policy of his Government towards the optimum size of Perth, and the appropriate growth rate of the population of Perth in the foreseeable years, but he was not.

Mr Laurance: What do you consider should be the optimum size?

Mr CARR: I should like to make it very clear that I am convinced Perth already has reached, or is very close to its optimum population.

It is reasonable to presume that Perth will grow in the foreseeable future, but a great deal can be done to affect its rate of growth. For example, more positive steps should be taken to support decentralisation, and to make the idea of living in country areas a much more attractive proposition so that it may decrease the desire of people to live in Perth.

While it is very easy to talk of such things, as the member for Gascoyne pointed out earlier we cannot totally plan for people, because people are individual entities, who make their own decisions as to where they will live and I, for one, would not want to interfere with that right. By the same token, however, people make those decisions according to what is attractive to them at the time, and Governments can take definite action to make one option more attractive than another option. I believe this is the sort of approach we should be adopting.

Western Australia is an extremely highly urbanised community which has, in effect, only one city or large urban area; three-quarters of our population live in Perth, and that urbanisation is increasing. We are finding that the dominance of Perth over our State's population is increasing and with this we are finding increases in associated problems.

For example, we see an increase in the whole range of social problems existing in a modern, urban community; crime problems in the city are increasing; Perth transport problems are increasing; and, problems in the areas of urban poverty and isolation encountered in living in the city are growing. In fact, I do not think it is unfair to say that Perth is approaching what could be called a concrete jungle. It has not reached the stage reached by some other cities, which have expanded much further than Perth, but it is approaching that point. Perth has not yet reached a hopeless stage, but certainly

it is going the wrong way at the moment, as the urban sprawl continues and as all the associated problems increase.

I appreciate that this legislation may go some way towards controlling this urban sprawl, but if we make country areas more attractive *vis-a-vis* Perth there are likely to be fewer people wishing to contribute to that urban sprawl.

I was quite horrified to read some time ago that the present Lord Mayor of Perth was quoted—I do not know whether the quote was accurate—as stating he looked forward to the day that Perth's population reached two million. Quite frankly, I do not in any way look forward to that day, because such development would not be in the best interests of Perth. The Australian Labor Party recently adopted a policy that it would endeavour to take what steps it could to prevent the population of Perth passing beyond about one million people. I realise there are a number of problems inherent in this sort of policy, but it is the sort of ideal towards which every Government ought to be aiming.

The important thing I am trying to say is that the Government appears merely to be responding to the growth which is occurring, rather than taking positive steps to control and limit that growth and perhaps channel the growth of Western Australia into major regional centres. In the past, decentralisation was the cry raised only by the country areas. However, I am sure that more and more, people in the city are coming to realise decentralisation will be one of the salvations of the city people, and that the continuing urban sprawl now occurring in the metropolitan area will create problems which will cause greater harm to dwellers in the urban area than problems which occur in the country areas cause to people living in the country.

I do not wish to make a major speech on the subject of decentralisation, because this is not the time for such remarks; I intend to say more on the subject during the Budget debate, which is a more appropriate occasion. I am sure also that the shadow Minister for Local Government will have more to say on the subject during the present series of major policy statements being made by the Opposition, in which he will outline some of our alternative proposals regarding the optimum size of Perth and the manner in which growth and development should be channelled to decentralised areas.

I conclude my remarks by requesting the Minister in his reply to provide the House with some general information along the lines sought by my question today; namely, the attitude of his Government towards the future size of Perth. I reiterate I am left with the impression that the Government is merely responding to the urban explosion rather than adopting serious measures to limit that explosion.

**MR JAMIESON** (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [6.11 p.m.]: Although I support this Bill, I am somewhat surprised that such "diabolical" legislation has been introduced by the Minister, when one recalls the attitude he adopted in relation to very similar legislation introduced in 1973. When one considers the constitution of the corporation and a number of other areas, one sees the two pieces of legislation are extremely similar. Members can check for themselves by referring to page 2013 of *Hansard* for the 22nd May, 1973.

**Mr Rushton**: Read both pieces of legislation and you will see the difference.

**Mr JAMIESON**: Yes, I have, and I see that the powers of the board and the general set-up proposed by the two pieces of legislation are very similar. In fact, the legislation advanced by the Tonkin Labor Government was so similar to this Bill that it could well have been adopted by the Parliament. In his second reading speech in 1973, the then Minister for Town Planning, the present member for Victoria Park stated as follows—

A major consideration is the unknown factor of time. If, as past events have shown major industries locate in the region, it is clear that the local authorities would not have the financial or staff resources to handle this area in addition to their existing urban areas, already expanding at a rapid rate—

Members should bear in mind that the Labor Government's proposal related to an extremely large area of some 80 000 acres, whereas the present proposal is concerned with only some 3 500 acres. *Hansard* then records the following interjection from the present Minister for Local Government—

**Mr Rushton**: They could if you gave them some funds.

Similarly, I do not see why the Wanneroo Shire Council could not carry out this function if the Minister gave it sufficient funds.

**Mr Rushton**: Your proposal was to take away power from local government, whereas in this Bill the Wanneroo Shire Council will retain its powers; that is the difference.

**Mr JAMIESON**: Subject to certain conditions.

**Mr Rushton**: The Wanneroo Shire Council will retain its present powers.

**Mr JAMIESON**: Certainly it will have some central, overriding powers, but other factors must be taken into consideration; the Minister will find there will be a variation between the two areas of responsibility which will need to be clarified.

**Mr Rushton**: None of the council's legislative powers will be removed.

*Sitting suspended from 6.14 to 7.30 p.m.*

**Mr JAMIESON**: I was saying there were some points I would like to make because apparently the Minister who introduced the Bill takes the attitude that anything the Labor Government introduces is a dreadful thing, but anything a Liberal Administration introduces is good for the public, no matter what form it takes. While the Minister complained by interjection a while ago that it was something different, it is not really that much different from the previous legislation.

It is true there is reference to the local government authority remaining in existence, but with the other powers the authority has there is not much left for it to do. When one compares the two Bills it looks as though this legislation has been taken from the other; as a matter of fact the clauses and the sub-clauses are numbered the same. So it appears that somebody has made a very good copy of the previous Bill.

I notice another part of the Minister's interjection on the particular day referred to. At page 2012 of *Hansard* of the 22nd May, 1973, the following appears—

The members of the corporation will hold office for four years, with eligibility for reappointment, and to ensure that business is adequately dealt with the corporation will meet at least eight times a year. The corporation will have all the rights and powers of a municipality and, in effect, will act as one and its chairman and corporation clerk will have powers similar to those of a mayor or president of a municipality, and its town clerk.

**Mr Rushton**: They have not been elected by the people.

**Mr DAVIES**: The member for Dale is not knocking it already?

**Mr Rushton**: I am suggesting I would like a little democracy.

This was when the Minister for Town Planning of the day—the present member for Victoria Park—was introducing the second reading of the Salvado Development Bill.

I doubt whether the present Minister for Town Planning has given any thought to a little democracy in respect of the inclusion of the qualifications of the five personnel in the proposed legislation—the separate one dealing with a member of the local authority and then going on to define what qualifications the others should have, which again is almost identical with the previous Bill to which I have referred.

So again it seems that the Minister makes much play of the fact that if he introduces such legislation it is all right, but if somebody else introduces similar legislation it is all wrong. To refer to the matter of the local authority being

the Minister's prime consideration, I would point out that various Governments in the past have not given much consideration to local authorities when they introduced many such similar authorities; and rightly so, because sometimes it is necessary to go beyond the scope of local authority, when overall development is required as is the case here. For instance, in Kwinana this was necessary and there have been other occasions where it has also been necessary to do something like this rather than have authorities which, in the main, have in some places grown up in a different environment from that prevailing at the time of a major development.

There is nothing wrong with this. We always revert to a democratically elected local authority as soon as things sort themselves out. For instance, in recent times in the Roebourne-Karratha area it was somewhat different because of the prevailings of the Minister and the feeling of inability on the part of the local authority to handle all the development taking place. As a consequence, the authority in that region resigned *en masse* and allowed a commissioner to be appointed without the necessity for legislation to be involved.

But I imagine we would not always get such co-operation. However, this is an instance where it did occur. Where there is special development under consideration a special purpose and type of personnel is needed, as is the type of legislation the Minister has introduced.

I would like the Minister not to forget in the future that Governments do bring in such Acts with sincerity of purpose, and not necessarily with a view to doing something diabolical, as the Minister seems to imply from his general reference in *Hansard*, particularly in the bulk of his speech in which he was critical of such legislation being introduced.

Mr H. D. Evans: He would not do that!

Mr JAMIESON: To refresh my colleague's mind I would refer him to the relevant *Hansard*. One is apt to forget and forgive in normal circumstances, but unfortunately my mind lingers a little longer on some of the activities in the parliamentary sphere.

I merely chide the Minister on this occasion, because I feel he deserves to be chided. I recall he used to hold us to ransom for a considerable number of hours for no reason other than to satisfy his own personal ego and his own activities in this regard. The action he was taking was not a responsible one. A responsible action is the type of action that is taken when something is introduced for the benefit of the State—whether it is introduced by a Liberal or a Labor Government—and when it is given the responsible consideration it should by the Opposition.

I know we have differences in philosophy and perhaps we would not reach agreement on certain things, but on such legislation as this we need special action for a special reason, and we feel it deserves support from both sides of the House. Accordingly, the Opposition has no hesitation in supporting the legislation.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) [7.37 p.m.]: I thank the three members of the Opposition, including the Leader of the Opposition, for their support of the legislation. I will run through in summary form the general reasons for the Bill and what it is all about, because obviously some members of the Opposition do not seem to know what it is all about.

Mr Jamieson: We know what it is all about.

Mr RUSHTON: It is also good for the Opposition to realise that this legislation is totally different from what the Opposition proposed while in government.

Mr Jamieson: No, it is not.

Mr RUSHTON: Read it again.

Mr Jamieson: You read it word for word.

Mr RUSHTON: It should be compulsory reading for members of the Opposition.

Mr Jamieson: It should be compulsory for the Minister introducing the Bill to know what it contains.

Mr Taylor: You would have to change the schedule only.

Mr Jamieson: That is the only thing. You have not paid any attention to the drafting of the Bill.

Mr RUSHTON: Members of the Opposition are sensitive.

Mr Jamieson: No, they are not sensitive; it is you who are stupid.

Mr RUSHTON: The previous legislation which the Opposition would now like the House to believe is similar to this legislation is totally different for one reason—the Opposition of the day introduced three Bills basically to control all the land it desired throughout Western Australia. This was spelt out in three Bills, of which the Salvado legislation was merely one.

The previous legislation obviously can be seen to be a totally different approach from what we have done as a Government. What we have done is a good example of what a private enterprise Government can and will do to co-ordinate and implement development without the heavy hand of socialism.

Mr Taylor: You look at it the other way around.

Mr RUSHTON: This is a co-ordinating role.

Mr Taylor: All being done by the Government.

Mr Jamieson: You have not read your Bill.

Mr RUSHTON: I have read it a greater number of times than has the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Jamieson: You had better go back to square one.

Mr RUSHTON: It is all very interesting and the constant interjections from the Opposition show its sensitivity to this legislation. I did not wish to introduce this thought, but I feel it is necessary.

Mr Jamieson: We support this; you would not support ours.

Mr RUSHTON: If members go back to the days of the iniquitous legislation that was introduced in 1973 and read the three Bills, they would go pale at what the present Opposition proposed to do while in government. Those Bills were not rejected; they simply fell off the notice paper, because the opposition outside was so strong that it was of some concern to the Tonkin Government. The legislation was not defeated in this House as the member for Cockburn has said; the Bills merely fell off the notice paper—they were not rejected.

Mr Taylor: Did you not filibuster for something like 19 hours on one Bill alone? You kept us here night after night.

Mr RUSHTON: No; the honourable member should read again the history of the legislation; it would be illuminating if he did. This legislation does not usurp any of the powers or authority of local government in particular. The Shire of Wanneroo will still have its administrative role over this area and the town planning requirements of the area will be subject to the same statutory bodies. The corporation plays only a co-ordinating role and, as members will see, there is provision for the winding up of the corporation which means it will get under way, carry out its work, and then go out of business.

Mr Taylor: It shall go out only when the Governor shall approve. Look at clause 51.

Mr RUSHTON: No, it cannot; the Minister can close it down.

Mr Taylor: That is right; otherwise it could stay on indefinitely.

Mr RUSHTON: There is a clause at the end of the Bill which says a report will be made to the Minister when their work is near completion, and the other clause provides that the Minister may close it down.

Mr Taylor: He may, but if he does not want to it stays on.

Mr RUSHTON: So this is a totally different concept, and it would be wrong to suggest it was not. If members will look

at the three Bills in question—the Salvado Development Bill, 1973, the Land Control Bill, 1973, which gave power to control the whole of Western Australia; and the Land Commission Bill, 1973—and if we review and carefully read the details of that legislation we will realise the 1973 legislation basically was seeking to control by this method all the land in Western Australia. There were provisions for the resumption of land and the Land Control Bill allowed all land to be considered for public works which, therefore, would have applied to any part of the State.

I do not want to prolong the issue, nor do I wish to go back into the history of the legislation, but I would like members to realise that this is totally different legislation from that which appeared before. I appreciate the support members have given the Bill because they are now agreeing to a form we have introduced.

The member for Cockburn has described this as important legislation and has said it is taking the initiative. That is so. He also said it is not a new Bill in itself, but we know in other parts of the world there is a different concept, unlike this which provides for a co-ordinating role only. It is good to remember that the member for Cockburn said the Tonkin Government's three Bills were similar to this proposition, but I deny that completely. The honourable member also said those Bills were rejected by Parliament, but this is known to be incorrect.

The establishment of the corporation to handle the development of Joondalup was being queried by the honourable member who asked the reason and the necessity for it. He wondered why it was dealing with such a small area, against the 80 000 acres contained in the Salvado Bill, the 65 000 acres at Wanneroo, and the 15 000 acres in the Shire of Gingin.

This Bill deals with something like 3 500 acres. When we came into office regional planning had not progressed very far, but we took early steps to plan and I am pleased to say that the regional requirements for the north-west corridor are nearing the stage where we will be able to announce them and they will be placed before Parliament next session. This has been possible because of the constant effort and good work of the officers who have been set the task. I have attended as chairman of the steering committee which developed the plan and the House will have the opportunity to give its opinion on the proposals.

After consultation with the shire and experts Joondalup was selected as the centre. However, as I said in the early part of my address, Joondalup is only one centre in the whole concept of the corridor plan. I would like to emphasise for the benefit of the member for Cockburn, that when we came to office there were no

urban lots available in the south-west corridor, the one to which he belongs; and certainly extra attention was needed in the corridor in which I live; that is, the south-east corridor. The position was static in the eastern corridor and the situation in the north-west corridor certainly required attention. Work has been done in all these areas in the 2½ years we have been in office and the legislative proposal before the House is a result of part of that work.

I agree with the honourable member that perhaps things are moving too fast in the north-west corridor. Since I have been in office it has been my endeavour to try to speed up the planning in other corridors in an effort to reduce the activity in the northern corridor.

We had lost a lot of time from lack of attention by the previous Government, but we have endeavoured to improve the situation. In the south-west corridor and the Cockburn Shire there was next to nothing in the way of urban lots on the market when we came into office, but that position has improved as it has in all the corridors.

Mr Taylor: Which sections in Cockburn have you opened up in the last three years? Which lots?

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Cockburn has been in the House and should know that 9 500 lots have been rezoned.

Mr Taylor: In Cockburn?

Mr RUSHTON: In that area, yes. Now there are development proposals for five or more heads of development proceeding in Cockburn and Melville and those lots will be coming onto the market. Another is in Newton Street South which is in the news at the present.

Mr Taylor: It certainly is.

Mr RUSHTON: I am saying that when we came into office these urban lots were not available.

Mr Taylor: And there are none yet.

Mr RUSHTON: No zoning had been done, but we have done it. It has been through the House and then the development has proceeded. There is also development in East Bibra, Forrest Road, and Newton Street south, and the Sommerville Pine Plantation, which is mainly in Melville. This is what is occurring in that area and it is occurring all over the metropolitan area in an endeavour to relieve the pressure on the north-west corridor.

The member for Cockburn asked why some other body was not responsible for the development at Joondalup. We studied the proposal with the Shire of Wanneroo, but it was considered it could not manage the development by using its borrowing powers and it thought it would be better to retain all its administrative powers, but have a body of people co-ordinating the

work; and this has been done. It could be said that the MRPA could have done the work. However, the decision was that it should be done by a separate body. Another suggestion was the Rural and Industries Bank, but it was felt it already had a fairly substantial task so the job was given to a separate body.

The honourable member also raised the question of the adjoining area and what will occur there. As I have intimated briefly, when I came into office I found that this work was static. However the planning is now well advanced. The MRPA has the responsibility of the regional planning and its work is now well under way. The shire has the responsibility of local planning and I have every confidence that it will manage this in the future and that the population will be increased to something like 350 000. What a job that will be for the shire. I believe that the day must be reached when the Shire of Wanneroo will be divided into a number of shires in order that the work might be carried out efficiently; but that is something for the future.

Mr Taylor: By changing the Local Government Act?

Mr RUSHTON: No. I have had words with it and the council will give—

Mr Taylor: It will be an interesting exercise.

Mr RUSHTON: Yes, but it will have to occur in due course.

Mr Taylor: It will be difficult after you have amended the Act.

Mr RUSHTON: It is interesting that the honourable member should react in the way he does.

The honourable member referred to private land. My calculation reveals that there will be 269.5 hectares of private land and 1 155.5 hectares of public land. That will be the total area. I have a map if the honourable member would like to study it. It shows the various areas of private and public land.

He also mentioned the "A"-class reserves and I have this explanation for him: it is in the main because of a rerouting of the road and this is one of the major reasons for the change, and it is subject to negotiation. As he has already said, a tremendous amount of reserve land is being provided which certainly would compensate for it in the Joondalup area. Thousands of acres are already provided by Statute for regional open space.

I am trying to answer the points as they were raised by the honourable member and I think I have done so. However, one which comes to mind now concerns the town centre. He was wondering who would make the decisions. We can consider places like Midland, Armadale, and Rockingham. Such places have progressively developed and these areas

are already part of a scheme and are spelt out in a zoning scheme. This is what will occur in this town centre because the Shire of Wanneroo will have a town planning scheme and zoning will be introduced. There will be no basic change in that regard. The zoning scheme of the Shire of Wanneroo will apply.

The honourable member suggested that we should have a different number of people on the corporation and that the Leader of the Opposition should have a representative. I suggest that if the law had been that proposed by the previous Tonkin Government all the powers would have been taken out of the hands of the local authority. However, now the Shire of Wanneroo, its councillors and elected personnel will have full jurisdiction over this area.

Mr Jamieson: There will be interminable rifts, you mark my words.

Mr RUSHTON: There will not be because the president has been involved.

Mr Jamieson: I do not care who has been involved. There will be interminable rifts because of the way it is set up. History will prove one of us right.

Mr RUSHTON: That is right.

Mr Nanovich: It will be the Minister.

Mr Jamieson: That remains for history to prove.

Mr RUSHTON: The idea is to have the shire fully involved and the only rift will be one of personality. The legislation will not create them because no power will be taken away and the corporation will be required to develop the area in accordance with the town planning scheme. Therefore there will be no more rifts than there are in any zone planning. All planning has some problems because of differences of opinion.

I have covered the question concerning the small area so I will not elaborate on it any further. I have also dealt with the reason for five members as against seven. The shire will still have full power over the area. The group of people will have the expertise to develop the area and one of the group could well be a woman. There would be no opposition to that. The whole idea will be to get the best possible people to carry out the task.

I do not feel I need say any more in connection with the remarks of the member for Cockburn because I have briefly covered all the points he raised.

I wish now to respond to the remarks of the member for Geraldton whom I thank for his contribution. He basically supports the concept behind the legislation, but naturally he applied his remarks to the needs of his own electorate; that is, Geraldton. He raised a doubt as to what is taking place in the metropolitan area and the future of Perth.

The future of Perth is dictated by a number of features. One of the present aspects being followed is the corridor concept which has been agreed to by the last two Governments. It allows a growth in a certain way.

As members are aware, the city centre is under attention at the moment. The question of the population is being considered. There may be a difference of opinion expressed regarding the residential or commercial use of the city centre when the plan is advertised.

However I would like to say to the member for Geraldton that I see that the future growth of the City of Perth must be basically controlled by moderating influences. We could have satellite cities further out, at Northam, Pinjarra, and such places, and obviously we could deliberately attempt to develop the country towns wherever possible. Of course, the Government applies itself to that task. I for one make every effort in every shire I visit to ensure the shire gives full attention to monitoring its own urban land situation in order that not one person will leave or refrain from going to a town because of lack of supply of lots. The shires are invited to keep in touch with me at all times and I have responded to all the requests I have received in that regard. All local authorities have the responsibility to watch that position very carefully to ensure no-one is debarred from living in the country.

The next speaker was the Leader of the Opposition, who was a Minister in the previous Government. He made play on a few extracts from the debates of that time, but he is usually a very frank and straightforward man and I am sure he would realise the difference if he read the three previous Bills. We have only to look at page 13 of the Salvado Bill, which takes away all local government responsibilities. Clause 40 of that Bill spells out that the chairman, the corporation clerk, and such people will take over the powers of the local authority. It is interesting to read that clause.

The SPEAKER: Would the Minister please resume his seat? I would like to say this is a second reading debate and the points of comparison made should not be so detailed as to obscure the salient points of the Bill to which the Minister is speaking. There has been considerable discussion of the differences between this and previous legislation, and I ask the Minister not to dwell upon the differences but rather to remark upon them and be done with them.

Mr RUSHTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. They are not very long but I will comply with your request. Members may read the clauses in the old legislation which contains proposals which fell by the wayside. Clause 40 spells out the functions the Bill would have taken away from local government and it is there for members to

read. It should be studied by all members who are interested in town planning and the handling of developments because it gives a good comparison with the way a Government of a private enterprise philosophy performs such a task.

Mr Bertram: Where is the Government of a private enterprise philosophy?

Mr RUSHTON: Over here.

Mr Bertram: I am glad you identified it.

Mr RUSHTON: We had the situation where personnel who were not elected would have taken over the functions of a local authority. We now have the situation where the local authority retains all its powers, as we would wish.

Mr Nanovich: The Salvado legislation would have allowed the local authority to participate in the initial stages, mainly to pick up the garbage and look after traffic.

Mr RUSHTON: That would have been at the request of the corporation.

Points were raised in relation to Roebourne and Karratha, but I conclude by saying to the Opposition that this Bill is an example of how an area can be developed without applying the heavy hand.

I trust the task will be implemented with all speed and will be very successful. It will provide an opportunity to observe the two systems. At least one system is to be tried. I am confident it will succeed and that all the parties involved will co-ordinate very well. Of course, a five-member corporation is to be appointed and its task will be very demanding.

The Government and I are confident the Bill will play a major part in providing facilities such as a regional hospital, which is to be an immediate task. The opportunity will exist to modify urban land prices in the area. A considerable amount of land under the Joondalup corporation's administration will be brought onto the market and the Government will have an influence in the way this is done. I am looking forward to the progress of this work and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr Rushton (Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Development of centre—

Mr TAYLOR: This clause reads—

5. There shall be developed on the land described in the Schedule such infrastructure and residential, recreation, community, commercial, business, professional, industrial, trade and any other facilities as are necessary or desirable for housing and servicing a centre of population.

Clause 9, under the heading "Joondalup Development Corporation", says—

(1) A Corporation shall be established for the purposes of this Act . . .

(2) Under its corporate name, the Corporation . . .

(d) may take, purchase, and hold real and personal property including property devised, bequeathed, or given to the Corporation;

I would like the Minister to examine clause 5, which refers specifically to the task of the corporation with respect to land described in the schedule—which is clear enough—and then relate it to clause 9 (2) (d). I ask whether in his opinion the clause allows the corporation to take, purchase, and hold real and personal property including property devised, bequeathed, or given to the corporation—that is, areas outside the area in question—provided that land is in some way used for the purposes of the legislation, whatever its use may be—that is, for the purposes of developing land within the area described in the schedule.

Mr RUSHTON: Clause 5 spells out what the purposes will be. In my opinion, the land referred to in clause 9 (2) (d) is the land within the area already described.

A certified copy of the plan has been tabled, and the honourable member may have seen this already. The provision does not go outside that area.

Mr TAYLOR: I would like the Minister to have a further look at this matter. Without obtaining legal opinion, it appears to me that a large proportion of the clauses of the Bill refer to what may be done within the area described in the schedule. That is clear enough, but sub-clause (2) of clause 9 provides that the corporation may do a number of things without any restriction on the land within the schedule.

At least before this legislation is debated in another place I would like the Minister to check this matter. As I say, it may be possible for other dealings such as the acceptance of gifts of property outside the scheduled area to take place. The corporation is to be set up to develop a certain area as defined in the schedule, but this subclause appears to allow the corporation to go outside the scheduled area.

Mr O'Neil: You do not object to the principle if that is so?

Mr TAYLOR: No, but if there is a change of Government that Government may wish to take land from outside the area and give it to the corporation. I am not sure of my facts here, but it appears that the provision does not specify that it applies only to the area defined in the schedule.

Mr RUSHTON: It is my belief that this provision does not apply to land outside the schedule. If the honourable member



wishes me to do so, I will have this matter checked out and I will confer with him about it.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Constitution of Corporation—

Mr TAYLOR: I raised this matter during the second reading debate so I do not intend to labour the point now. However, in the interests of good government I ask the Minister to examine clause 13(1)(b) which states—

four shall be persons each of them having, in the opinion of the Minister, knowledge of and experience in any of the fields of town planning, housing, industry, commerce, finance, engineering or transport.

This does not appear to allow representation of any number of people who will occupy the area. All corporations need some flexibility and I would appreciate the Minister having a further look at this provision.

Mr RUSHTON: I have answered this question previously when I said that the interests of the people will be protected by the local authority which will have full jurisdiction over the area as it has now. The corporation will be a co-ordinating body answerable to the Minister of the day who will see that all the tasks prescribed are undertaken. I do not think the honourable member was in the Chamber when I said that there would be no opposition to the appointment of a woman to this corporation. It is my belief that we need the best five people available for this corporation, and I emphasise that technical advice will be freely available if necessary.

I would like to stress that the council, elected by the people of the area, will still have powers of administration over it. The honourable member need have no qualms about the matter of continuity because the Wanneroo Shire Council has a role to play and legislation to administer. The rights and interests of the people will be protected in that way.

Mr DAVIES: I have listened with interest to some of the remarks made tonight, and I feel sure the Minister did not receive the same advice from the department as I was given when I held this same portfolio.

The whole future of the area depends on the quality of the people who are appointed to the corporation, and I feel the Minister overlooked completely the remarks made by the member for Cockburn in this regard. The Minister was anxious to tell us that the Wanneroo Shire Council would still have control of the area, but no-one is arguing about that. We want to see the very best people available appointed to this corporation.

Is the representation on this corporation wide enough? I raise this point because the Bill contains one of the most curious clauses I have ever read. Clause 13 provides that one member of the corporation shall be a councillor of the Shire of Wanneroo and of course, this is in line with the Government's desire that the shire should be actively concerned in the development. We are not arguing with that. However, the next paragraph states that the other four members of the corporation shall be people with knowledge of and experience in seven different professions; that is, town planning, housing, industry, commerce, finance, engineering and transport. Even this list may not exhaust the fields of experience from which we may want to draw.

If it is the Government's wish to obtain the best possible corporation, it may be necessary to add to the list from which the Government can select nominees, and to add to the membership of the committee. I am on record time and time again as saying that I do not believe in large and unwieldy committees. However, I do believe in the best available committee for the job in hand.

It appears to me that this corporation needs representation from all the fields mentioned. It may happen that someone has experience in two fields, perhaps a town planning engineer or a commercial man with experience in transport. If my memory serves me correctly, in other legislation introduced into this Chamber, there was provision for co-opting members with appropriate skills to a similar body. However, there is no such provision in this Bill, and that is a great pity. I am sure that no five people would have all the knowledge and experience necessary for this task. At the very least I would like to see a provision allowing the corporation to co-opt other members.

Mr RUSHTON: I thank the member for Victoria Park for his contribution, and, as I well know, he played a big part in the legislation drawn up previously. In my introductory speech I referred to the people who have accomplished a great deal of the planning up to now. The honourable member will realise that the people I mentioned have given us reports and recommendations relating to the financial affairs and administration of the corporation.

I would like the member for Victoria Park to accept that this corporation will be like a board of directors and will give consideration to the expert advice that comes forward. I see it as having more of a local role, and there will be no limit to the advisers it may have.

Mr Davies: To whom will it give advice?

Mr RUSHTON: It will be like a board of directors, and it will seek advice from people who are interested and whom we have already spelt out. The field is fairly wide, and all the people have the expertise which is necessary. That expertise has been available to the Government and will continue to be available. I hope the member has no qualms about this point when he sees it in operation.

Mr DAVIES: I thought the Minister might give us an indication. The names he mentioned are Mr N. C. Hawkins, Dr David Carr, Mr Aitken, Mr Searson, Mr A. Keil of the Town Planning Department, Mr Terry of the Main Roads Department, Mr Sanders of the Department of Conservation and Environment, Mr Robinson of the MTT, Mr Harse of the Metropolitan Water Board, Mr Reid of the Wanneroo Shire Council, Mr Woodward of the Town Planning Department, Mr Holmes A'Court, Mr D. Whitely, Mr B. Waldeck, and Mr D. Collins.

That is a large number of people who have already been associated with this and from whom I presume we could draw the committee. Of course, the committee will be like a board of directors, but it will still have power to demand that things be done. It is to have the right to make rules and regulations, and if it cannot ensure those rules and regulations are carried out there is no point in our giving it the authority of a Statute. We could merely appoint a board similar to any of the three that have already been appointed.

However, the Minister is giving this statutory authority for a purpose; so that it can do whatever the Government of the day wants it to do. The Bill sets out that the committee can borrow money, engage staff, and do all sorts of things. Therefore, let us not run away with the idea that this will be merely an advisory body, because it will be far more than that.

If I were a member of the Wanneroo Shire I would want to know in greater detail just how this will work, because I agree with my leader there will be a clash of personalities eventually. It is not unreasonable to suggest that with all the goodwill in the world members of the committee will not see eye to eye at all times. It seems to me this clause is quite loosely drawn. Certainly we are aware that these are some of the fields from which we will require men, but they may not be the best fields. There may be other fields from which we may want to draw assistance.

That is why I want to place on record what I see as becoming a truth, just as what my leader has said will prove in the future to be a truth. I say this committee will be found to be wanting. It will not be

able to enjoy all the authority and expertise it might be able to enjoy if it were constituted on a wider basis.

Mr RUSHTON: I thank the member for again giving me an opportunity to explain a situation which apparently is not understood. This corporation will be related to the shire like any other developer, and its role will be similar to that played by any other developer. It will be required to act within the administration of the Shire of Wanneroo and within the town planning scheme of that authority.

Mr Davies: Well then do away with clause 52 which gives it the right to make by-laws. If it is just another developer, its members don't need the right to make by-laws.

Mr RUSHTON: The corporation will have a task, and it will be subject to the Minister and the Government. It will have no more power than that.

I trust the member now understands a little more about this. The Government is confident that the people and the criteria we have listed will be satisfactory.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 to 18 put and passed.

Clause 19: Dismissal of member—

Mr JAMIESON: Had we got to this provision in the Salvado Bill I imagine the Minister would have raised a great deal of criticism and called it a "Big Brother" clause. I know of no legislation that deals as particularly with the dismissal of committee members as this legislation does.

The clause says that the Government may terminate the appointment of a member for inability, inefficiency, or misbehaviour. Other reasons for the vacation of office are dealt with in the following clause. Clause 19 gives the Minister absolute power. If the members do not do what he wants they could be judged to be inefficient, misbehaving, or suffering from an inability to meet the Minister's requirements. I do not think we should tolerate such a provision.

Such a clause was included in the Salvado Bill—as a matter of fact, I am reading from it—and I make no excuses for that. However, if ever there was a provision which should not be included in the Bill, this is it.

Where the clause refers to the Governor, it really means the Minister, and the provision gives the latter absolute power to have committee members do what he wants them to do. I oppose it.

Mr RUSHTON: This is a powerful clause which is similar to one used previously. We have to relate it to the fact that it was more necessary under the Salvado legislation because in that case people who would not have had the same influence on the area as will the Shire of Wanneroo in this case were involved. Therefore, it may have been more necessary for the Minister to remove people in that case.

This legislation is put forward with the recommendation of people who have had a big influence in preparing for the task. They believe they do not require extra powers in respect of co-ordinating this matter.

The legislation is before us because it was thought to be too big a task for the other bodies such as the Shire of Wanneroo, the MRPA or the R & I Bank. It has been given to a small group of people to co-ordinate under the direction of the Minister. The Minister has powers of direction in accordance with planning, while the Shire of Wanneroo has direction in regard to local administration of the town planning scheme.

Members should have no qualms about people making recommendations to the Government in relation to the corporation's task. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that these are strong powers, but it is considered such powers are necessary to ensure a major task such as the one we are undertaking is completed satisfactorily. Such a provision is not seen to be outside the general objective of the legislation.

Mr JAMIESON: It is very difficult to follow the Minister's line of argument, because the people appointed will be required to have certain qualifications. Having been appointed, it would be a gross reflection on the Minister if this part of the legislation were invoked. I might go along with terminating the appointment of a member for continual misbehaviour, such as consistently striking the chairman at meetings of the corporation, but the matter of "inability and inefficiency" is one for individual judgment. Who will be the individual? From the legislation, it looks very much as though it will be the Minister.

I am not convinced that this is a desirable feature of the Bill. Sufficient powers already are included in the Bill, and it is wrong to hold this provision over the head of the corporation. We may as well not even have a corporation; let the Minister do it all, and take whatever action he wants to take from time to time. I do not believe we are here to pass legislation giving the Minister such powers.

Mr TAYLOR: I support the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. What would be the Minister's attitude with respect to the representative of the Shire of Wanneroo who is a member of the corporation? How will he determine whether that person has the capacity to be a member of the corporation? What sort of situation would it be if the Minister of the day, for one of the reasons outlined in the Bill, was to dismiss that person? Incidentally, it has not even been indicated how that person is to be appointed, whether he or she is to be by nomination of the Shire of Wanneroo, or by some other method.

It is bad enough to have this provision hanging over the heads of the four members the Minister himself will appoint, but it is another matter altogether to have it hanging over the head of the representative of the Shire of Wanneroo which, in the Minister's own words, has a substantial responsibility with respect to this area. The Minister should consider deleting the clause *in toto*.

Mr RUSHTON: It is quite obvious that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Cockburn are not seeing the legislation in the way it is presented; namely, in a co-ordinating role. In fact, the Shire of Wanneroo will have the full powers it presently possesses, and therefore must be seen in a different role. If it were to be a dominant, all-powerful corporation, what members opposite have said would have some substance; however, as I said before, that is not our way of doing things.

Mr Taylor: If that is the case, why leave it in the Bill? If you are not going to use this power, why do we need it at all?

Mr RUSHTON: I am not saying we will not use it. It may be that, at the recommendation of one of the members of the corporation—

Mr Jamieson: What would be your attitude towards a recommendation to remove the local authority representative?

Mr RUSHTON: If suitable reasons were advanced to support a claim of inability, inefficiency or misbehaviour, the shire would have to consider appointing someone else. But the shire must have a representative on the corporation; this is provided for. I do not believe members should have any qualms about this provision.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Shalders
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr McPharlin	Mr Watt
Mr Mensaros	Mr Clarko
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

#### Noes—18

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bertram	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bryce	Mr Jamieson
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Sir Charles Court	Mr Moller
Mr Sibson	Mr B. T. Burke
Mr O'Connor	Mr May
Mr Young	Mr J. T. Tonkin

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 put and passed.

Clause 22: Disclosure of interest—

Mr SKIDMORE: I ask the Minister: What is meant by this clause? It reads—

22. (1) A member who has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any matter that is before a meeting of the Corporation for consideration shall disclose the nature of his interest to the members present at the meeting—

That seems to me to be quite straightforward. I believe that should be done. It then says—

—and the disclosure shall be recorded in the minutes of the Corporation;—

I have no objections to that. However I quarrel very much with the remainder of the clause because it then says—

—and the member shall not take part in any decision of the Corporation with respect to that matter.

If a person has a pecuniary interest I believe he should not take part in any of the discussion. Am I to understand from this clause that the member can debate and involve himself in all those matters and then simply have no vote? If that is so, by virtue of his pecuniary interest and his wish to protect that interest he may have a valid contention that he has taken part in the decision. His contribution to the debate could mean that the decision of the corporation could be influenced by his pecuniary interest which would be reflected by him in discussion. In my candid opinion such a person should not take part in the discussion at all. Why should anybody who owns any amount of land be allowed to influence the corporation by entering into discussion and then walking out of the room and saying, "I convinced sufficient people to get my point over. My pecuniary interest will be protected. I shall absent myself but my affairs will be looked after because I have been able to influence the decision"? I believe that is wrong. I would like an assurance from the Minister as to the exact position.

Mr RUSHTON: I think subclause (2) gives an idea of the sort of interests in which a man could be involved. This type of provision is normal in other legislation and is certainly similar to provisions in local government legislation. It is a broad provision to provide for the declaration of a person's interests. Those interests could be so minute that they will be seen to be in order or otherwise by the nature of his disclosure. Not being a legal man, I am not aware of the full ramifications of the clause, but I believe it provides adequately for the circumstances that would prevail.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not completely convinced by the Minister's answers to the queries I raised. I have been a member

of the local authority in two towns—Wagin and Albany. In Wagin there was an instance of pecuniary interests with regard to the purchase of a block of land which was set aside for recreational needs. In Albany there was a matter concerning road works and a member was part of the contracting firm for the road clearing work. On each of those occasions the members concerned did not enter the debate at all and quite rightly absented themselves from the meetings. Merely because the Minister says this is a general clause I am not satisfied that a person with pecuniary interests should take part in the discussions. This seems to me to be a fundamental principle particularly when we consider the ramifications of this piece of legislation which is to set up a statutory body to handle the subdivision of land and other matters.

If it were considered that the possibility of a person concerned with the particular land being seconded to the corporation is very small, I would not worry. But why have the provision in the Bill? If it is considered that this situation is not likely to take place, the provision should not be there.

I am not satisfied with the answers that have been given to me. I am raising a point of principle. If a man is to make a gain out of something then he should not vote on that matter. It is a point of principle and not so much a matter of practice and precedent over the years in local government. It is a question of what is right and wrong.

I believe a great deal more effort should be made in these circumstances. I am sure we do not wish to follow the sheep that takes us up the ramp because eventually the Judas sheep will lead us into getting our heads cut off. I have no desire to get my head cut off. I will be quite happy if the Minister can assure me that the intention of the clause is that a person who has a pecuniary interest will not take part in the debate and will not vote on the issue.

Mr HARTREY: The Minister could not give any such assurance to this Chamber. Neither could I nor anybody in the Chamber, however qualified to give an opinion. Only a judge could decide what those words mean, if we carry them. In a court of law one cannot even produce *Hansard* and say, "This is what the members said." The courts would not be the least impressed. They would say, "What do these words mean?"

I think the point raised by the member for Swan is sound. There is an ambiguity here that should be clarified. The Minister cannot clarify it and I cannot clarify it, but the Committee can by a simple amendment. I suggest that after the word "and" in line 3 on page 9 there be inserted the words "discussion or". That would clarify the matter quite simply.

I believe the member for Swan has a serious and valid objection to the proposition that a man who has disclosed his interest should still be allowed to influence the votes of other people although not to cast a vote himself. If he is not allowed to take part in the discussion or decision we have done the best we can to ensure that he may not influence the votes of others as well as rolling his own barrel, so to speak.

I suggest the Minister might agree to my proposition. It will make the words assume their plain and ordinary meaning and the words will convey what the Committee intends. I think the Committee and the Minister intend that to be so. I do not think anyone is saying, "I agree that a man should disclose his interest and should not vote on the subject but I do not think there is anything wrong with his using his influence in debate to induce other people to vote the way he is not allowed to vote himself."

I do not think any member of this Chamber holds that point of view. We can easily overcome the ambiguity by inserting the words "discussion or". I move an amendment—

Page 9, line 3—Insert after the word "any" the words "discussion or".

Mr RUSHTON: Already we have agreed to a provision which states that any person who has a pecuniary interest that might prejudice the exercise of his conscience as a member of the board, will not be acceptable as a member of the corporation. That provision coupled with the provision in clause 22 (1) will meet the need to clarify the position.

Firstly, under the provision in clause 20 (h) if a member has any financial interest that may affect prejudicially the exercise of his functions as a member, his office shall become vacant. The provision in clause 22 will serve as a further safeguard. I would ask members opposite to reconsider the amendment they have put forward.

Mr SKIDMORE: I cannot agree with the comments of the Minister. He has said that in his opinion a person with a pecuniary interest would not be appointed as a member of the corporation. Initially that could be the position. If, for instance, the Minister is aware that a person has a pecuniary interest in the Joon-dalup area in that he is the owner of three blocks of land, he will not appoint that person to be a member of the corporation. That could defeat the purpose of the corporation because that person might be a very valuable member to assist the corporation in its functions of land development.

On the one hand the Minister has decided that because that person has three blocks of land in the area he should be excluded from membership of the corporation. On the question of pecuniary interest it has been suggested a member

should be excluded from discussion and voting on an issue in which he has a pecuniary interest; but the corporation should still have the advantage of that person's expertise. If initially such a person is considered to be a valuable member of the corporation, it is a great pity to exclude him merely because he has some pecuniary interest.

On the other hand a person who has no pecuniary interest in land in the Joon-dalup area could be appointed to the board, but later on he could secure a pecuniary interest by acquiring three or four blocks of land. He would be placed in the same situation as the person with the required expertise, and would be excluded.

It would appear to me that the most logical thing to do would be to agree to the amendment which is aimed at overcoming the ambiguity of the provision in the clause, by making it clear that a person with a pecuniary interest shall not discuss or vote on the particular matter. That seems to be the logical way to overcome the objection.

We are not dealing with a question relating to local government as to who will build this road or some other project. In this case we are dealing with the live issue of real estate. Today there are many people in our community who merely seek office in local government to serve their own selfish interests. They want to be forewarned on subdivisions and resumptions of land. The first thing which some of these people do when they find that land is to be resumed is to approach someone and offer the land for sale at, say, \$4 500. The person approached no doubt would consider it to be a good buy. However, in a few weeks' time he finds the land is to be resumed by the local authority. That sort of malpractice is indulged in.

This is the first occasion since I have been a member of Parliament that legislation has come forward containing such a provision. I object to it. I support the amendment because it will make clear to all concerned that if a person has a pecuniary interest in a matter he shall not take part in any discussion or vote on it. By agreeing to the amendment we would remove any stigma that a member of the corporation, by virtue of his membership, was able to gain prior knowledge of the activities of the corporation. To me the amendment is a safeguard to the credibility of the corporation. It is important that we place the corporation in such a position where its credibility cannot be challenged.

Mr HARTREY: I am surprised and disappointed to find the Minister has some reservations about accepting my amendment. I know the Minister has introduced the Bill in all sincerity, but I am sure that neither he nor any other member

can say what the words in clause 22 (1) mean exactly, without the inclusion of the words proposed in my amendment.

Ultimately a court of law might say that the point I am now trying to clarify does not, in fact, need clarification. However, I do not feel that way. It is a pity that we find in this Chamber far too many so-called party Bills introduced. It is all right voting along party lines in respect of workers' compensation, because there are two sides involved—the employers and the workers.

In the case of legislation dealing with consumer protection we find that some people are in favour of the sellers, and some are in favour of the buyers, and it is only natural that we divide on party lines when voting on those measures.

The question I ask is this: Why should we continue to adopt a party line on Bills, such as the one before us? The members of the corporation are obliged to be honest, and we are ensuring that they are obliged to be honest.

I leave it to the Minister to accept the amendment simply to clarify the point. We want to say what we mean instead of having a judge to clarify the position. I feel certain there is not a member in the Committee who does not agree with what I said. If a person informs the corporation that he has a financial interest he would then be obliged not to take part in any of the discussion or voting on the question. However, as everyone knows, a man can influence his friends in a debate. If he gains three votes by discussion and loses one vote—his own—he is still two votes better off. Do not let us be partisan about this. Please accept the amendment.

Mr RUSHTON: With deep respect to my learned friend, the member for Boulder-Dundas, and the member for Swan, I point out first of all that a person should not belong to the corporation if he has a financial interest.

Mr Hartrey: He will be there or the clause would not be there.

Mr RUSHTON: Under the second clause, which is also included in other legislation, a person can discuss an issue if he has an interest. For instance he could be a member of a golf club or another organisation, and this is something I have come across frequently in local government. This provision covers things of this nature. There could be a club which they all might join and if the amendment were accepted it would prevent those people even taking part in a discussion.

There is protection for the person who has a financial interest. No-one would want such a person to vote. I would not want him on the corporation if he has a financial interest. This clause allows for

a disclosure of his financial interest and if it were considered prejudicial to the carrying out of his task, he would not remain there very long.

Mr SKIDMORE: I rise to answer the Minister's rather puerile efforts to justify his nonacceptance of the amendment. In answering the debate on the amendment and giving his objections to it he has really supported the very basis on which we submitted it. He referred to a golf club. Let us suppose there is a Joondalup country club which has five or six acres of land which is required by the corporation for the development of a child minding centre. The Minister stated that the members of that club would have no right to vote. In that case no-one would be able to vote and that is what we say should not occur and it is what the amendment will prevent.

Mr Rushton: There would not be anyone to speak, and we do not want that to happen.

Mr SKIDMORE: It is ridiculous in the extreme that all a company representative has to do under subclause (2) is to declare that he is a member of a specified company or firm interested in a contract. He could then convince the corporation that it should have his company do the work.

The member for Boulder-Dundas has already said that it is possible for a person to influence three votes in his favour and then walk out, but he will have influenced a sufficient number for him to win the contract. If that is not affecting the decision of the corporation, I do not know what is. It is the essence of what we have been saying. A person should not be able to gain as a result of his position on the corporation.

Subclause (3) states that a member need not attend in person at a meeting if he has taken reasonable steps to secure that the disclosure is made by a notice which is brought up and read at the meeting. That is the only saving feature of the whole clause. It is not mandatory. It merely states that he may do it. He need not attend the meeting, but the meeting is notified of his pecuniary interests. Who is kidding whom? The people who make money out of land are the most avaricious people in the world today. They hold all the community to ransom and will make a quick buck out of land if it is possible for them to do so.

The Minister should accept the amendment. It is such a little thing to ask. A member with a pecuniary interest should take no part in the vote. If he is to take part in any decision it should be made quite clear. I hope that if I have not convinced the Minister, I have convinced some Government members and when the vote is taken they will be in favour of the amendment. It is in the best interests of the corporation, and all people concerned.

Mr HARTREY: I am very disappointed that the Minister is not prepared to accept this small amendment. I take it for granted he does not wish the situation to arise in which a person who has a financial interest in a subject under discussion should be allowed to discuss that matter and be restrained only from voting. If that is the wish of the Minister I understand his reason for not accepting the amendment, but I do not believe that is his desire. I do not believe members of this Committee want that situation to arise.

I give the Minister credit for having a good deal more integrity than to want that situation to arise. I think he has already indicated that a person with a financial interest in a matter under discussion should have nothing to do with the decision. The decision is the vote; nothing will be done until the members of the corporation have voted. But the discussion is very often more important than the decision, because it creates the decision.

I do not want to make a party issue of this amendment. Surely the Minister will be big enough to agree to the proposal. I again ask the Minister to say straightout whether the real intention of the measure is that a person with a manifest interest will be allowed to influence, by debate, the vote of other people, or whether a person who states he has an interest in a matter under discussion shall take no further part in that discussion. Such a person can cause much more damage and injury to the object of this clause by taking part in the discussion and not the voting, than by having the right to vote.

Mr RUSHTON: I respond to the honourable member by saying it is my intention that a person with a financial pecuniary interest should not influence a decision.

Mr Hartrey: Then, make sure of it.

Mr RUSHTON: As far as I am concerned, the words in the clause give that intention. I will give the honourable member the satisfaction of knowing I will certainly check this out, and if there is any doubt I will have the clause attended to. It is my intention that a person with a pecuniary financial interest should not influence a decision.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 23 and 24 put and passed.

Clause 25: General functions and powers—

Mr TAYLOR: I think members understand that it is the purpose of this measure to give substantial authority to the corporation to carry out certain functions. Those functions are defined and set out in the schedule. When discussing clause 11, covering the objects of the corporation, I reminded the Minister that there appeared to be power for the corporation to purchase or obtain property outside the

area to be developed but which appeared to be within the activities of the corporation. It may be possible for certain powers of the corporation to operate outside the area specified in the Bill. The Minister indicated that he was not sure of the position when he answered my query.

I would like the Minister to read clause 25 which, in part, reads as follows—

25. (1) The Corporation may exercise such functions as are consistent with its objects and may carry out, or arrange to be carried out, such works and do such other things, or arrange for such other things to be done as may be necessary or convenient for the purposes of carrying out its objects . . .

The objectives of the corporation are clear—to develop the Joondalup centre. I ask the Minister whether, in his opinion, the corporation will have the ability to become involved with land outside the bounds specified in the schedule providing only that such action was to assist in the development of the centre.

Mr RUSHTON: This matter has been put forward previously, and I will certainly go into the position further. If I thought the member implied this was a weakness on my part I would tell him I was not prepared to give further consideration to it. In my opinion the corporation will be confined to the land in question, and it will not have jurisdiction over land outside that prescribed in the schedule.

Mr Taylor: Irrespective of the fact that it may be considered to have some functional purpose with respect to its jurisdiction inside the area?

Mr RUSHTON: I think the jurisdiction of the corporation is spelt out, and its functions will be within the area defined. I cannot see that it can be construed the corporation will have access to areas outside the land prescribed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 26 put and passed.

Clause 27: Committees—

Mr TAYLOR: Where do we go with this Minister? This clause says—

(1) The Corporation may appoint committees to investigate and advise the Corporation on any aspect of the development of Joondalup.

I do not know what Joondalup is because it is not defined. The Joondalup centre is defined—it is the area specified in the schedule—but I do not know what Joondalup is. Yet the corporation has the power under this clause to appoint committees to investigate and advise on any aspect of the development of Joondalup. I endeavoured to obtain a copy of the street directory to find out what Joondalup might be.

Mr Skidmore: It is much wider than the Joondalup centre.

Mr TAYLOR: Then clause 28 says that the corporation may in relation to any matter or class of matters, or in relation to any activity or function of the corporation, by resolution delegate all or any of its functions, powers, and duties under the legislation, with some exceptions, to any member of the corporation or any committee appointed under clause 27.

I agree the Bill is clear that the corporation may carry out certain functions within the specified area. The point I am trying to get across to the Minister is that certain things apparently may be done outside that area, in the area administered by the Shire of Wanneroo. It may be that an alternative Government would want to change things.

For the third time I am putting it to the Minister that Joondalup, as mentioned in clause 27 seems to be a far larger area than that defined in the schedule, and clause 28 says the corporation may delegate any of its functions and powers to any committee. What answer has the Minister to that? In three clauses it appears the corporation could have greater powers than the Minister believes it has. I am not saying I know that to be so; we on this side of the Chamber do not know. Our task is only to ask questions, but the Minister has not been able to give a clear answer in relation to three separate clauses. Does he not think he should come up with an answer before the Bill leaves this Chamber?

I think we have gone far enough. In relation to clause 9 the Minister said, "No, but perhaps we will have a look at it." In relation to clause 25 the Minister still did not know and said he would have a look at it. In regard to clause 27, it is not defined what "Joondalup" is. I think the Minister should report progress and seek leave to sit again so that this matter can be settled one way or the other; otherwise the Bill will be sent back from the other place and embarrassment will be caused at both ends. I hope the Minister will do the right thing.

Mr RUSHTON: I will certainly do the right thing; that is, proceed with the Bill. There is no doubt that the corporation's powers are related to the area described in the first schedule. The honourable member will find that applies in other parts of the Bill. Perhaps he thinks a disastrous time will arrive when he will find himself Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning and he will be sad to find he does not have that power.

I have given the honourable member an indication in a spirit of goodwill. If he has any doubts I will clear the matter up for him, but there is no doubt in my mind about the point he has just raised.

Mr HARTREY: I feel, as does the member for Cockburn, that clause 28 goes a great deal further than I think this

Chamber would desire it to go if it understood the full implications. The object of the corporation is stated reasonably clearly earlier in the Bill. The definition is—

"Corporation" means the Joondalup Development Corporation established under section 9;

The Joondalup centre itself is described as follows—

"Joondalup Centre" means the infrastructure and facilities to be developed in accordance with section 5 on the land described in the Schedule;

Part II of the Bill clearly describes what the Joondalup centre is. The function of development of the centre is delegated by this Parliament to a corporation. That is perfectly lawful but it is a well established principle that a delegate shall not have power to delegate what has been delegated to him. That is eminently sensible. I might want Bill to do something for me, but I do not want Bill to get Jack to do it. That is common-sense law. The law is as stupid as people make it.

If we look at clause 28, it is proposed quite seriously that the corporation—that is, the body which we are creating and entrusting with quite responsible duties to perform in respect of quite a large area of development land—may in relation to any activity or function of the corporation by resolution delegate all of its functions to any member of the corporation, and all the rest can go home.

Mr Rushton: Except its power of delegation.

Mr HARTREY: Surely it is not the intention of this Chamber to create an entire corporation, one member of which will perform all the duties while the others stay home by the fireside. If that is not our intention, why do we make it possible? If we do not want it to happen it will not happen unless we make it possible for it to happen. Why should we deliberately make possible something we do not want to happen?

Let us pull ourselves together and talk sense for a little while. I do not want to be sarcastic but we have reached the stage where this proposed legislation does not talk sense. If we want one person to exercise these functions, why do we have the other persons? If we do not want one person to exercise these functions, why do we have a special provision to enable him to do so?

Let us remove clause 28 altogether. What does it add that we did not have before? What does it empower the corporation to do that it could not do before? We are entrusting this corporation with grave responsibilities, and yet all of a sudden we say that the majority of the members of the corporation can delegate the whole responsibility to one man. What



is gained by doing that? Absolutely nothing. What is brought about by doing that? The destruction of the corporation.

This is just like a company where one man owns the majority of the shares. He can sell the company, sack himself as managing director, appoint his grandson to be a director for six months, or appoint his granddaughter. That is all right when one is using one's own money. However, we are talking about a corporation to be constituted by an Act of Parliament. For some ungodly reason it is proposed that the statutory body we are creating should be able completely to delegate its power to one member of it. If the Minister can give us a good reason for such a course, he will be doing really well.

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to suggest an amendment to overcome the obvious objections to this clause. The problem arises because the word "Joondalup" is not defined. Members will see in the interpretation clause a definition of the words "Joondalup Centre". I move an amendment—

Page 10, line 36—Insert after the word "Joondalup" the word "Centre".

If my amendment is accepted we will align ourselves clearly and concisely with the definition of the words "Joondalup Centre" and there will be no doubt at all that the committees may investigate and advise the corporation in regard to the area of land as defined in the definition of the words "Joondalup Centre". This seems to me to be the logical way to overcome the problem and I believe the Minister will accept my amendment.

Mr RUSHTON: The amendment appears to be quite logical and I see no argument against accepting it. The member for Boulder-Dundas was referring to the next clause and the matter he raised will be discussed when clause 28 is considered.

Mr TAYLOR: With due deference to the member for Swan, I would like a little longer time to examine this amendment. In clause 4 we see the following definition—

"Joondalup Centre" means the infrastructure and facilities to be developed in accordance with section 5 on the land described in the Schedule;

That interpretation refers to physical items—buildings, roads, etc. Clause 27 provides that the corporation may appoint committees to investigate and advise on the development of Joondalup. What exactly does this mean? It cannot refer to the appointment of a committee to investigate aspects of land holdings; presumably a committee would not be appointed for that function. If the amendment is accepted the corporation would be precluded from appointing committees to important functions, such as the investigation of land tenure and future land tenure, as well

as attracting finance in order to allow the whole development to proceed. I would like the Minister to think about this matter again.

Mr RUSHTON: I would like to accommodate everyone, but I am afraid I cannot. The member for Cockburn has raised a doubt now. I believe we should accept what is in the Bill and I will have this matter examined in greater detail. I cannot see any point in holding up the passage of the measure because of this query. The member for Cockburn is leading the Opposition in regard to this measure and I think we should have regard for the point he raised.

Mr Skidmore: I thought my amendment was a sensible solution to the problem.

Mr RUSHTON: As a doubt has been created by the member for Cockburn I ask members to accept the clause as it appears in the Bill.

Mr TAYLOR: I am afraid I have changed my mind again. The argument put forward by the member for Swan was fairly cogent, and the Minister supported it as he believed it to be correct. I was thinking about the matter whilst on my feet and although I had some doubts about the result of the amendment, I am not now sure that I was correct. Two to one appears to be a better proposition, and it may well be in the Minister's interests to accept the amendment as it is apparent he has not known what appears in the Bill.

Mr Young: The Minister is trying to help you and you will not let him.

Mr TAYLOR: What other role does the Opposition have when on so many occasions the Minister has not been able to tell us what the provisions mean?

Mr Young: You are now playing politics where a moment ago you were trying to be helpful.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): Order! Would the member please address the Chair.

Mr TAYLOR: If the suggestion is that I am playing politics, I am prepared to accept it. What function do we have as an Opposition if we are not here to ensure that legislation is correct when it passes? It is no good members opposite saying we are playing politics and being silly.

Mr Young: You are not doing that at the moment! You had an undertaking from the Minister that he would agree with the amendment of the member for Swan. Then, because you are the Opposition spokesman, he said he would agree with you and review the situation. Now you are trying to change your mind again.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Cockburn is on his feet and will address the Chair.

Mr TAYLOR: I have no objection whatsoever to the interjection of the member for Scarborough. What he is saying is that the Opposition should be nice and, having pointed out to the Minister that he may be wrong in at least one area, we should then sit down and say, "All right, you put the legislation through." This is a very important measure.

Mr Young: Yes, and you should not be mucking around with it. You have had two assurances from the Minister, and you are not happy with either of them.

Mr TAYLOR: We have had that many assurances; that is the point. It is not just one matter alone. One clause which has already gone through is in respect of the powers of the corporation, and they can be very, very wide. The clause to which we are referring and the question of whether it should be "Joondalup" or "Joondalup Centre" make up only part of the whole question. If the suggestion is that after one or two speeches we should sit down and allow the Government to have its way, then that is not the way it is done, it never has been, and it will not be tonight.

Mr Young: The Minister has said he will agree with you. What more do you want?

Mr TAYLOR: I want him to be frank, and if he does not know what is in his Bill he has no right to ask the Chamber to vote on it, nor has he the right to forward it to another place for acceptance. He should report progress as any responsible Minister would do.

The Minister does not know the answer in respect of this clause, and he has admitted it. Had I not risen to my feet the amendment would have been passed. After I rose the Minister changed his mind again. He still has not defined "Joondalup", and I suggest he reports progress.

Mr RUSHTON: I have no wish to involve myself in the nonsense created by the member for Cockburn. I will leave the Bill as it is, and we can proceed from there.

Mr HARTREY: The member for Swan proposed a reasonable amendment to clarify clause 27. "Joondalup Centre" is defined in the Bill, and part of the Bill is devoted to it. No part of the Bill is devoted simply to "Joondalup". Therefore it might be appropriate for the member for Cockburn to move for the insertion of the definition of "Joondalup" to show it is intended to mean something different from "Joondalup Centre".

"Joondalup" need not necessarily mean the same thing as "Joondalup Centre"; but at the moment in this Bill "Joondalup Centre" means something because it is defined, while "Joondalup" means nothing at all. It is simply a geographical expression, and has no legal significance whatever. I suggest for the time being we

accept what the Minister accepted to begin with: the reasonable and useful amendment suggested by the member for Swan. If it is desired by the member for Cockburn or anyone else to distinguish between the expression "Joondalup" and the expression "Joondalup Centre" the way to do that is to define "Joondalup" in the definitions clause.

If there is no reason for distinguishing between the two concepts, then let us accept the concept that we have already: Joondalup centre. But if there is a reason for distinguishing the two concepts, then let us distinguish them by defining both expressions. At the moment we seem to be wandering off the track, and I suggest we accept the member for Swan's amendment. If the member for Cockburn still has misgivings, I suggest progress be reported.

Mr RUSHTON: There is no need to wander off the track. Clause 27 refers to the appointment of committees to advise on any aspect of the development of Joondalup. Joondalup is a particular area, and it can have influence on the area in question. That is the reason the clause is worded in this way.

In the first instance as a result of the plausible argument of the member for Swan—

Mr Skidmore: That is a shocking description. You almost make me feel as if I was conning the Chamber.

Mr RUSHTON: The member is very plausible from time to time, and at first I was prepared to accept his amendment. However, I now see good reason for the wording of this clause and I ask the Chamber to accept it as it stands.

Mr SKIDMORE: I ask members to accept my amendment. The Minister stated that the clause as it stands will enable the corporation to look at the broad concept of Joondalup. I suggest that if the Minister for Works were to open the map he has in his hand and look at the postal area of Joondalup he may find it encompasses all the area of land known as the Joondalup centre, or it may not encompass all of that land. I am not sure whether it does or not, but that is certainly a proposition we could look at. Residents of the area might feel that the area of Joondalup finishes at Brown Street and does not include land north of the Wanneroo townsite; but all this is purely a geographical exercise.

I take the Minister to task for saying that the clause gives a discretion to the corporation. That discretion does not exist, because clause 25 (2) says that nothing in clause 25 shall be construed as authorising the disregard by the corporation of any Act or other law in force. In my opinion it is implicit in that provision that the corporation shall deal only with those things contained within the definition of "Joondalup Centre". The power to

do anything else has been specifically removed by virtue of clause 25(2).

I believe the Committee should examine the loose term "Joondalup". I can well understand the perplexity of the member for Cockburn; he has asked the Minister on three separate occasions, "What does this mean as it relates to the powers of the corporation?" On the one hand the Bill is establishing a corporation with power to do certain things, yet three or four clauses later this power is removed, and given to an advisory committee. It is impossible for the Opposition to accept this legislation in its present form, because it is riddled with holes and ambiguity. As the member for Boulder-Dundas pointed out, while we as legislators may understand what it means, in practice the meaning of the legislation will be resolved by the lawyers and judges to whom these matters will be referred. My amendment will clarify this clause.

It is obvious that "Joondalup" refers to the Joondalup centre, and the Committee should accept my amendment which will provide for a simple and concise definition. I do not take anything away from the objections raised by the member for Cockburn in regard to the poor drafting of the Bill; it is badly written, drafted, and expressed, and obviously lacks in intent. It should not be allowed to pass onto the Statute book without clarification. The Minister may smile, but I believe what has been said tonight by the member for Cockburn and myself is quite true. If my amendment will remove one small area of conflict it should be agreed to; it is a sensible approach to overcoming an obvious discrepancy.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 28: Power of delegation—

Mr SKIDMORE: I rise again to quarrel with the Minister on this badly drafted piece of legislation. It takes a great deal of time for officers of his department to bring forward a Bill such as this, which will give certain powers to a corporation to administer and look after the affairs of the Joondalup centre, and establish the infrastructure and facilities. The corporation is given specific and wide powers in previous clauses of the Bill.

But under clause 28 what do we find? We find the corporation may delegate these powers to any member, officer, or committee of the corporation. Let us assume we agree to this clause. Under clause 27, we have given the corporation the power to appoint committees to investigate the development of "Joondalup". The sheer stupidity of this badly drafted clause of the Bill is that we will allow these committees to go outside their charter and deal with an area not previously referred to in the Bill. In my candid opinion, the intention was that the committees should

investigate the development of the Joondalup centre, but because the Committee did not accept my amendment to clause 27, an anomaly will be perpetuated.

Let us look at the other side of the penny. The corporation will be permitted to delegate the determination of any issue to a member of the corporation. Let us consider the example of an issue which requires a degree of negotiation, such as the alienation of a piece of land. This would require the discretion of the member engaged in the negotiations.

Under this clause he will have the power in his own right to make the owner an offer of, say, \$5 000. In addition, if the owner demands \$6 000, the member of the corporation to whom the responsibility has been delegated will have the power to pay the owner his \$6 000; whether or not the Minister or the corporation like it, he will be given this power. If I am wrong in my interpretation of this Clause, I hope the Minister will spell out clearly and concisely what it means.

This is an obvious inconsistency in the drafting of the Bill; in fact, I reiterate that the Bill is riddled with ambiguities and inconsistencies. The corporation is the body which should determine policy, and power should be delegated to a member of the corporation only in the most clear and concise terms so that there will be no misunderstanding.

If that is the intention why give it to the member? Why give it to the committee? I imagine that a contribution from the corporation in this regard would be given on the assumption that there would be a negotiable area around which either the member of the corporation or the committee would say to the people concerned, "What is bugging you? Why can we not agree?" If that is so, it must be obvious that there must be restrictions on the member or the committee to report to the corporation on the deliberations. If this is so, why send it to the committee in the first place? It is either clear and concise or it is not.

If there is a question of negotiability on whatever terms necessary to achieve the objectives of the corporation, why not just call in to the corporation those people concerned and discuss it at corporation level? Why give it to a member to consider if he must report back if there is an area of disputation? How damned stupid can one get with legislation?

I am not blaming the Minister. Whoever drew up this legislation should see one of those people who will shortly be discussed in this Chamber with regard to what they have between their ears. These people are putting forward puerile and infantile legislation that we have to accept. I do not accept it. I believe we should delete clause 28 because it is an

abomination and is not needed. It delegates unnecessary power to people who can act only to a certain extent and then must report back. Who in the name of hell wants that sort of legislation? This provision will give nothing whatsoever to the credence of the corporation and I believe the best interest of all concerned would be served by deleting clause 28.

I commend to members of this Chamber the defeat of clause 28 because it is stupid in the extreme to delegate a power and then not to impose restrictions on that power to ensure it is not abused. If a member or the committee is determined not to have what the corporation has suggested, the corporation would be the loser. I suggest to the Committee that it does not agree with clause 28.

Mr HARTREY: One of the lamentable deficiencies of this unfortunate proposed law is that in neither clause 27 nor clause 28 is the meaning of the word "committee" made clear. A committee means any number of persons more than one appointed to perform any particular function. Therefore, the committee need not include any members of the corporation itself. I take it that the committees referred to in clause 27 could consist entirely of persons who are not members of the corporation. That is not at all inconsistent with subclause (2) which says that each committee appointed by the corporation—not from the corporation—shall report to the corporation on its activities at such time as the corporation directs.

Where would be the sense of a corporation delegating any of its powers to a committee which did not consist of any of its members and then proceeding under the provisions of subclause (2) of clause 28 to exercise the same powers concurrently with the committee to which it has delegated those powers? Where does this nonsense stop? Does it stop at all?

It is quite possible for the corporation to appoint a committee consisting of non-members of the corporation, to delegate to it certain functions, then to delegate all its functions to one member of itself and then to lie down and go to sleep for six months or concurrently not to sleep at all but to exercise the same functions it delegated in the first instance to a committee and in the second instance to an individual. What is the meaning of it? What is to be gained by doing this astonishing thing? What is the object of this ridiculous clause?

I am not being sarcastic. I am not trying to be unpleasant. I am trying to explain that the English language has been absolutely butchered by the draftsman. Why I do not know. Perhaps he has forgotten how to speak English or perhaps he should go back to school, although school

is the last place to learn English nowadays. If one wants to learn to spell one ought to obtain a spelling book. If one wants to know what this clause is all about one needs to know something about the English language. I do not know enough about the English language to know what in the name of God clause 28 will convey from the point of view of a proposed piece of legislation.

Mr RUSHTON: I should like to indicate to the member for Swan and the member for Boulder-Dundas that my experience to date with the various committees which have been working towards the creation of this legislation leads me to believe that clause 28 is necessary for them to be able to get the various works done. Opposition members have referred to the need for a bigger corporation.

Mr Hartrey: The legislation is probably well intentioned.

Mr RUSHTON: It is certainly well intentioned. I cannot see any problem with it. I see a need for what is intended and I cannot see any confusion about the matter. I think it will enable the corporation to do what is intended. The Opposition's point of view is that it should press for a bigger corporation.

Mr Taylor: We have requested it. We have not pressed and we have not moved an amendment.

Mr RUSHTON: The Opposition was proposing previously a corporation of nine. It has suggested seven on this corporation.

Mr Taylor: We asked for seven. We have not pressed and we have not moved an amendment. I think your language ought to be a little more circumspect.

Mr RUSHTON: One item that needs to be considered at the same time as this is that relating to the corporation being required to bring down a plan for the approval of the Minister. The other one is that the corporation is under the direction of the Minister.

There can be no fear there will be any misconduct by the corporation. There will be a continuing and constant relationship between the Minister and the corporation in respect of planning. The corporation is required to bring down a plan, to which the Minister has to give approval, and it will have to abide by that plan.

Mr SKIDMORE: The arguments put forward by the Minister are untenable. If he is trying to convince me that this is a good provision he will have to do better than he has done. When we look at what clause 28 purports to do we can only read it as laymen, like myself with very limited legal training, and accept that the corporation has said that it needs the authority to delegate its powers to a committee.

I would point out that such delegation of power has been agreed to under the provision in clause 11, because under paragraph (b) one object of the corporation is to co-operate with other public authorities and persons in carrying out its functions. I suppose the "persons" mentioned in that paragraph will comprise members of committees which will be set up to advise the corporation on how the best interests of the Joondalup centre can be furthered.

Having given such power to the corporation, the provision in clause 28 ensures that what has been provided in the first place—the delegation of power—can be withdrawn. In effect what clause 28 provides is this: notwithstanding the provision in clause 11 (b) it will be rewritten, and the authority to delegate the powers of the corporation to a committee will be included.

The most remarkable procedure is set out in clause 28 (2) which states—

No delegation under subsection (1) prevents the exercise by the Corporation of any of its functions, powers or duties.

On the one hand we are giving the corporation the right to delegate its powers to a committee; but in subclause (2) we are providing that the power to delegate can be taken from the corporation, because the Minister might not like what the corporation does. The intent of the provision is ridiculous. The draftsman might believe that he has spelt out what is required, but the provision in clause 28 (3) is even worse, because under it the corporation may by resolution revoke a delegation of power under subclause (1).

Clause 28 contains a lot of gobbledygook. It spells out nothing in substance; it adds nothing to the legislation; and in fact it clutters up the Bill with many useless words.

The provision in clause 11 (b) is precise and concise in setting out the powers of the corporation. It provides that a corporation may co-opt other persons in the carrying out of its functions.

The argument of the Minister that the corporation needs the provisions set out in clause 28, to enable the corporation to appoint committees to advise it, cannot be substantiated, because there is nothing to prevent the corporation from doing that. Clause 28 makes a laughing stock of the functions of the corporation.

Whether or not members on this side of the Chamber want to increase the corporation to seven or nine members is beside the point. We have not denigrated the powers of the corporation, and we have not tried to make its efforts ineffectual. The increasing of the membership from five to nine will not take away any of its powers, such as its powers set out in clause 11 (b).

When we turn to clause 28 we see a ridiculous situation, because the power already given is restated in a different way. Having given the corporation the power under clause 28 (1), that power is taken from it under clause 28 (2). Clause 28 (3) makes sure that any delegated power can be taken away.

Clause 28 could be deleted altogether, and such deletion will not reduce the powers of the corporation, nor will it nullify the objectives of the corporation in promoting the development of the Joondalup centre. Furthermore its deletion will not take away the rights of the people who have an inherent interest in the area. The deletion of the clause will make the legislation more credible to the people I represent. I am not prepared to add my name to what is supposed to be a valid and concise piece of legislation, when in fact it is not. For those reasons I say clause 28 should be deleted.

Mr HARTREY: I hold the same view as that of the member for Swan. I have remarked before that the person who drafts a Bill should know what he wants to provide. On this occasion if he tells me what he wants to say, I will set it out in writing for him.

If we have a piece of legislation which makes confusion worse confounded the first problem to be overcome is what does the person who drafted it intend to say and what is he aiming at. The Minister has not told us, and I do not think he can because there is nothing in the clause which makes sense.

Here we have a corporation created by Statute which has the authority to delegate all its powers to a committee which does not consist of any of its members. Simultaneously it can exercise the same powers itself, or it can delegate its powers to one member. So, we have three legislating authorities. Firstly, we have a member of the corporation invested with the powers of the corporation; secondly, we have the rest of the members of the corporation retaining all its powers; and thirdly, we have a committee, not comprising any members of the corporation, being given the same powers.

It is ridiculous to suggest that these three bodies will all exercise their powers in the same way. So we have three power-exercising bodies exercising their respective powers in different ways.

For goodness sake, what do we gain by that? If we want confusion worse confounded, we certainly have it. Is the Minister trying to bamboozle us, because that is what he is doing? What is the good of creating chaos? Will the Minister please tell me what he expects to achieve by this disastrous clause 28? Are we here to waste our time talking nonsense?

Mr RUSHTON: I did not intend to rise again as I have already explained the position. It is quite clear that the corporation will delegate these functions, but by

delegating them it will not lose its own powers. It has the power to revoke those delegations when it feels it should do so. That is what the clause states and it entails no problems.

Mr Skidmore called attention to the state of the Committee.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Mr SKIDMORE: I have already referred the Minister to the powers of the corporation under clause 11(b). I have indicated the chaotic conditions which will exist if he persists in including clause 28 in the Bill. Without debating the situation I would now like to refer the Minister to clause 36, which again will overcome some of the objections on which he is obviously hanging his hat. It does not need any stretch of the imagination to realise that clause 28 is redundant because it does nothing whatever. The power exists to co-opt committees, persons, and statutory authorities under clause 11(d) and under clause 36 is the power to co-opt services of an administrative, professional, technical, or other nature, and to second any person upon such terms as may be agreed upon. Therefore, in all instances the Minister's objections have been overcome. Clause 28 does nothing of importance and should be deleted because the Minister's objections are already catered for.

If the Minister reads the Bill further he may find other provisions which overcome his objections. However, this is my last opportunity to speak on this clause, which I believe should be defeated.

Mr RUSHTON: I do not need to give any further explanation. The purpose of clause 36 is to co-opt and second staff from the Public Service, and has no relationship to the subject under discussion. It appears the honourable member is trying to make nonsense of the situation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 29 put and passed.

Clause 30: Contracts etc. subject to approval—

Mr DAVIES: This is not an unusual clause except in the context that this corporation was to be a board of directors, a co-ordinating body, and not an initiating or spending organisation. However, under clause 30 the corporation can let contracts of up to \$49 999 without the Minister's approval. Therefore I gather it will be something more than a co-ordinating body. In view of what has been said by other speakers, I gather it will be something of a "Big Brother" organisation.

I did not speak on the previous clause relating to the fact that the corporation can acquire land, and there are other things it can do under later provisions in the Bill. I just draw attention to the fact that this will be more than a co-ordinating

body. I cannot imagine how it would spend \$50 000, and the Minister did not enlighten us in this regard.

We have been told that a committee has been studying administrative and financial proposals, but nowhere in the Bill or in the Minister's introductory speech have we been told what the likely financing of this corporation will be or how much money will be involved. Surely if those three committees have been operating the Government should know by now just how much money will be spent. Has a feasibility study been done, or are we buying a pig in a poke and supporting another "Big Brother" organisation?

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Victoria Park raised the question of the corporation being one thing or another. Clause 30 sets out the power of the corporation to expend funds up to a maximum of \$50 000. It is customary to apply a limit to the amount which can be expended by bodies in their day-to-day functions.

When it is necessary to bring services to the area the developmental expenditure will be quite large. This is a task to which the corporation will give close attention and it will advise the Government on that aspect. It was thought that an amount of \$50 000 was reasonable, and it cannot be considered to be a large sum of money under present-day conditions.

The development of the Joondalup centre will involve expenditure in many ways. There will be a regional hospital, in which the member for Victoria Park has had a direct interest as the former Minister for Health. Those items may not be paid for by the corporation, but developed through the marshalling of services. I think the honourable member understands that the basic costs will be quite large. In the case of day-to-day expenditure, it is considered the corporation should have jurisdiction over items costing under \$50 000.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 31 to 40 put and passed.

Clause 41: Funds of the Corporation—

Mr DAVIES: This clause deals with finance, and I find the sketchy answer which the Minister gave to my last query to be quite unacceptable. I am able to read the clause quite clearly and I know what it is all about, but I thought I would give the Minister an opportunity to explain, in some greater detail, just what the corporation will cost the community.

For many years a hospital site has been approved for the area. When the Tonkin Government was in office there were a number of Press releases with regard to what was proposed in the area under discussion. The Minister has said that the corporation will have a board of directors, but he has not told us how much the corporation is likely to cost. Had the Minister done his homework he would have been able to give an estimate of running expenses and the cost of basic works.

Is this just an election gimmick? Does the Government believe it has reached the stage where it has to say something? It is of no use the Government saying that under the provisions of clause 31 the corporation will be able to borrow, beg, or steal funds, if we do not know how much will be involved. Are we buying a "Big Brother" organisation; are we buying a board of control or a board of directors; just what will the organisation do?

The powers of the corporation are loosely set out. We have been told it will be an overseeing organisation and that it will not take the place of the local authority. We accept all those things but we still do not know what the cost will be. Surely to goodness some basic accounting must have been carried out.

The Minister said the corporation will accept responsibility for head works, but here again he was airy fairy. If a hospital is to be constructed in the area new roads will be required. Just what expenditure will the corporation be responsible for? Will it accept the responsibility for all the head works associated with the construction of schools, parks, recreation centres, a civic centre, and a hospital? Will it accept full responsibility, or will it just do what it can as it goes along?

I do not believe there is any provision in the Estimates for money to be appropriated to the organisation. It certainly will not be able to operate without money because it will have the right to engage staff and do all manner of things.

It seems to me that the setting up of the corporation is just an election gimmick. If information concerning expenditure was available it would have been supplied to us. I find the present position to be unacceptable.

Mr RUSHTON: A feasibility study of the financial aspects has been carried out. It is considered there will be a surplus which will be included in general revenue at the end of the development. A cash flow will be generated from the development, as it takes place. The speed with which that money is generated will be dictated by the needs from time to time.

If the head works are to be carried out by the corporation, a far smaller sum will be injected into general revenue than will be the case if the normal functions of the other departments are to occur. The co-ordination between the two factors with regard to finances will be developed.

An extensive area will be developed for residential purposes, and that development will generate funds for the corporation. The corporation will have the power to borrow money towards development.

The feasibility studies carried out to date show funds will be generated from the development. I cannot project the amount of the surplus because it will vary

depending on the degree to which the corporation is involved in the head works, and the development of other facilities.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 42 to 50 put and passed.

Clause 51: Winding up of Corporation—

Mr TAYLOR: This clause refers to the winding up of the corporation. The Minister has made it plain that the corporation will be a temporary organisation.

The Opposition has been at pains to try to find out from the Minister how long that task is likely to take, bearing in mind he is not able to tell us just what powers the corporation will have. I would like the Minister to comment on clause 51, which says—

51. When, in the opinion of the Corporation, it has substantially fulfilled its objects, it shall advise the Minister accordingly and the Corporation shall be wound up in accordance with such directions as the Governor shall approve.

As I see it, that does not mean the Minister or the Government can wind up the corporation. It means the corporation exists as long as the corporation wants to exist, subject to two things: firstly, it can be dismissed for inability, inefficiency or misbehaviour; and secondly, it is appointed for a four-year term which can be extended and at least three of the members could keep it going as long as they saw fit.

Clause 38 specifically requires the corporation to keep the plan under review from time to time—which seems to imply it will keep going for some time—and if requested by the Minister it shall review the plan completely. It must also submit to the Minister for approval any proposal for a significant or substantial variation, amplification, or revocation of the plan considered desirable or necessary as the result of any review.

With that requirement on the corporation, we find in clause 41 the corporation cannot be wound up by the Minister unless it says it has done its job. That seems to be an unusual situation. It is the only instance I can think of where a body is set up by the Government but it has the final say as to when its term of office will end.

Mr RUSHTON: I refer the honourable member to clause 26, which reads in part—

26. (1) Without prejudice to any provision of this Act requiring the consent of the Minister to be obtained for anything to be done by the Corporation, the Minister may give directions to it restricting the exercise by it of any of its powers under this Act or requiring the Corporation to exercise any of those powers in any manner specified in the directions.

Clause put and passed.

**Clause 52: Power to make by-laws—**

Mr DAVIES: I do not think we need to give the corporation the right to make by-laws. Clause 25 says it cannot do anything which is inconsistent with any Act. Clause 40 specifically states that the corporation shall not do anything inconsistent with the Local Government Act, the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, and the Town Planning and Development Act.

We have been told the corporation will be a type of board of directors which will get people together and show them the way to go. As there is specific mention of the Acts which could cause concern, I do not think there is any need for the corporation to have the power to make by-laws. All kinds of things could happen which are not in accordance with what the Minister said, but if this clause is passed it will strengthen our opinion that the corporation will become a "Big Brother" organisation.

Mr RUSHTON: The corporation will not intrude upon the powers of the local authority or any other authority, but it may from time to time need power to make by-laws relating to the conduct of the centre. That is the purpose of clause 52—to allow for necessary by-laws from time to time in the carrying out of the management of the centre.

Clause put and passed.

**Schedule—**

Mr TAYLOR: The powers of the corporation contained in the legislation refer largely to the schedule, which defines the area of land. In the light of clause 38, under which the corporation must keep the plan under review, is it possible for the schedule to be changed from time to time if the Government of the day considers it necessary, so that the provisions in the Bill would apply to any new area which may be defined in the schedule?

Mr RUSHTON: If there is to be an amendment to the schedule the Chamber will be able to make its comments upon such amendment when it comes before the Parliament in due course.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

**Report**

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

**As to Third Reading**

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) [10.48 p.m.]: I move—

That leave be granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Question put and passed; leave granted.

**Third Reading**

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning), and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 10.49 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 13th October, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS (3): ON NOTICE**

**1. PRE-PRIMARY CENTRES**

*North Province*

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Education:

**(1) In North Province—**

- (a) what pre-primary centres have been constructed for the Education Department;
- (b) what pre-primary centres have been formally taken over by the department;
- (c) what provision is made for the development of pre-primary centres in the financial year 1976-1977; and
- (d) what forward planning decisions have been made in respect to pre-primary education generally?

(2) Specifically, in the absence of any allocation of funds in the General Loan Fund Estimates of Expenditure for the construction of a permanent structure, is it proposed to erect a transportable pre-primary centre at the Derby District high school for the commencement of the 1977 school year?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) (a) Karratha, Double Unit;
- (b) Dampier, Karratha, Tom Price I, Tom Price II, Wickham—operating in temporary primary school premises;
- (c) nil;
- (d) pre-primary centres will be provided as part of Stage I of all new primary schools. Pre-primary facilities will be provided at established schools according to need and the availability of funds.

(2) Yes.