

Sir CHARLES COURT: I wish to join with the Deputy Leader of the Country Party to make it clearly understood that we are opposed to the Bill, and this of course is the most important clause in it.

I am also disappointed that the Minister persisted in going into Committee on this Bill today. We endeavoured to co-operate by dealing with it today after getting notice of it only last Tuesday.

Mr. Taylor: There was no intimation to me that you wished a longer time before the debate was resumed. I hope you are being fair.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am being fair. We have not had much time to contact many people.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Well sit down, and we will report progress.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I thank the Premier. That is the best news we have had today.

Mr. Graham: If you sat down more often we would make more progress.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Harman.

House adjourned at 6.02 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 15th August, 1972

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

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE FORCE

Inquiry: Press Report

The HON. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) What was the reaction of the Minister to the Press article which appeared in today's issue of *The West Australian* and which reported that the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party will seek an inquiry pertaining to certain conditions in the Western Australian Police Force?
- (2) Is he not disappointed at the insinuation contained in the article which suggests that perhaps the right type of men are not joining the Police Force, and the present training methods are not achieving the desired standard to enable the police to deal with their duties efficiently without antagonising the public—which I believe is not the case?

- (3) Does he intend to agree to the inquiry?
- (4) Is there any other comment he considers he should make?

The HON. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) to (4) As this question is based on a newspaper article I desire a little time to look into the matter. I therefore request that this question be placed on the notice paper.

QUESTIONS (19): ON NOTICE

1. INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Employment Effect

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Will the Minister give details of the extent to which employment was affected by the recent industrial dispute involving the metal trades?
- (2) Is it correct, as has been reported, that contracts available to Western Australian steel firms have been lost as a consequence of the dispute?
- (3) Is it correct that as a consequence of the dispute, certain major construction projects have been structurally re-designed in concrete in place of steel, to the detriment of the engineering and steel industries in this State?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Man days lost in the Metal and Engineering Industry due to work stoppages connected with a reduction of over award payments were:—

Date of Work Stoppage	Man Days Lost
7/7/1972—11/7/1972	962.5
17/7/1972—18/7/1972	525
24/7/1972—25/7/1972	107.5
25/7/1972—31/7/1972	3,150
1/8/1972— 5/8/1972	3,500
6/8/1972— 8/8/1972	2,040
	<hr/> 10,285

- (2) and (3) No information has been given to the Department of Labour although there has been some reference in the press media along these lines.

2.

HEALTH

Unregistered Chiropractors

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that in a recent court case in Perth, a person had been calling himself and practising as a chiropractor without being registered?

- (2) Will the Minister ensure that the Chiropractors Registration Board take action to preserve the integrity of those registered as chiropractors in this State, and thus expose those charlatans who are not registered?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) I am aware that a newspaper referred to a person as a chiropractor but I have no evidence that he himself used the title of chiropractor.
- (2) The Chiropractors Registration Board acts in these matters on receipt of a complaint.

3. MARKETING OF POTATOES ACT *Amending Legislation*

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to introduce amending legislation to the Marketing of Potatoes Act, 1946-1966?
- (2) If so, when is it likely to be brought to Parliament?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is hoped to introduce amendments as soon as practicable.

4. PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE *Trainee Medical Practitioners*

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) How many trainee medical practitioners were enrolled for the final year studies at the Perth Medical Centre for the year ended the 31st December, 1971?
- (2) How many are currently enrolled for their final year studies?
- (3) (a) Is it possible for a greater number of trainees to receive instruction; or
- (b) is the school filled to capacity with the numbers referred to in (1) and (2) above?
- (4) If the reply is "No" to (3) (a) and "Yes" to (3) (b), is it intended to increase the facilities to enable more students to participate?
- (5) If not, why, in view of the shortage of qualified personnel in this field?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) 50 students were enrolled in the sixth year of the course for the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine, Bachelor of Surgery at the University of Western Australia in 1971.

- (2) 54 students are enrolled in the final year in 1972.
- (3) It is anticipated that 55 students will graduate in 1973. Following the increase in the number of places in the second year of the course to 90 in 1970 it is estimated that 78 students will graduate in 1974 and approximately 80 per year thereafter.

- (4) Any increase beyond this figure is dependent on increased financial assistance being made available through the Australian Universities Commission.

- (5) The Minister for Education and Science has recently appointed a committee of the Australian University Commission "to inquire into and make recommendations on the need for new or expanded medical schools in the light of likely trends in the delivery of health care in Australia over the next twenty years".

In assessing the needs for medical practitioners in the future, the Committee will have regard to possible changes in the type of health services available to the community and in the nature of the training of medical students.

The findings of this Committee will have implications for any likely future increase in the number of places available in the courses.

5. UNIVERSITY

Employment of Gary Cook

The Hon. J. HEITMAN, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Did the Minister telephone the Guild of Undergraduates at the University of Western Australia asking them to suggest a job for Gary Cook at the University?
- (2) Did he suggest that Labor Party supporters would supply the funds to the Guild to pay Cook's wages?
- (3) (a) Is Cook employed officially by the Guild as Education Research Officer; and
- (b) if so, what is the subject matter of the research on which he is currently engaged?
- (4) What qualifications has he to do research for the Undergraduates?
- (5) If Cook is not engaged on research, what does he do at the University?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.

- (3) (a) Yes; employed as Assistant Education Research Officer.

(b) Research Project

The purpose of this research project is to go beyond the traditional surveys of student attitudes in order to present a more complete articulation of student needs. This will require an investigation of: the social function of the University and the extent to which this university approximates the (conventional) ideal of "the community of scholars"; the question of change in University structure and functions (what changes are required and possible strategies for attainment of these changes).

The study will take the form of critiques of the functioning of the major faculties and departments together with essays of a more general scope. It will be produced by groups of interested students and/or staff and will involve critical analysis of such interrelated topics as course content, course structures and teaching and assessment methods.

Other duties

Assisting Education Officer in student surveys by coding of raw survey data in order to facilitate processing of this data.

Also subject to directions by Education Officer in other areas of research.

- (4) Bachelor of Economics.
(5) See 3 (b).

6. **TRAFFIC**
Seat Belts

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many persons have received Traffic Infringement notices for non wearing of a seat belt in a motor vehicle from the 1st January to the 31st July, 1972?
- (2) How many of the persons referred to in (1) have elected to be dealt with by Court procedure?
- (3) Of the number of persons who elected to be dealt with by Court procedure, in how many cases was the penalty imposed—
- (a) \$20; and
- (b) a lesser amount?

- (4) As the number of road deaths to date this year is quoted to be 12 less than last year, does the Traffic Department attribute this slightly lesser number of deaths to compulsory wearing of seat belts?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) 837.
- (2) These records are not maintained but in the period 10/12/1971 to 30/6/72, thirty-nine persons were dealt with by the Courts and in July, 1972, thirty persons were dealt with by the Courts. However, this includes a number who were charged in conjunction with other traffic offences.
- (3) Separate records are not maintained, but generally the penalties imposed by the Courts have been less than \$20.
- (4) Whilst statistics are not available over a sufficient period to give conclusive proof, it is the opinion of Police Officers who attend traffic accidents that the wearing of seat belts has been one of the contributing factors to a lessening of fatal and serious injury.

In the period February 1972 to 30th June, 1972, of 1,830 people who were injured, 520 were wearing seat belts and 1310 were not. Of 114 fatal accidents, 24 wore seat belts, 71 did not, and 19 were unknown.

7.

MARGARINE

Quotas

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What specific action is being taken as a consequence of the Agricultural Council meeting, to alter the quotas for the manufacture of margarine?
- (2) Did the State Government seek an increase in the Western Australian quota?
- (3) If so—
- (a) has the actual quota been agreed upon; or
- (b) what method is being adopted to establish the quota?
- (4) Was consideration given to establishing quotas—
- (a) on total quantities of margarine manufactured; or
- (b) on quantities manufactured of—
- (i) table margarine;
- (ii) poly-unsaturated margarine;
- (iii) cooking margarine?

- (5) Was any consideration given to basing quotas on—
 - (a) content of Australian vegetable oil;
 - (b) content of imported vegetable oil; or
 - (c) content of materials other than (5) (a) and (b) above?
- (6) If so, with what result?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) to (6) Australian Agricultural Council agreed in principle that quotas of all States for table margarine be reviewed and that before increases in the quotas of table margarine are granted, a working group comprising State Directors of Agriculture meet to recommend on details.

8. METRIC SYSTEM

Introduction

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Who made the decision to introduce the Metric System of Weights and Measures into Australia?
- (2) How was the decision reached?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The decision to adopt the metric system in Australia was made by the Commonwealth Government and was announced by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister in January 1970.
- (2) The decision made was based on the unanimous recommendation made in May 1968 by a Senate Select Committee on the Metric System of Weights and Measures. Responsible Commonwealth and State Ministers in charge of Weights and Measures legislation in joint consultation agreed to adopt the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee.

9. FISHING

Esperance District

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

With commercial fishing increasing in the Esperance district, and numerous complaints of polluted beaches from fish refuse, what is the Government's intention to police this new industry?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

Funds have been made available for the appointment of a departmental officer to be stationed at

Esperance to police the provisions of the legislation administered by the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, including the Fisheries Act.

The officer appointed will take up residence before the end of the year.

In the meantime an experienced fisheries inspector is being sent to the district to carry out a special patrol and to investigate a number of matters.

The Director of Fisheries and The General Fisheries Advisory Committee will be visiting the district later this month to inform themselves on local conditions and to discuss problems with the local authority and other organisations and persons.

10. PERTH DENTAL HOSPITAL

Trainee Dentists

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) How many trainee dentists were enrolled for their final year studies at the Perth Dental Hospital for the year ended the 31st December, 1971?
- (2) How many are currently enrolled for their final year studies?
- (3) (a) Is it possible for a greater number of trainees to receive instruction; or
(b) is the school filled to capacity with the numbers referred to in (1) and (2) above?
- (4) If the reply is "No" to (3) (a) and "Yes" to (3) (b), is it intended to increase the facilities to enable more students to participate?
- (5) If not, why, in view of the shortage of qualified personnel in this field?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) 25 final year trainee dentists were enrolled in the Dental School within the University of W.A. in 1971.
- (2) There are 18 final year trainee dentists currently enrolled in the Dental School.
- (3) (a) Facilities exist for the enrolment of 25 graduates in each clinical year.
(b) Capacity was reached in 1971 but not in 1972.
- (4) There is a tendency for more first year students to enrol. There is a quota of 45 first year students and a maximum situation for 30

students in second year. As can be seen by answers (1) and (2) there has always been a fluctuation in the number of students in final year.

This fluctuation comes about because a large number of students from early years do not necessarily proceed to the end of the course. The current situation is that we are rapidly approaching saturation point and there is a definite plan to develop facilities to take more students. Statistics show that we will, before long, need to graduate 35 dentists per year to meet Western Australian requirements.

(5) Answered by (4).

11.

MILK

Transport: Report

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Director General of Transport been requested to report on the transportation of milk in Western Australia?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) has the report been submitted to the Government; and
 - (b) will the Minister Table a copy of that report?
- (3) Was the report, if any, prepared prior to the merger of Sunny West Dairy Co-operative and Westralian Farmers?
- (4) If no investigation was carried out, or report prepared, can the Minister explain the reasons?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) In February 1971 the Joint Dairy/Whole Milk Committee of the Farmers' Union of W.A. (Inc.) requested that the Director General of Transport arrange for a comprehensive study to be made into the transport system employed by the Milk Industry.
- (2) (a) A study was not undertaken.
- (b) Answered by (2) (a).
- (3) Answered by (2) (a).
- (4) The successful completion of the proposed research project depended on the co-operation and direct assistance from companies engaged in the industry, particularly in respect of the provision of data. Unfortunately some of the companies declined, for a variety of reasons, to participate at that time which meant that a study could not proceed.

12.

TRANSPORT

Review of Rural Problems

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has he received and studied a submission made to him by the Pastoralists and Graziers Association of W.A. (Inc.), dated the 26th June, 1972, entitled "A Submission on Rural Transport Problems"?
- (2) If so, does he agree that a complete review of the State's entire transport system would be timely?
- (3) Does he agree that the rural transport problems of Western Australia are complex, and might be best solved by a return to pre-Transport Act conditions?
- (4) Is it the intention of the Government to allow livestock road transport contractors to back load with any goods required for on-farm purposes?
- (5) Is the Government prepared to make concessions in any part of the State in the transport of wool?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Most transport problems are complex. A return to "Pre-Transport Act Conditions" would not necessarily improve the overall transport system; any proposal for change should be related to the results of in-depth research work.
- (4) Not unless it can be shown that existing transport facilities cannot cater for such goods.
- (5) The Transport Commission Act requires that, before granting licences or permits, consideration must first be given to existing services. In general railways have no difficulty in catering for the transport of wool. Concession freight rates have been agreed to in the lower Great Southern Area to develop the Port of Albany in the interests of decentralisation.

13.

TRANSPORT

North West Road Permits

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are permit fees charged by the Road and Air Transport Commission for goods transported by road from the rail heads at Geraldton, Meekatharra and Leonora?
- (2) If so, what are they?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes.

(2) The scale of fees is as follows:—

	miles	per ton
		\$
Up to 50	0.20
100	0.40
150	0.70
200	1.00
250	1.30
300	1.60
350	1.80
400	2.00
500	2.40
600	2.80
700	3.20
800	3.60
900	4.00
1,000	4.20
1,100	4.40
Over 1,100	4.50

14.

DAIRYING

Advisory Committee

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Government at any time received a request from interests in the dairying industry for the creation of an advisory committee, representative of the total industry, to report on and plan the needs of the industry?
- (2) If so, what action has been taken, and with what result?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Requests have been received from dairy interests for membership of the proposed Dairy Industry Authority.
- (2) It is intended to form an Advisory Committee, on which all interests will be represented, which will advise the Dairy Industry Authority.

15.

WILDFLOWERS

Protection

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In view of previous answers to questions asked by me indicating that the Government takes a serious view of wildflowers being exported from the State in quantity, and in view of the Minister's statement on the 9th September, 1971, that it was hoped to bring amendments considered necessary to the Native Flora Protection Act before the next session of Parliament, will the Government indicate at what stage during the current session a new Native Flora

Protection Act in a more effective form than the present one will be put before the House?

- (2) If the Government does not intend to bring in such an Act in the very near future, then in view of the approach of the wildflower season will it continue to take the emergency measures it indicated it was taking during the last wildflower season in order to attempt to preserve the State's heritage of wildflowers during the approaching season?
- (3) Will the Government indicate what emergency measures were taken during the last season, and what emergency measures it would propose to take during the current season?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The Native Flora Protection Act could not be amended to provide the required powers and it was found necessary to rewrite the whole Act. The Forests Department circularised all interested organisations, Government Departments, Shires and persons requesting suggestions for the preservation of Native Flora. It has taken some time to correlate the information and rewrite the Act and it is unlikely that new legislation will be submitted to this session of Parliament.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Measures taken last year—

Areas of wildflower picking were investigated. Persons connected with the export of wildflowers were interviewed.

Complaints were investigated. Returns of wildflowers picked, sold and exported were obtained under the provisions of the Forests Act.

These returns confirmed that the majority of the native flora exported was obtained from private property.

Measures to be taken this year—

Increased patrols of wildflower areas.

Forests Department officers have been directed to closely supervise the picking of Boronia, which will include weekend patrols.

The conditions on licenses to pick Boronia blossom and sprays have been considerably tightened up.

Returns will again be obtained. The quantities exported will again be investigated through the main export outlets.

16. **PLASTIC EGG CARTONS***Royalties*

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

What royalties are paid to the United States of America on the plastic foam egg cartons now in use in Western Australia?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

These cartons are manufactured locally by Gay-Dor Plastics Limited.

The Egg Board is not aware of the amount of royalty paid or if in fact royalty is paid.

17. **EDUCATION***Denmark High School*

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT, to the Leader of the House:

Would the Minister give details of all work completed recently at the Denmark High School under the contract let at \$186,000?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

No work related to the \$186,300 contract has been completed on site. The contractor anticipates commencement of the on site work on 24th August, 1972.

18. **PASTURE AND SOIL SURVEY***Gascoyne River Catchment Area*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my question on Thursday, the 3rd August, 1972, regarding the pastures and soil survey conducted in the Gascoyne River catchment area, will the Minister please Table the report?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:
No.

19. **GRAIN***Bulk Handling Facilities at Albany and Fremantle*

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What are the districts presently served by bulk handling facilities at Albany and Fremantle?
- (2) Are they expected to decrease for the Albany district once the new installations at Kwinana have been developed?

The Hon. W. R. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The approximate areas served by bulk handling facilities at Albany and Fremantle are as follows:—
Albany—

All country installations included in a line from Albany north to Wagin thence north-

east to Hyden, thence south through Newdegate, Pingrup and Ongerup to the coast.

Fremantle—

All country installations included in lines from the west coast north of Cuballing thence north-east to the east of Kweda thence east to the limit of production and from the west coast at approximately the northern boundary of Dandaragan Shire eastwards to the limit of production.

- (2) The Kwinana installation is not expected to affect the Albany district.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Claughton, and read a first time.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Railways) (5.08 p.m.): I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to make two minor amendments to the Government Railways Act: firstly, to section 24 dealing with provisions as to by-laws; and secondly, an amendment to section 52 dealing with railway servants responsible for damage.

Section 24 provides that a copy of all by-laws relating to matters affecting the public shall be painted upon or printed and affixed to boards, or printed in a book hung or attached thereto, and such boards shall be exhibited and maintained in a conspicuous place at every station at which tickets are sold: Provided that the validity of any by-law, or the liability of any person under any by-law, shall not be affected by any noncompliance with this provision. Any by-law published in the *Government Gazette* shall be evidence in all courts of the same having been duly made and exhibited under this Act.

This provision to exhibit a printed copy of the by-laws has been retained in the Act over the years but it is considered that no useful purpose will be served in continuing this practice. The obligation was a provision of the original Act in 1904, but having in mind that other Statutes contain no such requirement it is not readily seen why the Railways Commission should be committed to this unnecessary expense.

It has been the practice to exhibit these by-laws printed on a calico poster approximately three feet square, but due to vandalism and weather conditions their maintenance in presentable condition has become a problem. Very few members of the public bother to make any use of the posters to familiarise themselves with the railway by-laws as displayed. The obligation on the Railways Commission to continue this practice is no longer warranted and the purpose of this amendment is to delete from section 24 all reference to this requirement.

The second provision in this Bill is to amend section 52 to clarify the right of employees to appeal when they are held responsible for damage, and the loss occasioned by such damage is deducted from any wages, salary, or emolument due to such employees.

In past years it has been the practice for the Railways Appeal Board to hear and determine appeals against departmental decisions to recover losses by deduction under this section, prior to actual deductions being made. The procedure has been that, when the department advised an employee in writing that deductions from wages or salary would commence from a specific pay period, his right of appeal was recognised by the board and the appeal was heard.

In a recent case the board decided that it did not have jurisdiction to hear and determine the appeal until the full amount of the loss concerned was deducted. The reason advanced for arriving at this decision was that in the second paragraph of section 52 the term "is deducted" appears, whereas in actual fact no deduction had taken place at the time of lodging an appeal. In view of this decision it is evident that the board had some doubt regarding the practice previously followed.

It is customary to recover losses by deductions in instalments from employees' wages or salaries. This practice has been followed to obviate financial embarrassment which could result if amounts were recovered in one deduction, or where a sum in excess of an employee's fortnightly wage or salary may be involved.

In this particular instance which the board decided it did not have jurisdiction to hear, recoupment of the loss of \$38.20 was made at the rate of only \$2 a fortnight and it was therefore some considerable time before the appeal was finally heard and determined.

There is also the further point that protracted delays in the hearing of appeals are undesirable from the aspect of subsequent availability of vital witnesses and case preparation. In addition, under the present circumstances, an employee must make full restitution before gaining the right of appeal.

The Commissioner of Railways agrees that the present position is unsatisfactory and concurs in the amendment to section 52. The additional clauses to section 52, as proposed in the Bill, are to define clearly the time when an employee may appeal to the appeal board.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. N. McNeill.

CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [5.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend the existing Act to ensure that adequate facilities are established and maintained and will be available to the public at reasonable rates.

As members may know, the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act, 1956, was assented to on the 18th January, 1957, to enable the City of Perth, amongst other things, to control and regulate the parking or standing of vehicles in defined regions, and to provide and operate parking stations and parking facilities, including installation of parking meters.

Section 7 requires that all revenue received by the council and all charges, fines, and other penalties paid or recovered under or pursuant to the Act, shall be paid into the parking fund. It also directs that the council shall utilise the moneys in the fund for carrying out generally the objects and purposes of the Act, and particularly for the administration of the Parking Facilities Department, the acquisition and maintenance of equipment and the purchase and development of land and buildings for the establishment of parking stations.

The original Act has remained substantially unchanged, the only variations being amendments in 1969 and 1970 to section 8 to grant the City of Perth borrowing powers and to section 21 to extend the by-law making powers to allow the control of unauthorised parking on privately owned land.

The amendments now submitted arise after years of extensive experience in parking management by the City of Perth.

The Bill proposes to amend section 9 of the Act to enable the council to submit its annual report of activities including audited financial statements, within three months of the close of the financial year. The present requirement is that the report be submitted within two months and while the council has always complied with the Act, the accounts have not been audited because the city auditors are unable to certify the parking fund statements until audit of the whole of the council's financial transactions has been completed.

Section 15, at present, provides that no person shall establish a fee-paying parking station without the approval, in writing, of the council and confirmation of that approval by the Minister.

Unfortunately the section does not allow conditions relating to the standard, or the conduct of parking stations to be imposed. It is desirable that the City of Perth exercise complete authority, subject to ministerial superintendence, over the establishment and operation of parking facilities within the parking region—now comprising the whole of the municipality—with the objective of maximising the use of available parking space at an acceptable price level. It is proposed that the section be amended to widen the council's powers.

Subsection (1) of re-enacted section 15 will provide that no person, other than the council shall establish, provide, or operate a public car park for which a charge is made without a license in writing issued by the council. It will enable the council to grant or refuse a license or grant it for a period not exceeding 12 months on such conditions as the council thinks fit. These conditions would relate to such matters as conduct and management, construction and maintenance of a parking station or parking facility to a proper standard, erection of fences or barricades to ensure that motorists do not indiscriminately drive over footpaths and expose pedestrians to unnecessary danger, and the hours of operation.

The latter aspect is very important in relation to a site adjacent to a major traffic artery where vehicles entering or leaving the parking station could generate or worsen traffic flow in peak periods. To be able to regulate the hours of operation of a car park is regarded as a desirable feature. Likewise, because of the limited capacity of a road system, there is a need to determine whether the facility is for commuter parking or for short-term use.

Subsection (2) will empower the council with ministerial approval to fix the maximum scale of charges to be paid by persons using a parking station. To attract shoppers into the city centre and make best use of strategic sites, short-term parking charges should be kept to a reasonable level, and it is, therefore, considered desirable that the City of Perth should have control over the fees to be charged by private operators.

Subsections (3) and (4) will provide the right for an applicant who is refused a license or renewal of a license to conduct a parking station or parking facility; or if conditions imposed by the council are considered to be unsatisfactory, to appeal to the Minister, and the Minister, whose decision would be final and conclusive, may uphold reverse, or vary the decision of the council. This provision is a worth-while safeguard.

It should be a requirement that the council's approval be obtained for an assignment of a license so that the council is afforded the opportunity to draw to the attention of the assignee, the conditions which were originally imposed and are still required to be observed. New subsections (5) and (6) would ensure this is done.

Subsection (7) enables the cancellation of a license where any conditions are not complied with or observed. Ministerial approval would be necessary for cancellation to be effected.

Offences against this section are dealt with in subsection (8). It prescribes a maximum penalty of \$200, and the inclusion of a daily penalty of \$20 is considered necessary to deter a person from operating a parking facility, for which a charge is made, otherwise than in accordance with this Act and with the conditions set out in the license.

Subsection (9) is a re-enactment of a provision in the existing legislation and is designed to protect the operator of a car park established prior to the assent of the original Statute.

Section 21 relates to the by-law making powers. At present, subsection (1)(t) limits the maximum penalty for a breach of any by-law to \$40, but there is no authority for imposing a daily penalty. An escalating inflationary trend has been experienced since 1958 and an increase of the penalty to a maximum of \$100, with a maximum daily penalty of \$10, is justified.

The addition of paragraphs (Ua) and (Ub) would enable the council to make by-laws to prescribe fees for licenses or renewal of licenses should it so desire, and prescribe, by regulation, the operation of parking stations or parking facilities licensed under section 15 of the Act.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. J. L. Williams.

PERTH REGIONAL RAILWAY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 9th August.

THE HON L. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan) [5.23 p.m.]: This is a very short Bill. It consists of only five clauses and three schedules. The five clauses propose that the existing railway from Perth to Leighton be removed and that an underground railway be installed in Perth. Apart from this there are other interim measures including the construction of a new bus terminal and the removal of the Perth central railway station; the opening of a central bus station, together with the construction of other buildings there and in the vicinity; the creation of a new railway station east of Barrack Street; the creation of a number of bus terminals, and the electrification of a

whole new section of railway. In addition, the proposals include the construction of busways on what is at present the Perth-Fremantle railway line.

All that work which will cost about \$560,000,000, is contained in five clauses and the Minister occupied 2½ pages of *Hansard* when referring to the expenditure of the sum of \$560,000,000.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Are you sure that figure is right?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I cannot say whether I have the figure right and I am very pleased I was asked that question. I have been trying to work out what the figure should be and my only source of information is the Minister's second reading speech.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: On what page was that delivered?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: It was delivered in this House on the 1st June, 1972, and is to be found on page 1831.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think the honourable member can manage his own speech; he does not need any help.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: In answer to the comment made a moment ago by the Leader of the House I might say that I had some difficulty in attempting to work out just how much the State of Western Australia is proposing to spend. The Leader of the House asked me whether I had the figure right.

I can only refer the Leader of the House to the Minister's second reading speech, because my information comes from that source. I will, however, tell the House exactly how I calculated the figure to be \$560,000,000. In the first place, on page 1832, the Minister says that the cost of the first stage will be of the order of \$110,000,000.

The Minister then goes on to say that it will cost \$4,000,000 for the plans to be drawn up and that this will take place over the next four years. He also indicates that the \$4,000,000 is included in the \$110,000,000 already mentioned.

Later, on the same page the Minister says there will be certain interim measures which will cost \$14,600,000. I have, however, discounted this amount; I have not even added it to my total because these are described as interim measures and I have accordingly taken it as an acceptable proposal.

If the Government is going to spend over \$500,000,000, what is an extra \$14,000,000-odd, because it will be discontinued when the final measure takes effect? Therefore, as I have said, I have not included that figure of roughly \$15,000,000.

We come back, therefore, to the \$110,000,000 which appears on page 1832. We find that on page 1833 the Minister

says that the first stage of the present plan, including undergrounding of bus depots, will mean an outlay of \$450,000,000. So I assume this would mean a further expenditure of \$110,000,000. By adding \$110,000,000 to \$450,000,000 I get the figure to the \$560,000,000. I do think I was generous, however, in not including the interim expenditure of \$14,600,000 which would have increased the figure by that amount.

The Minister informs us that this estimate is in 1972 currency values. He makes that quite clear. I am now referring to the estimate of \$110,000,000.

I can well understand that the Leader of the House should have some doubt as to whether I am right in my figure, because he would have had the same doubt had he read the Minister's speech. I must frankly confess that I am puzzled and I hope the Minister will explain why on page 1832 he says the first stage will cost about \$110,000,000 and yet on page 1833 he says the first stage, including undergrounding of bus depots, will mean an outlay of \$450,000,000.

I have assumed that these sums refer to two separate operations of the same total work. If the \$110,000,000 is included in the \$450,000,000, then the total outlay will be \$450,000,000. But I have no means of knowing this, because I can only interpret the words that are before me in *Hansard*.

I hope I have answered the question which the Leader of the House raised; namely, whether or not I have the right figure. I must confess that, inadvertently, I may have obtained the wrong figure, but I have endeavoured to obtain it to the extent that I was informed on the subject. At any rate, even if we were to choose the lesser figure and say that the cost was to be \$450,000,000, to me that seems to be a great deal of money to authorise in a Bill with five clauses and three schedules, and the contents of which have been explained in about 2½ pages of *Hansard*.

I am aware that it is customary for people who have the spending of money—I am not necessarily referring to Governments; I am referring to any organisation that has the spending of many dollars—to be much faster about spending a great deal of money than in spending a small amount of money. It is well known that it takes any local authority, or any body, a much longer time to authorise the building of a bus shed or a bike shed than it does to authorise the expenditure of some hundreds of thousands of dollars for a new sewerage system, for example.

Perhaps this is because the mind begins to boggle a bit when it is necessary to consider the question of spending millions of dollars. The expenditure of large sums

of money is beyond the means of the ordinary man. He can well understand that if the expenditure of \$1,000 or \$2,000 is involved he may himself, at some time in his life, have to spend such an amount of money. Therefore he knows roughly the sacrifice entailed in earning \$1,000 or \$2,000 to spend on something, or, after he has borrowed it, earning that amount of money in order to repay the debt.

Therefore, the average man is more careful about spending a few dollars—or a few thousand dollars for that matter on a house, for example—than in spending some millions of dollars if he happens to be in some responsible position on a local authority that is in charge of spending large sums of money.

However, I wonder whether we should not exert even greater care when we are considering the spending of many millions of the State's money than we would if we were spending only a small amount. When we authorise the sum contained in the annual Supply Bill, or the Estimates for the Government, many millions of dollars are involved and, traditionally, Parliament may take considerable time discussing any subject whatsoever that is in any way related to the Supply Bill or the Estimates. This is because it is important to spend a great deal of time considering the details of the measure introduced.

I do not propose to spend a great deal of time on this measure, because I do not consider I am qualified to discuss the intricacies of the regional transport plan, but I do notice that it has already been considered by the Perth Regional Transport Study Group. First of all, there was the first regional transport study in 1970, which was referred to in the Minister's speech. A study group known as the Perth Regional Transport Study Group was then set up under the Director-General of Transport, who is chairman of the steering committee of that group.

That study group made a report to the Government, but it has decided to ignore that report. In his second reading speech the Minister said that the study group made certain recommendations concerning the underground railway, and that a start was to be made during the 1990s. The study group also proposed certain interim arrangements. On page 1831 of *Hansard* the Minister for Railways went on to say—

Such interim arrangements are considered unjustified by the Government . . .

The Government decided the proposals of the Perth Regional Transport Study Group—which the Government of Western Australia had set up—were unjustified, and it further decided that a start should be made immediately on the high capacity electric railway system so that the first stage, at any rate, would be completed—including three miles 32 chains of underground railway—within 10 years.

I do not quarrel with the figure of three miles 32 chains of underground railway, the amount of electrification, or anything else, but I would like to be satisfied that this project is based on a proper study. After all is said and done, the study group has made certain recommendations which the Government has decided it will not accept, and it has also made some further proposals. I would hope that before we embark on granting authority to spend over \$450,000,000 or \$560,000,000 expressed in 1972 currency, or any greater sum that that project will actually cost when the time comes to spend the money, we should have a proper study before us. We should have a proper report in which the Government is advised that this project will economically hold water.

I notice Mr. Logan has placed an amendment on the notice paper proposing just that; that is, there should be a feasibility study made by a competent independent authority. I think a feasibility study is one which examines and indicates whether something is economically feasible; whether in fact it is economically viable; whether it is a sound project to undertake from an economic point of view. Feasibility does not just mean that the project can be carried out from an engineering point of view. I gather that, from an engineering point of view, there is no doubt that an underground railway can be put through the metropolitan area of Perth; this is borne out by comments that have already been made. I imagine that this can be done at some cost, and perhaps it can be done within the estimate mentioned by the Minister.

However, a feasibility study means that someone should be commissioned—a proper person, body, company, firm, or anyone who is competent; whether it is an individual qualified experienced engineer, an economist, a body of people, or a commission—to study the economics of the project. A study should be made of the usage that is expected; whether the aim of the project should be one type of thing or another; whether the ways which lead into this railway will be the most productive; whether it will produce business that will make the railway a reasonable proposition based on the likely population growth, and all the other factors that enter into this proposition.

On the question of feasibility itself, I notice that Mr. Logan refers to a competent, independent authority, and I would like to stress that, because I believe it is most important. In making a feasibility study, one does not look to anyone who is personally interested in any way. Recently I heard that a feasibility study was conducted on the subject of abattoirs. I was rather astonished to read—perhaps I may be corrected if my information is wrong—that the persons who made the feasibility study were also interested as

possible builders of the abattoirs; at any rate, they were connected with them. To me, this is not a proper feasibility study at all. A feasibility study must be made by someone who will not make anything out of the project that is to be studied, other than the fee that will be paid for the study itself.

Therefore, I hope some notice will be taken of Mr. Logan's reference to a competent, independent authority. I believe that this is such a serious matter—that is, the expenditure of such a large amount of money—we should be properly armed as a Parliament with all the information that can be made available to us. Personally, I would not be happy to give my vote to a Bill which leaves me in such doubt as does the present one. So little has been said in the Bill and there is so much more that could have been said in the Minister's speech and which has not been said. There are so many details lacking that I believe more information should be made available to the Parliament.

Therefore I will give my support to the Bill only on the condition that it is suitably amended to provide that a feasibility study shall first be made. I am aware of one point that has been made; namely, that the Government has said—through the Minister in his second reading speech—it wants this Bill passed so that planning may proceed. I believe if the Bill is passed with the proposed amendment, planning may proceed. There will be nothing to stop planning from proceeding if the amendment is agreed to.

I notice the amendment refers only to the actual lifting of the railway lines and the carrying out of the physical work, but at the same time it does in fact encourage planning to proceed by requesting a feasibility study and a plan. I think that planning should proceed. It may well be that this plan is the right plan; I am not saying it is not. It may well be that this proposal will work out satisfactorily, but I would like that proved by an independent feasibility study and I hope the Government will see fit to proceed with its plans and examine exhaustively every aspect of this matter before committing the State to this expenditure.

One final point I feel constrained to mention is the reference to the source of the money. It appals me to think we may be proceeding too hastily with this proposal merely because the Commonwealth Government has shown some interest in urban transportation development. I quote the Minister's comments recorded on page 1833 of *Hansard* as follows:—

However, with the Commonwealth Government showing an interest in urban transportation development, it

is hoped that within the next three, four, or five years some finance might be forthcoming from that source.

We know from what source the Commonwealth Government obtains its money. It is not Commonwealth money at all; it is money that belongs to the taxpayers of the entire country. I recall that some years ago I heard a statement made by a prominent public servant concerning the Ord River dam proposal. This was made well before the Ord River dam project ever became a subject for concrete proposals; it was back in the 1950s. This public servant said that it was a good idea, because we could get Commonwealth money to assist in the financing of it.

I am not saying the Ord River dam project was not a good idea; I think it was. I think that which has resulted from the building of the Ord River dam will vindicate the project, even if it is used only to supply water to other areas. Nevertheless, to put forward as a reason that the project should go ahead merely because Commonwealth money was forthcoming to assist in the financing of it was, in my opinion, utterly fallacious. I say that because Commonwealth money is actually the taxpayers' money. In effect what we are really saying is that we should go ahead with this project because the taxpayers are paying for it. That is not a real reason, but that is the reason the Minister put forward.

I will give the Minister credit for the fact that he did not actually say he is putting this project forward simply because we are obtaining Commonwealth money; nevertheless, I believe a feasibility study would be in the best interests of the people of the State.

THE HON. F. R. WHITE (West) [5.45 p.m.]: I rise to support the remarks of both Mr. Logan and Mr. Medcalf. However, for very obvious reasons, in so doing I will confine my remarks to public documents, these being *Hansard*, the *Perth Regional Transport Study*, the Bill itself, and the tabled report of the Director-General of Transport (Mr. Knox).

Mr. Medcalf referred to the 2½ pages in *Hansard* as being the full content of the Minister's speech, but the Minister's speech in fact is practically in its entirety a recitation of the tabled Knox report. However, Mr. Dolan, the Minister, did have a few things of his own to say before actually reciting the report. In his introductory remarks he referred to the need for the Bill before us. He emphasised that the Bill required parliamentary approval so that planning and research could take place. He referred to the fact that the Bill allowed for the discontinuance of the section of the railway line from Leighton through to Barrack Street, the construction of a railway line from West Perth through to Victoria Park, and

the construction of a further section of railway line from the vicinity of Forrest Street, East Perth, to the East Perth terminal.

Mr. Medcalf stated that he was a little confused concerning the money to be spent on the first stage of the project, which is only part of that outlined on the map displayed in the corridor. I feel this map would have been better placed in this Chamber while the debate was taking place because the final project shows not only the railway line as proposed under this Bill, but also the northern link line which will run around the top of the city coming back to the western and eastern points of the proposed railway.

When referring to Mr. Knox's report, the Minister, in the fourth paragraph of his speech, said—

The Director-General of Transport is the chairman of the steering committee of the Perth Regional Transport Study Group. Mr. John Knox's report in the matter covers the details of both these proposals and in explaining the Bill to honourable members I shall lean heavily on that report.

The Minister certainly leaned heavily on that report because from that paragraph on he quoted the report almost word for word. I say "almost word for word" because in a couple of places he did add one or two words of his own, and in another place he used an entirely different word. I refer to page 1832 of *Hansard* the penultimate paragraph in the left-hand column of which reads—

This requires the removal of the railway east of Barrack Street and substitution of a bus transit system on the vacated rail right-of-way between Perth and Leighton.

If we refer to the report which Mr. Knox produced we find his words were—

This requires the removal of the railway west of Barrack Street and substitution of a bus transit system on the vacated rail right-of-way between Perth and Leighton.

Only one word is different in the portion of *Hansard* I quoted, but it indicates a direction opposite to that indicated in the report. I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Minister to this fact so that in his reply he can state whether an honest mistake has been made and he failed to detect the need to make a correction when reading the proof of his speech or whether the change from "west" in the report by Mr. Knox to "east" in his own speech was intentional.

Mr. Medcalf mentioned the amount quoted as being the cost of the first stage, this being the tearing up of the railway line from Leighton through to Barrack Street and converting it into a rapid bus system together with the appropriate

amenities, the building of a railway line from West Perth through to Victoria Park, and the building of another small section of line from Forrest Street, East Perth, to the East Perth terminal, plus other details such as the beautification of the vacated railway and the construction of a new station east of Barrack Street.

In his own words which were once again the concluding few paragraphs following the quote from the Knox report, the Minister stated—

By comparison with the proposed Nielsen bus-way plan, the total concept of which was estimated to cost \$435,000,000, the first stage of the present plan, including undergrounding bus depots, etc., will mean an outlay of \$450,000,000 on the part of the State.

I wish to refer briefly to *Hansard* of Wednesday, the 10th May, 1972, page 1451, where, in answer to a question asked in another place the Minister (Mr. Jamieson) stated that \$546,000,000 was the estimated amount, in 1972 currency value, required for expenditure on the scheme recommended under the Perth Regional Railway Bill. That is the Bill we are now discussing. A ministerial answer to a question stated that the figure was \$546,000,000, but the Minister introducing this debate stated the amount was \$450,000,000. Obviously it is understandable that a degree of confusion has occurred concerning the cost of the proposal under this Bill. The estimated figure was given in 1972 currency, but obviously if our costs continue to escalate at the estimated rate of 3½ per cent. per annum the figure will be much higher by the time the works are completed.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Another Sydney Opera House.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: In addition, if the works are put into operation, other works will be required at later stages. It will be necessary for the northern ring railway to be completed. Then, as has been mentioned, the existing railway lines to Midland and Armadale will have to be torn up and placed in completely new positions. Furthermore, other railway lines would have to be provided running north and south of the city.

These expenditures have not been mentioned, but if this Bill is approved in its present form, goodness knows what will be the final expenditure on all the proposals.

When making reference to the \$450,000,000, the Minister mentioned the Nielsen busway plan and he said that the total concept was estimated to cost \$435,000,000. The Nielsen busway plan is contained in the *Perth Regional Transport Study 1970* which, as members can ascertain by reference to the cover of the report is referred to as PERTS.

The report does not mention a figure of \$435,000,000 anywhere that I am able to determine. It does mention a figure of \$413,100,000, if I remember correctly. This represents only a minor difference, but here again incorrect figures are being given, naturally producing confusion in the mind of anyone debating this Bill. To verify my statement that the Nielsen concept would cost \$413,100,000 members need only refer to page X-25 of the PERTS report.

The Minister and Mr. Medcalf stated that the plan may possibly be financed to a degree by the Commonwealth, but that if it were not financed by the Commonwealth, we would not be any worse off than we are now; and the Minister indicated that possibly we may adopt the suggested proposals of the PERTS report, because in his speech he said—

Dr. Nielsen looked at a number of schemes and settled on the one at the price I mentioned because he thought it would be more acceptable. His plan would have covered a similar area, and it could have been financed as he suggested, if it was thought necessary.

The alternative methods of finance are mentioned on pages XI-9 to XI-12, and I would now like to refer to some of the proposals suggested to raise in the vicinity of a \$50,000,000 deficiency which would be needed to supply only part of the system; that is, for the upgrading of the bus fleets and the busway plan. He suggested four methods, one of these being the following which appears on page XI-10:—

It is suggested that a percentage of parking revenues be allocated to the M.R.T.A. from all parking throughout the Region, for which charges are made.

It is estimated that, if 10 per cent. of the total parking revenues derived from areas for which charges are made (including fines and other penalties) was allocated to the M.R.T.A., the income of the Authority from this source—in the first year—would be approximately \$120,000. With the expected expansion of private and public parking facilities throughout the Region, for which charges will be made, it is estimated that this amount would increase to \$1.5 million by 1989.

One source of acquiring additional revenue is to levy a charge against the parking revenues collected from both public and private sectors which are charging for this privilege.

The second proposal is a rezoning levy. It says—

During the next 20 years there will be a continuous demand to rezone land from rural to residential; from residential to high density residential; from rural to industrial; and from

residential to commercial. Each approval for rezoning by the Town Planning authorities bestows an unearned value increment on the owner of the land. At the same time, the rezoning predicts a more intensive future use of the land for some particular purpose, resulting in increased motor vehicle traffic or the need for additional public transport to serve the area. Under such conditions the owner of the land benefits from the rezoning, but the public must pay for the intensification of needs for transport and other services.

To relieve the public of this cost, it is suggested that a charge be made against the increased value of land that benefits from rezoning.

Mr. Nielsen then goes on in his report to say that this would yield an average of \$500,000 per annum.

A third proposal is to institute a development tax. The report states—

Once land is zoned, or rezoned for any purpose, it then rests with the owner to what extent the land will be developed within the class of use permitted. By developing the land completely, the owner imposes a maximum increment on the transport system, the cost of which increment must be borne by the public. A smaller degree of development involves a smaller transport increment, but again the cost must be borne by the public.

It is suggested, therefore, that a graduated development tax be levied on each industrial, multi-residential and commercial building permit using a formula which takes into account population, work-force and building density.

Later on he says—

Preliminary analysis suggests that the proposed development tax would generate \$500,000 annually during the next 20 years.

The fourth proposal is, in my opinion, a real beauty! It is a household transport levy. The report reads—

Transport development is the responsibility of all persons resident in the Perth Metropolitan Region. This is true whether it be improvements to existing roads, construction of new bridges, provision of adequate parking areas or the development of a modern public transport system. The total transport system is exactly that—a total system. This means that the more effectively the component parts operate, the better will be the total system.

It is suggested, therefore that a household transport levy be instituted in the Perth Metropolitan Region.

Later on, the report states—

A levy of \$2 per year on each household would generate \$400,000 annually under present conditions, and increase to \$800,000 annually by 1989.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: A popular levy!

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I personally think Mr. Nielsen must be politically naive to suggest four methods such as those to raise additional funds to the tune of approximately \$50,000,000 over a 20-year period. If the Minister did, in fact, suggest in his speech that these methods may be used to make up part of the deficiency, I think that he and his Government are politically naive.

I had not intended to speak for so long, but one aspect of the Bill before us is very important.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I wish to refer to another statement made by the Minister in his second reading speech. This statement also appears in the report of Mr. Knox. I quote from page 1831 of *Hansard*, as follows:—

The precise alignment of the underground can only be determined after an engineering study of alternative routes and of the best location from the point of view of public convenience in the long term with the need in mind that the total area eventually serviced by the underground ring—

I wish to emphasise the following words—
—should be sufficient to allow for unlimited central city expansion well into the next century.

Members will note the words, "Unlimited central city expansion." The PERTS report is a transport study up to and beyond the year 1989 and its findings are based, not on unlimited expansion of the Perth central area, but on restriction of the work force in the central area to 90,000 workers. As a result, the transportation plan in the PERTS report will satisfy not only the needs of the Perth central area but also the needs of future sub-regional centres. The central city work force is to be restricted to 90,000 and yet the Minister says we must allow for unlimited growth.

Mr. Dans, when speaking to the debate on the Supply Bill, made a statement that decentralisation is the problem of the Federal Government. This is an instance where decentralisation is the problem of the State Government and the State Government must determine at this point of time whether it intends to decentralise the central work force. The proposal before us is to bring an increasing number of workers into the city centre and not to decentralise for the betterment of the community as a whole, as the PERTS report proposes.

The fundamental concept of the PERTS report has been completely reversed by the proposals contained in the measure

before us. Instead of proposing decentralisation it proposes centralisation. It makes me wonder just what is happening to our planning process.

Any member who has studied the PERTS report will know that it contains a tremendous amount of information and must have cost a great deal to prepare. I do not know the figure, but I would guess it was somewhere in the region of tens of thousands of dollars. The Bill before us seems to me to have been prepared in a very short time, and the alternative transport proposals appear to have been rather hastily conceived and certainly without a great deal of expenditure. As members of this Chamber we are expected to approve something which appears to be a very hastily prepared concept of transport as against a very lengthy, costly, and well-prepared PERTS report. I wonder what is happening to the planning of our city when we see this haste and reversal of basic concepts taking place.

In my opinion the concepts contained in this Bill have been prepared in haste under the pretext that this Chamber and another place must grant approval to the Government so that basic planning and investigation can proceed—planning and investigation to the tune of \$4,000,000. In my short period in Parliament I know of no other instance where Parliament has been asked to approve the investigation of a project. Parliament has been asked to approve final proposals after they have been fully investigated, but to my knowledge it has not been asked to approve an investigation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The request for the Ritter report did not come to Parliament.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: This particular plan undoubtedly cost a lot of money and to my knowledge did not have to be approved by Parliament beforehand. Obviously the Government is worried about the fact that the investigation will cost \$4,000,000, and it is also worried about where the money is to come from.

The PERTS report refers to the fact that \$10,500,000 was put aside by the previous Government for the development of an underground busway where the present railway now stands. Apparently money is available for certain works to be undertaken. If the Government cannot put its hands on \$4,000,000 how on earth is it going to get the \$450,000,000, \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 needed for the envisaged project?

Before the tea suspension I referred to the fact that the PERTS report advocated methods by which deficits in its proposals could be made up. Those deficits would not be as many as the deficits contained in this proposal. The expenditure involved in the PERTS report was to take place over a period of

20 years. The expenditure necessary with the passage of this Bill would be over a much shorter period. Therefore, the annual deficit would be much greater under the provisions of this Bill. With a greater deficit, the Government would have to seek many different alternatives to make up the leeway. The Minister gave us no suggestions as to how these deficiencies could be made up.

Before approval can be given to this Bill we must have firm proposals—not only on the engineering and constructional aspects, but also on the finance involved. We must have firm proposals as to the ultimate costs and whether those costs will be met from revenue or other sources. Until such time as this information is forthcoming, I must support Mr. Logan's proposed amendment. If the amendment is passed the Government will have to present concrete and factual submissions so that we may decide this matter with wisdom.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [7.41 p.m.]: When I listened to the Minister's second reading speech and later read it, I was reminded of Professor Parkinson's law; the time taken to do jobs is directly disproportionate to their importance. The professor gave an example of a council which was gathered together to discuss two subjects. One was the establishment of a public convenience which was to cost about \$20,000 and about which all the members knew a great deal. It was discussed for about three hours and the council finally decided against the erection of the convenience. The other subject was the establishment of a nuclear power house about which nobody knew anything. This was discussed for about five minutes and the council agreed to the expenditure of \$200,000,000 on the power house. The same sort of thing applies to this legislation. Confusion surrounds the issue and we have a great paucity of information.

I would like to refer to a little of the recent history leading to the particular plan which is incorporated in the Bill. Part and parcel of the history is the concept of the corridor plan as suggested by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. When Mr. Graham was Minister for Town Planning the Ritter report, costing somewhere in the vicinity of \$8,000, was authorised. This report was designed to confuse and confound the proponents of the corridor plan.

A number of members attended a meeting at which we were supposed to receive an explanation of the Ritter proposals. I am sure many members shared my anger that, having given up a couple of hours, we received no explanation.

Running side by side with the corridor plan was the Nielson report, the PERTS programme which has been referred to at some length by Mr. White. Perhaps I am

a little more confused than most because as Mr. White has told us, the Minister's second reading speech is virtually the report of Mr. Knox, and yet, in Cabinet I listened to a very lucid dissertation on the PERTS report by Mr. Knox. I refer to the Cabinet before the present Cabinet—I thought Mr. Willesee was looking a little alarmed.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Just surprised!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I thought I should make the situation clear. Following that I was fortunate enough to be invited to attend the university where Professor Nielsen—who had been brought back for the purpose—explained the PERTS programme and everything associated with it. Mr. Knox was also present, as were a number of other people. At the time there was no doubt about the enthusiastic acceptance of that report. As a matter of fact, I spoke to a number of people after the meeting, including Mr. Ritter. I well remember his attitude as expressed to me at that time.

So, in a very short space of time we have seen wild fluctuations and changes. Recently a change occurred in the Ministry for Town Planning. I found on my desk within the last few days an invitation to yet another explanation, this time regarding the corridor plan. Are we going back to that? Has Mr. Graham's effort with Mr. Ritter run its course? I do not know, but it would appear to be so. I would not be surprised if that were the case, particularly after the fiasco of the explanation made by Mr. Ritter. If ever a town planner had a heaven-sent opportunity, that was it. Under what circumstances can a member of any other profession have handed to him on a plate virtually most of the members of Parliament with a Minister present to ensure fair play? Even so, such a muff was made of it that it really beggars description.

I am recounting these things because they provide the background against which we must view the Bill which is before us. We have seen a change in concept from a corridor plan to a group plan as a result of Mr. Tonkin, in his wisdom, seeing fit to reallocate the portfolio of Town Planning; at least that would appear to be the case. Maybe if it does not work out we will have another change. I would imagine that Mr. Davies is overloaded. I have a rough idea of how busy he could be, and I know he would be very busy indeed. It may well be that the portfolio of Town Planning will be reallocated to go with Housing or Local Government, which is the logical association. Will we have another change, and will Mr. Knox be asked to produce or to take under his wing yet another report?

All these matters are pertinent to the Bill, and we must bear them in mind when we consider it. Let us consider the

aspects which affect this matter. Firstly, we had a very detailed study which culminated in the corridor plan for Perth. On top of that we had the Nielsen report and the PERTS report, which are linked closely together. Then we had the Ritter report which merely confused the issue. Now we have this Bill which again overloads the issue. All these conflict, the one with the other.

Certainly the PERTS report was based on a 90,000 C.B.D. work force, and there is a valid argument for not coping with that figure on a temporary basis but, rather, going a step further as was proposed by Nielsen in the further expansion of his plan when he mentioned certain undergrounding. However, it would seem to me that insufficient information has been provided regarding why these steps should be jumped. Maybe it was expected that the sheer enormity of the figures would frighten us and reduce debate; but we have become accustomed to large figures. The PERTS report figures were, in all conscience, frightening enough, but these figures are even more frightening.

Is there good reason to jump the step which Professor Nielsen decided was the most logical to implement? We must bear in mind that the PERTS report contained about five alternatives, which worked out at a very high cost indeed. I address that remark to Mr. White through you, Mr. President. Professor Nielsen selected as the most logical figure—and it is the one upon which he elaborated—a C.B.D. work force of 90,000. There may be a valid reason for going beyond that figure and moving into the area which makes this Bill a necessity; but I do not believe we have been given logical, concise reasons for disregarding the PERTS report.

As I have said, I have heard the argument twice—once while listening to a dissertation given by Mr. Knox himself, and once on hearing a dissertation by Professor Nielsen. The matter was considered to be so important at the time that Cabinet decided that Professor Nielsen should return to make an explanation. So I view this Bill through a maze of mental confusion, because we already have a document in which well-worked-out alternatives are given and into which went a great deal of study. I refer to the PERTS report, which has been available long enough for a number of experts to consider and criticise it and come up with alternative suggestions. But suddenly out of the blue we get a complete change of plan.

The Minister may rise to his feet and say that this is not a complete change of plan and that if we proceed far enough with possible extensions of the PERTS report we will arrive at the same result. That may well be; but we have been given no explanation as to why we should jump all of the logical steps.

Dealing with the Bill for a moment, clause 3 states—

3. On a date to be proclaimed the scheduled railway shall cease to be operated, and on and from that date—

(a) the material comprising the scheduled railway or any portion of that material may be—

(iii) sold, disposed of, or otherwise dealt with; and

I assume that the schedule to the Bill describes that material, and it also describes the land. I want to know, as a specific question: Does this Bill empower the sale of the right-of-way which now compromises the railway easement? I think the Bill provides authority to sell that land if required, and I think this would be a very bad step indeed.

I do not think that any of us, in the light of technological advances over the last 50 years, could possibly guess what mode of transport might be in use in the next 50 years. But whatever mode of transport is used I have no doubt it will require easements of some form. Therefore, those we already have should be retained. Whether the future mode of transport be of a wheeled type on the surface or underground, whether it runs on a cushion of air on road or rail, or whether it runs on rubber or steel wheels on road or rail above or under the ground, easements will be still necessary. At least they will be highly desirable. So I certainly believe this land should not be sold at present.

The argument I have advanced will naturally make members aware of the fact that I am interested in this Bill only inasmuch as I want the proposed amendment of Mr. Logan to be passed. A large amount of money has been spent on reports up to date, and particularly on the report which I think was a complete waste of money; that is, Mr. Ritter's report. I said that before he commenced it and after he finished it, and in case members do not believe me, I am saying it again now.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: But that does not necessarily mean we believe you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think I have made my attitude clear enough.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I like your emphasis, but that does not mean you are necessarily right.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Well, I think I will be proved to be right. The Government has jumped into this proposal without giving us good reasons. This is simply a bright idea which has been put forward by Mr. Knox and accepted by the Minister. Some Minister's name will go down in history as a result of it. Nevertheless, insufficient reasons have been given to us.

Whilst I am aware that Mr. Medcalf mentioned my next point, I would like to mention it again. The reason that the Federal Government, in its anxiety about urban development, might see fit to provide money for this proposal is no justification whatsoever to jump into the project. The Commonwealth Government is not spending its own money, but yours, Mr. President, and mine. There is no such thing as Federal money any more than there is any such thing as State money or local government money. I am not sounding off on a new drum in this regard because I preached this for six years at every conference I attended where this idea was put forward by Federal Ministers.

It is the Australian taxpayers' money that is being spent, and you, Sir, and I must pay for it. Hence the reason for Budgets and Budget speeches—and that has some bearing on today; although it is not the only reason that today is a notable day; it is also the day on which the last war finished so far as I was concerned.

However, this matter has been thrashed so much in the past that I think it is a great pity that it was included in the Minister's speech when he introduced the Bill, even though it was mentioned in the last paragraph. Too many mistakes have been made in the name of money coming from somewhere else and not being a cost to us. It might not be a cost to us if one happens to be the State Treasurer, but it is certainly a cost to the citizens of this nation. I have been over the history as it affects this particular measure, and I have pointed out it is an extremely confused history. If we have another change in the Ministry, will we also have another change of ideas about how this \$500,000,000—or, let us say X million—should be spent? We must remember that the cost is worked out on last month's prices, and already they would be different.

A tremendous sum of money is to be spent on this confused issue even before we have any firm advice regarding just which plans will be actually adopted and accepted for the development of the metropolitan area. At least let us have the detailed study that we had with the other plan. I think Mr. Logan's proposed new clause is fair enough. It states—

6. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Act the scheduled railway shall not cease to be operated nor shall any of the material comprised therein be used sold disposed of or otherwise dealt with nor shall any part of any railway be constructed pursuant to this Act until such time as a comprehensive feasibility study and plan to be prepared by a competent independent authority relating to the

works proposed by section 5 of this Act shall have been approved by Parliament.

I agree that the proposed new clause will not prevent any planning which is required from going ahead. If the planners are convinced that they finally have the right solution they must be able to convince others that their plan is right.

I wish to advise the House that I will agree to the Bill only on the basis that Mr. Logan's amendment is accepted.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. D. K. Dans.

BILLS (6): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment Bill.
2. Alumina Refinery Agreement Act Amendment Bill.
3. Alumina Refinery (Pinjarra) Agreement Act Amendment Bill.
4. Public and Bank Holidays Bill.
5. Interpretation Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), read a first time.

6. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

COMMONWEALTH CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

Appointment of Delegates—Request for Council's Participation: Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read as follows:—

The Legislative Assembly having this day agreed to certain resolutions concerning the Parliament of this State joining with other Parliaments of the Commonwealth of Australia in a Convention to review the operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, transmits a copy of the resolutions in the schedule annexed.

The Legislative Assembly requests that the Legislative Council will consider its participation in the proposed Convention and appoint members in accordance with the resolutions contained herein to act with the seven (7) Members of this House who have been so appointed.

The Schedule

Whereas it has been proposed that a Convention comprising delegates appointed respectively by each Parliament within the Commonwealth of Australia should be constituted to review the operation of the Constitution

of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose such amendments to that Constitution as the Convention thinks fit;

And whereas it is desirable that the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia should by resolution declare its will on the proposal to constitute the Convention and make such decisions consequent thereupon as may seem appropriate:

Now therefore the Legislative Assembly doth resolve and declare its readiness to participate in the proposed Convention, and further resolves:

1. That for the purposes of the proposed Convention—

(a) a delegation consisting of twelve members of the Parliament of Western Australia should be appointed, of whom seven shall be appointed by the Legislative Assembly, and five by the Legislative Council;

(b) the seven members appointed by the Legislative Assembly shall comprise four members from the Australian Labor Party, two members from the Liberal Party and one member from the Country Party; and

(c) the five members appointed by the Legislative Council shall comprise two members from the Australian Labor Party, two members from the Liberal Party and one member from the Country Party;

2. That each appointed member of the delegation shall continue as an appointed member while a member of the Parliament of Western Australia or until the House of Parliament by which he has been appointed otherwise determines;

3. That the seven members appointed by the Legislative Assembly shall be—

The Hon. J. T. Tonkin
The Hon. H. E. Graham
The Hon. T. D. Evans
The Hon. C. J. Jamieson
The Hon. Sir Charles Court
The Hon. D. H. O'Neil
Mr. W. A. Manning;

4. That the Hon. J. T. Tonkin be Leader of the delegation, and the Hon. Sir Charles Court be Deputy-Leader;

5. That where, because of illness or other cause, a member is unable to attend a meeting of the proposed Convention the leader of the party from which that member is drawn may appoint an alternate member, and the member so appointed shall be a member of the delegation for that meeting.

6. That the Leader, from time to time, make a report to the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly respectively of such information and matters arising out of the proposed Convention as he thinks fit, and such report shall be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament.

7. That the Honourable the Attorney-General provide such assistance to the delegation as it may require.

8. That the Leader and Deputy Leader of the delegation, or their respective nominees, be appointed to represent the delegation on the Convention's Steering Committee.

9. That the Legislative Council be invited to resolve and declare its readiness to participate in the proposed Convention on the basis outlined in the foregoing resolutions and to appoint five members of the delegation as provided therein.

10. That the Honourable the Premier inform the Government of each other State of the Commonwealth, and of the Commonwealth of this resolution.

AGE OF MAJORITY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 9th August.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.07 pm.]: I appreciate the remarks that have been made by members on this Bill, and particularly those made by Mr. Medcalf who drew our attention to certain aspects that are much wider than those contained in the Bill. I was conscious of the remarks made by Mr. Medcalf when he quoted four occasions where we pursued the question of the age of majority. The honourable member supported the proposal to the extent that the lower age became the age of majority on those occasions; so we disagreed with the Government of the day on that particular issue. Obviously, as a result of that, a very wide field was left open, and the then Leader of the Government frequently drew our attention to it.

There are many aspects of this legislation to which Mr. Medcalf has drawn our attention, and they apply to the total concept of the Bill. However, the measure

does not deal with all the problems associated with the age of majority, other than the ones that are specified in it. If we look at the points raised by Mr. Medcalf relating to the many legal matters involved, we find there is at law a reasonable answer; nevertheless our attention was well and truly drawn to them. These points were the subject of some consideration before they were included.

In the case of a will, no great difficulty will be experienced whether the age of majority be 18 or 21 years. This depends on the date of death of the person concerned. With regard to apprenticeships and the like I see no great problem arising, because the provisions are to be activated as they are written.

So we move into the field of giving people of 18 years of age certain entitlements in the most deserving cases; this does not necessarily apply to all the fields into which we could move at this point of time.

I do not know that the remarks of Mr. White would have very much merit on the issue that is before us. He said that we should take a Gallup poll, or some similar poll, to determine what the young people want. However, I am advised that when approaches were made to various organisations of young people, such as the Young Liberal Party, the Young Labor Party, and similar groups, there was no reaction from them; and apparently they accepted the position as it is to be.

This Bill comes before us as part and parcel of a platform announced by this Government prior to its election. The question of the age of majority provides a great field for development in this new era. I regard the precincts of the Bill as sacrosanct, and I regard the legislation itself as a reasonable proposition in extending to people of 18 years of age the responsibilities of maturity.

Mr. Baxter was most critical of the Bill, and he was quite entitled to his views. However, I cannot agree with what he has said. Without possessing the rhetoric to present this question as I would like, and without the fanfare that goes with its introduction, I say that the fact we send people of 18 years of age off to war is a very good reason that they should be given the privileges of adulthood at that age.

Under our present education system I sincerely believe that a right or entitlement is conferred on people of 18 years of age when they are called upon by the hierarchy of the Government to serve in the interests of the nation; therefore, in the interests of democracy, they should be given other rights at that age. In that regard I think there is no great disagreement among members. The fields relating to the age of majority which exist outside this particular piece of legislation can be picked up and treated in some other way

in the course of evolution as the people in general come to accept 18 years of age as the age of majority.

I say this on behalf of the Government: fundamentally we must accept the fact that in these times persons of 18 years of age are regarded as adults, are recognised as having ability, are given the required training, and have the capacity to act as adults.

Therefore, it is with this background that I support the legislation, and I commend the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Persons of age of eighteen years or more to have full legal capacity—

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: This is the main clause of the Bill which will give to persons of the age of 18 years full legal capacity. For that reason this is the clause which I fear. The Minister referred to my being critical but I would like it understood quite clearly that I was not critical of the young people, but of what the Bill will do to the young people.

This clause will place young people in the position where they will be at the mercy of high-pressure salesmen and the sharks who will take advantage of the opportunity to extract money from such young people. I think we have all had experience of the methods used by some people who are not at all particular about the way in which they make money. We know that many middle aged people have been taken down as a result of signing contracts which they have not read. I object to the clause.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As I said previously, I believe we have gone too far to be able to retrace our steps. This is a pity. During the last couple of years I have come to believe, even more forcibly than Mr. Baxter, that many of the arguments which led us on this path were quite false.

I have never believed the argument that a fellow who is 18 years of age and who can enlist in the Army and fight for his country should have these rights. If a man can carry a rifle he will defend his country, and children of 10 and 12 years of age have already done that. However, there was never any mention of giving them the vote.

There is a time—and it is an average sort of time—when a person starts to return to the community; to give to the community rather than take from it. I do not think anything has occurred to

change that time from 21 years to 18 years. Indeed, quite good arguments have been put forward to the effect that if a person is still attending an educational institution and using facilities provided out of taxation there are certain responsibilities which he should not have whether he be 21 years of age or 23 years of age.

There has been a lot of argument that people are too young at 18 years of age and they need the sort of protection referred to by Mr. Baxter. I believe I am speaking too late but I still feel I am expressing an opinion which has come to a lot of people too late.

People who have spoken to me about this matter, not only in this House but also outside, believe there is a reversal of opinion. I believe that reversal of opinion is held not only by adults—people over the age of 25—but also to a greater extent than we previously believed by people under the age of 21 years. These people do not wish to be shouldered with the responsibilities which normally have been the lot of man when he reached the age of 21 years.

I doubt whether there will be any turning back from this move. However, I have the feeling that in future years people will come back to the older idea. I do not think this will preclude participation in matters of mutual interest to young people and adults; for instance, having a voice on management committees at schools, colleges, or universities.

I believe we have gone too far but I also believe that such is the pressure of opposing parties generally, we have also gone beyond the point of return. In doing so, we have not done the country or the young people any great service.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The last time I spoke I expressed opposition to this Bill on the basis that the jump from the age of 21 years to the age of 18 years was too great. I said I felt the young people of the State had not been given the opportunity to express their feelings in this regard.

Last Thursday at lunch time I was fortunate enough to discuss the lowering of the age of majority with a group of young people at the Institute of Technology. Some of these young people considered they were mature enough to accept the age of majority at 18 years, but others did not. However, it was obvious to me that the young people concerned had not given any great consideration to the particular question.

Since then I have spoken to other young people and they have expressed to me the opinion that they could not care less. However, one intelligent young man of the age of 24 years, who was with the group of people at the Institute of Technology, expressed the opinion that the age of 18 years is not desirable as the

age of majority. He had experienced some of the traumas of being an adult and on looking back on the years between 18 and 21 he saw that he obviously had protection during those years. That protection was denied him when he became an adult. He did not favour lowering the age in view of his own experiences.

I feel that the main problem here is that the young people have not given due consideration to this matter. They are so involved in every day living that they do not have the time necessary to consider the consequences. Therefore, they must be guided by what their elders think is best for them.

Their elders are usually parents; parents who protect them. The parents will continue to protect them even though they are considered to have attained the age of majority at 18 years. Surprisingly enough, many intelligent young people do not realise that there are other young people who do not have parents. They also do not realise that there are many young people who, even though they have parents, do not live with them because they find them incompatible.

In my discussions with this particular age group I was surprised at their ignorance of some aspects of life itself. I would very much like to see the age of 18—the proposed age of majority—altered to the age of 20 years. I have always been cautious in my approach to any change and this is an area where I feel caution is desirable. I have not given any notice of an amendment to change the age from 18 to 20 years, but if any member of the Committee feels as I do I would appreciate his moving such an amendment.

The Hon. W. F. WILESEE: I appreciate the frankness of the remarks made by Mr. White. I do not wish to elaborate too much but I also appreciate the great depth of the remarks made by Mr. MacKinnon for the reasons I have previously expressed in this Chamber.

Without doubt there is a better degree of education today than was available in, say, my day. We do call upon our young people to accept responsibility quicker and sooner than was the case previously.

The figure of 21 years was, I suggest, a fictitious figure at which to set the age of majority. A man of 24 years of age can be as intelligent as the man about whom Mr. White spoke. However, some people are still idiots at 48 years of age. Are we right? Is the hippy right? We have to look at society today and ask just who is right. Are those correct who say that democratic science, as applied under democracy, is right? Such people range from under 18 years of age to well over 18 years of age.

This legislation is a sincere effort to carry out a promise made by an elected Government. I accept the remarks made

by members but I do not agree that they are right. If we are to establish an age of responsibility in this day and age, we must go down rather than up. Although we may feel Grandma was right, we laugh at her in certain respects. However, throughout the whole of this State, from the north-west downwards, we see young people predominating right, left and centre, in every avenue of life.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: And in the Kimberley, too.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Yes. My apologies. At Kununurra we have a classic example—not in the political field, I might add. Wherever one goes—wherever there is a mining operation, a dam dredging operation, an oil search venture, and so on—one finds young top-brass men. I cannot believe they would not have had responsibility at 18 years of age.

If we are to succeed as a nation in competition with other nations, we must believe in our youth. We must give them better education. We must equip them to go out and do better than we have been able to do. That is important. I think most of us had very serious disabilities in our backgrounds. I, at least, appreciate the value of education. We can give education only to young inquiring minds. I believe in this legislation and I hope the clause will be agreed to.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I could not agree less with what the Minister has said. Admittedly, in some academic fields young people are well educated today, but those fields do not include the cold, hard facts of life. In the early days, young people who left school at 14 or 15 years of age and went to work, particularly in business houses, acquired more knowledge of what went on in the business world than do the young people of today who go to high schools, leave school at 17 or later, and do not have time before they reach 18 to acquire the knowledge of the business world that would be necessary if legislation such as this were introduced.

I started work at 17. I felt that a young man who started work at an age earlier than I had learned more about the business world than I learned in the years between 17 and 21. As a young fellow of 21 I went out and battled on a farm, and it was a very hard school. The young people today do not have the opportunity to grasp the cold, hard facts out in the business world. I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 5—Delete the word "eighteen" and substitute the word "twenty".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Unfortunately, I think there is a tendency on the part of some people to form opinions about the youth of today according to the example that is set by a small proportion of them. I am one who views with complete abhorrence some of the things young

people do, but I have satisfied my feelings on the subject by saying to myself, "After all, they are a very small proportion of the total. The majority of young people are more responsible."

If we were to accept the amendment moved by Mr. Baxter we would be in a complete muddle. According to the laws of the land, in electing people to this Chamber one can vote at 18 years of age, but one must be 21 to become a member of this Chamber. That is one provision of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act or the Electoral Act that we did not change. The law already allows people of 18 to enter into certain forms of contract. We now have this Bill which Mr. Baxter suggests should provide that the age of majority will be 20. I would be very reluctant to support a proposition of that nature.

I think the comments made by Mr. Medcalf when he spoke to the second reading of the Bill are very important. We should have regard for the things he said. We still have a long way to go to bring about responsibility in all things at the age of 18 rather than 21. I think it is probably better to make haste slowly in these matters than to make haste and be sorry we have gone too far.

I can appreciate the sentiments expressed by Mr. White. I watched the television interview he gave last Thursday and I found the discussion quite interesting, particularly having heard him express his point of view on this matter in the House the previous afternoon. However, I think we would cause confusion if we set the age of 20 in this Bill when in a number of other pieces of legislation we have reduced the age of responsibility from 21 to 18. Therefore, I cannot support the amendment.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I have listened to all the reasoned arguments on both sides of the Chamber. I think we must remember one or two historical facts about this matter.

Mr. MacKinnon said that in this Bill we would perhaps be taking an irreversible step for which we might be sorry. No-one can give me the historical reason for this magical age of majority of 21. It has not been authenticated. I have every reason to believe that in medieval times it was considered at the age of 21 years a man had grown sufficiently to fit a suit of armour. Armour being expensive, at that age he had only one suit.

What the Minister has said is perfectly true of the present day. There are sensible people of 18 and there are sensible people of 80; there are idiots of 18 and there are idiots of 80. In a move such as this, we must make a clean break down to the age of 18.

One member sitting in this Chamber tonight has not said a word. I once had the pleasure of working alongside his

daughter, who, at the age of 18, was an extremely mature person with some very sensible ideas. By the time she was 18½ or 19 she had become the leader of a group of young people in this State. I am sure that, as a father, he was very proud of her. He might not have agreed with all she did, but in fact she did some extremely valuable work for the youth of Western Australia, and she still does.

In giving people intelligence tests, there are inbuilt safety regulations as to how they should be tested. It is significant that intelligence measurement scales finish at 18 or thereabout. That is only a guide but I think we should have the courage of our convictions. We should stand by what we have done in the past in reducing the voting age to 18.

Admittedly, we must be cautious. Admittedly, some people in our electorates say we should not have reduced the voting age to 18 because of the young hooligans. But, as the Leader of the Opposition said, they form a small part of society. After all, we hear about them only through the mass media and only because they make spectacular news. Newspapers are not in business for any other purpose than to sell newspapers. The same thing applies to other arms of the mass media. Although 2 per cent. of those aged 18 might be idiots, I venture to say 98 per cent. conform to the ordinary mores and patterns of society.

I call on anybody in this Chamber to say there is an arbitrary age. Why not make it 19½ or 18½? Let us be sincere about it, and, if necessary, come back in three, four, or five years, time and say it did not work. In 1940, any British person from 17 years of age onward could join any of the armed services. At 17½, many were leading men. At 18 or 19 they were in extremely vulnerable positions all over the world. I have never been able to be satisfied in my own mind that it is possible to draw an arbitrary line and say that at the age of 20 years and 364 days one can go to bed denied the privileges of an adult and wake up the next morning a much wiser person with the responsibilities of full adulthood on one's shoulders. It was decided to make 18 the age for voting, and I think we should stick by it. I certainly could not agree to the amendment proposed by Mr. Baxter.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Perhaps I should comment on this aspect of the matter in view of the loud "Noes" that came from this side of the Chamber a while ago. I consider this is just another step along the way. We took the first step when we lowered the voting age some time ago. We cannot turn back; we must go on.

I appreciate that a number of 18-year-olds do not want the age of majority to be lowered. On the other hand, anyone who has been associated with youth organisations, as Mr. Williams has, knows that many of them do want the age of

majority to be lowered; they are quite capable of standing up to any responsibility. I want to make it quite clear that I support the measure as it stands.

— The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: As members of Parliament it is our duty to inform the public that these measures are not passed without some thought or consideration being given to them. During the period we have debated this matter it has been of some concern to me whether or not it is wise to reduce the age of responsibility.

There are two conflicting trends in society. The first is that the physical maturity of a person is attained at an earlier age. By that I mean that 40 or 50 years ago sexual maturity was reached at a much later date than it is now. Apart from this, we, as adults, now maintain our children for much longer than was the case previously.

I know that my parents were thrust out into the world at an age when my own children can still look forward to three, four, or five years of further education. So we have these two conflicting trends—the age at which people attain physical maturity, and the age at which they are thrown into society as completely independent adults. Accordingly it is a matter of some concern to me as to what attitude I adopt.

Like The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson, I believe the tide of events has overtaken whatever feelings I may have had in the matter. As we all know, these days young people are inducted into the services and sent off to fight our battles; we have considered them to be mature enough to accept such responsibility. They have also been provided with the privilege and responsibility of entering into mortgage agreements and contracts in relation to the purchase of their homes, etc. They already have that right.

Whatever our uncertainties may be we must take this step into the unknown, trusting our decision will be a wise one. It has been a long-standing contention of mine that people are not led into responsibility; they cannot be taught responsibility except by being given the responsibility to act on their own initiative. This is a matter which we must finally decide.

If people of 18 or 21 years of age have responsibility thrust on them circumstances will force them to deal with the matters which create that responsibility. If they are not made responsible for their actions it is possible they may not attain the attributes necessary for the acceptance of such responsibility.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: As The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson has said, we have given these young people the right to vote. That

may have cost a great deal of heartburning and that is all; but this Bill will cost them plenty.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SYMBOL BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 1st August. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Postponed clause 6: Offences—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Members will recall that progress was reported on the clause after The Hon. W. R. Withers had moved the following amendment:—

Page 3, line 5—Add after the section designation 6, the subsection designation (1).

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I move an amendment—

Page 3, lines 6 to 16—Delete all words in the clause from and including the word "affixes" down to and including the word "dollars" and substitute the following passage:—

not being the holder of a valid and current permit issued under this Act and authorising him to do so affixes or causes to be affixed a prescribed symbol or modified prescribed symbol to any product, or to the container of any product; or

(b) being the holder of a valid and current permit issued under this Act, does not observe any condition of the permit; or

(c) uses any symbol that so nearly resembles the prescribed symbol as to be likely to deceive,

commits, subject to subsection (2) of this section, an offence.

Penalty: Two Hundred Dollars.

(2) It is a defence to a charge of an offence under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section to prove that the person charged believed on reasonable grounds that, at the time he affixed the symbol, or caused the symbol to be affixed to the product, he did so in the course of his duties as an employee or agent and that his

employer, or, as the case may be, his principal, was the holder of a valid and current permit issued under this Act and that the conditions, if any, of the permit were observed.

(3) A person who sells a product to which, or to the container of which, a prescribed symbol is attached, knowing that the symbol has been attached without the authority of, or in breach of a condition of a valid and current permit issued under this Act, commits an offence.

Penalty: Two Hundred Dollars.

I gave the reasons for this amendment at the second reading stage. I would only remind members that clause 7 deals with the appointment of inspectors. We already have inspectors appointed under the Factories and Shops Act who I feel could undertake the necessary inspections under this measure.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: This is a follow-on of the situation that existed previously. We had some difficulty in achieving continuity. Having accepted the previous amendment I daresay the Committee will accept this amendment in order to provide continuity. It is not a principle of the Bill which was submitted to the Chamber, but I accept the decision of the Committee and I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Postponed clause, as amended, put and passed.

Postponed clause 7: Appointment of inspectors—

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 17—Insert after the word "person" the passage "appointed to and holding the office of Inspector under the Factories and Shops Act, 1963, or under the Health Act, 1911".

I have already referred to the provisions of clause 7 and I will not reiterate what I have said.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I cannot allow these amendments to pass without registering some protest. The honourable member has made things as difficult as he can for the Government and this amendment further adds to the difficulties.

Inspectors appointed under the Health Act and those appointed under the Factories and Shops Act would not have the qualifications required to carry out the necessary functions of the Act now before us.

This is a further nail in the coffin which will inhibit the effectiveness of this Government. The amendments moved are damaging and not in the best interests of the State.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Would the Minister in charge of the Bill be good enough to tell us the Government's views on this?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The Government's intention was to oppose the original amendment moved by Mr. Withers. We did this to the best of our ability but the amendment was carried. I see no point in prolonging the issue.

Because we felt we could not make sensible legislation by accepting the amendment to clause 5 progress was reported to give us the opportunity to draft an amendment which would make the Bill acceptable in another place.

So on that basis I have accepted the decision of the Committee and have nothing more to say. The Committee having given its decision on clause 5 the other amendments were considered consequential after having been looked at by the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This one is not consequential on clause 5.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I took that view after looking at the Bill as a whole, following the decision of the Committee on clause 5. As I believe that that clause forms the basis of the Bill, the principle it contains must now be returned to another place in order that a decision may be made.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think the Leader of the House and the Government are obviously acting in a spirit of compromise. I think the amendment moved by Mr. Withers, contrary to the view expressed by Mr. Cloughton, is a sensible one. It saves cost, avoids duplicity of appointment, and gives to the officer already appointed in this field an additional duty to perform.

Amendment put and passed.

Postponed clause, as amended, put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 9.04 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 15th August, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (31): ON NOTICE

1. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Erection of Poles: Northam

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Upon what date did officers of the S.E.C. Northam depot enter upon Avon location 15744 for the purpose of erecting poles for a power line?

- (2) What date appears on the letter signed by the district engineer, Northam, advising of the proposed entry upon the property?

- (3) Does the notification of entry contain these words: "Entry to your property will be some three or more days after the issue of this notice."?

- (4) Could he advise whether in fact three or more days did elapse between the issue of the notice of entry and the erection of power poles?

- (5) If not, why not?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) 18th July, 1972.

- (2) 18th July, 1972.

- (3) Yes.

- (4) A construction crew was working in the area. Rather than withdraw them and return at a later date, the wife of the owner of location 15744 was contacted by telephone on the 18th July prior to entry and approval obtained to proceed.

- (5) See (4) above.

2.

POPULATION

Metropolitan Area: Studies

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Are there any recent studies which purport to state an optimum population for the Perth metropolis?

- (2) If there are no such studies, will he undertake to have such a study made, using the resources of Government departments and tertiary educational institutions?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Though there are no studies which specifically deal with the question of an optimum population, the corridor plan for Perth and the associated report on the corridor plan prepared by The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority discuss in detail the problems of population growth and the means by which they might best be approached. There is ample capacity within the Perth region as at present constituted for the absorption of more than 2,000,000 people.

- (2) Because the definition of the term "optimum" is primarily a question of subjective judgment, I do not consider that a specific study is warranted.