

The CHAIRMAN: That aspect is covered by Clause 5 of the Bill.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: This is a case where the schedule tacks pieces of legislation on to the one under consideration. A person reading an Act and coming across this measure would be confused unless he had a knowledge of the tacking system that the Crown Law Department is adopting. For a time that was prohibited; and to follow it one needs the mind of a Philadelphia lawyer. It is a dangerous policy from the point of view of a novice. Of course, legal men can follow it; but the more they have to investigate these matters, the more expensive it is to the public.

Schedule put and passed.

Third to Fifth Schedules—agreed to.

Sixth Schedule:

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Alterations will be required to this schedule because of amendments that have been made to the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Numerous consequential amendments will be required, including some to the schedules. It is intended that before the recommitment stage all the consequential amendments will be listed and placed on the notice paper for consideration.

Schedule put and passed.

Seventh to Twenty-fifth Schedules—agreed to.

Twenty-sixth Schedule:

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Perhaps it would not be inappropriate at this stage to express regret that Moses did not make a second visit to Mount Sinai and bring down a law relating to local government, preferably in one tablet.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 5.23 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 19th September, 1957.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Coal, (a) tenders for supply to Government .....	1671
(b) Government contracts debate, division .....	1672
Treasury Buildings, provision of toilet facilities .....	1672
Trust funds, investments outside Western Australia .....	1672
Mines Regulation Act, number of men examined, findings, etc. ....	1673
Mine Workers' Relief Act, number of men examined, findings, etc. ....	1673
Goldmining, tonnage crushed by Kalgoolie State battery .....	1674
National Park, establishment at Albany Land settlement, provision for farmers' sons .....	1674
Traffic, suburban parking provisions .....	1674
Gloucester Lodge, Yanchep Park, tenancy conditions, etc. ....	1674
Royal visit, Queen Mother's itinerary .....	1674
Show week, parliamentary sittings .....	1675
Native welfare, (a) departmental administration costs, 1956-57 .....	1675
(b) news broadcast of commissioner's statement .....	1675
(c) position of parliamentarians and civil servants .....	1675
(d) disciplinary action against commissioner .....	1676
(e) reaction to select committee's report .....	1676
(f) opportunity to prove allegations .....	1676
Bills : Interpretation Act Amendment (No. 2), report .....	1676
Chiropodists, report .....	1676
King's Park Aquatic Centre, 2r., defeated Health Act Amendment, Council's amendments .....	1697

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### COAL.

(a) *Tenders for Supply to Government.*

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Did the Government call tenders for the supply of coal to Government instrumentalities, prior to signing an agreement?

(2) If so, what was the lowest price tendered irrespective of the source?

The MINISTER replied:

Public tenders were called as far back as October, 1955. The lowest tender received was from the Griffin Co. for 100 per cent. open-cut coal at 37s. 4d. per ton for smalls.

Public tenders were not called this year, but each company was asked to supply quotes for varying quantities of coal.

*(b) Government Contracts Debate,  
Division.*

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Chairman of Committees:

Last night, when the division took place on the motion to table all papers in connection with the Government coal contracts, the Chairman of Committees was Acting Speaker. We on this side called for a division and it finished up with 100 per cent. of the members being on the other side of the House and no one on this side. In view of the misunderstanding, I was wondering whether the Acting Speaker would explain the position to the House?

Mr. MOIR replied:

When the question was put, there was almost an equal call for ayes and noes and I gave the decision to the noes. A division was then called for by the ayes and the bells were rung. When it became apparent that all members were on the other side, voting with the ayes, I declared, under Standing Order No. 205, without counting the House, that the resolution had been agreed to.

**TREASURY BUILDINGS.**

*Provision of Toilet Facilities.*

Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) On what date did work commence on the provision of additional toilet facilities in Treasury Buildings?

(2) When is it expected that the work will be completed?

(3) What is the cost of the work?

(4) What number of men are employed?

(5) Is this work being done by contract or by day labour?

(6) Is work proceeding to schedule?

The MINISTER replied:

The job referred to by the hon. member comprises a very small part of a project covering the clearing of the site of the proposed headquarters building for the Rural & Industries Bank, estimated to cost £70,000.

Work was commenced on the 2nd July, 1957, and necessitates the removal of all the existing conveniences in the Treasury yard and the erection of new conveniences adequate for requirements; also additional strong room accommodation for the Titles Office, additional office accommodation and amenities section for staff.

The schedule of work has been drawn up to suit the convenience of the departments affected and of the Commonwealth Bank.

Five men are at present employed on day labour and the project is expected to be completed by the scheduled date (the 30th July, 1958).

**TRUST FUNDS.**

*Investments Outside Western Australia.*

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Treasurer:

Further to the answer to a question I asked on the 17th September, in respect of the amount of £1,360,744 invested outside Western Australia, can he say:—

- (1) What are the details of these investments?
- (2) When were these investments made?
- (3) What was the procedure for making these investments outside Western Australia?
- (4) What is the total amount of money held by the Treasury in trust funds?

The TREASURER replied:

(1) and (2) The amount of £1,360,744 represents the investment in other States of funds of the State Superannuation Board and the Coal Miners' Pension Fund. Details are as follows:—

New South Wales.		Date of Investment.
Amount.	Interest Rate.	
£	£ s. d. per cent.	
<b>Sydney Water Board—</b>		
11,500	3 8 9	15/10/1944
160,000	3 6 3	30/9/1948
100	3 7 6	15/8/1950
35,700	4 15 0	1/1/1956
1,850	4 15 0	1/11/1954
10,000	4 15 0	27/9/1954
8,150	4 2 6	1/2/1952
35,500	4 15 0	9/7/1953
100,000	3 7 6	10/1/1950
6,000	4 2 6	15/1/1952
£368,000		
<b>State Electricity Commission—</b>		
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
3,771 3 8	4 15 0	9/10/1953
5,450 0 0	4 15 0	21/8/1953
£9,221 3 8		
<b>Broken Hill Water Board—</b>		
£14,492 10 0	4 15 0	12/3/1953
<b>Queensland.</b>		
<b>State Electricity Commission—</b>		
2,906 7 0	4 10 0	11/5/1955
76,162 2 1	3 7 6	15/3/1950
3,700 0 0	4 15 0	25/11/1952
10,000 0 0	4 17 6	29/5/1953
488 16 0	4 15 0	11/5/1955
£93,257 5 1		

**Brisbane City Council—**

400,000	0	0	3	6	3	1/9/1949
25,000	0	0	3	6	3	26/1/1949
160,000	0	0	3	6	3	15/3/1949
12,599	13	3	4	15	0	8/5/1955
1,173	2	0	4	15	0	3/7/1955
477	11	0	4	15	0	4/8/1955
<hr/>						
£599,250	6	3				

**Southern Electric Authority—**

10,364	5	5	4	15	0	30/12/1953
99	11	9	4	15	0	12/7/1955
<hr/>						
£10,463	17	2				

**Tasmania.****Hydro Electric Commission—**

10,000	0	0	4	15	0	12/10/1954
--------	---	---	---	----	---	------------

**Victoria.****State Electricity Commission—**

5,714	4	3	4	2	6	4/5/1954
9,962	5	8	4	15	0	9/6/1954
5,000	0	0	4	15	0	1/2/1955
492	10	6	4	15	0	22/7/1955
2,213	19	3	4	15	0	28/8/1955
296	9	6	4	15	0	5/8/1955
198	15	11	4	15	0	18/8/1955
99	10	6	4	15	0	8/9/1955
693	1	6	4	15	0	22/9/1955
40,000	0	0	3	6	3	19/6/1950
30,000	0	0	3	7	6	17/8/1950
31,800	0	0	3	7	6	6/3/1951
15,550	0	0	4	15	0	19/11/1952
2,550	0	0	4	15	0	24/3/1953
12,900	0	0	4	15	0	4/12/1953
14,801	17	6	4	15	0	9/12/1953
2,898	11	3	4	2	6	12/5/1955
15,000	0	0	4	2	6	30/5/1952
<hr/>						
£190,171	5	10				

**Gas and Fuel Corporation—**

4,686	13	2	4	15	0	5/6/1956
401	11	6	4	15	0	4/8/1955
<hr/>						
£5,088	4	8				

**Grain Elevators Board—**

£60,000	0	0	4	2	6	1/5/1952
---------	---	---	---	---	---	----------

(3) In the postwar period, competition among lenders was keen and the State Superannuation Board was unable to invest all its accumulated funds in Western Australia. It was necessary, therefore, for the board to invest a portion of its funds in loans on offer from other States' semi-governmental and local authorities.

In more recent times, it has been possible for the board to invest all available moneys in Western Australia because of the increased avenues for local investment and this policy will be pursued so long as the local demand continues.

(4) £13,563,592 at the 30th June, 1957, of which an amount of £9,205,635 was invested in the manner shown in the answer to Question No. (1) of the 17th September.

**MINES REGULATION ACT.****Number of Men Examined, Findings, etc.**

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) What number of men on the Eastern Goldfields were examined under the Mines Regulation Act during 1956?

(2) What were the particulars of the above examinations for new applicants—

Number classed as—

- (a) normal;
- (b) pneumoconiosis;
- (c) silicosis early;
- (d) silicosis advanced;
- (e) query tuberculosis;
- (f) tuberculosis?

(3) What were the similar findings for men re-examined?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 944 (557 new applicants and 387 re-examinees).

(2) Normal	.....	550
Pneumoconiosis	.....	2
Silicosis early	.....	1
Silicosis advanced	.....	Nil
Query tuberculosis	.....	1
Pneumoconiosis plus query tuberculosis	.....	1
Tuberculosis	.....	Nil
Other conditions	.....	2
<hr/>		
Total	.....	557

(3) Normal	.....	305
Pneumoconiosis	.....	50
Silicosis early	.....	14
Silicosis advanced	.....	Nil
Query tuberculosis	.....	1
Pneumoconiosis plus query tuberculosis	.....	Nil
Silicosis early plus query tuberculosis	.....	
Tuberculosis	.....	
Other conditions	.....	15
<hr/>		
Total	.....	387

**MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT.****Number of Men Examined, Findings, etc.**

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) What number of men were examined under the Mine Workers' Relief Act at the Kalgoorlie laboratory during 1956?

(2) What number, and percentage of the whole, of those examined were classed as—

- (a) normal etc.;
- (b) early silicosis;
- (c) advanced silicosis;
- (d) silicosis plus tuberculosis;
- (e) tuberculosis only?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 5,067.

	Number.	Per Cent.
(2) Normal, etc. ....	4,600	90.78
Early silicosis	426	8.41
Advanced silicosis ....	33	.65
Silicosis plus tuberculosis ....	4	.08
Tuberculosis only ....	4	.08
Totals ....	5,067	100

While some of these x-rays were taken at the Perth chest clinic and by the mobile x-ray unit, all films were interpreted at the Kalgoorlie laboratory.

### GOLDMINING.

#### *Tonnage Crushed by Kalgoorlie State Battery.*

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) What was the tonnage crushed by the Kalgoorlie State battery during 1956?

(2) How many separate crushings, on behalf of a prospector or group of prospectors, does the above represent?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 8,755½ tons.

(2) 109.

### NATIONAL PARK.

#### *Establishment at Albany.*

Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has any provision been made in the Albany area by way of land reserves for the purpose of establishing a national park?

(2) If no such provision has been made, will he investigate the matter of reserving or resuming land for such a purpose, and discuss the matter with the local authorities concerned?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes. There is a Class "A" reserve for national park and recreation, containing 9,000 acres, on the southern side of Princess Royal Harbour. This reserve is likely to be extended to embrace further coastal land.

There are also large reserves for such purposes as public park and conservation of flora in and adjacent to Albany.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

### LAND SETTLEMENT.

#### *Provision for Farmers' Sons.*

Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) What provision is made in land settlement schemes to enable the sons of farmers working under that arrangement to take up land when qualified to do so?

(2) If no such provision is made, will he give the matter further thought so as to retain the skill of these young farmers in the farming industry?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The only land settlement scheme at present operating in Western Australia is the war service land settlement scheme. Eligibility of applicants is clearly defined in the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State relative to the settlement of ex-servicemen under that scheme.

(2) Any future scheme of land settlement is dependent upon the availability of finance. If, and when, any new scheme is authorised, consideration will be given to the matter raised by the hon. member.

### TRAFFIC.

#### *Suburban Parking Provisions.*

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Transport:

Now that large-scale parking provisions are being prepared for use in central Perth, what steps are being taken to provide equivalent parking facilities for suburban areas such as

(a) Leederville;

(b) Wembley?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Transport) replied:

Parking facilities for suburban areas are being examined as the need arises.

### GLOUCESTER LODGE, YANCHEP PARK.

#### *Tenancy Conditions, etc.*

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Is he examining the tenancy conditions in respect of Gloucester Lodge, Yanchep Park?

(2) Is it likely that rent remission will be granted the tenant and some structural safeguards undertaken, in view of the financial position confronting the tenant, arising from the litigation in respect of the 1955 diving accident at the pool?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) A letter dated the 17th September, 1957, has been received by me and has been referred to the chairman of the National Parks Board for a report.

(2) The matter will receive full consideration upon receipt of the report.

### ROYAL VISIT.

#### *Queen Mother's Itinerary.*

Mr. BOVELL (without notice) asked the Premier:

What is the State Government doing to have Western Australia included in the itinerary of the Queen Mother during her visit to Australia next year?

The PREMIER replied:

The Government has written to the Prime Minister asking that arrangements be made for the Queen Mother to visit Western Australia on the occasion of her visit to this country next year.

### SHOW WEEK.

#### *Parliamentary Sitzings.*

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Premier:

What will be the arrangements for sitting during Show Week?

The PREMIER replied:

Cabinet has not yet made a decision in regard to the sittings during Show Week. If we make much more progress in the meantime than we have been doing recently, and we make a reasonable impression on the notice paper, maybe more than the normal amount of leave will be given to members during Show Week. However, if progress between now and the beginning of Show Week is no better than it has been recently, the amount of time off during Show Week will, I am afraid, be very limited.

Mr. Cornell: Is that a threat or a promise?

The PREMIER: An incentive.

### NATIVE WELFARE.

#### *(a) Departmental Administrative Costs, 1956-57.*

Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

Will he furnish details of how the amount of £80,634 was expended on the Department of Native Welfare administrative costs during the year 1956-57?

The MINISTER replied:

	£	£
<b>Salaries—</b>		
Head Office .....	20,033	
Field Officers .....	31,396	
Departmental Institutions .....	3,206	54,635
<b>Office Administration—</b>		
Head Office and Ministers .....	3,182	
Field Offices .....	15,692	18,874
<b>Departmental Institutions—</b>		
Administration and maintenance .....	7,125	7,125
		<hr/> £80,634

#### *(b) News Broadcast of Commissioner's Statement.*

Mr. GRAYDEN (without notice) asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) Is he aware that in an A.B.C. news broadcast this morning, it was stated that the Commissioner of Native Welfare had

described the remarks which I made in this House last night as a malicious and unprovoked attack on his integrity?

(2) Is he aware that after the parliamentary select committee, which reported on the spot regarding the natives on the Warburton reserve, submitted its report to this House, and after this House had unanimously accepted that report, the Commissioner of Native Welfare, in a Press statement, described the report as being grossly exaggerated?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Commissioner of Native Welfare waited upon me this morning and told me that he was desirous of having a full investigation into the remarks made by the member for South Perth and he gave me a copy of a Press statement which he intended to hand to the Press in regard to the matter.

(2) The Commissioner of Native Welfare has never satisfied himself that the report of the select committee was in accordance with facts; and I think he holds that view, despite the fact that the House has carried a resolution agreeing to the select committee's report.

Mr. Bovell: It is like his impertinence to reflect on members.

#### *(c) Position of Parliamentarians and Civil Servants.*

Mr. GRAYDEN (without notice) asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) Does he uphold the principle that Parliament is the ultimate master of civil servants?

(2) Does he believe that members of Parliament are the watchdogs of the people so far as the actions of civil servants are concerned?

(3) Does he believe that members of Parliament should have complete freedom to state in Parliament what they believe to be true?

(4) Does he believe that a civil servant should state to the Press that he disagrees with the decision of Parliament?

(5) Does he believe that a civil servant should single out a member of Parliament for personal attack?

(6) Does he believe that Parliament can carry out its functions if civil servants refuse to recognise the authority of Parliament?

The MINISTER replied:

In view of the number of questions and the importance of the replies that might be given, if the hon. member will place these questions on the notice paper I shall have them fully investigated, so that I can reply at the next sitting.

*(d) Disciplinary Action against Commissioner.*

Mr. BOVELL (without notice) asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

Will he take disciplinary action against the Commissioner of Native Welfare for having referred to the decision of Parliament in the manner described by the Minister this afternoon?

The MINISTER replied:

The hon. member is very uncertain about the question he is asking. I have not heard of the report over the air and I am not in a position to say whether I intend to take disciplinary action. I have reported to the House that the commissioner was somewhat concerned over the statement made in this House last night. He felt that both he and his department have been placed in a difficult position and he wanted a full inquiry. If that full inquiry is undertaken, then a report could be made to this House and members would be able to see for themselves whether the statement made last night was correct. I think the Commissioner of Native Welfare or any other officer of a Government department is entitled to have that much protection.

*(e) Reaction to Select Committee's Report.*

Mr. BOVELL (without notice) asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

In regard to his statement regarding what the Commissioner of Native Welfare said on the parliamentary select committee's report, of which I was a member, and as that report has been placed before this House and adopted unanimously, does he intend to take disciplinary action against the commissioner in view of what he, the Minister, said this afternoon?

The Premier: What do you want to be done? Hang him or shoot him?

Member: What about both!

The MINISTER replied:

In view of what could arise out of this question, I would ask the hon. member to place it on the notice paper so that due regard could be paid to the matter before replying.

*(f) Opportunity to Prove Allegations.*

Mr. GRAYDEN (without notice) asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) Will he give the Commissioner of Native Welfare a chance to prove his allegations that if given the opportunity he can substantiate that there has been no manipulation of departmental files, by tabling in this House all papers relative to the parliamentary select committee's inquiry on the Warburton reserve, and the file relative to the body of the native who

was found in that reserve earlier this year to which reference has already been made in this House?

(2) Will he cause an inquiry to be made on the lines suggested by the Commissioner of Native Welfare?

The MINISTER replied:

If the hon. member will place this question on the notice paper, along with the others relating to this matter, I shall cause the matter to be investigated so that I can give an answer at the next sitting.

**BILLS (2)—REPORT.**

- 1, Interpretation Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 2, Chiroprodists.  
Adopted.

**BILL—KING'S PARK AQUATIC CENTRE.**

*Second Reading—Defeated.*

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [2.35]: I want to make it quite clear at the outset that I am all for the measure.

Mr. Oldfield: Why?

Hon. D. BRAND: Because it is a commonsense approach to a progressive move.

Mr. Johnson: When have you ever made a commonsense approach?

Hon. D. BRAND: The hon. member would not know.

The SPEAKER: I ask that the hon. member be permitted to make his speech without interruption.

Hon. D. BRAND: Now that the preliminaries are over, I for one, more or less, agree with the 1954 amending Bill to the Parks and Reserves Act. It placed greater responsibility for the control of King's Park in the hands of Parliament. I cannot help but feel that that move has been carried on until the present juncture when, on a very trivial Bill, a lot of unnecessary and drawn-out debate has taken place, designed to prevent the construction of an aquatic centre in King's Park.

I join with the many members who have said that they desire to see King's Park preserved as a park for all time. Those who have cited the instance of a desire to build a hospital or such structure in the park as a precedent, have no argument because that does not compare with the present project put forward by the Perth City Council for establishing an aquatic centre on 20 acres out of almost 1,000 acres of parkland, the majority of which at the present time is in a virgin state.

Mr. Roberts: What is wrong with that?

Hon. D. BRAND: There is nothing wrong. On the other hand, I cannot say it is of very great benefit. The point which appeals to me and which I expressed to the member for North Perth when he spoke to me about where I stood in connection with the matter, is this: I pose the question as to how long the park will remain in its present condition, because I believe, situated as it is and surrounded by some 200,000 people, divided by paths, edged in by such artificial portions as we see facing the river, that gradually nature must give way to the influence of man. Already we see it. Many of the large trees have been cut away or destroyed, and in the major portion of the park there are found only banksias and a little undergrowth.

Mr. May: They were not destroyed but were taken for firewood.

Hon. D. BRAND: I do not know what happened to them, but they have been removed. I understand that the large trees were removed as a result of permission granted by the proper authorities. At the present time the park presents in some ways a very untidy and very unattractive sight.

Mr. May: It is not the park's fault.

Hon. D. BRAND: Each year it is necessary for the authorities to put a controlled fire through the park in order to destroy the veldt grass and undergrowth so as to avoid a great fire hazard which could be built up from year to year, and result in a fire capable of destroying everything if the grass and other waste in the area were not first disposed of.

Mr. Gaffy: That is common practice.

Hon. D. BRAND: No, it is not; not for this reason. I also understand that a fire is put through each year in order to prevent a large blaze, a fierce fire, which would destroy the plants and the 5,000 trees that are being planted there by the King's Park Board. I fail to see that the park presents an attractive appearance when it is burnt out; or when, as at present, it is simply a virgin waste. There is nothing attractive about it.

The Minister for Education: That is a matter of opinion.

Hon. D. BRAND: As the Minister for Education said recently, members could go there for relaxation. But if I wanted relaxation, I would sooner drive to National Park or out to the virgin bush where the effect of man's interference has not been felt. There one will find the natural flora and fauna of this State.

Mr. May: You are always different from everybody else.

Hon. D. BRAND: That may be so. On this occasion I think I am on the side of the majority. I will not admit that we can preserve the park in its natural state, because it is not in its natural state at

present—certainly not as Stirling saw it. As for children 1,000 years hence, they will have Buckley's chance of seeing it in that condition, in spite of the "hands-off" policy that has been adopted through the years.

Mr. Andrew: How do you know?

Mr. Lapham: That depends on the administration.

Hon. D. BRAND: We cannot preserve the park in its natural state; and I ask: What is the alternative? It appears to me that the project submitted by the Perth City Council is one that would improve the park. That project is for the establishment of a swimming pool—an aquatic centre—for which the capital of Western Australia is crying out. I for one believe that this highest point of the city, in the corner of King's Park, is the proper site for such a centre.

Only 20 acres of land would be required. Members should visualise how much it would improve that corner of the park, appreciating the fact that beyond the 20 acres we would still have a fair amount of natural virgin bush. I agree with those who suggest that there should be development along the edge of the park; that there should be some marginal improvement, even if it be only by the provision of artificial trees and well-laid-out lawns and gardens, with a well-defined background of natural forest or—should I say—bush; because it is not a forest. Such activity would certainly improve the park.

I regret that a number of members made a decision prior to listening to the debate on this matter. I believe that if we reject this measure we will lose an opportunity to improve the appointments and the facilities for sport, particularly swimming, in the City of Perth.

Mr. May: You are entitled to your opinion.

Hon. D. BRAND: I certainly am. Thanks very much! As for the money which would be involved in the construction of an aquatic centre, I disagree with my colleague, the Leader of the Country Party, that we would have schools and hospitals in lieu. I doubt whether, if we do not obtain money for an aquatic centre, money will be available for schools and hospitals in the metropolitan and country areas.

So I do not think any other part of the State is making any sacrifice in respect of an aquatic centre being established in Perth. I hasten to refer to the position in the electorate of Greenough. We must not lose sight of the fact that the Greenough flats and certain other portions of that electorate have a very long history, and there are many families there who might well have been thought to be interested in backing up the arguments of those who say that Sir John Forrest set aside this park for the preservation of the

indigenous flora and fauna. But I have received only three pro forma letters to which I have replied; and I have not received any further communication from those people.

The Minister for Education: That shows the amount of interest in the matter.

Hon. D. BRAND: It does show the amount of interest; and therefore I flatly deny that country people generally are opposed to this project. I have gone to no end of trouble to discuss the subject wherever groups of people have been gathered—and glory only knows that I have had opportunities to do so in visiting shows over the last three or four weeks. In those discussions I have sought to obtain the views of people on the decision of the City of Perth to ask for the approval of Parliament for the construction of a pool in King's Park. By and large, the people have been in favour of the proposal, chiefly because it is a progressive move. In short, they realise that we would have something worth while, something positive, if we allowed the excision of the 20 acres. But if we do not do so, we will not have anything.

I am wondering at what stage the majority of members of this House will decide to allow any authority to do anything progressive and make any improvements to the park, because the amendment which was put to this House by the member for North Perth, pretty well closed the door to anything being done.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Hear, hear!

Mr. May: That is what we want.

Hon. D. BRAND: It is all very well to be "Hear, hearing!" I feel that members have not given sufficient thought to what must happen; to the inevitability of changes taking place, forcing the population to say, "We want to preserve this as a park, so we had better do something about it—a park for the enjoyment, leisure and recreation of the people."

I can imagine a few hundred acres being set aside and every endeavour being made to keep that area of land in its natural state. Put all the scientist members you like on the board! Nevertheless, if the park is to serve the purpose for which I feel it was set aside, we should clear it up. We should establish groups of trees and gardens and lawns; and then I am sure we would see it patronised in the same way as is the very small acreage on which improvements have been made, overlooking the Swan River.

Our own people, and tourists who are so impressed with the beauty of our park, are impressed in the main that it was set aside, and by the glorious views to be seen from that portion of the park which has been cleared.

Mr. May: And you reckon a swimming pool would improve it?

Hon. D. BRAND: Without a shadow of a doubt. I would refer to the attitude of those who were opposed to the removal of the trees in King's Park-rd. In the main, that road is now referred to as a beautiful drive. The same principle exists in respect of King's Park. I am speaking only of the 20 acres of land which would be set aside.

Mr. Lapham: That would be only a start.

The Minister for Education: Would you stop at 20 acres?

Hon. D. BRAND: Of course, we would.

The Minister for Education: You would stop at nothing.

Hon. D. BRAND: When Lord Forrest, whose remarks have been so often quoted, set aside the park, he decided that, because of certain circumstances, he could allow a tennis club to be established, and provide land for the bowling club and for Hale School—and there it stopped.

Mr. Roberts: Why was the land given to Hale School?

Hon. D. BRAND: It may not have been for as good a reason as we believe there is for leasing 20 acres to the Perth City Council for the establishment of an aquatic centre, but I am dealing with the proposition as it was put to this House.

Hon. A. F. Watts: Why not use the site of the Observatory?

Hon. D. BRAND: I have not heard any strong arguments put forward for any alternative site. The Leader of the Country Party suggests the Observatory site. At all events, Lord Forrest saw fit, for good reason, to allow acres of land to be cleared for a recreation ground for Hale School, and as far as I can see, since that time no more of the parkland has been alienated, nor do we intend now that it should be, as the proposal is simply to lease the site to the City of Perth.

The Minister for Education: Yes, to put a bulldozer in.

Hon. D. BRAND: To lease it to the City of Perth for the establishment of an aquatic centre, which will be a great civic asset. I am not impressed with the argument that we should provide a swimming place for little children; this is to be an aquatic centre and all such facilities will go with it. The City of Perth has need of a project such as this and is prepared to face up to the problems. We are not concerned at this juncture with whether the rates of the Perth City Council will be raised or whether it will hold a referendum. Those are domestic problems that do not arise here.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If the Bill is defeated, do you think the Perth City Council will build the aquatic centre elsewhere?

Hon. D. BRAND: I have no idea and am not concerned with the city council's intentions regarding any alternative. I am



concerned at present only with this proposition which I think is a grand opportunity, and I regret that it appears that the Bill will be thrown out.

Mr. May: Nothing surer.

Hon. D. BRAND: I cannot emphasise sufficiently how much I regret it as I think we will be losing a grand opportunity. There is little more I can say to make my position in regard to King's Park clear. As far as my influence and responsibility in this matter are concerned, I will do everything possible to preserve the park for the recreation of the people and in no way will I allow it to be filched away. When the aquatic centre is completed, the boundaries of King's Park will remain but it will be a much better park and will attract many more people than it does now.

Mr. May: With the pool completely shut away from the public, unless they pay to go in.

The Premier: That applies to the tea-rooms.

Hon. D. BRAND: Of course it does. I heard the same arguments raised against the pool at Kalgoorlie when that was proposed—that no one would pay the admission fee—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Who said that?

Hon. D. BRAND: I heard the hon. member ask such questions previously. No one can deny that the project was implemented against the consensus of public opinion at that time, but since then it has proved a glorious asset and a monument to the confidence and courage of those who constructed it. If Parliament could give this question a second thought and members who are committed to opposing the Bill could appreciate the opportunity of really making the park more worth while and attractive, I think there would be a possibility of the measure being passed, thus allowing the Perth City Council to proceed with the project which I believe would be a great civic asset. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [2.55]: I hope I never hear the Leader of the Opposition giving another such speech of despair as that which he has just delivered. He cannot see any future for Victoria Park and I am pleased that I do not share his views.

Mr. Roberts: You mean King's Park, don't you?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Yes, King's Park. Perhaps we should commend the Perth City Council on its ideas and its tenacity; but when the enthusiasm of that body runs away with it and it loses its long vision, I

think the move is being overdone. If I were a member of the Perth City Council, I might well say "Let us have a go at Parliament and see if we can get a bit of King's Park," because it would be a cheap piece of land. The Perth City Council, in its enthusiasm, has, as I say, lost its long vision.

Although it has already been stated, I will quote again that when the hospital proposal was raised in regard to King's Park, the Perth City Council said that it was of the highest importance to the people of this city and, in fact, the State of Western Australia, that King's Park should be retained intact for the use of the people for ever. There are two important statements contained there, the first being that the park was of the highest importance to this city and, in fact, the people of Western Australia. At that time the city council acknowledged that the park was a State asset and it would, therefore, expect country members to have a say in the use of the park; but it has changed its opinion in the meantime.

The second point then raised was that the park should be retained intact for the people for ever. Whether that will be done is a question for the future. We are dealing with the point of view of today, and the problem is ours. We cannot deal lightly with it because the question is important to a number of people. It has been said that if the present proposal is rejected, it will be accepted as a vote of no confidence in the members of the King's Park Board. Are we to be concerned if that is so? Is it our problem to preserve that board or to preserve the park?

Our task is to preserve the park, and if the board elects to take that as a vote of no confidence, we cannot let that influence our judgment in any way. If members of the King's Park Board are the men they should be, they will be the first to admit that our responsibility is the park and not the board. It has been argued that because the bowling club and the tennis club have been given a certain portion of the park, we should now allow the aquatic centre to be built there, but what a dangerous argument that is. If we must grant land for an aquatic centre because land was granted for something else 50 years ago, what will be the argument next year? Someone will say "You gave land for an aquatic centre last year. What about land for something else this year? You gave it in 1957, and surely we must have more land in 1958!"

If that argument is admitted, it does away with the argument in favour of putting the aquatic centre in King's Park. We are the trustees of the park for the time being, and if it had not been securely held by those who were its trustees in the past, there would have been nothing for us to debate today because the park would no

longer have been there. It is our responsibility to preserve for the future what has been handed to us in the form of this park.

My main contention is that the city needs more open spaces, as is borne out on pp. 100-101 of the Stephenson report where it is said that the public open spaces now in the metropolitan region total 21,500 acres, while the report recommends that the area should be 69,000 acres, an increase of 47,500. Of the increase, it is stated in the report, 30,000 acres should consist of landscape parks, natural reserves and a camping ground.

Hon. D. Brand: Do you know that the same gentleman recommended that we put Government House up there?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am not dealing with that aspect, and if the hon. member will follow my points, he will see that I have a good argument. If in the near future we are to increase such parks as I have mentioned, including natural reserves, let us preserve those natural reserves that we have on hand because we shall need more of this type of park in the future. One of the innumerable letters we received—which incidentally did not provide any information to help our argument—was from the City Amateur Swimming and Lifesaving Club, whose interests, of course, we must consider. That letter says—

The site in King's Park is the only suitable one in the city area.

I do not know what investigations the club has carried out to prove that statement, but if it is true then, I would say, instead of being an argument for it, it would provide—or it should provide—cause for alarm. If we are so short of space that there is nowhere else that we can establish an aquatic centre, it is high time that we looked around and did something about it.

It would be better to resume some land on which to build this aquatic centre rather than delay the matter much longer. It would even be very much better to destroy buildings at today's values than postpone the issue to some future date. Although I admit the necessity for doing that may not be quite justified, it would be better than destroying the park. On page 83 of the Stephenson report we find that in some districts existing small public open spaces can be extended into adjoining areas of land as yet not built on. That is very definite, and I think it is a pity that the city council has not proceeded along those lines instead of seeking portion of King's Park for its purpose.

I would also like to point out that the type of work involved in the construction of an aquatic centre, or a swimming pool, is such that it is an excellent medium for improving an ugly portion of the city—some portion that is neglected and is an

eyesore. By this means it would be possible to do something to make it more attractive. I would like to quote again from the Stephenson report. At page 186, we find the following:—

Few cities in the world have so much open space and such an attractive river frontage within walking distance of the central area. Many cities in their original planning have made provision for central parks and recreational spaces only to relinquish some of their ideals and civic holdings under the pressure of various interests. Subsequently in an attempt to relieve the intensity of urban development, small spaces have had to be acquired at great cost.

Should we relinquish some of our ideals at this stage? There can be no justification whatever for relinquishing any part of King's Park.

There is another angle of this question of open spaces. Where does the city require its future open spaces? I would like to quote again from the Stephenson report. At page 40 we find the anticipated population growth in the city over the next few years. Based on a future increase of 3 per cent., which is the average since 1901, we find that the population of this State will reach 1,000,000 by 1985. If the increase is 4 per cent., which is the average since 1947, the population will reach 1,000,000 as early as 1978; that is, in 21 years' time. Let us have a look where the population will be at that time, as explained in this report. The existing population of Perth's central area is 18,800. The proposed population at that time will be 5,000, which is a decrease of 13,800. The population of West Perth is now 2,990; at that time it will be only 2,900. Where is this increase of population going? It is going to the areas to the north, the east and the south. I would like to quote some figures from page 44 of the Stephenson report. In the areas north and south they are as follows:—

District No.	Existing Population.	Proposed Population.
9	50	44,400
10	1,280	37,100
17	600	33,100
18	3,930	38,300

Now let us go south of the city.

29	6,570	37,800
27	980	42,100
28	550	36,600
30	1,840	39,400

In the western areas where this proposed pool is to be situated, the population rise is very small, and in one that I have already quoted, in West Perth, a decrease is shown. In addition, we have the fact that the western suburbs are already served by some of the world's best ocean

beaches. Accordingly, we cannot claim that that site would fit in with the population requirements—far from it.

There is a lot of confusion as to olympic pools and aquatic centres and what they mean. Let us have a look at the Lord Mayor's report which says that the aquatic centre as proposed is largely an area for children and families. This is what he says—

The landscape garden area will contain the wading pool where toddlers will have the opportunity of gradually getting used to water under the supervision of their parents. The facilities within the enclosure will not only be used for the training of children but will also provide general recreation for the moderate swimmers who comprise the great majority of the aquatic centre's patrons, and for the reasonably good swimmers who may care to indulge in surface diving, high diving and aquatic games.

The Lord Mayor says that the moderate swimmers would comprise the great majority; let us say 60 per cent. I would estimate that the toddlers would form about 5 per cent. The children being trained would constitute 10 per cent., and those who are reasonably good swimmers 5 per cent., making a total of 80 per cent. All of that 80 per cent., I contend, could be catered for and would be most suitably catered for if the city council spread its activities into the suburbs where the homes are, and where the future homes will be. If there is to be an aquatic centre for 80 per cent. of the population, which comprises children and medium swimmers, they do not require an olympic pool and they could be catered for in their home areas.

The main purpose of swimming pools as against ocean beaches is that we can take a swimming pool to the home instead of taking the family to the beach. That is the value of it. It is not in our province to tell the city council what to do, but many statements have been made that while we oppose King's Park, we have no alternative suggestion to offer. I would suggest that the Perth City Council provide three swimming pools. A magnificent swimming pool could be provided at a cost of £50,000 and such pools could be built in different areas.

Mr. Potter: What about the administrative cost?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That would not enter into it. One does not need to have an aquatic centre to be able to run a swimming pool. If the city council built three pools at a cost of £50,000 each, it would still have £100,000 for an olympic pool which could be established wherever that body wished. The expert swimmers could use the olympic pool while the children and normal swimmers availed themselves of the other pools. However, that

is only a suggestion I am making because I have heard it said that we have no alternatives to offer in this matter. The Perth City Council would be doing a far better job if it spread its activities.

There is also the matter of transport to be considered. In his leaflet the Lord Mayor says—

Certain it is that travel to King's Park is and will be more convenient for many years than travel to Burswood Island and, further, that once having arrived at King's Park, the shade, lawns and amenities which are already established and those which will be added to the natural tree-setting of the park will be well worth while.

When dealing with the matter of transport, the Lord Mayor says that, in his opinion, King's Park will be more convenient for many years. I would point out that by our action we would be destroying King's Park for ever. We must look to the future in this matter. His first point is rather strange concerning the pool in King's Park as opposed to Burswood Island, while his second statement is a grand admission. Having arrived at King's Park we find that the shade, the lawns and amenities already established and those which will be added to the natural tree-setting of the park will be well worth while. That is what the Lord Mayor says.

On the other hand, this same Lord Mayor and others, when referring to this area, have talked about decaying vegetation. The Lord Mayor refers now to natural tree-setting as being ideal for an aquatic centre. If it is that good, then it will make an ideal setting for anything, and I would say that he has put forward the best argument for the retention of King's Park in its present state. On this matter of transport I would like to quote from the city council brochure. At page 4 we find—

There will be three entrances to the area, one from King's Park-rd., one from Thomas-st. and one from May Drive.

Members can visualise these three entrances. Perhaps we should skip the fact that the entrance from Thomas-st. and King's Park-rd. would cut across the two main city arteries. That does not seem to worry anybody. What about May Drive? One of the main entrances to a big aquatic centre costing £250,000 must have plenty of space. May Drive will become a highway and, of course, it will be widened because we cannot deprive a £250,000 aquatic centre of transport and parking facilities. It will be foolish to say, "You cannot widen May Drive and prohibit the people getting in." It will become a highway, and we would not be able to have a speed limit of 20 miles an hour.

Of course, other amenities must be provided. I notice in the plan that there is provision for the parking of 500 cars, and the Minister has already told us that provision has been made for another 200 cars along Thomas-st. This will not be sufficient to support a £250,000 aquatic centre and it will not be long before more parking areas are required. And so it will go on, once an aquatic centre is established. We must have a lot of parking areas; it is absurd to establish an aquatic centre without adequate parking.

What about buses running direct to the pool? We must have a bus service to a pool of that size, especially on occasions when there is a carnival or big swimming event, and these buses must have a stopping and turning place. All these changes will come; they must come. That is only reasonable, because once the pool is established, these provisions are only incidental. Therefore, the park will go.

Mr. Nalder: Probably they will construct a railway line from West Perth to Subiaco in a circle.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: There is an excellent small publication entitled "The Western Australian Naturalist". I am quite sure a lot of members have not read it. If they had, they would obtain some very useful information from it. I will now read from some figures which are given on page 39 in regard to the habitation of the park. It states that there are 64 species of birds which inhabit the park. Of these 32 are permanent breeding residents or regular seasonal visitors. The remainder of 32 are visitors of varying order of frequency. As regards native flora it says there are over 200 species. The booklet has made suggestions for the preservation of the flora, which seem very practical, so that makes one wonder whether we should not have people who love the park on the board.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: We must have very substantial reasons for parting with any portion of the park for the purpose of putting something there which can very well be somewhere else. There is no doubt about that. Such amenities can be built in other places than the park. Here we have another important admission from the Lord Mayor, when he gives details concerning the Burswood Island site. I would like members to notice his words, because they indicate that the Lord Mayor feels that Burswood Island is the future site. He had this to say—

It is true that one day it would appear possible to establish the great sporting stadium referred to in the Stephenson-Hepburn plan, but where is the million pounds to come from that is required to develop such a site? The scheme of park development for Burswood Island and the adjacent foreshore is certainly a long-term one,

and unless a large sum of Government money may be initially granted for the purpose, it will be many years before park and recreational facilities may be possible in this area.

Those who are supporting the aquatic centre in King's Park have accused those opposing it with a lack of vision. If we want a real vision, what about that of the Lord Mayor, when he says that Burswood Island should be the future place for such a project. If we want to talk about vision, why not look forward to that as the objective for a future site? If we build a temporary aquatic centre in King's Park, what is going to happen to the main scheme, which the Lord Mayor has already outlined?

The Royal Society of Western Australia made some very helpful suggestions. This is a society which is only interested in this matter from the point of view of geology, zoology and botany. In a circular, dated the 11th January, 1957, that society had this to say—

It is commonly believed that the removal of a few acres from such a large area as King's Park would have little detrimental effect on its value as a fauna and flora reserve. Unfortunately, this is far from true. If the park is reduced in size, it will inevitably lose its natural character, and not only plants but birds, insects and various other fauna will rapidly disappear. This has been realised in England and America where extensive and costly schemes are afoot to preserve natural features.

I feel that the discussion we have had on this matter should surely stimulate the King's Park Board to some activity so that it will seek to preserve the natural fauna and flora of that park.

Mr. Potter: Will you give them £1,000,000 to do it?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I would like to point out to members that whatever we do, we cannot provide another King's Park near the city. In fact, there is nowhere else in the world where we could duplicate the setting of King's Park with its superb location on the banks of a river and adjacent to the city. We must also have regard to the flora which is there at this time of the year. Some members do not seem to appreciate that King's Park is unique and irreplaceable, and it is impossible to express its value.

Mr. Lawrence: True words.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I do not know what the future holds, and whether the park will be used for this or that. It is something for the future to decide; but I am sure it is our responsibility to preserve the park. Science and industry, architects and city councils and town planners or

anybody else cannot make a King's Park. Therefore, it is our duty to preserve it as it stands.

**MR. NORTON** (Gascoyne) [3.23]: I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not opposed to a swimming pool or an aquatic centre in any way, but my objection is to the establishment of a pool in King's Park. Before giving my reasons, I would like to deal in brief with letters which have been received by me. The first one I shall refer to was received from the Lord Mayor himself. This letter, in my opinion, was almost insulting and belittling, and I wish to have one particular paragraph recorded in Hansard.

**Mr. Heal:** Read it all and let us all know what was in it.

**Mr. NORTON:** The hon. member received one. This is the paragraph which I wish to have recorded—

Little was it thought that such a small body of people, who have taken upon themselves to represent the great mass of the public as being opposed to the proposals, should beguile members of Parliament into the belief that this was so.

What is the definition of "beguile"? In looking at Webster's 20th Century Dictionary, I find that the definition of "beguile" is to "deceive" or "to deceive by deceit".

**Mr. Potter:** That is what happened when you signed the ultimatum.

**Mr. NORTON:** Following this letter, we received a large number of communications from various sporting bodies, three of which were signed by the same person. All were enclosed in envelopes typed by the same typewriter and by the same person. At the same time, there appeared in "The West Australian" a letter which is headed, "An Open Letter to 30 from 30,000!" It was signed by Air Commodore R. J. Brownell (chairman); Patricia Howard (hon. secretary); C. R. G. Mallet (W.A. Lawn Tennis Association); F. T. Treacy (W. A. Amateur Athletic Association); (Mrs.) M. Matthews (W.A. Women's Basket Ball Association); P. McC. White (W.A. Rugby League); L. A. Cary (W.A. Volunteer Fire Brigades).

**Mr. Heal:** What was the matter with that?

**Mr. NORTON:** Nothing at all.

**Hon. J. B. Sleeman:** Did Cary speak for the volunteers?

**Mr. NORTON:** Apparently. On the following page of the same issue of "The West Australian" dated the 22nd August, we find an article headed, "Sport Group Joins Park Pool Fight" and in part of this article is the following:—

Committee secretary Miss Patricia Howard said the open letter was not the opinion of the committee's senior

body, the National Fitness Council, which had clearly indicated support for an aquatic centre but was not prepared to indicate any particular site.

The letter is the opinion of the committee—an autonomous group.

**Hon. J. B. Sleeman:** You have let the cat out of the bag.

**Mr. NORTON:** If that does not come within the category of "beguiling," I do not know what does. Speaking on referendums, I would say that one can get any result one desires by the question which is asked, and it is difficult to find out just what question was asked in these referendums. Therefore, like the letters, they can be cast aside as not expressing the opinion of the majority.

King's Park has, over the years, built up a reputation with overseas and interstate visitors as something unique. We might not think it is beautiful, but no doubt the park is unique and certainly exhibits, at this time of the year, a good example of the flowers which used to grow in profusion around the metropolitan area. Whilst we may not appreciate them as a general body, people from overseas and interstate think they are well worth looking at. Not only are the flowers unique to Western Australia, but so are many of the trees which grow there, and if we are going to chisel away parts of the park, little by little, we are going to destroy once and for all the native flora which exists there. If we take a little bit here and a little bit there from around the fringes, we are decreasing the whole and will soon reach the centre, with the result that eventually the park will disappear.

At the present time the park is subdivided by roads and firebreaks, which are necessary, and there are over 50 sections. Each subdivision has killed native scrub, in order to provide a road, bridle path or firebreak, because the scrub dies back from each opening that is made. Let us keep King's Park as a flora reserve and look elsewhere for a site on which to build an olympic pool. Let us have an olympic pool which will be something to be proud of. Let us have two attractions instead of one. It does not take a great deal of knowledge to build an artificial park such as St. James Park or Hyde Park in London, but it is impossible to produce a natural one like King's Park. Therefore let us keep it.

The veldt grass that has been talked of so much is not the menace it has been made out to be. Members have pointed out that veldt grass has been in the park for 30 years. Well, where is it? It borders the roadways, bridle tracks and firebreaks, but very little can be seen in the scrub, and in particular, none can be seen wherever the timber is dense. Veldt grass is purely a grass for the open plains and will not

stand being covered over as it is in King's Park. Away from the bridle tracks, roads and firebreaks little or no veldt grass is to be found. Anyone who has been through the park will know this only too well.

Mr. Potter: I do not; and I have been through the park.

Mr. NORTON: That voice keeps popping up there! I do not know what the trouble is. In "The West Australian" of the 25th July, there appeared an article under the heading "Lord Mayor has Little Hope on Pool Plan." I would like to read part of this—

Lord Mayor H. R. Howard was gloomy yesterday when asked about an alternative site for Perth's olympic pool, should Parliament reject the King's Park plan.

No motion of the council mentioned an alternative site and no consideration had been given to suggesting one, he said.

It is obvious from these words that he is just endeavouring to bulldoze people into believing that King's Park is the only site for an olympic pool or an aquatic centre.

I draw the attention of the House—also that of the Lord Mayor—to a letter which appeared in "The West Australian" of the 5th July. It is headed, "Near Reabold Hill—A Pool?" It was written by R. Wyatt Young of Claremont and it reads—

There are 30 acres opposite Reabold Hill where stone is to be quarried. A Mr. John Jelft has offered to remove the stone by sawing, instead of blasting, and form a basin to the right measurements of an olympic pool, paying the council £100,000.

That has not come out in these debates, nor has much been said about it. The letter goes on—

It is the Perth City Council's property. Waste water could be easily disposed of here. It is easily accessible and could accommodate large crowds.

This would be as beautiful a setting as King's Park which would cost much regret and considerable expenditure.

This is the comment made by the town clerk, Mr. W. A. McI. Green—

A preliminary plan for the development of an area opposite Reabold Hill was submitted to the council about two months ago. Detailed information about the plan and precise proposals had not been received.

I do not know just what he means, but he certainly dodged the issue in the letter. Let us keep King's Park—if not for our own use, then as an attraction for overseas

tourists. Let us build an aquatic centre at Reabold Hill as a further advertisement of what we can do in Western Australia.

No matter where a pool is situated, it will not be convenient to all, but it will suit the professionals, and the people will go to it when big tournaments and swimming sports are held. We cannot suit the whole of the city by putting it in one place. Therefore, if the Lord Mayor would accept this £100,000 for the excavation of a pool at Reabold Hill, he could spend that sum on other pools round the City of Perth and use the £250,000 to develop his pool at Reabold Hill.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES** (Hon. L. F. Kelly—Yilgarn) [3.35]: This debate, which has occupied a great many hours, has produced some remarkably strange bed fellows. There have been some statesman like addresses, but curiously enough they have come from the section in favour of the pool.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: You will get on!

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** There has been a diversity of opinion expressed on many aspects. There was much skirting around the question and red herrings were drawn across the trail; and, in many instances, a distorted outlook was expressed, as to what King's Park really represents, and in regard to the importance of an aquatic centre in the heart of Perth.

Many speakers centred their argument almost entirely on the subject of our indigenous bush. They regaled the House with their desire to preserve to the State the indigenous wonderland known as King's Park. We heard some impassioned appeals based on the preservation of our natural bush and the reserving of our indigenous areas for posterity. Others, just as impassioned, approached the subject from the point of view of our great heritage. I suppose everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but this did not prevent illogical thought getting into this discussion.

At the outset I want to make the position perfectly clear that I am a keen lover of our indigenous bush country. I am a keen advocate of everything from a natural history standpoint; and here I include our beautiful trees, flowers, bird life and the general animal life in much of our virgin bush. I say virgin bush advisedly because we are fast getting to the point where we have little virgin bush left in Western Australia and we certainly have no virgin bush in King's Park.

My idea of our bushland beauty is something far different from what we have on Mt. Eliza. I suppose I visit that area as much as I visit many other parts of the State—parts that afford me more enjoyment, from a bushlover's point of

view, than does King's Park, no matter how deep my enthusiasm for our bushland. I believe that for bushland to be really worth while it has to abound in healthy trees; there have to be towering gums that are a sight for man to behold. It must be a place where there are attractive shrubs, a wide variety of orchids, an abundance of myrtle, plenty of green and other kangaroo paws, and a profusion of other attractive bush flowers. That is what I envisage. I can see that the member for Darling Range is about to interject. I go into his territory—not far from his residence at times—and I see some marvellous bushland there.

Mr. Oldfield: What about the worker who has not a motorcar?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: When we go into territory such as that in the district represented by the member for Darling Range, we can really enthuse about the bushland of this State because it is really beautiful. It is still intact, in its natural state.

Mr. Norton: Are there reserves?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A big portion of that area is a reserve.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have certainly tried to establish yourself as a lover of nature.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: All the things I have enumerated can be found in a beautiful setting throughout the whole of our National Park. This is a lovely territory preserved in its natural state. Little has been done in the making of roadways through it or making it more beautiful than nature has made it. There has been no great influx of shrubs into that area nor have various types of flowers and orchids been transplanted there. It is a natural bushland which is something that Mt. Eliza has never been or is never likely to be, because the types of flora that occur in these areas in many cases are far removed from what we find in the sandy country. It does not exclude what is growing in the sandy country, but the sandy country excludes what is growing in the clay and gravel lands of the State. All of this is in a natural setting; the hand of man has not been used to create it in any degree as it has in King's Park.

What do we find in King's Park? Where is this beauty of our bushland? I have during the period the Bill has been before the House, heard people enthuse about King's Park. I suppose I could be put in the category of those who would be most enthusiastic in regard to its beauties, but let me classify what I term the beauties of King's Park. Have we there any of those attributes that I have mentioned as being natural?

Mr. W. A. Manning: You are advocating a change in the board now.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am not advocating a change in the board. Later in my remarks, I will come to the question of what the board has done. In my recent visits to the park I have failed to find any of the healthy trees or shrubs and the 101 other types of plants that I can find in other parts. Even Reabold Hill, that has been mentioned, is in better heart today than is King's Park. Why should that be? I say to the House: What of the indigenous life of King's Park today? What is really attractive once we get away from the macadamised roads in King's Park?

Mr. Roberts: Everything.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I suppose the only time the hon. member has been in King's Park is since the controversy started.

*Sitting suspended from 3.40 to 4.5 p.m.*

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Prior to the tea break when I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Bunbury, I had got to the point of making abundantly clear my impressions of good indigenous shrub or bushland. I was saying what was the indigenous growth in King's Park. At best, the growth in King's Park today cannot be described as anything better than tenth-grade bush. I am referring to the general portion of King's Park, beyond the river perimeter. I do not say that all the banksia and gum trees are dying, but the majority of banksia trees in King's Park are showing signs of going backwards. They have passed the prime of their bush life. The same applies to the remaining gum trees. In some cases they are only semi-alive with their hearts burnt out. They are tumbling very fast.

Very little regrowth is taking place, because of the thick undergrowth that has taken charge of the paths. We see the spectacle of a number of shaggy sheoaks. We find quite a number of shrubs which long ago have lost their interest in life and which at present just grow. There is very little of the natural beauty one would expect to find in indigenous growth on land such as King's Park. There is a very limited variety of the various types of shrubs which years ago were there in their glory and in reasonable abundance. The native flowers and orchids have been reduced considerably.

Any member who cares to spend some time in the park, particularly during November and March, will find that the bushland which we have heard spoken of so reverently is a snake-ridden area, dangerous to the people. Although some members might say that not many people have been killed as a result of snakebite sustained in King's Park, there is always the first time. There is a tremendous number of snakes in that area.

Reference has been made to veldt grass in the park as not being of any real concern. If I were a pastoralist, I would be very happy at the amount of veldt grass found in abundance in almost all parts, not only the perimeter, the tracks, the roads or cleared spots, but right throughout where the undergrowth is not too thick for the veldt grass to get a footing. Those are the spectacles we find today when we seek beautiful bush in King's Park. What we find is what I term "rubbishy" undergrowth. In short, King's Park, as indigenous bushland, has degenerated very fast, and at its best, it is nothing better than a great fire hazard.

Let us examine the other side of the picture, that is, the attractions to be found in King's Park. Where do we take our visitors when we conduct them through the park? Do we escort them into the indigenous shrub land? Do we lead them up any of the several bridle paths? Do we ask them to view sentiment, as I have heard expressed in this House so many times in the course of this debate? Do we ask them to view sentiment as being the chief drawcard in King's Park? Of course, we do not!

When we take our tourist visitors to King's Park, which I, as Minister responsible for tourist trade, have done so frequently, we do not take them to view the indigenous bush. We take them to the man-made attractions and to the slopes from where unsurpassed views of the city can be obtained. We point out to them the wonderful view of the Swan; we show them the Darling Ranges; and we do not forget Moondyne Joe when we do that. When we escort them along Memorial Drive, and along the other fine drives, we do not find any indigenous flora; all that is evident of any beauty consists of rows and rows of trees planted by man, not the natural growth. The natural growth has long since lost its attractiveness.

We show our visitors the wonderful red and white gums, and the domestic wattle, all having been planted by man. There is nothing natural about any of those plants. We go further, and in season we show them the kangaroo paws, the Geraldton wax and the flame trees when they are in flower. We show them what beauty there is, and people with cameras take photographs. None of these plants are indigenous. They have all been brought into King's Park. We extol to them the virtues of the park and show them the wonderful scenery. I would not listen to anybody decrying the beauty of the park, but the beauty is not the indigenous beauty.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Have you ever walked over the area proposed to be bulldozed?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have visited it frequently. I am not in the habit of putting my name to a piece of

paper without investigating the position myself. I was not coerced to put anything on paper or to record my protest against the project. I went to see the place myself. I have been going through King's Park since some 20 years before the hon. member came into the world. I have always had a tremendous feeling of pride in King's Park, and I want to make sure that King's Park will be maintained and developed in the only way possible; that is, in the way that man can develop it.

An opportunity has already been given to King's Park to develop under its own resources and natural conditions; that has gone on from 50 to 100 years. All that has been registered in the minds of unbiased persons is that the park, from the bushland angle, has been degenerating gradually. Do we desire to see a hill of sand, and nothing more, to be left to posterity, a phrase I have heard so very often in this discourse; or do we want to leave some progressive trend in the natural surroundings to the people who follow us, to the coming generations who will become the ratepayers of Perth? Let us leave them something that will be a memorial, and not something that stands up starkly on top of Mt. Eliza, an eyesore for the coming generations.

From an indigenous flora point of view, the King's Park area is not going to receive many marks from the majority of the people of Western Australia. It is up to us to do something really worth while with an alienated area of the park which has outlived its usefulness as bushland, in stead of drawing back into our sheaths and being prepared to do nothing at all about a wonderful asset when the opportunity is given to us to do something progressive.

In my remarks I have not intended to express one uncharitable thought with regard to the King's Park Board or the employees who are clothed with the responsibility of looking after the park. I feel that they have done an excellent job; and, to the extent of the financial resources available to them, have beautified that area as much as possible. They have kept it clean and tidy, and have provided an area overlooking the Swan River which is a delight not only to us but to visitors to this State. It is a pleasure to travel along the drives in King's Park; but through all the years that have passed only 40 acres of that reserve have shown any sign of being developed by boards, governments and councils.

It has been said by some members that they would not like to see man-made developments in the park; but there would be no worth-while feature in the park if it had not been for the developments effected by men. We have 960-odd acres of wilderness at present. It is tenth grade bush; and I think that any member from the South-West would agree with me that



there is not a vestige of resemblance between the shrubs of King's Park and the beautiful banksias, sheoaks and gums to be found in the South-West or, for that matter, even in the Darling Range, where there is an abundance of everything worth while.

Let us adopt a modern approach. Let us recognise the potential that the Perth City Council is prepared to develop in its plan for an aquatic centre. Let us show some degree of progress and move with the times. Instead of our doing that, we have had in this Chamber during the last two or three weeks nothing but a succession of comments that have carried very little weight. I suppose that my comments will carry very little weight with some of those who are opposed to the city council's proposal.

But I feel that there is a background that must be preserved in the park. There is a means of our doing something which many members in this House have said should have been done a number of years ago, and which would have been done had it not been for the contention that the time was not opportune. The time is not opportune, no matter what sort of progress is proposed—whether it is industrial legislation brought down from this side of the House, or something that is submitted from the opposite side of the House with a flavour of its own line of thought.

It is never an opportune time; and it is the same old catchcry that has been heard on this occasion. There has been a complete absence of logic on the part of those who have submitted reasons why an aquatic centre should not be established in King's Park. Not one sound reason has been advanced during the whole of the discussion against the siting of an aquatic centre in Mt. Eliza. I feel that the Perth City Council should be commended for the vision and the courage it has displayed. I have heard remarks concerning who would pay for the project. I can only say that I would be very pleased to be a ratepayer in an area in which a progressive body had conceived the idea of developing an aquatic centre in a place like King's Park.

**THE MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE** (Hon. J. J. Brady—Guildford-Midland) [4.20]: I wish to make a few remarks on the Bill, which I intend to oppose. Like some other speakers, I am not opposed to an aquatic centre, but I do not think that King's Park is the place for it. I was rather surprised to hear the Minister for Mines speaking in such a strain, particularly as he has travelled rather extensively in recent years through the British Isles and America. I do not know if he is aware of the fact that during the time he was in America there was a great upsurge of interest in the national parks of that country.

In the "Christian Science Monitor" of the 3rd May, 1956, there was a map, which I have here for members to see and which shows the location of 38 national parks, in connection with which no lesser person than the President of the United States agreed to spend millions of pounds on a 10-year programme designed to bring the parks to the condition in which they should always have been, but from which they had degenerated, owing to neglect. I am rather disappointed that the Minister for Mines did not make himself conversant with those particular areas. The article in the "Christian Science Monitor" is headed "Support of National Parks: A Public Responsibility." There is a sub-heading which reads, "The National Parks: A Heritage Worth Saving."

This debate, Mr. Speaker, has continued for some weeks, and you are probably tired of repetition. I could read 10 columns from this paper, but I will content myself by reading just a few paragraphs to give members an idea of what another nation thinks about this subject of parks.

The Minister for Mines: You are evading the main issue.

**THE MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE:** I shall come back to it effectively in a moment; and I think that I will give the Minister a shock concerning his logic. This article reads, in part—

A massive effort to save the national parks from further despoliation and even eventual destruction has begun to gather momentum. Its continued progress will depend upon how much Americans treasure their priceless scenic and historic heritage, on how much support they give to the protective efforts now under way. Only an aroused and vocal public—the people who own the parks—can insure that the parks and monuments will be saved.

Of greatest significance, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Parks Service and originator of the bold, imaginative Mission 66 program to provide urgently needed parks preservation over a period of 10 years, has enunciated his unequivocal stand to keep the park areas free from any activities that would impair their natural state as envisioned by the park founders.

One would almost imagine that they were here in the City of Perth! The article continues—

Affirming that the National Parks Services fundamental policy of protection has not changed Mr. Wirth says, nevertheless, "there are situations and conditions in the National Park system to which I object . . . as rapidly as it is feasible to do so we hope to remedy them, meanwhile preventing others from developing or becoming established."

"We definitely don't want the National Parks to be resorts as that word is commonly understood," says Mr. Wirth.

Along with this heartening policy statement, the best news the nation could have with spring in the air and the wilderness beckoning is the hearty reception that has been given here in Washington to Mission 66.

Park officials warned, however, that the assistance program in the national parks has just begun after long years of neglect and that the upward trail ahead is beset with the obstacle of general apathy and the challenge to promote public enlightenment. These must be met before the peaks of parks preservation are reached. Even then, continued vigilance and efforts will be necessary.

Parks enthusiasts have been pleased with the reception given the Parks Services Mission 66 plan. President Eisenhower enthusiastically approved the program, and his administration authorised a very substantial increase in the parks services rather modest 1957 appropriations request.

Not to be outdone, Congress, with a warming glow of appreciation for the nation's great scenic and historical shrines, increased the appropriations they gained.

As it now stands, the House has passed a 1957 National Parks Appropriation in the amount of 67,688,000 dollars and the Senate has approved one of 68,020,000. All that remains is the minor task of adjusting the differences in conference.

There is a seven-column article on this subject in this paper, but it would not be fair to members to read it all. The fact remains that other nations of the world are awakening to the value of their parks, and we should awaken to the value of ours.

During the afternoon tea suspension, one of my colleagues and I went to King's Park and walked for a quarter of a mile, and the area was one vast mass of flowers and shrubs of all kinds such as are to be found 50 to 100 miles away from the city. I venture to suggest that there is not another city in Australia with a park almost in its centre, to which access can be gained within a few minutes, and where the natural flowers and shrubs of the State can be found in such prolific quantities.

This is a young State, and we have 1,000,000 square miles of country to develop. Perth will ultimately become the biggest city in Australasia—in 100 to 150 year's time. As times goes on, there will be increasing numbers of tourists from the Eastern States coming here to see our lovely flowers; and when it is possible to travel from England and from America to Australia within a few hours, the influx of

tourists will considerably increase. These people will want to visit our park and see our natural flora. Also, the people from the inland of our own State, and from the north, will desire to see the park in its natural condition.

I would challenge the Minister for Mines to point to any other park in Western Australia that has the prolific growth to be found in King's Park. I challenge any member to point to any place which has such an abundance of natural flora as is to be found in that park. Why should we, as a responsible Parliament, despoil that ground just to satisfy the whims of a few people who are looking forward to having the Empire Games in this State in 1960 or 1962?

For my part, I have travelled around Australia quite a lot and seen olympic pools. I know of two which are no longer used—one because of the existence of a colour bar in the town; and the other, because it was found too expensive to maintain. Yet here it is proposed to lease to the Perth City Council for 99 years, for the establishment of a pool, land which is valued at anything from £4,000 to £5,000 per acre; in other words, it is proposed to hand over to this body £80,000 worth of the State's asset. I do not think we are justified in doing that, because of the value of that land to the State as a tourist attraction.

One member said that only 40 acres of the park were used. I venture the opinion that there are 40 acres of road through the park, apart from other man-made improvements. So it is drawing the long bow to say that only 40 acres are used. The fact remains that if the King's Park Board, the Perth City Council, the National Parks Board and the Education Department do the right thing by the park, it will be one of the greatest heritages that we can pass on to posterity. I feel that over the years we have neglected the park. For the past 100 years our main interest has been to attain a decent standard of living and our pioneers went through greater privations and difficulties than those of any other country.

It is only in the last 10 or 15 years that we have really passed out of the pioneering stage. I can remember when Como beach and our sea beaches were opened up—all in the last couple of decades—and we have not exploited them to the extent that we should have. As a member of Parliament and a citizen of this State, I am disappointed at the amenities and conveniences that local governing bodies have provided at our beach and river resorts. In some instances the public conveniences are nil and children playing on the river foreshore have no change rooms or showers.

There are many things on which the Perth City Council could well spend its money in the interests of the mothers and

young people of the State, without wanting to spend money in King's Park. I would say to the Perth City Council, "In King's Park we have a valuable asset from the point of view of encouraging tourists to spend money in Perth; let us leave it as it is." One of the reasons why I oppose portion of the park being leased to the City Council is that that would put back 20 years the desire of the community to have the Swan River cleaned up.

The Minister for Works is about to introduce a Bill to set up a committee with the object of keeping the river free from pollution and I can envisage the day when that committee will be given power to make the Swan River the greatest pleasure resort in the State. To spend £250,000 on an olympic pool in King's Park would put that project back two decades—

Mr. Court: Why?

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Because money will then not be spent on Crawley Baths as it should be. Those baths are in far worse condition today than they were when I was 10 years of age, and the Perth City Council has never faced up to its responsibility in regard to the river.

Mr. Court: It is trying to do the right thing, but you will not let it do so.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: If an olympic pool is once built in King's Park, for the rest of the century nothing will be done to improve the Swan River. The children of the outer suburbs such as Midland Junction, Helena Vale and so on are forced to swim in the river and if it is good enough for them, it is good enough for the children of the inner metropolitan area. I repeat that in the past we have not exploited the river and our beaches to the extent that we should have. I hope the Bill will be defeated so that the city council may examine the asset which it now has and which the Bill would despoil.

Under this measure King's Park would be despoiled and the Swan River and Crawley Baths would be neglected, which I think would be a tragedy. An olympic pool such as is suggested would be used only in the summer and for six months of the year it would not be used at all, which would offset its value. Further, if a few Asiatics or aboriginals sought admission to the pool, a furore would result and the pool would be probably closed down and then there would be a move made to turn it into some other project for the City of Perth.

We must look forward 50 years to the day when the population of this State will number millions. It is approaching 1,000,000 now and at the present rate of increase in not very many years the figure will reach 2,000,000. Can anyone tell

me that King's Park would be too big for a population of 2,000,000 to have access to in order that the children of the metropolitan area might see the natural beauty of the Western Australian bush? I will not accept such a proposition.

I have always found King's Park pleasant to drive through on Sunday afternoon in order to show it to my visitors or friends who have not cars of their own. The atmosphere is tranquil but with an olympic pool established there, the peacefulness would be destroyed by blaring loud speakers advising one lot of swimmers that the time had come for them to leave the pool and another lot to enter, and so on. In the "Daily News" in the last few days there have been articles referring to scantily dressed maidens on the beaches. Do the people who have passed the age for swimming want, while in King's Park, to be confronted with hundreds of young people going backwards and forwards to the pool sparsely dressed on Sunday or Saturday afternoons? There are thousands of acres of our sea and river beaches where the young people can parade without destroying the peace and tranquility of King's Park. With an olympic pool there we would have the loud speakers blaring, "It is now 3 o'clock and such and such a school must leave the water," and so on.

I think it was the Minister for Lands who said we should be progressive and open up the park for further recreation for the people. I do not know whether he has in mind permitting circuses to be located there, but that would come within the scope of his words. The areas available behind Christian Bros. College and alongside the Ozone Hotel are virtually no longer available for circuses. Today there are schools the children of which are playing unofficially in King's Park, and if this Bill is successful, those schools will try to justify the granting to them of areas of the park because they have already played there unofficially for years. They would have every justification for doing so if this measure were passed.

There are over 100 sporting bodies in this city today and if each of them was granted only 20 acres of the park, none of it would remain. That is why this body I have referred to was formed in America—to put before Congress the inroads made into the national parks, the founders of which foresaw them as the heritage for the future. I want to see an aquatic centre built, but not in King's Park. There is room for three or four such pools in the metropolitan area, and, as the member for Narrogin said, the tendency is for the population of Perth to go north, south and east but not west. We have been told that King's Park would be the most accessible centre for the pool but I would say it is the most inaccessible for residents of the

northern, southern and eastern suburbs. I oppose the Bill and hope it will be defeated.

**MR. MOIR** (Boulder) [4.40]: I wish to record my objection to the Bill for various reasons. I am naturally in favour of an aquatic centre being built, and more particularly an olympic pool, as is only natural because I come from the Goldfields where we have had the benefit of such a pool since before the war. My opposition to the Bill, like that of many other members, is that the pool is sought to be placed in King's Park. I believe King's Park is unique in Australia and I have never heard of any other city in the world which has a park in its midst containing the natural flora of the country. Once the natural flora is removed, it cannot be replaced.

It is surprising to see the sharp clash of views on this question. I realise that we each approach the problem from our own point of view but it is striking that while, on one hand, many people can see beauty in King's Park as it is, others cannot do so, and some qualify that view by saying that they see beauty only in those portions of the area where man has destroyed the natural flora and has planted grasses and trees foreign to this part of the country.

If we were to clear away all the natural flora of King's Park and replace it with imported grasses and trees such as pines, oaks and so on, it would no doubt have a very pleasing effect, but we already have other areas that have been developed in that way. We have only this one area of natural parkland, which is King's Park and it is something that we cannot replace as it was put there by nature. This problem is much wider than the question of whether a certain portion of the land should be excised so that an aquatic centre might be built in King's Park.

The question is whether we should retain King's Park as we know it, or hand it over for other purposes. Let us make no mistake—and I am certain no member in this Chamber could logically argue against it—once we have approved the handing over of this section of the park, we could not logically refuse similar applications by other bodies for other portions. I could think of numerous bodies that would have a far more valid claim to sections of King's Park, than the Perth City Council seems to think it has on this occasion. But once we have granted this area of land, future Parliaments would find it most difficult to refuse similar requests coming forward for other areas.

Accordingly, we would find the park would gradually be whittled away. This is not peculiar to Western Australia; it happens everywhere. We know that in the Eastern States some of the best known parks have been whittled away. Many

years ago in Melbourne large areas were set aside for parks and these have been gradually whittled down. Albert Park has been reduced, until today it is half its original size; so much so, that the people of Melbourne are alarmed at this trend that has developed over the years, and they are now demanding that the portions of the park previously disposed of be resumed and restored to their original purpose.

That must go on, and it will certainly take place here. We know that in the not-far-distant future, Perth will be a great capital city and that covetous eyes will be cast on these areas. No doubt the people who will put their propositions forward will be just as sincere as are the people who are putting up the present scheme. We must, however, look at these things with a view to the future and realise that in this 900 acres of bushland, we have something that is priceless. Apart from the beauty which most people see in it, it constitutes a most charming and healthy area in and around the city.

It has been said by previous speakers—and I have no doubt that they are genuine in what they say—that the park is a heap of wild bush and rubbish. The Minister for Mines, when speaking to the debate, described King's Park as rubbish, undergrowth, and tenth-rate bush.

**Mr. Ross Hutchinson:** Beauty lies in the eyes of the beholder.

**Mr. MOIR:** The Minister made comparisons with our forest country in the South-West and said he felt that any member coming from the South-West would agree with him when he claimed there was not nearly the same beauty in King's Park as there was in the bushland of the South-West. I came from the South-West originally; I spent many years of my younger life there and I am well acquainted with this bushland. But it is a different type of beauty altogether. King's Park never was a forest area; it is an area that carries plant life that is peculiar to the coastal regions of this State. It is a very good example, possibly the best example that could be found anywhere, of the bushland that existed here before British habitation, and the resultant clearing had taken place.

There is much talk about natural and virgin bush. I do not know any place in Australia where there would be virgin bush. Much has also been said about fires that occur in King's Park but, of course, we know that fires have run through the bushland of this State before the white people ever saw it, because the native inhabitants put the fires through to scare out the game and for other reasons. Anybody who has been brought up in the bush knows that quite often a fire is seen going through the countryside. As I have said, these fires have been running through the bush since

long before white people inhabited this country. I have heard people say that there are not as many flowers in King's Park as there used to be. If that is correct, then all I can say is that previously the park must have been a riot of colour, because there are certainly plenty of wild-flowers to be found there today.

In relation to the aquatic centre, and its attendant facilities, I would say that some of the comments made here have emanated from a lack of factual knowledge. Anybody who has the idea that the proposed aquatic centre will serve the people of the metropolitan area is right off the beam. It will only serve the needs of some of the people of the metropolitan area because it will be far too small to serve the needs of the entire population here. To properly provide the metropolitan area with still-water swimming facilities, one would have to have several pools.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That is what is required.

Mr. MOIR: At the present time, we are told there are 40,000 children who will use the proposed pool. That is quite ridiculous. If that were so, the pool would be crammed all the time and the children would have to be run through in relays. I know what I am talking about because the same thing happened in Kalgoorlie with the children there. The people who control that pool have the utmost difficulty in planning the various functions that take place at the beginning of the summer in that pool. We find in the case of the Kalgoorlie pool, that children come from the various schools to indulge in swimming sports, and also to attend the swimming classes that are held every season. All these swimming functions have to be ordered and organised, and this is necessary in an area that has a total population of only 23,000.

On occasions the pool is very well patronised and though during the hot weather it is possible for one to get into the pool, I am sure it is not always very enjoyable because of the crowded conditions. The pool at Kalgoorlie although built to olympic standards is more crowded in the hot weather than Hay-st. on bargain shopping day.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You want another pool at Boulder.

Mr. MOIR: We could certainly do with one at Boulder. So anyone who has the idea that this aquatic centre will supply the needs of the people of the metropolitan area is entirely wrong. What is required in the metropolitan area is a number of pools scattered around the place. Indeed, I cannot understand why they have not been built long ago. The people in the country have pools and, as I have said before, we have had an olympic pool in Kalgoorlie for many years. The

people of Norseman have a pool, as have those at Merredin, Bullfinch and Cunderdin; and I now find that the people at Northam are building a pool. Pools have been built in many country centres of the State, but nobody made a fuss about the building of them.

Hon. D. Brand: Parliament did not have to decide the issue.

Mr. MOIR: The people there decided to build a pool and for their finance they approached the people in the district whom they thought would assist. Having done that, they found the balance of money themselves. But the people in the metropolitan area seem to be looking to the Perth City Council to provide them with swimming facilities. The plans that the Perth City Council has for the building of this magnificent centre will, I am sure, fall short of the requirements of the people of the metropolitan area for the very reasons that I have mentioned.

On many occasions I have taken visitors from the country and from the Eastern States and overseas to King's Park and, without exception, they have all acclaimed the unique beauty of the park and its wonderful position. If one happens to be visiting the Eastern States and is introduced to somebody who has been across to Western Australia, it is not long before they are referring to King's Park and talking about it in the most laudatory terms.

Mention has been made about the veldt grass detracting from the appearance of the park; and it has been said that this is a great problem. I do not think that this problem has ever been tackled seriously. It could not have been tackled seriously if the amounts allocated to the King's Park Board are any indication; because we find that the money allocated to the King's Park Board in 1956 was £7,900 while the expenditure was £8,500. This year we find an allocation of £9,000 being made. This is a mere pittance, and the board cannot do very much with such a small amount.

Over the years we have been quite unaware of the wonderful asset we have in King's Park. Members have also referred to the degeneration of the park, and have said that the trees there are dying. That, however, is the law of nature in any bushland. As is the case with the human race, there is always something dying and something being born to take its place. Anyone conversant with forests would know that there are always dead and dying trees in any bush land, together with young trees which are coming up to take their place. Anybody who walks through King's Park and is sufficiently informed on the subject would see this regeneration taking place.

Mention has been made of the fact that the scrub is taking over but we all know that trees will not grow without scrub. We had a perfect illustration of that on the Goldfields where dusty areas existed as a result of stock grazing. The scrub was cut out below its original level and, as a result, the trees died. That can be verified from forestry records, and members have heard me mention it before. When they set out to regenerate that country, they had to keep the stock off. They allowed scrub to thrive and the trees grew up, with the result that today we have green trees for miles around Kalgoorlie. Therefore, it is natural to have scrub in the park, as otherwise there would be no trees. Of course, people who go there expecting to see forest giants will not find them, as it is not the type of country to grow them.

Reference has been made to the enjoyment which children, teenagers, and older people would derive from an aquatic centre in King's Park. I think it was the Premier who made that statement. I do not yield to anyone in this Chamber so far as the provision for the enjoyment of children and old people is concerned. I come from a part of the State where children are very well catered for—far better than in many other parts of the State—and I am always mindful of what should be done to assist children in their enjoyment. I feel sure that many of the members in this Chamber who are opposing this Bill, have just as much concern for the enjoyment of children and other people.

I should like to say a word or two about some of the propaganda to which we have been subjected. I have no objection to it at all. I believe it is the right of every person who is interested in some matter before Parliament to write to a member and express his views. What I object to is people sending documents along and attempting to convey a false impression. I am going to refer to only one letter, which I immediately thought of when the member for Gascoyne made reference to the word "beguile." I received it from an association which is well respected in the community—highly respected—and it is one to which I have belonged for many years.

In writing to ask for my support of this proposition, they said that the membership of the association was 11,000 plus dependants, comprising all sections of the community, and the tenor of the letter is that they were speaking on behalf—although they did not say so, the implication is there—of all the members of the association and their dependants. I have been a member of that association for many years.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They did not speak for you.

Mr. MOIR: I know a lot of people who are members of that association and I asked them if they had been asked as to

their opinion on the proposition and without exception they said "No." Like myself, they never knew that the association was interested. This association is the Australian Natives Association. I do not know if members were ever consulted, yet the association writes to members—I suppose all members of Parliament were canvassed—leading them to believe that it spoke for 11,000 members and their dependants. I am standing here today, but I cannot speak for my dependants on this occasion, because I do not know what they want. The approach from that association is typical of the letters we have received.

Mr. Hearman: Whom do you blame for that. Surely the A.N.A.

Mr. MOIR: Yes. It has been sent by the general secretary and I take it that he and his executive were enthusiastic supporters of this proposal and undertook to write this letter to members on behalf of the association. However, it is something which, in my opinion, they are not entitled to do unless they first obtain the views of members.

Mr. Hearman: I just wanted to know whom you blame?

Mr. MOIR: Returning to my assertion that it is a question as to whether we are going to retain the park, or whether we will have it released for other purposes, the people who put this proposal forward take the view that the park must go eventually. I have here a pamphlet which was sent out by the Lord Mayor and one particular paragraph says that everyone agrees that the control measures necessary for the park's existence render the continuance of a purely natural park impossible. I know sometimes a different impression can be obtained by taking something out of its context and reading it, but the particular section is too long to read and all members have received a copy and would know what I have quoted does not alter the meaning.

In "The West Australian" on Tuesday, the 17th September, there was an editorial under the heading, "A Decisive Park Vote?" and the part which I think is significant is as follows:—

The Assembly should pass the Bill without further demur. By doing so it will record a decisive vote for better development of the park for public use. The question of an olympic pool is merely a test case.

Merely a test case! On the one hand, we have the Perth City Council, which says it is inevitable that the park must go as it cannot be kept in its natural state, and the leading article of "The West Australian" says that the Bill is just a test case. I agree that it is just a test case because if we agreed to the scheme

we would have no valid reason for refusing other requests for facilities in the park. I have no doubt that some people think the park should be cleared and the land sold for residential purposes. I have no doubt that the land and estate agent people cast very envious eyes on the park and would like to put it up for auction.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They would be ideal sites.

The Minister for Lands: It has never been mentioned in this debate.

Mr. MOIR: No, but I mention it as a view held by some people regarding the park. It has been said that the members of this Chamber who oppose the scheme, would like to tie the park up forever. All I can say is that we have a decision to make here and now. What decision is made in the future depends on the people occupying the same positions in this House then. However, we have to make the decision now.

I take exception to a letter from the Lord Mayor. I realise that he is probably very enthusiastic about this and people are liable to get carried away by enthusiasm. He had this to say in a letter to me—

Do you realise that in a very short time the Crawley Baths will be no more, because of senility in structural condition, and that then if the project is rejected, there will be no baths at all—no place for class or school instruction—no place for carnivals or competitions—no possibility of Empire or Olympic Games—all why?

This is a very serious reflection on the Perth City Council, which is charged with the welfare and care of the Crawley Baths, and there is no guarantee that what has happened there will not happen at King's Park, and this aquatic centre, if established, will be allowed to degenerate. The letter goes on to say—

Because Perth missed her chance—because Perth will be the only capital city in the Commonwealth without the very amenity which is regarded by all other cities as an essential—because those who had the enterprise and initiative were frustrated—because those who had the power were not courageous enough to face an issue on its merits—because the discouragement of those whose (City Council) duty it is to formulate these projects was not a matter for their (Parliament) concern and their (Council) encouragement was a matter of no moment.

I regard that paragraph as most offensive to members of Parliament.

Mr. Norton: It is insulting.

Mr. MOIR: Most insulting, and I feel that if the Lord Mayor were a little more restrained in his approach and in the type of language he used he would not have aroused the ire he has done in certain cases.

We would have to give serious consideration to the passing of this Bill, if King's Park were the only site available in the metropolitan area where an aquatic centre could be built, but I refuse to believe that it is the only site in the metropolitan area. I feel sure that the Perth City Council has suitable land under its jurisdiction for the building of an aquatic centre. I oppose the Bill.

MR. OWEN (Darling Range) [5.13]: There is no doubt that this Bill has created greater interest, both inside and outside the Chamber, than any other Bill for many a long year. It has been refreshing to hear so many members express themselves on this matter, uninfluenced and untrammelled by party politics.

There has been much talk in an endeavour to pinpoint the original purpose for which the park was dedicated. I am not very interested in that aspect although I feel that Lord Forrest, being a man of the open spaces, had in mind that it should be left in broad acres as an original park. Although Lord Forrest gave away small sections of it, we must remember that it was through his influence that the park was almost doubled in size from something under 500 acres to about 1,000 acres. If it was necessary to have 1,000 acres in those days, I would say it is necessary to have many thousands of acres now.

However, let us forget about the past and consider the future. We are fortunate that King's Park has been preserved as it is, and has not been cut up and used for residential or other purposes. It is our duty to see that it is kept as near as possible to the original bush of which it is constituted. Several speakers have stated that about 90 per cent. of visitors to the State see only the developed fringe along the river. One can quite understand this, because that is the part which is most accessible and from which we get glorious views of the city and the river. The position would be the same if we had no park there but a huge tower from which we could view the city and the river.

The people who want to see those views naturally go along that fringe, but there are many thousands who, in the course of the year, go deeper into the park whether they merely drive along the tracks or walk down the bridle paths or ramble in the bush. I have taken numbers of visitors there, and I naturally take them along the fringe to see the views, but those who are interested in the naturalist side, I take to see what they want to look at in the park.

I think we have a great asset in King's Park and I would be sorry to see it cut up or even the smallest portion taken from it. We in this State and people in other parts of the world spend considerable amounts in maintaining zoos and museums. But I say it is just as important to keep the living specimens, whether flora or fauna, in their natural state rather than wait until they are nearly extinct and then preserve their images in a museum. Let us keep King's Park as, shall I say, a living museum so that the trees, shrubs and grasses, besides the fauna—particularly birds—may live where they can be seen and appreciated by the multitudes who visit the park.

In other parts of the State efforts are being made to build up or restore to their natural state, many areas of land. This cannot be done with just one or two acres of country, or even a hundred acres. We must have a big area if we wish to maintain the country in anything like its natural condition because much of our bushland will not stand competition, particularly if the surface of the ground is disturbed by man in his efforts to clear the land, as has occurred in clearing the firewood out of the park.

We see instances of this in the bush where, 50 to 100 years ago, sawmills were established. When these sawmills ceased to operate, the areas of 10 or 20 acres which had been almost denuded of natural bush over the course of years were gradually encroached on again so that what was once cleared land can now be seen in an almost natural bushland state again. I think this will happen in King's Park provided we do not disturb it very much. The Minister for Mines is also the Minister for Fisheries so, of course, it was perhaps only natural for him to draw a few red herrings across the trail.

The Minister for Education: On a big scale!

Mr. OWEN: Quite a lot of the park has been left in an almost natural state, but he said it is only tenth-rate bushland. I draw his attention and also that of the House to this little bulletin called "The Naturalist" which, at page 34 mentions five species of banksias. People when they see a banksia tree say, "It is only a banksia; why worry about it?" This is what the pamphlet has to say—

The most interesting of the four species is the Silver Banksia (*B. priocarpes*) with its silver-grey buds and deep orange flowers. It makes an attractive show over the greater part of the year in the vicinity of Thomas Street and King's Park Road. This small colony is the only one of this species left in the metropolitan area which is not growing on private land, and is thus the only area near Perth which could be preserved for posterity.

That is around the part where it is proposed to establish the aquatic centre. Very little has been said about the fauna, but this booklet also mentions that there are 65 species of birds in and around the park. Many of them use the park as a nesting ground, and from the park they travel over great parts of the metropolitan area. When we consider that these birds help to keep our gardens, trees and shrubs free from insect pests, we can realise the beneficial effect that King's Park has, through the bird life, on the metropolitan area.

It would indeed be a pity to see the park made even one acre smaller. It has been said that the establishment of an aquatic centre in the park would not greatly disturb the trees. We have received numerous letters and in one the Lord Mayor mentions that very few trees would be disturbed. Actually I think most of the trees in the 20 acres that would have to be cleared would need to be bulldozed out of the way, and then I think it would be a matter of only a few years before the remainder died.

Next, I would like to mention another little park which it was sought to maintain as a natural park. On the Welshpool-rd. there is a small area known as "Advent Park" where those who subscribe to a particular faith meet at their annual camp. This park consists of an area of six to eight acres on which there was beautiful banksia growth, and great pains were taken to preserve the banksias although it was resolved to establish a lawn there.

By the fact of maintaining the lawn—whether through the use of fertiliser or the destruction of the lower scrub, I do not know—from 20 to 30 per cent. of the banksias have gone. I think it will be only a few years before the remainder die and then there will be just the lawn and the other trees which will have to be planted there; but they will not be indigenous trees. The same thing will happen in King's Park. The more it is disturbed the more it will go back. We should try to preserve it in broad acres, as it now is, so that it will remain in its present state if not for a thousand years, for as long as possible.

I intended to say a lot about alternative sites, but that ground has been well covered. Before we agree to any part of the park being excised, even for an aquatic centre that would undoubtedly be a beautiful place, I think we should be satisfied that there is no alternative site in the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: Are you prepared to take steps to find out?

Mr. OWEN: There are others who should have more expert knowledge than I in that regard. It has been said there



is a high watertable in some areas, but that is not insuperable, as can be seen by the very tall buildings built south of St. George's Terrace on land where the water is close to the surface. The building of the pool in such country would necessitate the soil being dewatered so that the foundations could be excavated and the foundations might have to be a bit stronger, but that would cost only a few thousands of pounds extra.

I am not satisfied that there are not many areas around Perth that would be suitable for a pool such as is envisaged in the plan on the wall of this Chamber. Such a pool is man made and the lawns surrounding it would be man-made and many of the trees to be planted would be just as beautiful around the pool elsewhere as they would in King's Park. I, therefore, oppose the Bill.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. T. Tonkin—Melville)** [5.27]: I propose, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks in regard to this question, but not in the hope or belief that what I say will influence the vote of any member, because it is obvious that their opinions are well fixed. As a matter of fact, I cannot recall any other instance since I have been in this House when the futility of argument was made so apparent. We started off with a number of members not prepared to hear the question discussed in this House, but registering their opinions beforehand, and that has characterised the debate as it has proceeded.

It seems to me that we are not called upon to determine whether the proposed swimming pool will meet the needs of all the people in the metropolitan area or any particular portion of it. That is the business of the Perth City Council and its responsibility. The question is before us only because it was brought here by our own action in determining that no part of the park could be used for any purpose without Parliament making a pronouncement in connection therewith. The question before us, therefore, is not whether we should have an aquatic centre but whether the city council should be permitted to put it in King's Park.

I will yield to nobody in a desire to retain the obvious benefits of having such a large open space in the centre of a city which is destined to carry a very large population, but I cannot become lyrical about the type of bush in King's Park because a similar type is still to be found in many parts of the metropolitan area quite close to the city; many acres of it on the south side of the river, where people do not hesitate to destroy it in order to build their homes.

Personally I doubt whether a single member who has spoken in this Chamber about retaining the banksias and so on in

the park, has retained any on the land surrounding his own house. We all seem to hasten to get rid of the natural bush around our residences and to substitute lawns, trees and shrubs brought from elsewhere. I do not deny that it is most desirable to retain in the city large areas of parkland, not only as a breathing space for the people but also to provide a place where they can wander and enjoy the delights of such wandering.

Strangely enough, very few of those who visit the park wander through the bushland. Their habits may change in the future but it is undeniable that a great majority of the people who daily, and especially on Sundays, visit this park, remain on the road, adjacent to the tea-rooms, where they can view the river and where both sides of the road are lined with their motorcars. Some of them remain in their cars and those who do not, walk up and down along the road or stand on the bank overlooking the river. Only a very small proportion of the visitors takes the trouble to wander through the bushland—for obvious reasons. They do not like getting their shoes filled with sand and their stockings filled with grass seeds and so they stay where the conditions are more pleasant.

That is no argument against the retention of this bushland, but I think we can not get anything worth while without paying some price for it. Perth has needed an aquatic centre for a long time and I feel we have been recreant in our duty to some extent in not having before now taken steps to ensure that our young people will have the same opportunity as those of other States for training for competitive swimming. We like to see our own people excel and we should therefore provide the facilities they need.

This has been our first real chance of obtaining for Perth a pool that could be used for the purposes I have mentioned. It is possible that if the city council is denied the right to put the pool in King's Park, it will go ahead with the proposal elsewhere, but the indications are that it will not. To go anywhere else would appear to be a great deal more expensive and obviously the city council would favour this locality for that reason, if for no other. I do not believe we have the right to brush this proposition aside out of hand.

Those members who hold the view that we should have an aquatic centre but not in King's Park could strengthen their position by agreeing to let the measure go to a select committee in order that the question of the site might be investigated. If an investigation showed that another suitable site could not be found, I feel sure members who have made up their minds that the park shall not be touched under any consideration would have some

reason for reconsidering their decision, because it would be a very bold step to take to deny the State an olympic pool when it has an excellent chance of getting one; and that, I think, would be the result if this question were pushed aside out of hand without further investigation.

It has been made very clear by those who have spoken, and the number of members who have expressed their opposition, that the proposal has no chance whatever of surviving if dealt with on the question as to whether a portion of King's Park can be used or not. I do not think we should decide that question at this juncture. It would still be open to the House to make a determination on that point later on, and nothing would be lost in the meantime. Those who refuse the right to have this matter referred to a select committee are blindly prejudiced and are taking that action because they are determined that under no consideration will this question be kept alive. I hope they will adopt a more reasonable attitude than that and let us ascertain whether a more suitable site, or indeed a suitable site, can be found.

Although I am going to support this proposition, I am by no means enthusiastic about giving up portion of the park for an aquatic centre. I would rather see it somewhere else; but when it becomes a question of a pool or no pool, I am prepared to agree to a portion of the park being utilised for that purpose. Already some acres of the original reservation are used for other purposes. We have not a complete 1,000 acres free from alienation, or other uses; we have some 900 odd acres and we will still have 900 odd acres if 20 acres are made available for the aquatic centre. So the difference in the two areas would not be appreciable. I would be prepared to pay whatever price that involved if it ensured that Perth would get an aquatic centre worthy of a city of this size.

It may be that if the question is properly inquired into, other sites examined and the merits of them brought forward, a better site than King's Park will be discovered. I have sufficient faith in the Perth City Council to believe that if an investigation showed that a suitable site could be found, and one which did not involve a great deal of expenditure, the civic authorities would be prepared to utilise the site for the purpose. I think we should keep before us the desire of securing for Perth and Western Australia an up-to-date aquatic centre and we should not take any steps which will defer that proposal for any great length of time. It is in the hope that wiser counsels will prevail, and that an opportunity will be provided to have this position more closely examined, that I suggest to those members who feel very strongly about this matter

that they have no real argument against allowing the question to be referred to a select committee because they will still have an opportunity of expressing their opinion later on, and of taking what steps they desire to retain the park in its present state.

I give them full marks for their sincerity in that regard. Some of them are almost fanatical about it and I do not blame them because of that belief. I feel that the only real danger in the proposal is that once a portion of the park is given away for any purpose—an aquatic centre or any other—it is much harder subsequently to resist similar applications. I quite admit that that is a danger—always was in the scheme of things and always will be. We know how easy it is, once we give way on a principle or a fundamental belief, to give a little more, and then a little more, once the ground is broken. So in order to prevent the possibility of the park being whittled away I can understand members taking the attitude that even though they may be strongly in favour of an aquatic centre they will not give up any portion of the park for that purpose.

However, as the Premier mentioned the other evening, every proposal in connection with the use of land in King's Park must come before Parliament and it can then be treated on its merits. It can be weighed along with the advantages which are likely to accrue from any proposal that is submitted, and it does not necessarily follow that if land is made available for this purpose it must be made available for any other purpose in the years to come.

I suppose this debate is almost unique inasmuch as there are very few members who have not expressed their opinion and I rose to speak not because I believed it would be possible to influence the vote of any member, but because I considered that on this question, in view of what has been said, it was undesirable that one should cast a silent vote. I make a last appeal that this matter should not be determined out of hand but that it should be allowed to go a step further so that possible sites can be investigated and I would emphasise that this advantage will be derived from such a course: If Parliament denies the city council the right to use any portion of King's Park for this purpose, an investigation into alternative sites could result in a very satisfactory site being found which, if not used in the near future by the Perth City Council, might be used by them or by somebody else, in the not distant future. So the labours of a select committee would not be wasted in that regard and Parliament would have made a very useful contribution.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I move—

That the question be now put.

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

Ayes	25
Noes	18
Majority for	7

## Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Toms
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Watts
Mr. W. Manning	Mr. May
Mr. Marshall	

(Teller.)

## Noes.

Mr. Bovell	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Potter
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Wild
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Hutchinson

(Teller.)

Motion thus passed.

The SPEAKER: The question is—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	29
Majority against	15

## Ayes.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Court	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Potter
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sewell

(Teller.)

## Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Toms
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Watts
Mr. W. Manning	Mr. May
Mr. Marshall	

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

## BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

## Council's Amendments.

Schedule of seven amendments made by the Council now considered.

## In Committee.

Mr. Moir in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

## No. 1.

Clause 8, page 4, line 12—To insert after the word "or" the words "within six months."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have considered the Council's amendments and I would like to say at the outset that I agree with them all. This amendment will only limit the time in which the commissioner can take proceedings to a period of six months. In fact it is an improvement on the provision in the clause. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

## No. 2.

Clause 8, page 4, line 21—To delete the word "and" and substitute the word "or."

## No. 3.

Clause 8, page 4, line 30—To insert after the word "is" the word "correctly."

## No. 4.

Clause 8, page 4—To add after Subclause (4) a subclause to stand as Subclause (5) as follows:—

(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection (2), (3) and (4) of this section, a building contractor is not liable for an offence against this section for anything done or omitted, if the building, alteration, or extension, of the public building is supervised by a qualified architect, engaged by the building proprietor.

On motions by the Minister for Health, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

## No. 5.

Clause 9, page 4, lines 40 and 41—To delete the words "one hundred" and substitute the word "fifty."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I feel that further consideration should be given to this amendment. The fee was increased from the existing £5 to £100, but the amendment of another place has reduced it to £50. That seems to me to be ridiculous because the value of money has risen very greatly since the passing of the Act. Sometimes it costs the department hundreds of pounds to supervise alterations

under the Health Act. The matter was referred to the department, as another place had reduced the maximum fee from £100 to £50. As the other place is not responsible for the administration of this legislation and as finance available to the Government is very short, I would prefer to see £100 being fixed as the maximum. Before proceeding further I would like to hear the comments of other members.

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** The Minister should agree to the amendment. He mentioned that the original fee was only £5, and as the amendment has increased it to £50 or ten times the value, that would adequately cover any increase in supervision costs brought about since the passing of the Act.

**The MINISTER FOR HEALTH:** In view of those remarks, I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 6.

Clause 10, page 5, line 2—To delete the word "one."

No. 7.

Clause 10, page 5, line 4—To delete the figures and letter "241A" and substitute the following:—"240A."

On motions by the Minister for Health, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

*House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, 24th September, 1957.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment Bill, delay in introduction .....	1698
Discontinuance of railway services, tabling of papers, and centres visited	1699
Water supplies, provision and cost for Pithara and Buntine .....	1699
Railways, stock freighting, Miling to Midland Junction .....	1699
Voting on divisions, presidential announcement .....	1715
Motions : Education Act, to disallow transport grant regulation .....	1705
Charcoal iron works in South-West, export of Talling Peak iron ore .....	1709
Bills : Legal Practitioners Act Amendment (No. 2), Com. ....	1699
Health Act Amendment, Assembly's message .....	1705
Interpretation Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r. ....	1705
Chiropractists, 1r. ....	1705
Public Service, 2r. ....	1707
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, Assembly's message .....	1715
Occupational Therapists, Assembly's message .....	1715
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., defeated ....	1715

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### *Delay in Introduction.*

**Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH** (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways:

Why does the Minister keep the State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment Bill down on the notice paper in view of the anxiety of people, particularly in the country, over this Bill? When will the Bill be placed on the notice paper in such a position that it can be debated in this House?

The MINISTER replied:

I know of no anxiety being expressed by anybody. They are in no more doubt today than during the past eight or 10 years; and, judging by the attitude of this Chamber on the first reading of the Bill, I should imagine they are not worried unduly. However, the Bill is on the notice paper as Item No. 10 and will be dealt with when we arrive at that item.