

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think the suggestion is a worth-while one and it will bring the north into line with the rest of the State. I cannot see any objection to it and I support the amendment.

**Amendment put and passed.**

**Clause, as amended, put and passed.**

**Clauses 26 to 39 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

**Bill reported with an amendment.**

## ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

**Clauses 1 to 11 put and passed.**

**Clause 12: Section 140 amended—**

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am wondering if the Minister and his officers are content that the provisions of this clause will mean that the whole of the proceedings have been satisfied. Is it likely there would be anything else outstanding at the time the provision for the granting of probate or administration had been sealed by the court; or would all requirements have been cleared at that point?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The notes I have in regard to clause 12 state that the proposals in the clause provide for the issue under section 140 of office copy grants without annexure of copies of relevant wills. Section 140 contains requirements concerning records of grants, filing procedures, and so forth, required to be maintained by the master. The proposal contained in clause 12 to enable the copy of a grant of probate or administration to be issued under seal, with or without the annexure of a copy of the will, if any, and issued as sufficient evidence of that grant without further proof, has been considered by the Chief Justice and the Master of the Supreme Court, who can see no objections to it.

When these administrative changes are being made, the views of the Chief Justice, judges, or the Master of the Supreme Court are, as far as possible, obtained.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I was concerned about where this thought originated, but I am quite happy about it.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 13 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

### *Report*

**Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.**

*House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 16th September, 1964

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—Returned	974
Alsatian Dog Act Amendment Bill—Returned	974
Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill—Returned	974
Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	970
Cancer Council of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill—Report	970
Chiropactors Bill—3r.	970
Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	970
Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	970
Evidence Act Amendment Bill—3r.	970
Justices Act Amendment Bill—3r.	970
Local Courts Act Amendment Bill—3r.	970
Milk Act Amendment Bill—Returned	974
Mining Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Receipt ; 1r.	974
National Trust of Australia (W.A.) Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	970
Parks and Reserves Act Amendment Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	970
Presbyterian Church Acts Amendment Bill—3r.	970
Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act Amendment Bill—3r.	970
<b>MEMBERS' SPEECHES : QUOTATIONS FROM UNCORRECTED PROOFS—</b>	
Statement by Speaker	969
<b>MOTIONS—</b>	
Fire Brigades Act : Disallowance of Regulation 100A	970
Milk Act : Disallowance of Amendments to Regulation 318	974
Swan River Reclamation : Suspension of Work	976
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Dairy Industry Committee of Enquiry : Adoption of Recommendations	966
<b>Education—</b>	
Eastern Goldfields High School : Gymnasium Facilities	964
Oriental Languages : Teaching at High Schools	963
<b>Electricity Supplies : State Electricity Commission—</b>	
Electricity Supplies for Northern Towns	966
Power Line Route from Geraldton to Northampton	966
Purchase of Electric Power from Geraldton Town Council	966
<b>Floods—</b>	
Damage to Railways, Bridges, Culverts, and Abutments	968
<b>Flooding at Harvey—</b>	
Drainage of High School Grounds	965
Effect of Harvey River Diversion Scheme	965
Weir Wall : Elimination of Danger	965

**CONTENTS—continued**

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued</b>	
Harbour, Fremantle : Presence of Sewage-type Bacteria in Water .....	964
Health—Sale of Poultry and Rabbits : Control by Health Department .....	967
Land South of Mount Gibson Station : Survey .....	967
Marketing of Onions Act : Objections to Proposed Amendments .....	966
Pneumoconiosis Committee : Publication of Report .....	963
Police: Motor Vehicles—	
Regrooving of Worn Tyres .....	967
Speed Limits and Braking Efficiency .....	965
Public Buildings at Kalgoorlie : Provision of Water Cooling System .....	964
Railways—	
Fremantle Railway Bridge—Double Standard Gauge Tracks : Simultaneous Use .....	964
Standard Gauge Railway : Closure of West Midland Subway .....	967
Superphosphate—	
Difference between Western Australian and Victorian Products .....	967
Establishment of Inland Works .....	967
Swimming Pools : Number Subsidised by Government and Location .....	968
Theatre in Western Australia—	
Elizabethan Theatre Trust Representative : Appointment of Professor Alexander .....	968
Financial Assistance .....	968
Traffic—	
Railway Crossing Fund Account : Credits and Expenditure .....	964
Traffic Routes for City : Proposals and Alternatives .....	963

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

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE****ORIENTAL LANGUAGES***Teaching at High Schools*

1. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Education:
  - (1) What plans, if any, are envisaged to have oriental languages taught as normal subjects in high schools?
  - (2) If the answer is "nil," could this matter be investigated with a view to having it implemented at an early date?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

- (1) None at present.
- (2) Japanese and Malay are taught as extracurricular subjects after normal school hours in four high schools. If the demand increases this will be expanded.

**TRAFFIC ROUTES FOR CITY***Proposals and Alternatives*

2. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Works:
  - (1) What reasonable grounds justify the expenditure of £8,000,000 to provide facilities to handle traffic into, through, and around the City of Perth when an assumed large percentage would prefer alternative routes to avoid congestion?
  - (2) To cater for this percentage and anticipated increase in vehicles, will he recommend—
    - (a) building a bridge from Point Walter to Point Resolution with portion of the £8,000,000 mentioned in (1);
    - (b) using the remainder for providing a less elaborate scheme associated with the Narrows Bridge?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) The Mitchell Freeway project is the first stage of the implementation of the scheme for freeways embodied in the region plan which will ultimately require the expenditure of many millions of pounds spread over many years. Because the City of Perth is the centre of the region and of the system of radial roads, the first need is to provide traffic capacity at the centre to which most traffic is directed.
- (2) (a) and (b) No.

**PNEUMOCONIOSIS COMMITTEE***Publication of Report*

3. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:
  - (1) Is he now able to indicate when the report of the committee which inquired into pneumoconiosis will be made available for public perusal?
  - (2) Would he please give an assurance that this report will be made public before his second reading speech introducing the Government promised Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill so as to afford ample opportunity to the persons most concerned, namely workers, within the meaning of the Workers' Compensation Act, to study the contents of the amending Bill in the light of the contents of the committee report?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) The report was tabled in both Houses today.

## EASTERN GOLDFIELDS HIGH SCHOOL

### *Gymnasium Facilities*

4. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does he realise that Eastern Goldfields High School still lacks its own complete gymnasium facilities?
- (2) Does he not agree that a high school of this status, as a unit in the "centralised" scheme of education on which our educational authorities pride themselves, should not suffer in departmental supplied facilities in comparison with other units of comparable stature within the same scheme?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is a qualified "Yes," is the Education Department policy in respect of improvements to other existing high schools and the building of new high schools in the metropolitan and certain other country districts consistently shaped and effected by this same qualification in the matter of providing gymnasium facilities?
- (4) What priority has the provision of gymnasium facilities at Eastern Goldfields High School on the listed work (other than the provision of essential classrooms) yet to be executed by the department?
- (5) Could he please give an estimate when it could be reasonably expected full gymnasium facilities will be provided at Eastern Goldfields High School?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I agree that it should not suffer by comparison.
- (3) In regard to gymnasium facilities, yes.
- (4) No gymnasium facilities for Eastern Goldfields or any other high school are included in listed work to be undertaken by the department.
- (5) No.

## PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT KALGOORLIE

### *Provision of Water Cooling System*

5. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Would he please advise if the water cooling system approved for installation in the Kalgoorlie public building for the benefit of the public, court officials, and office personnel has been yet effected?
- (2) If not, will he undertake to have this installation completed before summer officially commences?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Installation has not yet been effected.
- (2) Yes. Two units will be installed—one on the ground floor and one on the first floor—before summer commences.

## FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE

### *Double Standard Gauge Tracks: Simultaneous Use*

6. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Railways:

Will it be practicable for both sets of standard gauge track on the new Fremantle railway bridge to be used simultaneously with complete safety, irrespective of the position of the two trains on the bridge when they are passing each other?

Mr. COURT replied:

Yes.

## FREMANTLE HARBOUR

### *Presence of Sewage-type Bacteria in Water*

7. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Following the reported statement on the 23rd March last by the Public Health Commissioner that, "Water samples taken from the harbour near the Fremantle bridge contained sewage-type bacteria" did the Fremantle Harbour Trust make its own investigations in accordance with the reported stated intention of the trust as expressed by the acting manager?
- (2) If "Yes," did the investigations which were carried out by the Harbour Trust confirm or refute the finding of the Public Health Department on the presence of sewage-type bacteria?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes. Tests were carried out at the request of the Fremantle Harbour Trust by the Public Health Department.
- (2) Traces of faecal bacillus coli were found. The result of the tests did not unduly perturb the Public Health Department.

## RAILWAY CROSSING FUND ACCOUNT

### *Credits and Expenditure*

8. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the total amount that has been credited to the Metropolitan Area Railway Crossing Fund Account each year since its establishment?

- (2) On what crossings have moneys from this fund been expended, and what was the amount in each case?
- (3) What sum is in the fund at the present time?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1)	1957-58	£21,650	
	1958-59	£22,840	
	1959-60	£30,758	
	1960-61	£28,787	
	1961-62	£28,274	
	1962-63	£36,418	
	1963-64	£47,570	
		<hr/>	
		£216,297	
		<hr/>	
(2)	Moore Street (Boom Gates)	.....	£23,660
	Lord Street (Boom Gates)	.....	£24,405
	Jewell Street Crossing	.....	1,746
	Seventh Avenue Bridge, Maylands	.....	1,452
	Ashton Avenue Bridge, Clarendon	.....	2,883
	Kerr Street Bridge, Leederville	.....	2,313
	Rivervale Crossing	.....	2,170
	Welshpool Crossing	.....	1,888
	William and Beaufort St. Bridges	.....	2,036
	Maintenance of Bridges	.....	603
	Spare Boom Gates Mechanism	.....	2,240
			<hr/>
			65,396
	Supervision		4,605
			<hr/>
			£70,001

- (3) Balance of fund as at the 31st August, 1964, £149,672.

### FLOODING AT HARVEY

#### Weir Wall: Elimination of Danger

9. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:
- (1) Are any proposals being developed to eliminate the possible danger of the collapse of the wall at the Harvey Weir?
- (2) If so, what form are such proposals likely to take?
- (3) When is work on any such proposals likely to commence?

#### Drainage of High School Grounds

- (4) Is it a fact that there is a serious lack of adequate drainage on the Harvey High School grounds?
- (5) If so, what action has been taken or is to be taken to provide better drainage?

#### Effect of Harvey River Diversion Scheme

- (6) Has the Harvey River diversion scheme created a flooding each winter at Harvey?
- (7) If so, are proposals being developed to overcome the flooding problem?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Floods of the magnitude of the recent one are very rare and no work on the Harvey Weir wall is considered necessary as with the actual level of overflow reached there was a satisfactory factor of safety.

When the next dam is built immediately below the Harvey Weir it will incorporate the existing wall.

- (2) and (3) See (1).
- (4) and (5) No. There is no serious lack of adequate drainage at the Harvey High School. Some trouble has been experienced with erosion of banks but now that agreement has been reached to take water from the irrigation channel, measures are being taken to bind the area with grass.
- (6) No. Flooding only occurs in years of severe winters.
- (7) Last year a start was made on a programme progressively to improve the carrying capacity of the diversion channel.

### MOTOR VEHICLES

#### Speed Limits and Braking Efficiency

10. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) What are the respective speed limits for the following vehicles in—
- (a) town, and
- (b) country—
- 20 cwt., 2 tons, 3 tons, 4 tons, 5 tons, 6 tons, 7 tons, 13 tons and over?
- (2) What are the respective stopping distances with brakes at required efficiency of the aforesaid vehicles at the following speeds:—
- 10 m.p.h., 15 m.p.h., 20 m.p.h., 30 m.p.h., 40 m.p.h., 50 m.p.h., 60 m.p.h. and over?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1)

		Town	Country
Up to 3 tons	.....	35 m.p.h.	Unlimited (but if towing trailer or caravan—maximum is 45 m.p.h.)
Over 3 tons to 7 tons	.....	35 m.p.h.	40 m.p.h.
Over 7 tons to 13 tons	.....	30 m.p.h.	35 m.p.h.
Over 13 tons to 20 tons	.....	30 m.p.h.	30 m.p.h.
Over 20 tons	.....	25 m.p.h.	30 m.p.h.

- (2) The maximum stopping distances that will comply with the regulations are—

(a) Where weight of the vehicle is under 50 cwt.

Speed : 10 m.p.h.	15	20	30	40	50	60
	7ft.	15ft.	27ft.	60ft.	107ft.	167ft.

(b) Where weight of the vehicle is 50 cwt. and over.

Speed : 10 m.p.h.	15	20	30	40	50	60
	8ft.	19ft.	33ft.	75ft.	134ft.	203ft.

## STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

### *Purchase of Electric Power from Geraldton Town Council*

11. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What progress has been made by the State Electricity Commission in its negotiations with the Geraldton Town Council for the purchase of electric power from its power station?

### *Electricity Supplies for Northern Towns*

- (2) What is the position in relation to the supply of electric power by the State Electricity Commission to the following areas:—

Northampton Town,  
Narngulu,  
Moonyoonooka,  
Waggrakine,  
Glenfield,  
Utakarra?

### *Power Line Route from Geraldton to Northampton*

- (3) Along which route is it proposed to take the power lines from the Geraldton town boundary to the town of Northampton?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Agreement has been reached.  
(2) Surveys are in progress northward to Northampton. When Northampton is supplied with alternating current, surveys to the other areas will be undertaken.  
(3) Via Chapman Valley. This was announced by the Premier at the Upper Chapman Valley Show last Saturday.

## DAIRY INDUSTRY COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY

### *Adoption of Recommendations*

12. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Could he advise if the Commonwealth Government adopted the recommendation contained in the report of the Dairy Industry Committee of Enquiry released in August, 1960, that a dairy development council be established?

- (2) If not was any other committee appointed in accordance with recommendation 21 of the report?  
(3) Could he advise what sections of the report have been adopted and what action has resulted?  
(4) Was any action taken in this State to put into effect recommendation 23 of the report?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) to (4) As far as I am aware, no action has been taken on the recommendation of the Dairy Industry Committee of Enquiry (1960). Any action is a matter for the Commonwealth Government.

## MARKETING OF ONIONS ACT

### *Objections to Proposed Amendments*

13. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he received any objections to the Onion Marketing Board's circular dealing with proposed amendments to the Marketing of Onions Act?  
(2) If so, from whom?  
(3) Does he still maintain that no single viewpoint was expressed by the board when its circular opens with the words: "Hereunder this Board submits to you amendments it seeks to the Marketing of Onions Act, 1938, with its reasons for their necessity," and when dealing specifically with section 4 (4) the board advocates its deletion giving as its reason that its object had failed?  
(4) Has he received protests regarding the proposal to delete section 4 (4) of the Act?  
(5) If so, from what bodies?  
(6) Is he aware that on the 9th September a meeting of onion growers held at Spearwood and attended by 90 persons unanimously voted against the nature of the board's circular, also the intention to proceed with deletion of section 4 (4)?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.  
(2) The executive of the Market Gardeners' Association of W.A. (Inc.).  
(3) I am satisfied that the referendum conducted by the State Electoral Department fairly stated the proposed amendments sought by the board.  
(4) Yes.  
(5) The Market Gardeners' Association of W.A. (Inc.).  
(6) Yes.

**MOTOR VEHICLES***Regrooving of Worn Tyres*

14. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Are any regulations in force to prohibit or to control the practice of regrooving worn tyres of motor vehicles?
- (2) If not, does he not consider that some measures are necessary to control the condition of tyres which are to be regrooved and which, when completed, often present a hazard to motorists, particularly on unsealed roads?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes. Some control is considered desirable and consideration is being given to the framing of a suitable draft regulation by the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee.

**STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY***Closure of West Midland Subway*

15. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has any final decision been made regarding the closing of the subway, West Midland, for standard gauge purposes?
- (2) What is the decision in regard to this matter?
- (3) Has the Town Planning Department approved closure of the subway to vehicular traffic?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. The vehicular subway will be closed and a pedestrian underpass substituted in the same locality. A road overbridge will be built between West Midland and Helena Street, Midland.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The Town Planning Department has no objection to the closure of the subway provided a bridge suitable for public use is provided nearby.

**SALE OF POULTRY AND RABBITS /***Control by Health Department*

16. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Health Department any control over the sale of poultry, rabbits, etc., sold for local consumption?
- (2) Have they to be stamped fit for human consumption by any party to the sale?
- (3) Are poultry, rabbits, etc., exported certified fit for human consumption?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. A medical officer or inspector may enter premises at any time and inspect animals or food offered or being prepared for sale for human consumption.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.

**LAND SOUTH OF MOUNT GIBSON STATION***Survey*

17. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is a survey of land, situated approximately south of Mount Gibson Station and north of the emu-proof fence currently being carried out or in contemplation?
- (2) If so, what is the area of land being, or to be, surveyed and the purpose thereof?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) No. The land in question is held by Mount Gibson Pastoral Company Pty. Ltd. as special leases expiring on the 31st March, 1969, and the 30th September, 1970.
- (2) Answered by (1).

**SUPERPHOSPHATE***Establishment of Inland Works*

18. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the optimum output that is regarded as justifying the establishment of a superphosphate works in Western Australia, say, 150 to 200 miles from the seaboard?
- (2) What would be the estimated initial capital cost of establishing a works capable of this capacity?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) The capital costs of seaboard fertiliser factories are about £20 per ton of annual capacity, i.e., about £1,200,000 for a 60,000 ton per annum factory.

*Difference between Western Australian and Victorian Products*

19. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is there any material difference in the 23 per cent. superphosphate manufactured in Western Australia as compared with the 22 per cent. product manufactured in Victoria, or does the figure of 23 per cent. refer merely to registration requirements in this State?
- (2) If a difference does exist as between the 23 per cent. and the 22 per cent. superphosphates, what would be the approximate

price of the 22 per cent. product (if it were manufactured) in Western Australia based on the current cost of the 23 per cent. fertiliser?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) The information asked for in this question is being sought, and will be made available to the honourable member when received.

#### THEATRE IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

*Elizabethan Theatre Trust*

*Representative: Appointment of Professor Alexander*

20. Mr. CORNELL asked the Premier:

- (1) By whom was Professor Alexander appointed to be the representative in this State of the Elizabethan Theatre Trust and to whom is he responsible?
- (2) What are Professor Alexander's qualifications to be the sole representative and arbiter of the trust in Western Australia?

#### *Financial Assistance*

- (3) Have any organisations of which Professor Alexander is or was a member of the board or committee of management received any financial assistance from—

- (a) Elizabethan Theatre Trust;  
(b) Government or local government grants?

- (4) If so, what are these organisations?

- (5) Have any organisations with which Professor Alexander is not connected requested assistance from the trust? If so, what are these organisations and what were the results of any approaches so made?

- (6) In respect of the grants of £2,000 made by each of the Elizabethan Theatre Trust and the State Government for the touring of drama this year, would the Premier examine the relative correspondence to satisfy himself that these two contributing sources were not, in effect, played off against one another?

- (7) Is it a fact that local theatre endeavours in Western Australia have received considerably less assistance from the Elizabethan Theatre Trust than any other State?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) Not known.

- (3) (a) Yes.  
(b) Yes.

- (4) The National Theatre and the Adult Education Board are the only bodies that I am aware of.

- (5) Not known.

- (6) The State Government grant of £2,000 to the University for allocation to the Adult Education Board was made on the understanding that the trust would increase its allotment for drama in Western Australia to make it possible for the number of contract players at the National Theatre to be extended.

- (7) The extent of assistance granted by the trust to local theatre endeavours in other States is not known.

#### SWIMMING POOLS

*Number Subsidised by Government and Location*

21. Mr. DAVIES asked the Treasurer:

- (1) How many swimming pools has the Government subsidised with construction over the past five years?
- (2) Where are these swimming pools located?
- (3) In each case what has been—  
(a) the amount of subsidy;  
(b) total cost of each pool constructed?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) 19.

- (2) and (3) (a) For construction of pools—

	£
Beverley .....	10,000
Brookton .....	9,879
Collie .....	6,719
Corrigin .....	10,000
Derby .....	11,359
Goomalling .....	9,570
Kalamunda .....	10,000
Kellerberrin .....	9,240
Moorra .....	10,000
Mullewa .....	10,000
Narembeen .....	10,000
Nungarin .....	3,000
Pingelly .....	10,000
Southern Cross .....	8,612
Three Springs .....	10,000
Wongan Hills .....	10,000
Wundowie .....	9,425
Wyalkatchem .....	10,000

For improvements to pools—

Gnowangerup .....	1,500
-------------------	-------

- (3) (b) Not available.

Mr. Davies: Will Victoria Park be given a subsidy?

#### FLOODS

*Damage to Railways, Bridges, Culverts and Abutments*

22. Mr. COURT (Minister for Railways):

The honourable member for Warren asked me a series of questions on the 27th August (*Hansard*, p. 641), and

he asked me for answers which were not available at the time. I now have the answers for the honourable member; and, with your permission Mr. Speaker, I would like to read them, as I understand that unless I do so they cannot be incorporated in *Hansard*. The answers are as follows:—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1) and (3).
- (3) Three bridges were damaged.
- (4) Cost of reinstatement is estimated at approximately £150,000.
- (5) No.
- (6) No.
- (7) Answered by (6).
- (8) Failure was confined to concrete piers and abutments without piling foundations and was caused by scour.
- (9) Yes, and as a result reinstatement of bridges will be on concrete piers with piled foundations.
- (10) Three.
- (11) Four abutments failed by scour.
- (12) Not necessarily so, but the longer the bridge the more water it can safely pass.
- (13) No. The difference of level upstream and downstream of a bridge is dependent mainly on the area of waterway provided and size of the flood.
- (14) (a) Flooding upstream of the bridge.  
(b) Only in very exceptional floods.
- (15) The timber structure replaced had reached the end of its life and the bridge opening was determined on information relating to and anticipated runoff.
- (16) About 30 ft.
- (17) The original bridge may have caused less flooding upstream.
- (18) The size of bridge openings are determined from the requirements of 50-year probability floods not from the width of the flood plain. When the south-western railway was built, it was cheaper to build timber bridging than to build embankments. It was for this reason that water courses with wide flood plains were crossed over their total width with timber bridging.
- (19) Normal unrestricted speeds will be resumed when the damaged bridges have been reconstructed. Temporary repairs have been effected to pass all trains at restricted speeds.
- (20) Maximum 18 days.
- (21) It is estimated that the cost of the temporary repairs to the bridges and permanent way, etc.,

will be approximately £20,000. In addition, there would be other costs in connection with disorganisation of south-west and great southern rail and road services which are not available without a good deal of research. An estimate would be in the vicinity of £5,000.

### MEMBERS' SPEECHES: QUOTATIONS FROM UNCORRECTED PROOFS

#### *Statement by Speaker*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): Yesterday I undertook to investigate a complaint from the honourable member for South Perth about the publication of an uncorrected speech made by the honourable member on Wednesday last.

I have ascertained that three copies of this speech were called for—two by Ministers, who received corrected copies; and one by the honourable member for Balcatta, whose copy was uncorrected.

This latter copy was handed to the honourable member for Balcatta in conformity with the direction I gave in 1959 that uncorrected speeches could be made available to honourable members after midday following the day the speech was made.

It is quite clear that the corrections to the speech made by the honourable member for South Perth were not sighted by the Chief Hansard Reporter prior to midday on Thursday last. I might interpolate here that a speech cannot be deemed to be corrected until the Chief Hansard Reporter has accepted the corrections made by the member who made the speech. It is not sufficient merely to drop the corrected copy in a box in the *Hansard* portion of the building, as the honourable member for South Perth apparently did on this occasion.

I have discussed this matter with the honourable member for Balcatta and accept his assurances that he emphasised to the Shire Clerk of the Shire of Perth that the copy of the speech made by the honourable member for South Perth which he had obtained was uncorrected, and the honourable member had no reason to suppose that any publication of this speech of any kind was to be made. It would seem that the Shire Clerk intended merely to make the substance of the speech, together with his comments, available to Perth Shire Councillors.

I have no reason to think that anyone—that is, either of the honourable members concerned, the Chief Hansard Reporter, or the Shire Clerk of the Shire of Perth—acted in anything other than good faith.

I would further point out that my responsibility in this matter, of course, extends to the actions and activities of the



*Hansard* staff, and of members in this Chamber. Naturally I can accept no responsibility for the actions of the Shire Clerk of the Shire of Perth; although, as a result of conversations I have had with the honourable member for Balcatta, I feel there is no reason to suppose that he acted in anything but good faith.

## **BILLS (5): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

### **1. National Trust of Australia (W.A.) Bill.**

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Brand (Premier), and read a first time.

### **2. Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment Bill.**

### **3. Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill.**

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Wild (Minister for Water Supplies), and read a first time.

### **4. Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill.**

### **5. Parks and Reserves Act Amendment Bill.**

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

## **BILLS (6): THIRD READING**

### **1. Chiropractors Bill.**

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health), and transmitted to the Council.

### **2. Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act Amendment Bill.**

### **3. Local Courts Act Amendment Bill.**

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and passed.

### **4. Presbyterian Church Acts Amendment Bill.**

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

### **5. Justices Act Amendment Bill.**

### **6. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.**

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and passed.

## **CANCER COUNCIL OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Report*

Report of Committee adopted.

## **FIRE BRIGADES ACT**

### *Disallowance of Regulation 100A: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 2nd September, on the following motion by Mr. W. Hegney:—

That regulation 100A made under the provisions of the Fire Brigades Act 1942-1963, as published in the *Government Gazette*, W.A., on Thursday, the 16th April, 1964, and laid upon the Table of the House on Tuesday, the 4th August, 1964, be, and is hereby disallowed.

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) (5 p.m.): I wish to say at the outset that I oppose the motion. The regulation in question is regulation 100A of the Fire Brigades Act, and the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board makes no apology for its introduction. I think it is appropriate that I should read the regulation, which is as follows:—

100A. (1) An employee of the Board shall, when so required by, and at the expense of, the Board, submit himself for examination by the Government District Medical Officer who may, however, engage the services of consultants if, in his opinion, the case so requires.

(2) The services of an employee certified by the Government District Medical Officer to be physically unfit for further service may be terminated by the Board.

(3) An employee who fails, when required by the Board, to submit himself for examination, is guilty of an act of misconduct and his services may be terminated by the Board.

Regulation 97 provides for medical examination of approved firemen candidates to establish an initial standard of physical fitness. Prior to the gazettal of regulation 100A there was no provision for the employer to insist on a medical examination to establish an employee's fitness for fire-fighting duties during the course of his service, which service could extend over a period in excess of 40 years. Regulations made under the Act are the proper place for the provision of this power, and the industrial award rightly prescribes the sick leave arrangements for staff.

Isolated instances do occur—and they are isolated—when an employee can become medically unfit for fire fighting, and as such may prejudice not only his own safety at a fire but also the safety of other members of the fire-fighting crew, and possibly members of the public. I submit that so far as the board is concerned, this sort of thing cannot and should not be allowed to happen. It is considered the board has a responsibility to require an employee to submit to a medical examination in such circumstances, and this is the purpose of regulation 100A.

The right to require an employee to submit himself for a medical examination properly belongs to the employer—particularly in this case, where public safety is involved—and in stipulating the Government District Medical Officer the regulation aims at impartial treatment. It is appropriate for me to say there is a medical standard of fitness laid down by one Government medical officer, which is desirable in the circumstances.

Examples of somewhat like regulations—regulations somewhat akin to those I have read to the House—apply to both the police and the Public Service. Police regulation 88 (e) reads as follows:—

Any member of the Force shall when so required by the Commissioner submit himself for examination by a medical board consisting of three medical practitioners to be nominated by the principal medical officer with a view to ascertaining whether he is fit for further active service and any such member who neglects or refuses to so submit himself when required will be deemed guilty of an act of misconduct against the discipline of the Force. Any member of the Force reported to be physically unfit by a medical board shall be called upon to resign from the Force.

Public Service Act section 49 reads as follows:—

If an officer appears to the Commissioner after a report from the Permanent Head to be unfit to discharge or incapable of discharging the duties of his office efficiently, the Commissioner shall enquire and determine whether it is proved such officer is unfit to discharge or incapable of discharging the duties of his office and the Governor on the recommendation of the Commissioner may deal with such officer either by calling upon such officer to retire from the Public Service or by transferring him to some other position and every such officer if called upon to retire shall retire accordingly.

As recently as January, 1963, a station officer contested the board's right to require him to submit to a medical examination by the board's doctor, and the problem could be resolved only by the board being prepared to accept the advice of the employee's doctor. Prior to this occurrence, officers had submitted for medical examination by the board's doctor.

Several years ago—I think it was in 1956—a fireman was reported by the station officer in charge as being considered unfit for fire-fighting duties when he returned to duty after sick leave. The Firemen's Union intervened and claimed the employee had satisfied the requirements of the Fire Brigades Act regulations when he submitted a clear medical certificate from his own doctor.

At the time, the board sought an amendment to the regulations, but the then Chief Secretary did not see his way to proceed. His reasons were not conveyed to the board. This fact was mentioned by the member for Mt. Hawthorn. It is the submission of the board that such a person could jeopardise the safety of himself, of the public, and of his workmates.

It might be added that one employee—a fireman—attended a doctor nominated by the board, without objection from the Firemen's Union, when such action was necessary for him to be retired on medical grounds so as to enjoy total benefits from the Staff Superannuation (Retirement) Fund. Under circumstances such as this, there is no objection; yet when vital requirements are concerned in the interests of the public and the workmates of the individual concerned, objections are raised. This appears to be highly anomalous.

Regulation 100A applies to all employees of the board—officers, firemen, mechanics, technicians, special servicemen, and clerical staff; and two firemen are currently employed on light duties, being physically unfit for active fire-fighting duties.

The board is mindful of the welfare of its older employees and recognises that physical fitness standards must be assessed having regard for age. Compulsory medical examination of the staff at large for the purpose of achieving a minimum standard of physical fitness is just not contemplated. The unions are anticipating problems which have not occurred, and should be prepared to give the regulations a fair trial.

I should like to point out finally that the examination which is required by the board is an examination which is paid for by the board. I oppose the motion.

**MR. W. HEGNEY** (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.10 p.m.]: I should like to reply to a few of the statements made by the Minister; and I should like to impress this upon members—especially upon those honourable members on the Government side of the House: The Minister in his reply made no reference to certain of my statements. One contention of mine was that the least the Minister could do was to meet the representatives of the union to discuss the position. The Minister very carefully overlooked that statement and made no reference to it whatsoever.

I again ask the Minister, before I deal with a few of his statements: Why is it that he, as the Minister administering the Fire Brigades Act—the employees of which consist of about 300 workers—refuses to meet the union?

**Mr. Graham:** Because they are workers.

**Mr. W. HEGNEY:** That is a fair question. The union does not want anything extravagant. All it requires is that it

should be given an opportunity, to which it is entitled as an organised body, of placing its case before the responsible Minister.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you want to know why?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: You have not said so yet.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you want to know?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I would appreciate it, even though the Minister is sitting down.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They didn't ask me.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am very pleased that the Minister made that interjection, because he must have seen the regulation before it was gazetted. I take it that silence is consent to my statement. The Minister must have seen that regulation before it was gazetted. If he did not, then the board is doing something without the knowledge of the Minister.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If you think the Minister has got to consult with everybody—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister is not going to put me off the track.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I did not interrupt the Minister when he was speaking. However, I do not mind his interrupting me, because it gives me an opportunity of pointing out how weak his reply was.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Then I shan't interrupt.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister—

Mr. Bovell: The honourable!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —is the responsible representative of the Government, to whom the Fire Brigades Board is responsible. I suggest that when the board proposes to gazette regulations, it should not do so behind the back of the Minister. If it does, then it is about time the Minister told the board where it gets off. If it did submit the proposed regulation to the Minister, then the Minister must have read it. If he had the interests of the public at heart, and if he wanted to improve industrial relationships between the board and the union members—both the officers and the employees—then the least he could have done was—to use the phrase of the member for Bayswater—to extend common courtesy—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What nonsense!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —by meeting the representatives of the union to discuss the matter.

Mr. Bovell: You are in reverse now.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Introducing the motion for disallowance, I mentioned that a previous Minister, eight years ago, had

discussions with the union's representatives. The union opposed the proposed regulation and it confirmed its opposition in writing. From the present Minister's own statement it is apparent that the then Chief Secretary did not proceed with the matter because, as I have already said, he was satisfied with the existing circumstances and the existing position.

The Minister said there had been cases of men who were unfit for duty. He referred to one that happened eight years ago, in 1956—getting on for nine years ago; and it is questionable whether the Minister was right or wrong. As a matter of fact the Minister used the words "an isolated instance"; and because of an isolated instance, the Minister and the Fire Brigades Board, behind the back of the union—without any reference to the union executive—apparently agreed that the regulation should be gazetted. Yet ministers of the Crown, day in and day out, talk about improving the industrial relationship between the employees and the Government departments. It is so much hypocrisy to my way of thinking.

I have mentioned previously, and I repeat, that there are certain regulations which have been gazetted and which, to my way of thinking, and that of the union, entirely meet the position. There was one regulation mentioned at the outset; namely, that when an application is made by a person to enter the service, he must have a certificate of physical fitness. The Minister skated lightly over this. He did not refer to it, actually. If a man has one day's sick leave he must, under the Fire Brigades Board regulations, produce a medical certificate of physical fitness before he can return to work.

Neither did the Minister make any reference to the provision in the industrial award which was made by the conciliation commissioner to the effect that if an employee's pattern of absences is such that it departs from the usual circumstances or procedures, then a certificate must be demanded.

I suggest that the least the board and the Minister could have done was to discuss the matter with the union before introducing the regulation. I will not labour this point, but the Minister quoted what happened in respect of the police. A medical board is the authority to determine whether a policeman is unfit for duty—not one medical officer; and the position under the Public Service regulations is entirely different from what the Minister proposes in his regulation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The principles are alike.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The principle has been established for years that the present regulations are sufficient to meet the position from time to time. Here is the

principle, according to the Minister; and this is the regulation under the Public Service Act—

If an officer appears to the Commissioner, after a report from the Permanent Head, to be unfit to discharge or incapable of discharging the duties of his office efficiently, the Commissioner shall inquire and determine whether it is proved that such officer is unfit to discharge or incapable of discharging the duties of his office, and the Governor, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, may deal with such officer either by calling upon such officer to retire from the public service or by transferring him to some other position; and every such officer, if called upon to retire, shall retire accordingly.

This regulation 100A peremptorily says to the man, "You shall submit yourself to an examination, and if you do not you will be committing an act of misconduct and can be tramped within a month." That, to my way of thinking, is dictatorship.

The union is incensed, and rightly so. Any body of trade unionists would be incensed at such dictator methods as the board has adopted, more particularly as this proposed regulation was submitted to a previous Minister. I repeat that the least the board could have done was to report the matter to the Minister. The file should have gone to the Minister and he should have perused it; and then, if he had done the right and decent thing, he would have invited the union representatives to discuss the matter with him; and they ask now that that be done. They desire to meet the Minister; and if a meeting can be held they believe that some reasonable arrangement can be made to overcome the position.

Is that an extravagant suggestion? Is that something dictatorial? Is that something that any member of this Chamber could not agree to? Of course it is not! All that the union representatives desire at this point of time is that this regulation be withdrawn and they be given the opportunity—and they are responsible men—to put their case before the Minister. Surely that is not beyond the Minister's ability! He is not bound to accept their views; but I suggest he is at least bound to meet them and to discuss the position with them.

Let me say this: That in any particular case where it is obvious that one of its members—I want the Minister to understand this clearly—is physically incapable of carrying out his work, the union would not desire that he should continue in the job, from the point of view of public safety, and because of the safety of its members. But the regulations already provide ample safeguards to meet that position. Where a man is booking off sick—not casually such as one day a year, but where the pattern

of his absences is such as to indicate that his health needs some examination—then, of course, the men themselves would be concerned at the position.

I do not intend to go into the matter in further detail at this stage. I have outlined the case for the union in my motion, and I would ask the Minister to agree to the disallowance of the regulation, and to meet the representatives of the union to allow them to put up their case. If then he is satisfied, as the previous Minister was, that the present position is adequate, I suggest the Minister will be the first to agree with the union's view. If on the contrary the Minister is not satisfied and he still holds the view that the board should have this safeguard, then I suggest the union will have to accept the position.

My final word is this: The union is concerned. It is perturbed, if not disgusted, at the backdoor—I was going to say underhand—methods adopted by the board to have the regulation brought down behind the back of the union; because the first the union knew about it was when it found the regulation published in the *Government Gazette*. I hope members will agree to my motion.

Question put and a division called for.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Just before the bells are rung, this division involves a personal problem for the honourable member for Cockburn, and I have decided to allow him to remain in his seat regardless of how he wants to vote. He can indicate either to the Whip or to me which way he intends to vote. I want that clearly understood before I ring the bells.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—17

Mr. Brady	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Curran	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Davies	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Evans	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Graham	Mr. Toms
Mr. Hall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hawke	Mr. H. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

(Teller)

Noes—18

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neill

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Rhatigan	Mr. Williams
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Hart
Mr. Norton	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Moir	Mr. Burt
Mr. D. G. May	Dr. Henn
Mr. Heal	Mr. Cornell

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

## MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), read a first time.

### BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Milk Act Amendment Bill.
2. Alsatian Dog Act Amendment Bill.
3. Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill.
4. Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

### MILK ACT

#### *Disallowance of Amendments to Regulation 318: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 2nd September, on the following motion by Mr. Kelly:—

That the amendments to regulation 318, made under the Milk Act, 1946-1963, as published in the *Government Gazette* of the 10th March, 1964, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 4th August, 1964, be, and are hereby, disallowed.

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.30 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the disallowance of regulation 318 as sought in the motion by the honourable member for Merredin-Yilgarn, and hasten to say that I cannot understand any honourable member who suggests he has the interests of an industry at heart rising in his place in this House to move that a regulation such as this, designed to assist every section of the industry, should be disallowed. Furthermore, the regulation was promulgated only after very serious thought by the board which was constituted by an Act of Parliament, and after I had given careful consideration to every aspect of it. Therefore I repeat that I cannot understand any honourable member moving for the disallowance of a regulation such as this.

Mr. Tonkin: What good does it do?

Mr. NALDER: Let the Deputy Leader of the Opposition just wait and he will hear what good it does.

Mr. Tonkin: I will wait; but I do not think I will hear.

Mr. NALDER: Let the Deputy Leader of the Opposition just be patient and he will have clearly outlined to him the need for this regulation. It was gazetted under the provisions of the Milk Act, 1946-1963. The Milk Act had various amendments made to it, and this amended regulation was published in the *Government Gazette* on the 10th March, 1964. Also, all milkmen

were notified that they must conform with the amended regulation by the 30th June, 1964.

The reason for providing that the name and address of a milk vendor be painted on both sides of his vehicle is that the Milk Board is introducing a licensing system based on districts. It is in the interests of the vendors themselves that they should assist to prevent other persons from delivering milk unlawfully in any licensed district. Under the original regulation milkmen were permitted to have a sign of some description hanging on the sides of their vehicles. Some milkmen had signs painted on pieces of timber, on pieces of iron, and by other means so that their vehicles could be identified by a Milk Board inspector. This regulation was gazetted on the 17th March, 1950, and breaches of it have continued from that time right up to the publication of the recent notice on the 30th June last.

Since that regulation was gazetted, 203 prosecutions have been launched because some milkmen were not hanging on the sides of their vehicles a sign which clearly indicated their names and addresses.

Mr. Toms: The number of prosecutions does not signify the number of breaches of the regulation.

Mr. NALDER: The milkmen were given an opportunity to conform with this regulation so that a Milk Board inspector could identify any vehicle. As I have said, 203 prosecutions have been launched. In the last five years, for breaches of the regulation by milkmen in the metropolitan area, 13 prosecutions were launched for the year ended the 30th June, 1960; in 1961 there were 13; in 1962 there were eight; in 1963, 11, and in 1964 there were 14; making a total of 59.

At the 30th June, 1964, there were 158 milkmen licensed in the metropolitan area. Although seven further prosecutions have taken place since the 10th March of this year, when the amendment to the regulation was gazetted, in each case the vehicle was not identified with the licensee's name and address. Action was not taken merely because of the failure of the vendor to paint his name and address on the vehicle as required by the amended regulation. The prosecutions were launched because some vendors had not abided by the previous regulation which had been in force up to that time.

Removable signs have been used by some milkmen in the past, but prosecutions have still been necessary because a few of them treated the regulation too lightly, and continued to deliver their milk without painting their names and addresses on the sides of their vehicles. In considering the hours during which a milkman may use his vehicle for delivering milk, regulation 144 prescribes that milk shall be delivered only between the hours of 1 a.m. and 9.30 a.m.

in the metropolitan area, with the exception of the city blocks of Perth and Fremantle where the hours are between 1 a.m. and 12 noon. The honourable member, when referring to this aspect, said that delivery took place during only two or three hours.

A milk round of 100 gallons daily in the metropolitan area, 10 per cent. of which would represent shop trade, would provide a gross income of £56 per week on the margins of 1s. 8½d. per gallon for household delivery, and 8½d. for delivery to shops. Under the system of licensing by districts, it is essential for the vehicles of milkmen to be readily identifiable. It is in their own interests for such identification to be displayed to assist in preventing other persons from delivering milk unlawfully.

Unlike other types of businesses, which do not require the names and addresses of the vendors to be displayed, in the milk industry it is necessary that this provision be observed by the milk vendor, because he is licensed to sell milk in a certain district or districts. Until the amendment to regulation 318 the position became quite farcical, with many milkmen making removable signs of cardboard, canvas, plywood, etc. This necessitated continual policing by the board's inspectors, and subsequent prosecution when the signs were not displayed on the vehicle. I might point out to the House that it is necessary, under these conditions, for two inspectors to be employed inspecting vehicles because the evidence of one inspector, for the purposes of prosecution, is not sufficient.

Mr. Tonkin: Will not the board still have to employ two inspectors?

Mr. NALDER: No, not for the inspection of single vehicles.

Mr. Tonkin: Why not?

Mr. NALDER: Because before the vehicles are licensed they have to be produced before the Milk Board, with the names and addresses of the vendors displayed on them.

Mr. Tonkin: How will the board know that the vendors are not keeping in their own districts if the districts are not policed?

Mr. NALDER: Such inspections will continue, but the vehicles will have to be produced before the Milk Board with the names and addresses of the vendors painted on them before licensing. I think that position is quite clear. In any particular situation, when the circumstances were a little involved, two inspectors were required to prove the case in the event of a prosecution. The Milk Board staff is better engaged on duties relating to the quality and hygienic production of milk instead of working in pairs in an endeavour to ensure that signs are attached to the vehicles of milkmen as required by the

regulation. Any variation in the procedure of identifying the vehicle itself, as is now required by the regulation, will undoubtedly mean that the board will have to revert to the unsatisfactory position of having to police continually the requirements of the regulation.

To identify a vehicle is a modest requirement, and the argument that the vehicles of milkmen are used privately is not considered valid as most firms engaged in delivery of milk use their vehicles as an advertising medium without limiting their private use, as is evident on any weekend at beach or other resorts. A delivery vehicle is an essential requirement in the business of a licensed milkman, and it is considered that its proper identification to assist in the regulation of the industry is entirely warranted, regardless of any other private or business purpose for which the owner wishes to use the vehicle.

At this stage I might point out that this was one of the strong points suggested by the Leader of the Opposition by way of interjection; namely, that possibly the vehicle could be used for other purposes. Therefore that is another reason why this regulation has been gazetted; that is, that many milkmen use their vehicles for other purposes.

Mr. Kelly: What other purposes?

Mr. NALDER: Inspectors have stated that in some instances the vehicle has been used for many purposes, one of which was to cart rubbish. In fact, in another instance it was said that one of the milkmen had been carting a load of cow manure in the vehicle he used to deliver milk. This is the situation that has developed, and it is considered wise that this precaution should be taken. I can assure the House that the information I have given is quite correct.

Mr. Kelly: Has a prosecution been levelled against any milkman for having done that?

Mr. NALDER: The board has the power to prosecute.—

Mr. Kelly: But has it prosecuted?

Mr. NALDER: —but now it will not be necessary, because the inspector will be able to see the name and address on the side of the vehicle.

Mr. Hawke: Will the Minister tell us whether the board prosecuted in the case he mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. NALDER: I am not able to give that information at the moment.

Mr. Kelly: You should know that.

Mr. NALDER: I will find out for the honourable member.

Mr. Kelly: It will be too late then.

Mr. NALDER: No; it will not be too late. I will ascertain the number of prosecutions that have been taken out in instances such as the one I have mentioned.

I know that reports have been made; and if it is found that a vehicle has been used for a wide variety of purposes, the board should have the power to take action when it is considered necessary.

In recent months new applicants have been required to submit their vehicles suitably identified for inspection at the office of the board before a license is issued. I have already made this point clear to the House. Twelve licensees have been licensed accordingly; that is, with their vehicles having their names and addresses painted on them.

The question has been raised as to what would be the position of a milkman if his vehicle broke down and he had to make a temporary replacement. The board is certainly tolerant in instances such as that, and no action would be taken when it could be proved that an accident had occurred, or the vehicle had broken down, making it necessary for the licensee to resort to the use of another vehicle to assist him during that period of inconvenience.

Mr. Davies: The board will still need two inspectors to watch them.

Mr. NALDER: I wish to add that under regulation 319 the use of an upholstered motorcar for the delivery of milk is prohibited. I think the member for Merredin-Yilgarn said that some people delivered milk in various types of vehicles, but under that regulation a licensed vendor is prohibited from delivering milk in an upholstered vehicle. I presume that would include a motorcar and a station wagon.

The requirement for the name and address of the licensee to be painted on the vehicle is considered to be reasonable, because the painting of the names and addresses by people in other businesses appears to be a normal procedure.

I put this question to the Milk Board: If a licensee required his vehicle for private excursions and for going on holidays, would it be possible to arrange for some type of covering to be used, so as to cover up the name and address appearing on the side of the vehicle? The board advised me that quite a number of vendors have obtained pieces of canvas, painted the same colours as their vehicles, to cover the name and address on the vehicles. If licensed vendors wanted to use their cars for private purposes there would be nothing to prevent them from doing so.

Mr. Rowberry: Why not adopt the suggestion of painting the name and address on the canvas?

Mr. NALDER: If the honourable member had been listening he would have heard the reason which I gave.

Mr. Tonkin: If they were permitted to use a covering, how could they be prevented from carting cow manure in their vehicles?

Mr. NALDER: I was referring to the point raised by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn that objections had been raised, because some licensees wanted to use their vehicles for private purposes, and did not want their names and addresses to appear on the sides of the vehicles. In that event they could put a covering over the side.

Mr. Tonkin: The same as they could do if they wanted to cart cow manure.

Mr. NALDER: If they were to take that risk, it would be up to the inspectors to ensure that their vehicles complied with the regulations when milk was delivered to consumers. I say that the regulation in question is reasonable and fair, and no objection can be taken to it.

I understand that nearly all the milkmen in the metropolitan area have agreed to the amendments which were published in the *Government Gazette*, although there are one or two who oppose them, because they want to use their vehicles for other purposes. The Milk Board considers it should not be necessary for the licensees to use their vehicles for purposes other than for milk delivery, because a reasonable return is allowed to them in their occupation. It is an accepted fact that they have full employment in this industry.

I hope the House will support the Milk Board in its efforts to help the delivery of a wholesome, clean product to the public. I cannot see any reason why this House cannot agree to the amendments to the regulation, because they will enable the board to deliver a wholesome product to the consumers in a hygienic manner. I hope the House will not agree to the disallowance of the amendments.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Davies.

## SWAN RIVER RECLAMATION

### *Suspension of Work: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 2nd September, on the following motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):—

That consideration by Parliament last session of the Government's proposals for the further reclamation of the Swan River in connection with the Mitchell Freeway and Traffic Interchange having been inadequate for a matter of such far-reaching importance, it is the opinion of this House that all work relating thereto which is at present in progress should be suspended and no further work undertaken, and the Chief Traffic Engineer and Town Planning Commissioner should go abroad to observe the latest trends in methods of traffic control in various parts of the world.

**MR. WILD** (Dale—Minister for Works) {5.50 p.m.}: Two weeks ago the Deputy Leader of the Opposition introduced a motion to this House relating to the Swan River foreshore reclamation. During a very lengthy speech he criticised the Government for the haste in which, just prior to the rising of Parliament last year, it sought permission of Parliament to carry out further reclamation of the river.

Further on in his speech he criticised the Government for failing to send engineers and town planners overseas to find out the latest developments relating to town planning, traffic matters, etc., and for failing to take heed of a deputation that was introduced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the Premier for the purpose of halting the scheme, because, in his view, there was no urgency for the work to be done.

I find it difficult to realise the Deputy Leader of the Opposition coming before this House in 1964 and telling members there is no urgency for the completion of the Mitchell Freeway. I intend to go back a few years, when the honourable member occupied my portfolio as Minister for Works. At that time he had the job of hurrying on with the Narrows Bridge project. I am not criticising him for what he did on that occasion; and I do not expect him to criticise me for what I am doing now. What the honourable member said to the House when he introduced the motion two weeks ago was to the effect, "Don't do as I do, but do as I say."

It will take me some time to relate what has transpired over the years in regard to the fairly quick upsurge in the population and traffic, particularly within the metropolitan area. In 1954 that brought about the proposal for the construction of the Narrows Bridge and Freeway as stage one of the programme. As I shall show later on, all that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could think about at that time, and all that I could think about on this occasion, was the speed at which the project could be completed. As I have said on many previous occasions, whoever occupies the portfolio of Minister for Works in 1969—when the Mitchell Freeway will be ready for traffic—will receive criticism from a lot of people for not having completed the project earlier.

In order to get the story of the reclamation of the Swan River straight, I wish to lay on the Table of the House for seven days the plan before me. It shows the reclamation which has taken place in the Swan River between 1954 and 1964.

I go back to the 30th August, 1954, when—the files disclose this on many occasions—the Commissioner of Main Roads, mainly through the traffic section, expressed great concern at the great upsurge in traffic in the metropolitan area. Quite a number of representations were made to the Minister at that time.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Minister for Works, decided to place the question before Cabinet in a hurry—probably just the same type of hurry in which I presented the matter to this House last year—to seek approval of Cabinet for the proposed work. Following the representations made by the Commissioner of Main Roads on the 30th August, 1954, certain proposals were set out in a minute. The following is an extract of what he put forward in a minute to the Minister for Works:—

All of this first stage of the reclamation in Mounts Bay should be regarded as a matter of much urgency as there is certain to be difficulty in adequately consolidating the filling within the time schedule of the overall plan.

Further on, he went on to say—

In blue on the plan is shown the proposed first stage position of the river wall. This will enclose an area of reclamation of forty-four acres approximately, and as the depth of fill will be approximately 9 feet something like three quarters of a million cubic yards will be required.

He went on to indicate how it was proposed to obtain the sand fill, and who was to do the work. Further in the minute he said—

All preliminary works at the Narrows Bridge will need to be expedited wherever possible, and the pressing forward of this initial work of reclamation is of particular importance owing to—

- (a) The degree of consolidation and stability of the fill being virtually directly dependent upon the time factor;
- (b) the need for establishing as early as possible a suitable and stable bridgehead area for assembly of construction material and plant;
- (c) the limited capacity of the dredge "Stirling" for coping with all works at present envisaged. In this connection I would like to be associated with and support any recommendations which may be put forward for the purchase and installation of a booster pump for increasing the dredge's output.

Submitted for your consideration and approval,

Commissioner of Main Roads.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as Minister for Public Works, then sent the following minute to the Premier:—

It is highly desirable that this work, if approved, should be allowed to proceed without delay, and I should therefore appreciate it if you could have consideration given to this proposal at today's Cabinet meeting.



Subsequently at that Cabinet meeting approval was given for the work to be done.

A few weeks later, on the 29th November, 1954, the Commissioner of Main Roads again pointed out in a minute to the Minister the need for urgency in pressing forward with the reclamation and consolidation. That was exactly the same position in which this Government found itself in respect of the Mitchell Freeway: and that was exactly what I said last year. It was the very point on which we hung our hats—to get the reclamation done as quickly as possible, because of the need for consolidation.

In the minute of the 29th November, 1954, the Commissioner of Main Roads said—

It is most important that the reclamation be commenced as soon as possible in order that consolidation may commence. The dredge "Stirling" will be available for about three weeks before Christmas. After that it has been arranged for it to go to important work in the fishing boat harbour at Fremantle.

Just note how important it was to get on with the job, because overtime was advocated. The minute continues—

This work at Fremantle should be expedited, perhaps by some overtime work, in order that the dredge may return to the Narrows as early as possible, and after its return arrangements should be made for working a double shift.

It is obvious that the Government of the day considered, as we did a few months ago, there was vital necessity to get on with the job. The minute I have referred to was sent to the Cabinet, and the proposal was approved by the Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Premier, on the 29th November, 1954.

These probings were carried on by my predecessor, or by officers on his behalf, and the reclamation commenced. Naturally, as with any project of this kind—and we are experiencing the same thing now—people write to the Press and state that things are being done the wrong way. They lose sight of the fact that we have our experts, as well as advisers from overseas. However, that is the right of the individual in our democratic country.

One person who, as we all know, writes to the Press fairly frequently on matters of this kind, is Mr. Harold Boas. He wrote some few days prior to the 18th July, 1955, and this prompted the then Minister for Works to give a pretty long dissertation in *The West Australian*, explaining the attitude of the Government for having carried on with such expedition. He said there was a necessity to get on with the work. I hope he will agree when I sit down that exactly the same set of circumstances prevails today. The same necessity exists—to get on with the job.

I will not read the whole of the article, because it is very voluminous. He referred to the build-up and what was going to happen, and then one of the final paragraphs, headed "Urgency of Work," is as follows:—

Mr. Tonkin said that in every communication criticising the Narrows Bridge scheme, whether addressed to the Press or to Ministers and Government departments, it had been observed that the writer had not appreciated the magnitude of the traffic problem of the future. *The West Australian* had commended Mr. Boas's proposals for traffic dispersion as being "far-sighted planning"; but such proposals were likely ultimately to cost motorists who used the Narrows Bridge for the purpose of enabling them to get to Perth £350,000 a year for an additional half-mile travel. It was not possible to disperse large numbers of vehicles through a series of intersections at grade, and with no provision for parking.

He went on to say—

There were many ambiguities in Mr. Boas's articles and the diagram that accompanied it, but these were not discussed here since the proposal on major grounds was so manifestly impracticable. There was, however, said Mr. Tonkin, one point that warranted comment. That was the question of urgency. In the leader of the same issue of *The West Australian* it had been suggested that there was no great urgency about the work because it was hard to believe that the Causeway capacity was rapidly approaching saturation. The Causeway was not at saturation over the larger part of the day, but anyone who travelled the Causeway at evening peak appreciated that it was already at saturation for at least one hour for five days a week.

I repeat that this was on the 18th July, 1955—nearly 10 years ago. The Minister in his Press statement went on to say—

Had the Government not taken vigorous action to analyse this problem, and to arrive at a prompt decision that the Narrows was the proper place to build the next river crossing, it could rightly have been subjected to very unfavourable criticism. Accepting the need for this new river crossing, the stabilisation of the reclamation and the approach embankments became a matter of indubitable urgency. Reclamation and consolidation of mud areas required time, and it would have been dangerous to delay action on this important matter until the bridge design and construction was further advanced.

He then went on to refer to the main roads and the number of vehicles coming in. His final paragraph is fairly conclusive, and it reads as follows:—

Constructive criticism of the planning of such a large project as the Narrows Bridge was very desirable and welcomed as being indicative of civic interest. It was hoped, however, that such criticism would always have regard to the many complicated engineering problems which confronted the designer.

Surely there was my predecessor saying to the people of Western Australia before he started the Narrows Bridge that there was extreme urgency to get on with the work! He did not mind that overtime had to be paid and extra shifts worked to get the dredge up here in a hurry. On that occasion he did not have to come to Parliament; but, having decided to take 42 acres of the river—

Mr. Tonkin: Was it not 44?

Mr. Toms: Make up your mind! you said 44 a while ago.

Mr. WILD: In addition to the Freeway, which involved 42 acres, Mounts Bay Road and Narrows Bridge required another 68 acres. Therefore, there were over 100 acres in two bites of the cherry.

Mr. Dunn: That's where the river went?

Mr. WILD: It was supposed to be a matter of urgency at that time, and yet the Opposition is criticising this Government for doing exactly the same thing today. The only difference is that instead of our taking 100 acres we took a paltry 19.

Mr. Tonkin: Is the Minister asserting I took over 100 acres?

Mr. WILD: I am not asserting anything. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition looks at the map on the Table of the House he will see that between 1954 and 1959 when he went out of office, the Freeway and Mounts Bay-Narrows Bridge reclamations were undertaken and the total area involved was over 100 acres.

Mr. Bovell: Did the Deputy Leader of the Opposition get parliamentary approval?

Mr. Tonkin: Will the Minister be definite on the point?

Mr. WILD: That is incidental to the main point—

Mr. Tonkin: The main point is to state the truth!

Mr. WILD: Firstly, I have proved to the hilt the point I have been making about the urgency of the situation; and, secondly, an amount considerably more than 19 acres was taken over to do this necessary work.

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you state the correct figures?

Mr. WILD: It is not fair for someone continually to get up in this House and publicly criticise the Government for taking 19 acres when the previous Government took something like five or six times as much.

Mr. Tonkin: No it didn't!

Mr. Court: How much did you take?

Mr. Tonkin: Give the correct figures! About 56 or 58 acres.

Mr. Court: That's not including the Freeway.

Mr. WILD: I want to proceed to another Press statement made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Minister for Works. He was replying to criticism apropos the Narrows Bridge. The statement appeared in *The West Australian* of the 8th March, 1956, and its purpose was to bolster up the case which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had built—and rightly so; I would have done exactly the same thing. But I repeat: Why turn around and say, "Don't do as I do, but do as I say"? The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was referring to another leading article which had appeared in *The West Australian*; and he had this to say—

Referring yesterday to the leading article in "The West Australian" of Saturday, 3rd March, in which several points concerning the Narrows Bridge were posed, the Minister for Works (Mr. Tonkin) said that he was delighted to join issue with "The West Australian" on the question as to whether a bridge at the Narrows was really essential at this stage and whether, from a town planning point of view the suggestion that the bridge be led into Kings Park was more commendable than the Government's scheme.

Regarding the need for the Bridge Mr. Tonkin said that a census taken at the eastern end of the Causeway on 22nd July, 1955 had shown that for a period of half an hour at evening peak, vehicles (excluding pedal cycles) had passed outwards from Perth over the Causeway Bridge at a rate of approximately 4,100 vehicles per hour, and that during the same period vehicles had left the Causeway rotary and proceeded southward along the Canning Highway at a rate of 1,950 vehicles per hour. At these figures the roundabout was at capacity, but the vitally important point was that the Canning Highway was also at capacity at 1,950 vehicles per hour, and nothing would be gained therefore by scrapping the roundabout and replacing it by a new and more expensive intersection treatment unless at the same time Canning Highway were widened, at great cost.

He went on to say—

In a period of 17 months to July 1955 even peak traffic eastwards over the Causeway had increased from 3,250 vehicles per hour to 4,100 vehicles per hour and southwards on Canning Highway from 1,600 to 1,950. Having regard to these figures and the governing capacity of Canning Highway, it was considered that the need for the construction of the Narrows Bridge was not debatable, but was clearly established.

It was pertinent to ask on what grounds and with what authority "The West Australian" was able to state that from a town planning point of view the suggestion that the bridge should lead into Kings Park was more commendable than the Government's scheme. The Stephenson Plan suggested that the central city area of Perth lying between the Causeway on the east and George Street on the West was more than adequate, on a plot ratio of five, for the commercial, professional and shopping needs of a population of 1,400,000 people.

He continued—

That being the case, it would seem sound town planning to enclose the central city area as closely as possible within a road ring of high standard so that the traffic generated by the city centre might be distributed freely along its boundaries.

I want members to remember that last passage; because later in his speech, which I shall refer to this evening, he made great play about that. Continuing—

It would not seem good town planning to have the western side of the ring removed too far from the city centre and taken through Kings Park, as suggested by Mr. Boas.

The route from the Narrows across to the western end of the central city area formed an essential extension of the proposed northern route from the north west corner of the city block to Wanneroo and this had been discussed at conferences between the Perth City Council, the Town Planning Department and the Department of Main Roads—

Members will bear in mind that this was on the 8th of March, 1956. Continuing—

at which the need for early resumption of land along the route had been agreed upon and a proposal considered to finance the resumptions—estimated to cost £475,000—by raising a loan in connection with which the State Government and Perth City Council would collaborate. It was expected that the need for the construction of the road would arise within a very few years of the completion of the Narrows Bridge. The location of the road outside the City boundaries has

been decided upon by the Main Roads Department and negotiations will soon commence to acquire the necessary land.

His final sentence was—

The City Engineer's Department of the Perth City Council and the Main Roads Department are at present co-operating in respect of the location and design of the Narrows-Wanneroo Road within the city boundaries.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. WILD: Prior to the dinner suspension I was indicating to the House that my predecessor had, from 1954 onwards, without doubt been pressed by his advisers to go ahead with the building of the Narrows Bridge and the necessary reclamation. I did this to give members the background, and to show how fallacious it is to think that we should be criticised, in the year 1964, for doing exactly the same thing.

Before dissecting the dissertation of the honourable member, I want to read to the House the comments of the Chairman of the Swan River Conservation Board who, prior to the introduction of the motion in the House last year, had given consideration to the representations of the Main Roads Department for the early reclamation and procedure in regard to the first stage of the Mitchell Freeway.

The honourable member indicated that the motion was brought to the House during the dying hours of the session. I want to read to honourable members the reason for the motion being brought in then. This is the report by the Chairman of the Swan River Conservation Board—

1. The proposal was first outlined to the Swan River Conservation Board by the Commissioner of Main Roads, at its meeting on the 8th August, 1963.
2. The Commissioner of Main Roads made a fully documented submission on 26th August, 1963. Copies of the document were circulated at the meeting on 5th September, 1963.
3. The board finally dealt with the submission at its meeting on 31st October, 1963, and indicated its approval.
4. The proposal was given careful consideration by all members and the decision was unanimous.
5. Members stressed they regretted any reclamation was necessary. However, there appeared to be no alternative and the Main Roads Department had done everything possible to minimise the extent of the fill. It was less than envisaged in the Stephenson plan, which had been produced and published at a much earlier date.

The proposals were linked with a major development project costing millions of pounds, and had been the subject of investigation by experts overseas. Many plans were considered and rejected in an effort to minimise reclamation.

Members were satisfied that the 19 acres of fill could not be avoided without serious limitation of the use of the freeway interchange. The amount of reclamation was directly related to the road engineering requirements—the angle of curve for quick dispersal of traffic.

6. Whilst the board regrets the loss of the 19 acres, it feels that there are some compensating factors on the credit side—not justifying the reclamation but offsetting its effects:

- (a) The fill will remove an untidy and dirty section of the river which, because of its muddy and shallow nature, had needed constant attention to preserve its cleanliness;
- (b) The area was not navigable and was of no use for recreational purposes;
- (c) The 19 acres is only a small portion of Perth Water totalling some 800-900 acres;
- (d) The dredging will deepen and widen channels to make for better navigation and a more free flowing river;
- (e) the landscaping envisaged by a committee of experts—headed by Professor Stephenson—will improve the foreshore and ensure a proper blending of river and foreshore facilities.

And so, Mr. Speaker, that was the reason for the delay in bringing the measure to the House. The circumstances were exactly the same as those which faced my predecessor when it was necessary to press on with the job as fast as the planners could possibly work. As I indicated, it was not until October, just prior to the end of last session, that the Swan River Conservation Board was able to receive the final considerations of the engineers of the Main Roads Department. The Swan River Conservation Board, in turn, decided unanimously that it should indicate to the Government that, whilst it was not happy about this 19 acres of reclamation, the reclamation was necessary, and the board gave its unanimous approval. Accordingly, I brought the motion to the House.

Let us now dissect the speech made by the honourable member. To each part, I will give the reply of the Government. The honourable member, after indicating the lateness of bringing this motion before the House, had this to say—

It appears to me that such a procedure could not possibly be excused on the ground of great urgency, because it was some weeks subsequent to the rising of Parliament that the initial work of filling in the river commenced.

Bear this in mind, "it was some weeks." To continue—

There was ample time for the Government to have agreed to the committee which was suggested, and moved for in this House, and for the committee to have given consideration to the proposal before any work was undertaken.

Now, let us have a look at what did happen. I think, from memory, it was the 3rd or 4th December when I introduced the motion to give approval for the 19 acres of reclamation of the Swan River. Borings to determine the depth of mud and to obtain samples for testing were not commenced until parliamentary approval of the reclamation had been obtained on the 6th December, just two days afterwards. Boring in the river commenced on the 13th and progressed continually until completed on the 15th January, 1964.

Several weeks were required for laboratory investigations to evaluate the results before deciding on the most economical methods of reclamation. Tenders were called for the supply and placement of sand filling on the 28th February, 1964, and they closed on the 12th March. A tender was recommended for acceptance on the 23rd and approved by Executive Council on the 15th April.

So I think that shows pretty clearly there was no delay whatever; it was a question of waiting for the House to give its approval; and, within a matter of days—or one could say hours, almost—the department went on with the job. Further on in his speech the honourable member said—

It seems remarkable that we, in Western Australia, can proceed on a task of this magnitude without a full realisation of the nature of the problem and the very great difficulties that have confronted people in other places.

Surely it cannot be said that the Government is not aware of the magnitude of the task; because it engaged the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company, of Chicago, as consultants; and might I say that these people are consultants, and have been for some years, to the N.S.W. Government which is of the same calibre as my political friends opposite. In addition, this same firm, I understand, has recently—in

the last week or two—been engaged by the Victorian Government; and, as the Premier knows from his visit to America, the firm is regarded as one of the greatest authorities in the world on this particular subject.

The Stephenson-Hepburn planning report of 1955, after three years in preparation, clearly indicated firstly a very real appreciation of a growing problem and the need to formulate a broad overall framework of roads on which to develop further detailed plans in the foreseeable future. It must be appreciated that this planning report was conceived and developed with all Government and local agencies involved, particularly those connected with transport, i.e., the Railways Department, the Main Roads Department, and the Town Planning Department. The Mitchell Freeway and the further reclamation of the Swan River are part of this plan.

I would draw honourable members' attention to the fact that this was in 1955, during the time when my friend on the other side occupied the position of Minister for Works. Later the Stephenson Plan was incorporated in the metropolitan regional plan, which was tabled in both Houses of Parliament and approved in October, 1963. The honourable gentleman then went on in his speech to say—

What is more, we started on it without complete plans of what we were going to do; and those plans are not yet completed.

On the 6th August of this year I asked the Minister for Works a question, and this appears on page 104 of the current *Hansard*. I asked him—

Will he table a plan drawn to scale which shows the position and extent of the embankments which will be required for the proposed Mitchell Freeway and interchanges?

This was some eight months after the Government had asked Parliament to agree to the commencement of the work. The following is the Minister's reply—

Plans showing the position and extent of the embankments of the proposed Mitchell Freeway and interchanges will be tabled as soon as detailed designs are completed. There are still aspects in planning and design which must be resolved with the Region Planning Authority, Perth City Council, and other authorities affected.

Here we are into September, but still there are no plans. This is some nine months after the Government commenced the work. So the Government commenced without knowing what it proposed to do. In view of the experience elsewhere, that is a most remarkable attitude.

The honourable gentleman's request for detailed plans drawn to scale implies finished drawings. These plans are not yet complete, and will not be for some considerable time. However, I would indicate to the House that a detailed model of the proposed works, at an accurate scale of 40 ft. to the inch, was presented to members of Parliament and the public, and it clearly shows the position and extent of the embankments to which the honourable member referred. The model could not have been built without adequate geometric plans, and such plans also define the reclamation area.

These geometric plans were an adequate basis for the work; and I might add further that continually—daily, and even hourly—these plans are being examined. They are still in the garage at the rear of one of the traffic offices in Mount Street and they are being used daily and, as I said, even hourly. The officers check this 40 ft. to the inch scale model and then move back to their offices to put on to paper the refinements considered necessary, in exactly the same way as they did when the honourable member obtained instructions from his Government, and issued those instructions to his officers to proceed with the Narrows Bridge project before the detailed plans were finally completed. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say—

When speaking to this proposal in the House last December the Minister said it was anticipated that by 1985 the traffic flow in the metropolitan area would reach 180,000 vehicles per day. Assuming that most of that traffic will occur during a period of 18 hours, say, from 6 a.m. to midnight, that gives us a traffic flow in the metropolitan area of 10,000 vehicles an hour.

I am certain the honourable gentleman has misinterpreted the figures I gave, as, when presenting to the House the proposals for the further reclamation of the Swan River, reference was made to the need for a complex interchange just north of the Narrows Bridge when a flow of the order of 180,000 vehicles per day will be achieved by the year 1985. This means 180,000 vehicles per day moving through the interchange and not spread throughout the metropolitan area, as was suggested by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This will produce a peak-hour volume in the morning and evening of the order of 18,000 vehicles per hour.

In the metropolitan area there are some 175,000 vehicles, including buses and commercial vehicles, making some 1,000,000 vehicle trips per day, i.e., in the peak hour more than 100,000 vehicles are moving over all the roads and streets in the metropolitan area, and only a proportion of this

traffic, of course, is directed to, or moving across, the central city area. The honourable member went on—

We were told that the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company had been brought here from America to report upon the Mitchell Freeway and the necessity for the reclamation of the Swan River. We do not know the full extent of the things upon which they were asked to report, but it seems to me they did not give any report about the capacity of the city to deal with the vehicles which would be directed to it. I think they were asked to report upon the amount of ground required for the traffic interchange and whether it would involve any reclamation of the river.

It seems to me that the consideration should have been far broader than that, because there is a lot more involved. If we are to have 10,000 vehicles an hour in 1985 without any redevelopment of the city, imagine what is going to be the situation in the light of what I am now about to read; and I quote from *The West Australian* of the 2nd April this year—

#### More Cars Brought Into City

Perth police estimated that hundreds of extra cars were brought into the city during the morning peak hour yesterday by owners who did not want to stand in the rain at bus stops.

Traffic accident inquiry men said that drivers forgot that wet roads led to skidding and most of the calls to them were for minor bumper to bumper knocks.

The evening peak flowed more smoothly.

Children waiting at bus stops on Riverside-drive after school near Langley Park were drenched by cars driving through the flooded gutters.

The St. John Ambulances from the Perth depot answered ten calls to accidents between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.

This firm of consultants, De Leuw Cather & Company, was requested to review the broad scheme of a system of freeways for the City of Perth as outlined in the Stephenson-Hepburn Plan, and, in particular, the more detailed planning for the western switch road, or, in other words, the Mitchell Freeway. I quote the following from the report made by that firm:—

The approach taken by the Department in following the broad recommendations of the Stephenson report . . . setting a clearly defined and well-balanced transportation for the future is commendable. With this plan . . . if properly executed over the years by gradual continual stage construction

in accordance with requirements . . . it is reasonable to assume that traffic congestion can be largely prevented from developing.

That is an extract from a report submitted to the Government last year by this consultant firm. In his speech, the honourable member went on to say—and here he referred to his own experience when it took him a long time to travel from point A to point B—

I happened to be in the city myself that day as I desired to make a small purchase. I drove around for 35 to 40 minutes, adding to the traffic congestion, looking for a parking spot and finding myself frequently at the end of a line of traffic which was unable to take advantage of the change in the lights because there was not sufficient time for all the cars waiting to go across to do so. That is in 1964. What is going to be the situation in the city in 1985 if, after we have built the Mitchell Freeway and provided for 15 traffic movements in and out of the city, no redevelopment takes place in the city to handle the traffic?

That passage clearly indicates that the member for Melville does not realise the purpose of the Mitchell Freeway, so I intend to quote to him the two basic requirements in the planning of a city such as Perth. Firstly, there are the short-term and long-term parking requirements, and then there must be some means of diverting the traffic which does not desire to remain in the city; and to achieve this the Mitchell Freeway will be used. The question of the amount of parking space available in the city for this community is divided into two parts. Firstly, there is the long-term parking required for workers in the city who travel to the city in private vehicles; and, secondly, there is the short-term parking required for those who are desirous of doing business and shopping in the city.

The Stephenson-Hepburn Plan envisages the provision of large fringe car parks, such as the Perth City Council No. 2 car park situated on the riverfront. The second of these requirements is being examined by the Perth City Council in association with the Town Planning Department and the Main Roads Department. The following is what the member for Melville had to say when he was unable to move for 35 to 40 minutes:—

It appears to me that we have rushed headlong into this without an adequate examination of all the aspects involved. We have a situation where the Main Roads Department, whose job it is to build roads, has no shortage of money or staff and is planning to build roads to provide for motor traffic. We have a band—and a very small band—of men in the Town Planning Department without sufficient funds and without sufficient

staff to enable them to keep pace with the development which the city requires. So they are not in a position to give adequate and complete answers to the questions which are posed following on the road development which the Main Roads Department is desirous of carrying out.

An examination of these aspects was commenced by the Main Roads Department when plans were first prepared for the Kwinana Freeway and the Narrows Bridge. Since that time investigations and studies have been made as a continuing process over many years, during which time both the Main Roads Department and the Town Planning Department have worked closely together with continuous daily liaison between their technical officers. The officers of these departments appreciate the need for co-ordinating transport planning with land use; and the magnitude of the task is also fully realised. In fact both departments require additional staff to keep pace with the problems which arise with rapid traffic growth, which is, indeed, now experienced.

Action has already been initiated to meet these demands, and both the Main Roads Department and the Town Planning Department have been advertising overseas and in other parts of the Commonwealth in an endeavour to recruit additional staff to make up the leeway to which the honourable member has referred. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition then went on, in the course of his speech, to refer to the Minister for Transport in Great Britain. He said—

The Minister for Transport in Great Britain, realising the magnitude of the task which was confronting him—and, in fact, confronting all countries in the world—decided it would be necessary to set up expert planning committees to advise the Government.

He then continued to make some stress and play on the personnel who occupied positions in a group known as the "Steering Group," and he went on to quote from a book called *Traffic in Towns* very recently published and said—

They draw attention to the complexity and the magnitude of these problems; and they keep on emphasising the very great difficulty in being able to find a proper solution. Mr. Buchanan said—

It would be unwise to feed in wide roads stimulating large vehicle movement from suburban areas if the central areas were not capable of accommodating the traffic.

From the extract I read from *The West Australian*, it is clear that the City of Perth at present is not capable of accommodating the traffic.

There is no doubt the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was referring to the work produced by Professor Colin Buchanan. His two publications, *The Motor Car in Great Britain*, and *Traffic in Towns*, are well-known to the Main Roads Department and have been thoroughly studied by its officers. The methods to be adopted in the development of the regional plan, and a transportation plan as recommended in the Buchanan report, have thus been known and used, and are continuing to be used by the department and the Town Planning Department in furtherance of the redevelopment of the city.

The quotation from Professor Buchanan used by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition relating to vehicle movement from suburbs to central city areas is so well understood in the field of urban highway planning as to be axiomatic. The value of the proposed city ring road is, of course, to provide a facility at the centre, which will be in balance with the capacity of the feeder radial roads and enable traffic travelling on the radial roads either to bypass the city or be directed to its destination in the city by the most efficient route. Its provision does in fact enable the city area to become capable of accommodating the radial traffic.

The honourable member went on to quote some figures which he understood was the situation in Perth at the moment and he posed the following:—

What is going to be the position in 1985, with 10,000 vehicles per hour if there is no redevelopment in the city and the provision of wider roads and the exclusion from some roads of vehicular traffic? The Mitchell Freeway proposal is one of ring roads, and Buchanan had this to say about such a proposal—

If a wider view is taken the actual contribution to relieving the centre is extremely uncertain.

I feel sure the quotation given by the honourable member was taken out of its context and is completely misleading. In the case mentioned the authors quoted the doubtful validity of an outer ring road around larger cities, not the case of an inner ring road as envisaged with the Mitchell Freeway. The two reports that the honourable member was quoting deal with the coming of the motor age. He had this to say—

They say we can anticipate a very steep growth in motorcar ownership and that it will not be reduced because of difficulty in travelling. It is the American experience that difficulty in travelling on the roads has not brought about any reduction in the amount of vehicular traffic.

The people who have not hitherto owned a motorcar, but find it possible to own one because of reduction in

price or improvement in their living standard, will own a motorcar even though they find the greatest difficulty in getting a place to park or in using it once they have got it. But it is the American experience that they will continue to buy; and so we have to take the steps available to us in some way to try to encourage people who have bought motorcars to use them only on certain occasions. The greatest possible emphasis is placed upon the absolute necessity to expand public transport, and to encourage people to leave their cars away from the city and use public transport in order to get to it.

He went on to say—

The argument is advanced that it might very well be sound economics to provide public transport without charge in order to encourage people to use it, because in so doing the Governments would save more in the roads that they would not have to build than they would lose in carrying people on public transport short distances to their work.

I think it is well here to have a look at what is happening in Western Australia, because growing vehicle registrations and the steadily declining ratio of persons per vehicle in this country indicate that our situation in terms of vehicle ownership today is the one that was predicted by Buchanan in the book referred to for Britain in 1975. I think these figures are very pertinent to the problem. The 1964 edition of *Australian Roads*, a publication of the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities, shows that Western Australia and South Australia have the highest vehicle-ownership index with 2.6 and 2.5 persons per vehicle; whereas New South Wales and Victoria have a similar index or ratio of 3.1. Experience has shown that cities in the United States with population densities of 4,000 or less per square mile, and with high vehicle ownership ratios, simply do not have, nor are they likely to develop, any form of public transport at all. It is, however, hoped, might I say, to improve on this in Perth. Likewise there are old densely-populated cities in Europe or America where populations of 40,000 to 100,000 persons per square mile are achieved, and it is in such an environment that good public transport is absolutely essential, and is reasonably and economically attainable.

Perth is a young city with a high vehicle ownership. Even in the more densely developed parts it achieves a population density of only some 6,000 persons per square mile; while, if the region is taken as a whole, the density is less than 2,000 persons per square mile.

Clearly this environment is not one which will of itself encourage the type of transport development suggested by the honourable member. However, active consideration is to be given to such encouragement by governmental action. In his speech the honourable member said—

Holford and Buchanan have both said with their associates that buildings which generate traffic should be integrated with the traffic arrangements in an overall concept of town planning, and this may require positive and comprehensive re-development; and following on this line, the future pattern of cities should be conceived as a patchwork of environmental areas; that is, areas from which traffic, other than that which has business in the area, would be excluded, with the environmental areas both separated by, and connected with, a network of distributor roads used for traffic and traffic only.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say—

With regard to our ring roads, I pose this question: Will they in truth be ring roads in 1985, or will they be roads in the heart of the city taking traffic through the heart of the city? Will they in 1985 be roads which are allowing vehicles to bypass the city, or will they be roads bringing into the heart of the city traffic that does not want to go there? I ask members to visualise just where these ring roads are to be placed. Think of the growth that has taken place in the city in the last 25 years, and then imagine what its size is likely to be in another 20 years.

The Stephenson Plan, introduced in 1955, was conceived as a means of preserving a strong city centre, largely by preserving the means of reasonable access to it; and, in fact, to prevent an uncontrolled drift to the suburban areas. The freeway system as it is envisaged, with an inner ring road and radial arms, will, in fact, achieve that aim. Without the inner ring, intolerable street congestion would develop, and without reasonable access the centre of the city would tend to decay, and decentralisation would inevitably take place.

I think the following comment is very interesting, because it was approved as a result of a traffic survey recently undertaken: More than 50 per cent. of the vehicles parking in the No. 2 car park come from origins north of the railway. These vehicles going to and coming from the car park cause congestion in the city streets. The Mitchell Freeway will provide easy access for this traffic which will not use the central city streets at all, and thus assist in freeing the centre of the city for business and commercial traffic.



The size of the city within the ring road will be more than adequate as a central area for a population many times that anticipated for the City of Perth; and providing development is controlled by the regional authority there is no reason whatsoever for the city to develop in such a manner that the ring road will, as suggested by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, ultimately be in the heart of the city.

In a community such as ours, reshaping of the city must necessarily be a slow process in which the legitimate rights of all members of the community should be considered. It is not a practical thing to attempt to reshape the city by a detailed plan, enforced by any Government, before steps are taken to provide increased capacity in the road system to meet the rapid increase in traffic. These two should proceed hand in hand, and it is likely that as new and modern highways are provided in balance with an overall plan of land use, their provision would act as catalysts for better city development.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say—

One of the main causes of the problem is to be found in what are known as the car commuters. According to Buchanan this is the heart of the urban traffic problem, and, to find some solution to this, we should endeavour to persuade—not to direct or coerce or force—the car owner to do his journey by bus or train rather than motorcar; and it is argued by the experts that it is possible to persuade a person to do that if the public transport is made attractive by being efficient, comfortable, frequent, and cheap.

How many members do as I frequently do; which is, park my car here and catch a bus into the city and back again, rather than drive into the city?

The Government is fully aware of these problems. Last year the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company was given a further assignment, to report to the Government on transportation. That report was received three or four weeks ago and is now being considered by the Cabinet. In it the company sums up the situation in regard to the small number of persons per vehicle who were coming into the city, whether to stay in the city, to commute in the city, or to pass through the city.

It also reported on the number of people who came by public transport; on those who came by car; on the direction from which they came; on the hourly rate; and on the flow rate. It is a very comprehensive report, and I will now refer to one or two facets contained in it.

It is reported that, in 1961, of the 65,200 people who terminated their journey in the heart of the city area between 7 a.m.

and 9 a.m.—the two peak hours in the morning—45.4 per cent. travelled by private car, 42.4 per cent. by public transport, and 12.2 per cent. lived at or walked to their place of employment. The basis of the ultimate plan is that 170,000 workers will come into the metropolitan area daily.

I might point out that the plan of the Mitchell Freeway is based on only 34 per cent. of the people coming to the metropolitan area in their own transport, and the whole of the plan has been built around that figure. As it is anticipated that 170,000 people per day will come into Perth by some means of transport, the plan of the Government and the various departments concerned aims at getting the balance of the people—excluding those who live in the city and walk to work, and the 34 per cent. who come in their own transport—routed back to rail or bus transport.

The report gives an outline of the manner by which that aim can be achieved. The plan has been based on the assumption that 34 per cent. of the people will travel in their own vehicles, while the remainder—excluding the 9 per cent. I referred to—will travel by public transport.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say—

My motion suggests that before we have gone too far and the step is irrevocable, we should call a halt and send our experts abroad to see what is going on. Let them go to the north of Ireland where a plan has recently been adopted, which is the result of very lengthy study in that country. It has been decided to limit the growth of Belfast and to provide for the growth of an entirely new city, in which the roads and schools will be so placed that it will not be necessary for a single child to cross the road in order to go to school.

When I heard his comments I wrote to the Minister for Transport of Northern Ireland and told him I was very interested in the proposal. I asked for some literature on the matter, which he most generously forwarded, together with a full report of the engineers who had advised the Government there on this particular matter. He intimated that the literature would provide most interesting reading, and no doubt it did.

The final paragraph in this particular portion of the honourable member's speech is as follows:—

We have competent engineers in Western Australia; but with a few exceptions, they have spent most of their time in Western Australia. They have not, at first hand, come up against the problems with which they now have to deal; and there is no substitute for experience. One can read as much as one likes; one can study as much as one likes; one can

listen to the experts as much as one likes; but there is no satisfactory substitute for personal experience. So we should send abroad the men who are in a position to profit by the experience.

In that regard I must say I am rather amazed that a very well-read man like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—because I have no doubt that, like most of us in this Chamber, he gropes for his paper at daylight every morning to see what someone else is saying about us—did not know that both Mr. Lloyd, the Town Planning Commissioner of Western Australia, and Mr. D. J. Davies, Chief Traffic Engineer of the Main Roads Department, were sent overseas by the Government to do the very things he is suggesting we should do. They both went overseas last year; and the result of the visit of these officers disclosed the fact that, compared with studies in many cities of a similar size, the studies undertaken in this sphere in Perth are at least comparable and, in many cases, in advance in their conception and execution.

I want to read what Mr. Davies had to say when he returned from his visit to America. The purpose of his visit was to examine and discuss traffic engineering, the transport planning experience, procedures, and organisation in that country.

Mr. Davies was asked to prepare a report on his experience; but he said, by way of preliminary comment, that the planning situation as between Perth and many American cities was quite different. Perth enjoyed the advantage of having adopted at a comparatively early stage of its growth a master plan for the region, which had been drawn up in close collaboration between the planning authority and the authorities responsible for the provision of essential transportation services. Many American cities were not in this happy position; and, consequently, some major highway facilities were not in balance with the needs and requirements of some city authorities. I have been reading from an interim report to the commissioner, which was sent on to me; and Mr. Davies went on to say—

There was a further diversity in age and form of many United States cities. These were a reflection of historical experience, and the transport systems which had grown up from them; for example, cities such as New York, Chicago and Boston were radically different from the newer cities of the West. Thus even in the United States itself there were many different views as to the best methods of providing transportation for the growing cities. It appeared that there was no simple and complete formula on which Perth or any other city could base its planning. However, engineers and

traffic planners were learning to quantify this complex situation and to make adjustments in planning as the cities grew and land use was modified. This did not imply that the Perth master plan was not an important and valuable documentation of a concept for the region's growth, but did imply that our thinking on its future development must be kept flexible. It was clear from the experience gained in America that the forms and functions of the various parts of a metropolitan region depended largely on the designs of transportation systems in the various modes, i.e., by private vehicles, by buses, by rail services or by some forms of rapid transit on rails. Waterborne forms of transport should also not be forgotten in a city such as Perth located along a river. An aspect which had to be widely appreciated was that the ultimate extent of activity of the Perth central area would be a function of the transportation capacity that could be built into the plan. Thus the various metropolitan transport schemes which were now under consideration in this State, such as the lowering of the railway through Perth and the construction of an inner ring road around the city would all have a major impact on the trade and other activities of the city centre.

Mr. Davies went on to say that he considered it important that those sections of the community interested in the future of the city should have some understanding of the magnitude and the kind of impact which these projects would create. He said further—

In the field of traffic engineering operations, there was a wide diversity in procedures across the United States since much of the traffic engineering work was carried out by the large number of local authorities, many of whom had quite an individual approach to the work. Thus it was difficult in the United States to obtain fairly rapidly, uniformity in traffic control regulations and devices, and in this respect Australia was in a far stronger position as a result of the work being carried out through the committees of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, the Traffic Engineering Committee of the State Road Authorities and the Conference of State Traffic Control Engineers, all of whom were working effectively towards uniformity in Australia.

Mr. Davies concluded by saying that although modern traffic engineering had developed in the United States, and Australia had in general based its practices on those of the United States, he did not consider

that today throughout Australia the practice of traffic engineering was in any way behind that in the United States. In some respects it was significantly better.

As I said before, a report was also submitted to the Minister for Town Planning by the Commissioner of Town Planning (Mr. Lloyd). He, too, went to America for about the same period as Mr. Davies, and also went on to England. He was away for about two months. After they returned I have no doubt they both benefited from what they heard and conversations they had with men in authority in that particular sphere in various parts of the world.

I think it is amusing that we as a Government have been twitted for being in a hurry to start something. The honourable member mentioned, during the course of his fairly long speech, his own personal experience, and talked about 1985—about 10 and 20 years ahead—and said what was going to happen to Western Australia then.

However, we did exactly the same thing as he did in 1954 when the first stage of the plan was commenced with the building of the Narrows Bridge. We are criticised for doing exactly the same as he did! I wonder really what would have happened if there had been a change of government in 1962, because it is rather interesting to read an extract from *The West Australian* of Friday, the 9th March, 1962—I presume it is correct—in which the policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition was reported.

Mr. H. May: A very good one, too!

Mr. WILD: The article is headed "Hawke: We'd Ensure Fair Deal For All", and as part of his policy speech he said—

Labor would complete the building of the western switch road from the Narrows Bridge through to George-street and across Wellington-street within three years.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear! There's progress for you!

Mr. WILD: Which way do you want it?

Mr. Graham: He didn't say we would put the road up the middle of the Swan River did he?

Mr. WILD: Here is the Government being blamed; and yet we are pressing on as hard as is humanly possible with the money, men, and materials available. We are being twitted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; and yet his own leader, a matter of only 2½ years ago, said that his Government would complete the building of the road within three years.

I say without fear of contradiction that, irrespective of what happens, and press on as we will, whatever Government is in power will be extremely lucky if this is

finished before 1969. I would like to see it finished in 1965 if I could; but, as I said, it is humanly impossible.

I close on this point: Irrespective of all criticism, whether from the Press, the public, or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I repeat what I said this evening: Whoever is sitting in my seat in 1969, when the time comes for the Mitchell Freeway to be completed and the traffic to move through, will have the hottest seat in Western Australia—and for about three years before that date—because he will be criticised by everyone from one end of the State to the other for not having had it completed earlier.

Mr. Graham: Sounds like a swan song!

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [8.32 p.m.]: I want to deal mainly with the earlier part of the motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. In the earlier part he draws attention to the fact that the Government's proposals, as covered by this motion, received inadequate consideration by Parliament.

The motion goes on to emphasise the far-reaching importance of the total proposals and underlines the fact, at least in an implied way, that such proposals should have received very careful and searching attention by members of Parliament before parliamentary approval was given.

The Minister has tried to wipe away that part of the motion by almost entirely ignoring it. It is true that in the earlier part of his speech he used the words "urgent" and "urgency" quite a few times. It is also true he tried to establish a legitimate comparison between the Narrows Bridge proposals as they were originally and the proposals in connection with the Mitchell Freeway.

Surely every member of Parliament would know that no legitimate comparison can lie in that direction. To compare the Mitchell Freeway proposals with the Narrows Bridge proposals as they were when at that stage is like comparing a rowing boat with the United States Ship the *Enterprise*. There is no comparison in size in the two proposals; no comparison in relation to the planning, the execution—or, of course, the cost. So any comparison the Minister tried to draw, as he did, in relation to these two proposals is a very strange one indeed and one which would not, I think, convince or persuade any member.

The Minister, in the last session of Parliament, made an endeavour to introduce the motion in connection with these proposals on Wednesday, the 4th December. A point of order was taken by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at the same time, and the point was upheld. On the 5th December the Minister tried again, and another point of order was taken, and that

was also upheld. So it was on Friday, the 6th December, that the Minister introduced the motion in proper order and made a speech in explanation of the proposal.

The Minister today and this evening has emphasised the great importance of these proposals; yet when he introduced the motion into this House last year and immediately set out to explain to Parliament what the proposals were all about so that he could convince and persuade members to support the motion, he spoke—including the time he spent reciting the wording of the motion—for exactly six minutes.

**Mr. W. Hegney:** Two more than on the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

**Mr. HAWKE:** That is how important the proposal was thought to be on that occasion. That is all the consideration he gave to the position of members of Parliament who at that time were being called upon, under great pressure, to make a decision for or against the motion.

I would here emphasise that the day on which the Minister introduced this motion and made that speech was the last day of the session. Yet all the time the Minister considered it was worth while spending to explain the motion and proposals was less than six minutes if we deduct the time he took to read the motion before proceeding to make his very, very short speech in explanation of it.

So I believe it is clear beyond any shadow of doubt or contradiction, that the Minister, on the 6th December last year, did not consider this proposal of much importance; or, if he did, then he treated members of Parliament with at least semi-contempt; and he treated the public, of course, very contemptuously, because he gave the public no opportunity whatever to develop an opinion and to express that opinion either for or against the proposals.

As the debate went on, and within the very strict time limits which were available to members in this House, members on the Opposition side made moves to try to get the proposals investigated by a committee of members of all parties represented in the Parliament. A preliminary amendment in that direction was moved by a member of the Opposition.

The Minister opposed the amendment and made it clear that from his point of view and the Government's point of view the approval of Parliament was so urgently required that not a moment's delay could be contemplated. I then offered the Government a suggestion which would not have caused one moment's delay. In essence, the offer was that the move for an all-party investigating committee, if approved by Parliament, could have attached to it an authority from Parliament that the Government could go ahead with the proposals, provided there was a unanimous

or majority opinion, or a decision from the committee, favouring the Government's proposals.

The only qualification would have been that had the majority of the committee, or the committee unanimously, refused to accept and approve the Government's proposals, then the matter would have had to be brought back to Parliament for further consideration.

Surely, that offer was fair and reasonable enough! It would not have involved the Government in one second's unnecessary delay; because, as we know from experience since then, no practical move was made in connection with these proposals for several months after the matter was finally rushed through both Houses of Parliament on the 6th December, 1963.

So it is clearly established that members of Parliament, in the great majority, had no opportunity at all of considering these proposals; no opportunity at all of investigating them; no opportunity of trying to reach a decision which could be based upon merit and upon fact. All we had at the time was a five-minute speech made in a hurry by the Minister in partial explanation of what the proposals were about.

The Minister's explanation was grossly inadequate to the situation, and therefore it is no wonder that subsequently considerable public unrest and protest developed, not only in relation to the reclamation of a portion of the Swan River, but also in relation to the fact that Parliament had been rushed into making a decision without any information of a worth-while character being made available to members to enable them to make a reasonably well-based decision.

The Minister, in that portion of his speech made tonight, pointed out that the Chief Traffic Engineer of the Main Roads Department and the Town Planning Commissioner had each in turn visited the United States of America last year, and the Town Planner had in addition visited England. However, from what the Minister quoted from the report of the Chief Traffic Engineer covering his visit to America, that engineer appeared to have had a sort of roving general commission. The Minister was not able, or failed, to quote anything from his report which in any sense, or in any degree, was related to the Mitchell Freeway proposals. Presumably, therefore, the engineer in question did not, prior to going to America, have any specific reference from the Minister to give particular attention and inquiry to equivalent or comparative proposals to the Mitchell Freeway scheme as they might have existed or have been in development in any part of the United States of America.

We, as members of the Opposition, in relation to this motion as now before the Chamber and as moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, want the officers

concerned to go abroad with a specific clear-cut reference of inquiry and investigation related only to the Mitchell Freeway proposals.

Therefore the reasoning of the Minister for Works in relation to this part of the motion is not effective, even though he thought at the time it was overwhelming in the destructive effect it would have upon that particular part of the motion as moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

I have dealt with the two phases of the matter which I wanted to say some words upon. I conclude by emphasising again that Parliament was not given any opportunity at all, let alone reasonable opportunity, last year to consider, study, and investigate these proposals. They were rushed in upon honourable members. They were rushed through the Parliament, and the decisions approving them were decisions which were obtained only because the Government was able to bring into line all of the supporters of its own two parties in each House of the Parliament and get the necessary motion of approval through. I consider there is considerable justification for the motion as moved, and I support it.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta) [8.48 p.m.]: It is not my intention to devote any great length of time to this matter, notwithstanding its transcending importance. The note on which my leader concluded—namely, the shabby way in which the Government treated Parliament—is, in my view, the most important issue.

I say that even if the inroads that are being made into the waters of the Swan River were necessary beyond any doubt whatsoever, the Government has a responsibility to this Parliament, as set out in a Statute, to apprise members of this Parliament—both Houses of it—in order that they may make a decision yea or nay.

It will be recalled that no plan giving any information was submitted to members. Subsequently the Government, under pressure, revealed a great deal more than it did initially, when the Minister for Works occupied a few moments only in a very bald outline of what was proposed. Notwithstanding the protestations from the Opposition benches, and their wish that there should be a full examination, the Government used its strength and conscripted every one of its members to support the motion which was before us. The Opposition, quite rightly, expressed some doubts as to the necessity for the full reclamation, and wanted to be assured—we wanted Parliament to assure itself—that the proposed steps were justified. However, the Government would have none of it.

Shortly afterwards, when Parliament had risen, little by little the mud curtain was raised and it was found there was to

be a large—that is to say a long and a high—embankment on the foreshore of the Swan River. I have forgotten now whether it is in that area already reclaimed or that proposed at the time. Only subsequently was it ascertained that there would not be one of these mounds but four of them—one, from memory, extending for the best part of half a mile; and this bank of mud, or sand, or whatever it is, is to rise to a height of 30 feet in the air. Talk about the Berlin Wall! That would be only a fraction of the height of this embankment which is to be placed on The Esplanade of the City of Perth

That was bad enough; but we subsequently found there was to be a three-storey deck of road system. Here and now I suggest that even if this conglomeration of roads—usually referred to as a spaghetti pie—were needed for traffic movement purposes, is it necessary, or is it commonsense, that everything—and I underline the word “everything”—should be sacrificed and made subordinate to the requirements of the movement of traffic? Are there not any other values or interests that should be borne in mind?

I know that those people who have an interest in the heart of the city feel that the capital of Western Australia would not be complete unless there were multi-storied skyscrapers in the heart of the City of Perth; but as a number of us observed this evening, there is a great deal of decentralisation taking place to the west of Parliament House, and that is obvious. New buildings are being constructed and old ones converted into offices to house professional people, architects, those in the medical profession, engineers, surveyors, and other forms of consultants, and so on.

Surely it is desirable that the city should spread rather than spring for ever upwards, unless it is to be on a very much restricted plot-ratio of area to floor space. I have suggested before, and I repeat: In my lay opinion ultimately the extent to which further development in the heart of the city—particularly in the upward direction—can be undertaken will be governed by the availability of footpath space. The heart of the City of Perth—certainly the shopping portion of it—would not average three storeys in height, and it is amazing, in certain portions—for instance, Barrack Street—to note the smallness of the buildings in such a busy street in our capital city.

If we continue the present procedure until such time as the buildings on those lots reach eight, 10, or 12 storeys, then obviously the work force engaged in those buildings, added to the many thousands of people who will be patronising those business establishments, will mean a doubling, or even a trebling, of the number of people who even now are tripping over one another and finding it possible, only with the greatest difficulty, to pass from one point to another. Are the footpaths to be widened

by reducing the widths of the streets, or what? I suggest such action would be unthinkable.

So, whether we have public transport or private transport, whether it be by ferry or helicopter, or anything else, it will become physically impossible for the people to move about the streets in order to do their business and their shopping. This proposition which the Government rushed through Parliament when none of us, not even those who support the Government, were apprised of the facts, does not cease where the Government placed it. You will have noticed, Sir, that even in the last week or so the Minister for Works was most reluctant to disclose certain information to me and other honourable members of Parliament.

Here let me say one of the reasons for the very many questions which emanate principally from Opposition members is the evasive replies given to us by Ministers of this Government. It becomes necessary to ask not one but half a dozen different questions to plug every hole; and even then Ministers find a way of circumventing the question that has been asked. So we have to ask a further batch of questions.

Mr. Wild: What questions didn't I answer?

Mr. GRAHAM: Eventually, in answer to the interjection of the Minister, he disclosed to me—and I think it is the first time it has been disclosed in this Parliament—that if the work is proceeded with eastward along the Perth foreshore, as it must be when the present work is completed, it will involve approximately another 40 acres of reclamation of Perth Water. We were never told that before.

Mr. Wild: That was in the plan that was on the Table—the metropolitan region plan.

Mr. GRAHAM: There would be a strip about 1/32nd of an inch in width shown on a small scale plan.

Mr. Wild: Every plan is drawn to scale. You know that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let us admit all that—and here let me tell the Minister that it was part of my job in a couple of Government departments to draw plans and know all about them and therefore, possibly, I would be in the best position of any member in this Parliament to read plans—but it is beside the point. The fact is that a question was asked—"How much additional land or area of the river will be reclaimed to enable the work to proceed eastward towards the Causeway?" The Minister did not supply me with an answer in acres. He said, "As shown on plan 27 under the metropolitan region planning scheme", or whatever it was.

Of course, that was not an answer! So it necessitated additional questions to elucidate the figure. The Government, just

as it sought to put it over Parliament, and succeeded in so doing, has gone a step further; because I will guarantee the public of Western Australia are unaware of the fact that it is a natural and inescapable complement to the work at present being undertaken that this strip of land, several chains wide, must be acquired by filling in the Swan River from the Barrack Street jetty complex along the whole of the northern bank of Perth Water, around the corner in the direction of the Causeway, and almost to the Causeway itself. Surely members of Parliament, if not members of the public—and I most definitely include them—are entitled to know the ramifications of a scheme and what is involved in it! It is obvious, therefore, that the Minister and the Government are not sure of themselves in handling this project. They are aware of the public reaction and they have endeavoured to get this measure through by suppressing as much information as they can.

Mr. Wild: I have nothing to suppress.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why did I have to make several efforts before I could obtain from the Minister the acreage of the Swan River that was to be reclaimed?

Mr. Court: Would you say there was any suppression with the model of the scheme that was made public?

Mr. GRAHAM: No; but again the model stopped at the foot of Barrack Street.

Mr. Court: It appeared to me to be pretty clear.

Mr. GRAHAM: Again, the through-traffic on the highways side by side could not proceed to the foot of Barrack Street square and then drop over the side into the river. Obviously, as is shown in the plan, the roadways would have to be continued eastwards. However, unless one had two plans—a plan showing what went before and what went after, as it were—one would be completely in the dark.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I asked the Premier if he would make available the relief model of the proposed complex on the north side of the Narrows Bridge so that members might be in a position to refresh their memories when this motion was being debated. I asked the Premier for that information on two occasions without getting any satisfaction. Finally he stated he would reveal to this House the upshot of his conversations with the Minister for Works, but nothing has happened as a result of that. Again the Government is shrugging its shoulders at the Opposition and at the weight of public opinion in the hope of drawing the blinds down and giving as little information as possible in an endeavour to get away with this project.

The unfortunate aspect of the whole situation is that when the work is done it is done forever and we write "finish" to

the episode. Even if there were political repercussions against the Government as a result, one cannot unscramble eggs, so when the river is filled in it is filled in forever. It could be that this is the right course that is being followed; that there is no other sensible or logical course to follow. Previous Parliaments have decreed that we should declare ourselves before reclamation work is undertaken, so surely there is a bounden duty and responsibility on the Government to supply the members of this Parliament with the fullest information.

On what grounds or pretext does the Government demur; or on what grounds does it hesitate? In the absence of the scale model to which I referred a few moments ago, and having to confess it is many months since I viewed that model, it is extremely difficult to describe exactly what one has in mind in any detail. Indeed, when there was quite a lengthy television session during which the Traffic Engineer of the Main Roads Department was endeavouring, for the edification of the viewing public, to point out with his marker stick the various features of the scheme and the necessity for them from his point of view, there was still a rather confusing picture in the minds of laymen; even in the minds of those of us who have had something to do with plans and models and matters of a similar nature.

Again, on my recollection of some of the statements that have been made, a great deal of the reclamation of that portion of the river which is being reclaimed now was essential to enable the highway from the northern suburbs to swing in an easterly direction. As there was to be a speed limit of 50 miles an hour on that highway—the same speed limit which applies on the Kwinana Freeway at present—obviously there would have to be a gradual sweep rather than a sharp corner. Everybody will agree with that from the point of view of traffic engineering. However, I have racked my brains, conferred with other people, and asked questions in many places, but not yet have I been able to ascertain from anybody the necessity for providing a speedway from the direction of Mt. Hawthorn and Osborne Park to skirt the inner portion of the city in order to proceed eastward along what is now known as Riverside Drive and so on to the Causeway.

Why should a vehicle from Mt. Hawthorn or Osborne Park, seeking to travel to Victoria Park, skirt the city between Parliament House and the Perth Town Hall, and between the river foreshore and St. George's Terrace? Why should not such a vehicle travel a couple of miles north of the city in order to reach its destination? Because of the limited access to the freeway, and the high speed limit that is

permitted, these vehicles will be encouraged to enter the City of Perth, instead of travelling several miles away from it.

Mr. Wild: You are going to divert them that way; that is the object of the exercise.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have already said that because it will be a limited access highway—in other words, no traffic lights and no intersections—and because there will be a speed limit of 50 miles an hour instead of 35 miles an hour as on other roads, obviously the motorist seeking to travel to the point I mentioned from Mt. Hawthorn—that is, to Victoria Park—will take the expressway instead of proceeding several miles north of the city, perhaps in the general direction of Bulwer Street, or further north along Walcott Street, in order to reach his destination.

In other words, this high speed road system, to be placed virtually in the heart of the city, and bisecting it as it expands in the direction of Thomas Street, is going to be a magnet which will attract people to the city, instead of which the policy, surely, should be to disperse vehicular transport generally away from the city.

We have some idea of the rate at which motor vehicle registrations are increasing throughout the State—and, in particular in the metropolitan area—and, once having allowed this pattern to develop, the future will hold for us—as has been found in other parts of the world—not three levels of roads on that land on our foreshore, but four and five levels of roads, until the whole of the city will be submerged as a result of this road speedway or expressway being built of roads one on top of each other. So the whole of our city, this hill upon which Parliament House stands and the placid waters of the river, will be lost and gone forever. Surely these parts of our city have some value! Surely the aesthetics of a city mean something! Is there any necessity for people living in the northern suburbs, and who desire to travel in the direction of Victoria Park, to go through the heart of the city? If they are experiencing a certain difficulty in coming to the city, parking in the city, and moving along the footpaths in the city, might that not ultimately be a good thing?

After all, it is because of certain of these things I have mentioned that the leading departmental stores have set up giant shops at various strategic points in and about the metropolitan area. Had they not done that at this time one might well imagine the hopeless chaos there would be in the city. Members can imagine the position if everybody sought to patronise the one Woolworth's store, the one Boan's store, or the one Walsh's shop in Perth if those firms had not seen the necessity to spread their activities around the suburbs. Surely that sort of development is one that should be encouraged!

I could say this in more detail and with greater exactitude if we had in this Chamber during the debate a model to which I might refer: a model that would be handy, not only to the speaker but to other honourable members as well in order that they might become familiar with the details of the matter; so that they might appreciate the point the particular speaker was endeavouring to make.

It is grossly unfair of the Government to deny this opportunity at close hand and at short notice to speakers who care to exercise their right to speak. It is unfair that they should be denied the right to familiarise themselves once more with the details of the plan. This, of course, also refers to those who might feel disposed to support the Government in what it has done. If they could refer to a relief model they would be able to ascertain whether or not there was some substance in the contra-viewpoint that was being expressed.

So on all counts the Government has been most remiss in its duty to this Parliament, to the people, and to the future of our capital city. There has been considerable delay between the completion of the Narrows Bridge and the commencement of this reclamation work. Because of that, I say there was no extreme urgency; no reason why the Government had to bulldoze a motion through this Parliament; no reason why it should not have allowed an inquiry to be made on a non-party or an all-party basis.

But after idling away its time for a couple of years the Government all of a sudden feels it is necessary to press on regardless—regardless of Opposition rights; regardless of the requirements of the public; and with a complete disregard of what its action may be doing in the way of destroying some of the most beautiful features of our capital city.

Whether the motion submitted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is exact in every detail is surely not the point. Surely the point and the substance of the matter is that the Government should cease further activity instead of proceeding until it is too late. Whether the officers submitted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—or whether some other people—should be delegated with a view to seeing if there is another alternative is surely deserving of consideration. I ask the Premier and the Minister for Works what they find wrong with the suggestion.

They constitute the Government for the time being and they have availed themselves of certain advisers. But surely that is not the last word, because the work now being undertaken will either make or deface the city for all time. The carrying of this motion is not intended to be, and would not mean, a vote of no confidence in the Government. All it

would mean is that what was denied this Parliament last November would now be given it by way of opportunity to private members. The opportunity should be provided to the private members of this Parliament—in other words, honourable members other than those comprising the Ministry—to enable them to make doubly certain that the work being undertaken is being properly undertaken. We would then know what we were doing.

If it is inevitable that we must lose this portion of the Swan River, together with the additional 40 acres, which it is almost impossible to avoid if and when this work is completed, then I suppose it will have to be. Seeing that this whole project is at the front door of the city, surely it is not too much to ask of this or any government that an opportunity be given for the closest scrutiny to be made of this undertaking.

I know that on both sides of the House we play party politics; and even if the Premier will not admit it here openly, I think he will admit to himself in all fairness that Parliament was treated most shabbily last November; that only a fraction of the information subsequently revealed was made available to this elected body, which is charged with the responsibility of saying yea or nay. This Parliament was entitled to all the information; and yet its members knew practically nothing. The Minister for Works made no attempt at all to enlighten us.

Mr. Oldfield: He did not know himself.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would be prepared to believe that there is every possibility of that. It is a sorry state of affairs. There is no doubt the Government has made up its mind; but I am asking and pleading that it give us opportunity for a further review.

Before I conclude, let me say here and now that those who are expressing the greatest concern are not agitators from the Trades Hall—those are the terms of endearment we hear from the other side of the House from time to time—but they are some of the old conservatives. The majority of them are those who are, or were, the backbone of the Liberal Party of Western Australia. They are the people who are expressing alarm and concern. They are the people who are worried and disturbed about this action the Government is taking.

Mr. Brand: How is it that they seem to have such great influence at this time and yet you take no notice of them in other directions?

Mr. GRAHAM: Such as?

Mr. Brand: The conservatives of this State do not seem to matter to you at other times.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am pointing out that if this were a party-political matter the Opposition would be expected to criticise



or embarrass the Government, or something of that nature. That is party politics. But, on this occasion, not only is that occurring—however negatively the Government cares to describe the action of the Opposition—but, in addition, people of considerable standing who normally, and probably throughout their lives, have been the bitterest enemies of the Labor Party and the truest friends of the Liberal Party, are the people who are assuming the lead and who are most vehement in their condemnation of the Government's attitude. They go much further than the Opposition. They say the work should not be undertaken. The Opposition asks that the whole proposition be looked at fairly and squarely.

Mr. Brand: Did not the same conservator of the river say that when the original reclamation was undertaken by your Government?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Bovell: You have a most convenient memory.

Mr. GRAHAM: At least I have a memory!

Mr. Rowberry: Better than none at all.

Mr. Brand: Exactly.

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been no condemnation of the present Government, because a bridge across the Narrows was absolutely essential. In fact, the project had been spoken about for a century, and it took a Labor Government to commence a long overdue need.

Mr. Brand: Who set the pattern that has been followed?

Mr. GRAHAM: A Labor Government commenced to construct the Narrows Bridge; but because it was built, that did not mean a whole road complex, encroaching further into the Swan River, had to be undertaken. The important thing was that a bridge had to be constructed; and in order to do that, and for the bridge to give access in a wide direction, a certain portion of the Swan River had to be reclaimed. Whether too much, too little, or the right amount of the river was reclaimed does not matter for this exercise; but some reclamation of the river was essential for that purpose.

In this motion we are dealing with the point, not of crossing the Swan River and giving an outlet on the city side, but of a process which will bring about an entanglement of roads, and which will have the effect in several respects of attracting traffic to the city—traffic which normally, and which at the present time, does not come within two miles of the Perth Town Hall.

Mr. Oldfield: Not only attracting traffic, but channelling it through the city.

Mr. GRAHAM: Channelling it through the city, because of the advantages of travelling on the road system.

Mr. Wild: You know quite a lot about some subjects, but not about this one.

Mr. GRAHAM: I only wish I had interjected when the Minister was speaking, to enable him to indicate the necessity for the establishment of the road from the northern suburbs, to bring traffic from many suburbs in the north-west quadrant on to the expressway between Parliament House and the General Post Office, and then for the traffic to turn in an easterly direction to travel between Perth Water and the General Post Office. Traffic will be attracted to follow that route; whereas today that traffic travels several miles north of the city and does not come into it at all. If that is good planning and common sense then I do not know what good planning is. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will be indulgent enough to allow the Minister for Works to make a lengthy interjection; if so, I am prepared to defer to enable him to do that.

Mr. Wild: Look at the model in the next day or two, and you will see that your argument is completely wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not only have I seen the model twice, but I also watched the half-hour session when Mr. Davies (the traffic engineer) and Professor Stephenson were present and endeavoured to describe what it was all about. I suggest that I have done my best, not only by visual evidence, but also by listening to an expert explain the position. What I wanted was a relief model to be made available in this Chamber so that the Minister would not be able to say anything irresponsible and get away with it. There would be a model and we could show him up for saying anything at all, no matter how irresponsible it was, which he is now doing and getting away with it. If the Minister does not know there is an expressway following the routes I have indicated, then I say he has not seen the model.

I endeavoured to conclude before, but was provoked by the Premier into continuing. I now conclude by expressing the hope that the Government, and members sitting on the Government side, will not regard this as a vote of no confidence, but will regard it as an express desire initiated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that Parliament should be more fully informed; that we should make absolutely certain that the work being undertaken is indispensable; and that there is no other way than for the road system to be placed where it is in the manner proposed; and, further, that the additional 40 acres of reclamation east of the Barrack Street jetty is inescapable.

I repeat as I conclude: If the Government completes the work which it commenced several months ago, then neither it, nor any succeeding Government, will

be able to obviate the necessity of encroaching still further into Perth Water. In other words, whatever is undertaken in the present project, an additional 40 acres will have to be reclaimed. I suppose that gives a certain measure of satisfaction to the present Government; because if there is a change of Government and the proposed road system is with us—all but complete—then no matter how distasteful it is it will be incumbent on the Government of the day, as there will be no alternative, to fill in another 40 acres of the Swan River. Should such an occasion arise, I suppose the present Minister for Works will be able to have a little fun by playing party politics.

The decision is being made at the present time; and if the Government votes against this motion, then it is voting in favour, and committing successive Governments to vote in favour, of an additional 40 acres of the Swan River to be reclaimed, in addition to the present reclamation.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) (9.28 p.m.): It is not my intention to speak at any length.

Mr. Graham: It was not mine either when I started.

Mr. BRAND: The honourable member for Balcatta endeavoured to imply this was an all-party, impartial discussion, and suggested that in the event of a change of Government and a Labor Government being returned to office, it would find itself in an embarrassing position, because it would be forced to undertake certain reclamations and adjustments, which were forced on it because of the decisions being made at present.

What I want to point out is that the whole scheme of the western switch road, as associated with the Narrows Bridge, was decided upon by the previous Government, not forgetting that a committee representing all parties in this House accepted the principle way back in the time when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Works. By and large we all realised there was to be a crossing of the Swan River in a certain direction, and certain reclamation was to be undertaken.

If my memory serves me correctly, Professor Stephenson did make a public statement, pointing out that it was essential to have something like the western switch road, with varying features, to distribute the traffic if the capacity of the Narrows Bridge was to be reached and used to its maximum. I am sure all thinking people accepted that, and the present plan was prepared on that basis.

The honourable member for Balcatta endeavoured to criticise the Government for reclaiming 19 acres of the river which, he would have us believe, was not essential;

and inferred that the reclamation of many acres by his Government was essential. The same people are advising us today as advised the previous Government. The same town planners were planning; and we are still working on the same principles that were established. Therefore I cannot understand why there should be all the consternation at the present time about this part of the plan as against that which existed when the member for Melville was in charge of the Public Works Department.

Mr. Graham: The same advisers, but the Government does not necessarily accept everything they submit.

Mr. BRAND: The Government of the past accepted, by and large, this advice—

Mr. Graham: I like that "by and large".

Mr. BRAND: —and so have we. I say that if this model were brought to this House and could be pushed in here by some manner or means, every member would get up and express an opinion as to the model and offer advice about the detail and we would not make one bit of progress.

Mr. Graham: That is why from the start you have tried to keep everybody in the dark, is it?

Mr. BRAND: Ultimately we would have to obtain the advice of the people who are trained to give it. This Government has already sent Mr. Davies to the United States, and it is not so long since he returned. I have had recent discussions with him and he intimated that even in some cities in America they are rather envious of the fact that we have an overall planning authority, which we know as the Metropolitan Regional Planning Committee. They are envious because they look upon this as some of the most up-to-date town planning legislation of its kind in respect of overall planning.

We have had Mr. Lloyd in the United States attending town planners' conferences; and this time last year we had Mr. Aitken in the Old Country. Therefore does it seem necessary we should send more engineers away for the special purpose of conferring on this plan? On top of the information which has been brought back by the people I have mentioned, we have had the consultants, De Leuw Cather & Company, whose engineers are working in Paris and in most of the States of America; and, from time to time, we receive the latest information that is available.

If this motion is carried, I can only see it as another means of unnecessarily delaying the urgent decisions that have to be made if we are going to cope with the ever-increasing traffic problem.

Mr. Graham: You held off for a couple of years; why was that?

Mr. BRAND: The delay was occasioned after the completion of the Narrows Bridge for the general replanning by De Leuw

Cather & Company and our own engineers in order to go on with the next stage. No-one can deny that.

Mr. Graham: Should not planning take place simultaneously with the construction of the bridge?

Mr. BRAND: Why not? You were in office.

Mr. Graham: You were the people who opened it.

Mr. BRAND: I do not know whether the honourable member for Balcatta meant to say that; but whilst the bridge and the freeway were being built by the previous Government, I presume certain planning must have been going on; otherwise the Minister and other people associated with him fell down on the job. I am sure it was going on; and it went on after the bridge was opened until we reached the point where we could begin the implementation of the plan a little further.

Mr. Graham: You were there five years before you started further reclamation.

Mr. BRAND: In regard to this planning it became quite plain certain reclamation would have to be made; and this information was given to the Minister late in the session of last year. He brought a resolution here, and it was carried by this House; and, I think, by the Council. He gave the information, in short, that it was essential we receive preliminary approval for this reclamation in order to avoid being at least 12 months behind with our programme.

A lot has been said about the reclamation of the river and about the lack of planning; but what is conveniently being overlooked is the problem of the increasing traffic difficulties. We do not seem to acknowledge at this stage that the rank-and-file citizen who owns a motorcar will soon find himself in a very frustrating situation unless some real action is taken.

I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition quoting from a book *Traffic in Towns* which I believe is being accepted in many countries as a textbook and basis for modern planning. Mr. Buchanan—I understand he is the author—has been able to put in package form some of the main principles of modern traffic planning requirements. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, there are some very prominent people on the committee responsible for this report; and in the last paragraph of the foreword, Mr. Buchanan said—

It is impossible to spend any time on the study of the future traffic in towns, even so short a time as we have been able to give, without being at once appalled by the magnitude of the emergency that is coming upon us and inspired by the challenge it presents.

He is speaking, of course, of traffic in England. Continuing—

There is another source of fascination. We are nourishing at immense cost a monster of great potential destructiveness. And yet we love him dearly. Regarded in its collective aspect as "the traffic problem" the motor car is clearly a menace which can spoil our civilization. But translated into terms of the particular vehicle that stands in our garage (or more often nowadays, is parked outside our door, or someone else's door), we regard it as one of our most treasured possessions or dearest ambitions, an immense convenience, an expander of the dimensions of life, an instrument of emancipation, a symbol of the modern age. To refuse to accept the challenge it presents would be an act of defeatism. The task it sets us is no greater, and perhaps less, than was presented to the rural England of two centuries ago by the Industrial Revolution followed by the railway. If we are to meet our challenge with a greater balance of gain over loss than our great-grandfathers met theirs, we must meet it without confusion over purpose, without timidity over means, and above all without delay.

I think England has a greater problem than we have; but surely this is a challenge to the Government of the day! I think we would all agree with that. I say that if the motion were carried it would unnecessarily delay the planning and the progress which we envisage in this very important matter.

The honourable member for Balcatta has talked about the ring road, and about the traffic coming into the town from certain suburbs if it is to cross over to Victoria Park. We cannot decide that here. These experts, who have studied the whole situation, are the people who can tell us about this; and if it is obvious to the honourable member for Balcatta, surely it is obvious to them! The solution of many of the problems is not going to be that we will cross from one point to another by the shortest means, because that will not be possible. The layout of the plan will mean the avoidance of intersections and the establishment of one-way traffic. I am sure that in the year 2000 there will not only be plans similar to the one which we envisage for this feature of Perth, but there will be many of them around the river and in Fremantle and, indeed, in many provincial towns.

Mr. Toms: We will be safe in 2000. I do not know about the rest of the pedestrians.

Mr. BRAND: I do not know whether the honourable member for Bayswater has made any study of this problem, but if he

has any worth-while suggestions to make I am sure the engineers will be only too happy to hear them.

Mr. Toms: I made a suggestion last session, but you did not listen to it.

Mr. H. May: The honourable member for Bayswater is quite sure where he will be in the year 2000.

Mr. BRAND: That was another move which was designed to delay.

Mr. Toms: It was designed to help, not delay.

Mr. BRAND: I want to say the Government will accept the responsibility for the decisions it has made; and I am sure, just as the decisions on the Narrows Bridge have proved of immense value to us up to this stage, that it is up to the Government of the day to accept the challenge and answer the criticism, whether it be by conservatives; or as the honourable member for Balcatta said, put up by agitators from the Trades Hall. It does not matter. It is up to us to get on with the most modern planning possible; and, let me say, not continue to send people around the world without getting on with the plan. We will have to continue to send engineers overseas to keep in touch with latest developments. However, we live in changing times; and no matter how modern and decisive we may be, what is suitable for today could be old-fashioned in 10 years' time.

We have just looked at a film which envisages the time when everyone in England will have a motorcar—everyone. I suppose this might be called the optimum. The planners cannot anticipate that anyone will want more than one car, so they will be able to plan accordingly.

I have no doubt from all I have seen that our own town planner, the traffic engineers, and others associated with this very difficult problem are working towards giving Perth in Western Australia the most modern town plan possible and the latest traffic devices in order to ensure the full use of the private car and also the general safe transport of the individual. I understand from all surveys made, not only here but also in Leeds in England, that it is aimed eventually, by careful and sound planning, to get to the stage where 34 per cent. of the people—I think that was the figure—would use private cars. It is possible by sound planning to devise means by which the balance of the people using the public transport to get them from their homes to their places of work—

Mr. Graham: Encourage them to disperse, not congregate.

Mr. BRAND: Anyone would think the honourable member for Balcatta was saying something which had not been thought of.

Mr. Graham: Why not do something about it?

Mr. BRAND: It is the very basis of the work we are doing. We have just approved, on the recommendation of the town planner and of the Commissioner of Main Roads, of the calling of applications for important posts in the Town Planning Department. I think the number to be appointed is five. We do not know where these top planners are to come from. They are very difficult to get because their services are in great demand throughout the world. However, these officers are to be highly paid, and the Government is very willing to pay them in order that the next stage of planning necessary to ensure a sound plan and good traffic movement is provided for the future of Perth.

I am satisfied that the motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, however well intentioned, could only, if passed, mean a further unnecessary delay; and any delay will mean greater chaos in the not far distant future for the motorists of this country. I oppose the motion.

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands) [9.45 p.m.]: I feel that speakers from the Government side, including the Premier himself, have lost sight of the history of the town planning scheme for the metropolitan region and certain cogent features surrounding it.

If we go back to the years 1948 to 1950, or thereabouts, we will recall that Professor Gordon Stephenson was visiting Western Australia for a few short weeks in each year to evolve a plan on the facts as then known as to future population and traffic problems, to meet the amount of traffic anticipated. Then, when the late Gilbert Fraser became Minister in 1954, because of the way the situation was getting out of hand and because the plan was not completed, he arranged for Professor Stephenson to come to Western Australia for a period of 12 to 18 months. He was to remain here until he had completed the plan.

Mr. Brand: We made the selection of Professor Stephenson.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Obviously the Premier was not listening to me. I said that Professor Stephenson was coming out for a few short weeks each year. He was invited by the McLarty-Watts Government, but remained here for only six to seven weeks each year, during which time he was trying to evolve a plan. It was the late Gilbert Fraser who arranged for him to remain until such time as the plan was completed.

Mr. Brand: He was the Minister of the day.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes; but instead of having him out for a couple of months a year, Mr. Fraser arranged for him to remain in order to get the plan completed.

Mr. Graham: He took a fancy to the place and stayed here.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes. He came back later on. If we study the plan of Professor Stephenson, which was finally presented to us in 1955, we must also analyse the reasons for certain proposals he made. He stated very clearly in his book the reasons for his decisions. However, we find that in the period—almost 10 years—which has elapsed since Professor Stephenson completed his studies and presented his findings in book form, the population trend has not followed the pattern anticipated, and this especially applies to the question of where people were going to live.

Suburbs and areas of development have sprung up although they were not anticipated at that time; and, on the other hand, areas which it was thought would go ahead have remained somewhat static. Likewise with the development of industrial areas: those which it was anticipated would develop have not developed; and industries which were not even envisaged at that time have been established.

Mr. Brand: What industrial areas have not gone ahead?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I will point out one to the Premier. I do not think the industrial area of Kwinana has gone ahead at anywhere near the pace envisaged in 1954-1955. Other industries which were to be allied with and based on the Kwinana refinery have not come to pass. It was anticipated in those days that Kwinana would virtually become a satellite city. It was envisaged that the twin towns of Medina and Calista, and the surrounding areas, would grow in population to something like 30,000 to 40,000 and form another Elizabeth, such as exists in South Australia.

But what do we find? People did not want to live there after the State Housing Commission had completed the homes and the refinery had been established, and the Housing Commission had to make the homes there available to aged pensioners in order that it could get occupants for the homes so that they would not remain vacant. That is what happened: the people did not want to live where the planners of the day thought they would wish to live.

If development of housing, industry, and commerce does not go ahead on the lines envisaged by the planners, it is obvious that the plan must be altered somewhere along the road to meet the demands which occur, particularly if the trend is contrary to what was envisaged.

I realise that in the early days the plan was brought into being because it was thought there would be a huge industrial and residential area in the Kwinana district. Likewise, it was thought there would be a large residential and industrial area in the north-western suburbs. A certain amount of light industry has developed there. Certain residential

areas are developing in that direction; but there is a state of imbalance with regard to the original plan.

We find that in the suburbs to the east of Perth, on the south-eastern side of the river, industry and residential areas have developed at a much greater pace than was anticipated. Therefore I would have thought that at this juncture considerable thought would be given not so much to the western switch road—essential though it may be for taking people from the north of the city to the south—but to the proposed ring road, which is to be situated somewhere in the vicinity of Aberdeen Street or Newcastle Street, to have it resited somewhere north to, say, Bulwer Street or as far north as Walcott Street.

We should have a bridge over the Swan River eastwards of the Causeway to relieve the Causeway of present traffic, and to provide for traffic wanting to travel from the north-western suburbs to the north-eastern, eastern, and south-eastern suburbs. That would appear to be the logical trend, with the rate of traffic wanting to proceed from point A to point B or from point B to point A, when we speak of the eastern suburbs and north-western areas.

It requires only a little bit of observation to see what is happening. The Mt. Lawley subway has overreached its capacity. It has more than reached saturation point in the handling of traffic—traffic which, in the main, comprises drivers who wish to travel from the north-western areas to the south side of the river, and *vice versa*, at peak hours in the morning and afternoon. Some drivers use the subway and go down East Parade and Plain Street to the Causeway; whilst others use the Mt. Lawley subway and the Garrett Road bridge, and *vice versa*.

We are building up a bottleneck. It is virtually a two-lane road. Traffic from the Midland Junction area is being held up, and it is almost impossible for it to get through. It is virtually impossible for drivers to use the Causeway in the mornings, and the alternative route is possibly to go down old Government Road, which is now known as Walter Road, and then through Morley Park, to get a clear run into the city.

At this stage it is most essential that we should proceed immediately with the ring road north of the city; and there should be a third bridge across the Swan River in the vicinity of the existing Bunbury railway bridge. That would relieve the congestion and would do far more good at this juncture than proceeding with the full plan of the western switch road as proposed, which is to bring the traffic from the western suburbs through the city, along what is now known as Riverside

Drive to the Causeway, once again throwing traffic on to the Causeway which it can ill afford to carry.

I understand the Causeway is carrying a greater volume of traffic at the present time than is the Narrows Bridge. It does not need a lot of imagination to realise that we must change our plan if anticipated trends do not come to pass. Having made a close study of the proposals when they were introduced in 1955, and having watched and awaited the developments with interest, I am well and truly aware that those developments have not occurred as anticipated.

I know that it is very nice for planners to lay down a plan and to say that we must get people to follow the plan, to live and work here, and to say that industry must go to this or that section. But it does not come about. One of the reasons is land speculation. That could be one reason. People will not release land. They want to hold on to it for a few extra years because it might be of value for subdivision for residential sites. We must develop industry and residential areas where land is available; and by "available" I mean where it is for sale for that purpose by the owners at the time.

I feel that I must support the motion. In conclusion, I wish to say that it is rather futile to try to choke the streets more than they are now being choked, just in an effort to try to do something spectacular. The Government would be well advised, if it has the future of the State at heart, to give away trying to be spectacular. It should do something practical and down to earth; something which is going to alleviate the situation which we are rapidly approaching.

**MR. TONKIN** (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.58 p.m.]: The proposal to which the motion under discussion relates is probably the most far-reaching in its effects, and the costliest project, which the Parliament of Western Australia has ever had to consider since its establishment.

In the ultimate the proposal, of which the Mitchell Freeway forms a part, will cost many millions of pounds. The estimate given for the Mitchell Freeway itself is from £8,000,000 to £10,000,000. When the other portions of the inner ring road are taken into consideration, it can easily be seen that the final cost will be multiples of £10,000,000; and the effect upon the city's development and the aesthetics of the city will be very great indeed.

It is those two considerations which cause me to say—because I firmly believe it to be true—that there has never before been a project of such magnitude and importance as the one to which this motion relates; and having that in mind, is it any wonder that many people in the

State felt, as we felt, that the consideration given to the proposition, when it was first brought to this Parliament in December last year, was inadequate to the magnitude of the proposition? If the Government at the time had regarded it as of a fraction of the importance that it is obvious it now regards this motion, the chances are that the motion would never have been moved.

Only the sketchiest information was supplied to the House at the time. The matter was under discussion on the last day of the session; and is it to be wondered at that people, generally, were dissatisfied with the consideration that had been given to the proposal? I do not think anybody could successfully argue that a speech of less than ten minutes by the Minister in charge of the motion was satisfactory in the circumstances; and when attempts were made to ensure that reasonable consideration could be given to the matter, the Government used its numbers to prevent such consideration from taking place. So it has only itself to blame if considerable dissatisfaction subsequently arose.

From time to time during the discussion reference has been made to a scale model which was supposed to indicate the nature of the proposals. I ask you, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Heal): Of what possible value is it in order to determine what the Government's proposals are? The scale model was constructed months ago; yet in August, when I asked the Minister for Works: "Will he table the plan drawn to scale which shows the position and extent of the embankments?"—and that is all I wanted to know: the position and extent of the embankments which are on the scale model—I was told I could not get that plan because there were still aspects in planning and design which must be resolved with the region planning authority, the Perth City Council, and the other authorities affected.

If I cannot get a plan showing the position and extent of the embankments, of what earthly use is a scale model which shows those embankments? Therefore, so far as the scale model is concerned, we can forget about it. It is of no advantage whatever; and apparently this amounts to an admission by the Government that it does not know where the embankments will go finally and what their extent will be; because they are still the subject of discussion between a number of authorities.

Does not that lend point to my assertion that the Government proceeded with this proposal before it knew where it was going? Because it is still giving consideration to the position of embankments, and the extent of the embankments embodied in the plan. I ask you, Sir, why it was necessary for the Minister for Works to attribute to me approval for reclamation which was about double the area that I

actually approved. What was his reason? Do not tell me the Minister did not know that what he was saying was not factual! Therefore, why did he set out to misrepresent the position?

Mr. Wild: The position was not misrepresented. Don't worry!

Mr. TONKIN: Well, we will see. Did not the Minister say that I was responsible for more than 100 acres of reclamation?

Mr. Wild: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: Is the Minister then asserting that that is in accordance with fact?

Mr. Wild: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: Well, when I prove to the Minister from his own diagram that it is not so, will he retract?

Mr. Wild: There is no need to.

Mr. TONKIN: The situation is this: The original proposal for reclamation in Perth Water was for 37 acres, to which I gave approval. It was subsequently necessary to increase that amount because when we obtained advice from overseas it was suggested to us that in proposing to place the bridge at right angles to the bank of the river we were not achieving the best appearance for the bridge. It was suggested to us that it would be better if the bridge were put on the skew, and that necessitated more reclamation than was originally anticipated.

My recollection of the matter—and it is some years now since it occurred—is that we had to step up the 37 acres to something a little in excess of 50 acres, because of that necessity to place the bridge on the skew. The Minister, in arriving at his 100 acres, included reclamation which his own Government has carried out.

Mr. Wild: No he didn't!

Mr. TONKIN: Oh, yes he did!

Mr. Wild: No; he did not. I did not do the reckoning.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes you did!

Mr. Wild: No I didn't!

Mr. Rowberry: He couldn't.

Mr. TONKIN: Fortunately the dates are placed on this diagram showing when the pieces of reclamation were carried out. Unfortunately, although the total reclamation at the end of the Narrows Bridge is shown in the one colour, and the figures "1958" appear in the middle, all that reclamation was not carried out by the Hawke Government; because at the southern part of it is the current 19 acres of reclamation being carried out by this Government.

Mr. Wild: There were 100 acres without that.

Mr. TONKIN: No there were not.

Mr. Wild: Yes there were!

Mr. TONKIN: Not anything like that! Why does the Minister persist in saying something which is untrue?

Mr. Wild: Why do you persist in saying something that is more untrue?

Mr. TONKIN: Well, it is up to the Minister to prove his point, if he will; but he never does.

Mr. O'Neil: How many acres were involved in the Kwinana Freeway—the three miles of the Freeway along Melville Water?

Mr. TONKIN: In discussions with a certain gentleman during the tea suspension, he assured me there would not be more than five.

Mr. Wild: Don't be silly!

Mr. TONKIN: Five miles of additional reclamation from the Narrows Bridge to Canning Bridge.

Mr. O'Neil: You mean five acres do you not?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, five acres.

Mr. O'Neil: It is three miles long.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not care how long it is. I was told that the total reclamation there was about five acres. We can add another four to five acres reclaimed for the South of Perth Yacht Club, and to that we add an area that was reclaimed for the construction of the bridge itself. That represents the total reclamation. But if one looks at this map I have before me, one will notice some reclamation on Heirisson Island that was carried out in 1949.

Mr. Wild: That was not included in the total; don't worry!

Mr. TONKIN: I challenge the Minister—and he is in a position to get the information from the department—to quote the figure for each piece of reclamation.

Mr. Wild: You put a question on the notice paper tomorrow and you will get it; don't worry!

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes! Why is it necessary for me to put the question on the notice paper?

Mr. Wild: How are you going to get it if you don't put a question on the notice paper?

Mr. TONKIN: If I put a question on the notice paper the Minister will say it is *sub judice*.

Mr. O'Neil: Is the Kwinana Freeway two chains wide? If it is, the reclamation represents 48 acres.

Mr. TONKIN: No; it is nowhere near two chains wide. Up to Canning Bridge, the greatest width of the Kwinana Freeway is near the bridge itself, and I very much doubt that it is two chains wide.

Mr. O'Neil: If it is only one chain wide it is 24 acres.

Mr. Wild: Does the honourable member realise that on the 10th August, 1955, he answered a question asked by Mr. Yates—who was then the member for Canning—and stated that the reclamation on the Narrows was approximately 43 acres? That was the reclamation for the Narrows Bridge itself.

Mr. TONKIN: That is in accordance with what I have just told the Minister. In fact, I went a bit beyond that. I said 50 acres. What does that prove? As a matter of fact, a few moments ago I told the Minister that the original proposal for the bridge itself involved 37 acres, which we subsequently increased to slightly over 50. Now he tells me it was 43 acres.

Mr. O'Neil: Your estimate of slightly over 50 acres is actually 68 acres to the Perth end of the Narrows Bridge.

Mr. Brand: The fact remains that, whatever it is, it compares unfavourably with 19 acres.

Mr. Graham: Plus 40.

Mr. Brand: Plus 40?

Mr. Graham: Yes, 19 acres plus 40.

Mr. Brand: We have not reclaimed 40 acres.

Mr. TONKIN: In fact, what the Minister is endeavouring to attribute to me in the total amount of what he called reclamation, was not, of course, reclamation at all in many instances, because it was covering up ground that was not the river. So that is not reclamation. If one is filling in the river, as the Minister is now doing over the whole area of 19 acres, and as he proposes to do with a further 40 acres, that is a different proposition altogether.

Mr. Wild: It will be done by some Government in 1970 or beyond.

Mr. TONKIN: But your decision on the Mitchell Freeway and the inner ring road makes the other area of reclamation inevitable and inescapable.

Mr. Brand: The same as it was with the 19 acres you reclaimed.

Mr. TONKIN: No it was not!

Mr. Brand: Of course it was!

Mr. TONKIN: In fact, the files will show that I declined to approve of further reclamation. The Minister laughs.

Mr. Wild: When one has the file it is a great advantage.

Mr. TONKIN: Well, it certainly does not show that I did approve.

Mr. Wild: I suggest that you ask tomorrow what area was reclaimed on the freeway, and you will get a shock.

Mr. TONKIN: I will not get a shock, because the Minister says all sorts of things.

Mr. Wild: I know you would never be shocked!

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot be any more certain that the Minister would tell me the truth about that than he did about the companies regarding which I asked questions the other day.

Mr. Wild: Oh, dear! Red-herring Joe!

Mr. TONKIN: No red herrings at all! The Minister should talk about red herrings when he hides behind a plea of *sub judice* in order to dodge a question! By way of illustration, the Minister refuses to answer questions which he regards as being *sub judice* when he should know that any member of the public can go to the Companies Office and obtain all the information that was asked for.

Mr. Wild: Well, why didn't you? Why ask me?

Mr. TONKIN: Because it would be readily available to you.

Mr. Wild: And so it is to you.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister comes here with a subterfuge that he cannot answer a question because it is *sub judice*. I would have thought more of the Minister if he had said, "I consider the honourable member should go to the Companies Office and get the information for himself."

Mr. Wild: Doesn't the honourable member realise that I am involved in this? That I was cited in the Act as the Minister for Works?

Mr. TONKIN: Not in regard to that aspect. It was straightout subterfuge to avoid answering the question.

Mr. Brand: Get on with the subject of solving the traffic problem!

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier, to whom I express appreciation for participating in the debate, seemed to think it was a waste of time to send officers abroad to gain information.

Mr. Wild: Far from it! He indicated three that have gone overseas in the last 12 months.

Mr. TONKIN: The Government did not hesitate to bring Sograh here to advise it on tidal power in the north.

Mr. Wild: In the same way as we send engineers overseas for information.

Mr. TONKIN: And when engineering problems arise such as the defects in the foundations of the Government buildings, instead of getting the advice of our own capable engineers on the set-up—

Mr. Wild: It got the best brains in Australia.

Mr. TONKIN: —the Government has to get someone from the Eastern States to advise it.

Mr. Brand: Are you not arguing against yourself? That is, that we have the best brains here in regard to traffic problems.



Mr. TONKIN: What I am saying is that if the Government considered there was no-one capable in Western Australia of advising it on a problem such as the weakness in building foundations, its case is pretty weak when it opposes a suggestion to send top engineers abroad in order to observe latest trends in traffic control.

Mr. Wild: That is in no way comparable.

Mr. Brand: We brought the best brains here; people who are advising the Government of New South Wales.

Mr. TONKIN: On the occasion when we had a deputation to the Premier at the Showgrounds, and I mentioned the inadequacy of the Town Planning Department, the Premier was aghast at the suggestion.

Mr. Brand: That was not so.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes it was! Because the Premier turned to the Town Planning Commissioner and asked him if that were the position.

Mr. Brand: Of course I did! And who was better able to answer it?

Mr. TONKIN: So it was not news to the Premier.

Mr. Brand: It was not.

Mr. TONKIN: If it was not, then why did the Premier ask him?

Mr. Brand: Because I have advisers, just as you had.

Mr. TONKIN: After I moved the motion with which we are now dealing there appeared in *The West Australian* of the 8th September the following statement:—

#### Five Will Plan Future Perth

The five senior town planning experts to be sought gradually by the Government will work only on long-range planning in the Perth metropolitan region.

Town Planning Commissioner J. E. Lloyd said yesterday that he expected to recruit one or two of the men within the next six months.

The added scope for future planning created by the new staff would give a clearer picture of areas in the region where major redevelopment was likely.

#### Quicker Answer

This would help to give a quicker answer to the general question of properties and their future.

Mr. Lloyd said the new planners would work under his direction. Decisions on their projects would be made by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

The Town Planning Department's routine work would continue generally as it was.

Premier Brand said the metropolitan region had to plan for three times the population and up to five times the traffic it now had.

"We must keep the five major factors—land use, roads, transport, parking and beautification—in continual balance," he said.

The plan to reorganise town planning staff had come after months of top-level talks, resulting in recommendations by a special committee.

If it came after months of consideration, it looks as though it must have started after the deputation to the Premier at the showgrounds, because at that stage he was unaware of the need for it.

Mr. Brand: He was quite well aware of the situation. It was obvious to anybody.

Mr. TONKIN: It was a strange thing that when I made the statement that that was one of the weaknesses in the proposal we were considering, the Premier had to turn to the Town Planning Commissioner and ask him was that so.

Mr. Brand: Exactly; I wanted him to answer the question.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Premier had a special committee to go into the need for augmenting the staff, he would have known it was so. So it was obvious that what was said then, and what was said when this motion was moved, was the true position—that the town planning capacity had not kept pace with the main roads planning capacity.

Mr. Brand: It had up to that point of time.

Mr. TONKIN: It could not up to that point of time—

Mr. Brand: It had.

Mr. TONKIN: —because it takes two months to get a simple subdivision through the Town Planning Board.

Mr. Brand: That is nonsense. There is no basis for this argument whatever.

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Premier deny that it takes two months to get a subdivision through the Town Planning Board?

Mr. Brand: That is a red herring across the trail. The broad problem of planning the future is a very different thing from the matter you are talking about.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Town Planning Department is so understaffed that it takes two months to get a simple subdivision through, what time has it to think about these broader problems of redevelopment?

Mr. Brand: I should not think the Town Planner and senior members would occupy themselves on these smaller matters of subdivision.

Mr. TONKIN: It is very plain that this decision—and I applaud it, because it is the right one—to augment the staff of the Town Planning Department emphasises the point that right up to now the department has been inadequate for the task

with which it has been confronted; and therefore it is a reasonable assumption that the planning for the roads of Perth and the handling of traffic has been lopsided. That is our complaint.

If the Government had agreed to the proposal which came from the Opposition last December that a committee be appointed, and that following upon agreement by it the Government would be authorised to proceed, we would have been able to satisfy the people that reasonable opportunity had been given to interrogate the engineers and officers and to give consideration to the proposals to find how far they had advanced. But the Government would have none of it, on the grounds of urgency.

Mr. Brand: That is so.

Mr. TONKIN: Yet the actual filling in of the river did not start until some three or four months later. The only conclusion to which I can come is that the Government was anxious to rush it through in the dying hours of Parliament—

Mr. Brand: We dealt with the problem when we came to it.

Mr. TONKIN: —because it did not have complete plans; and if it has them now it declines to disclose them. What valid argument can there be, if the information is available, against making public at this stage how many embankments are involved, where they are to be positioned, and what is their extent? We are told here that that information cannot be given, because discussions are taking place between various authorities.

Mr. Brand: There is no overall plan that is always complete in every detail. There are changes in decisions in respect of these mounds and features. Quite likely there are last-minute changes.

Mr. TONKIN: In that case of what use is the model?

Mr. Brand: It gives some idea of the features.

Mr. TONKIN: So there could be embankments shown that will not be there; and there could be embankments missing on the model which should be there.

Mr. Brand: These mounds were put in there to give you some indication of what sort of outline would take place.

Mr. TONKIN: To give a rough outline that there might be mounds. We are told it is a scale model which purports to show all that is involved in the proposal, and it now transpires that a few mud heaps were thrown on to indicate that there would be embankments. That justifies us in the charge that the Government moved hastily before the whole thing was properly planned.

Mr. Brand: It moved in time and it wants to get on with the job.

Mr. TONKIN: I have no doubt whatever that the information for which I have asked in regard to embankments will not be available before Parliament goes into recess—some 12 months after the scale model was prepared for the misdirection of the public.

Mr. Brand: It was not prepared for misdirection at all.

Mr. TONKIN: It is obvious that it is worth nothing.

Mr. Brand: The mounds might be more or they might be less.

Mr. TONKIN: Or they might be where they are shown; or they might be somewhere else.

Mr. Brand: There is a special committee working on this aspect of the scheme consisting of highly placed men in town planning and landscaping.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister quoted from the report given by the Chief Traffic Engineer after he had returned from the United States, and he said that in his opinion we in Western Australia were, in some aspects, in advance of the United States in this respect. I would point out that on the western coast of the U.S.A., in the State of California, the development has been of comparatively recent times; and yet the problems there are greater than those in New York, because of the greater rapidity of development. In California the people have voluntarily agreed to tax themselves in order to provide funds for the establishment of more public transport, because the use of private transport has almost come to a standstill.

If that has occurred in some of the more recently developed parts of the U.S.A., surely that is the place where we should observe what is required! We should send men abroad with a definite assignment, to go to places where the problems are most acute, in order to ascertain the methods of dealing with those problems.

It is idle for the Minister for Works to refer to the ideas which were held by the Main Roads Department back in 1954 and 1955, because the problem before us is growing so rapidly that it is changing almost from day to day, and the methods of dealing with it are also changing from day to day. Do not let us run away with the idea that because we have top engineers in this State—and they are good engineers—they are infallible. One need only refer to the traffic islands which were built in the middle of Stirling Highway at the suggestion of the Main Roads Department, and which were considerably altered because a supporter of the Government made a complaint about them.

I did not hear the Premier say at that time, "What does the member for Claremont know about the matter? The Government advisers were responsible, so it

must be accepted they were right." The Government did not rely on the advice of the Main Roads Department and the Chief Traffic Engineer. The Government, instead, pulled up the traffic islands and got rid of the "snake" along Stirling Highway. The engineers could be wrong, and apparently they were regarded as being wrong.

Mr. Brand: So would the people whom you propose to be sent overseas be liable to make the same mistake.

Mr. TONKIN: If they were wrong, and apparently they were in that instance, then they might not be the last word on the matter before us. We are not attempting to pronounce whether they were right or wrong. What we say is that because of the importance of the proposal, of the fact that the cost of the whole project in total could reach £40,000,000 to £50,000,000, and of the far-reaching effect on the city of Perth, it is worth while to tarry a few months in order to make as certain as we possibly can that this is the right step to take. The Government claims that what it is doing is right. It is accepting the responsibility and pushing on with the job. Of course, it cannot escape the responsibility.

Mr. Brand: There is no question of it. We accept the responsibility.

Mr. TONKIN: I think it is against the interests of the State for the Government to take that attitude, because of the very great importance of this project and what is implied subsequently. The Minister for Works shook his head this evening when I said that further reclamation was inevitable. It is inevitable, because if the present step is proceeded with, and the Mitchell Freeway is laid down and the interchange is established in accordance with the plan, it is unthinkable that all the money which will be involved in establishing the interchange will be thrown away for the reason that no use is made of it.

Mr. Brand: You are wrong.

Mr. TONKIN: To make use of it we will have to develop the road along the river and fill in another 40 acres.

Mr. Wild: What if the planners decide to take a strip of land from Langley Park? Would further reclamation have to be undertaken?

Mr. TONKIN: The Government would not be allowed to take that land.

Mr. Wild: That is what the planners will decide in the future.

Mr. Graham: You mean take part of The Esplanade?

Mr. Wild: I did not say that. That is a possibility.

Mr. Graham: You are considering it?

Mr. Wild: I did not say so. I say it will be done 10 to 15 years hence by whoever is responsible for planning.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Government proceeds with this initial part of the plan, one of two things is inevitable: Either there will have to be a further filling-in of about 40 acres of the river, or a strip of land at Langley Park will have to be used.

Mr. Wild: That is exactly what the planners have said.

Mr. TONKIN: So the position in connection with this project involves one of these two alternatives.

Mr. Wild: In 10 or 15 years' time.

Mr. TONKIN: We say the Government should not place the State in the position, without further inquiry, of having to face either of those unattractive alternatives. Every effort should be made now to determine whether this step must be proceeded with, or whether there is not a more satisfactory and alternative plan, which will obviate the necessity for using either of the alternatives subsequently.

Mr. Brand: The consultants, De Leuw Cather & Company, have advice from all over the world on the latest developments, and they are giving us the very latest.

Mr. TONKIN: The main purpose of the motion was to ensure that discussion would ensue, and that the arguments for and against could be more adequately brought out than they were previously. The motion seems to have achieved just that. I thank those who have spoken in the debate for ensuring that the required information, or some part of it, will be made available to the House. This evening it took the Minister for Works 1½ hours to address himself to the subject; whereas, when the proposal was first introduced in the House—I accept the word of my leader, because I have not worked out the time myself—the Minister took six minutes.

Mr. Wild: That was an entirely different proposition.

Mr. TONKIN: How the Minister for Works could justify placing before the Parliament of Western Australia a proposal of such magnitude and importance, in a speech of six minutes, I fail to see.

Mr. Brand: Which you had already decided upon when you built the Narrows.

Mr. TONKIN: No; it certainly was not.

Mr. Brand: By the way, how many engineers did you send over before you did that work?

Mr. TONKIN: We sent one.

Mr. Brand: Who was it?

Mr. TONKIN: Godfrey. Any more questions?

Mr. Brand: Davies has been overseas. That is one; Lloyd makes two; and Aitken, three.

Mr. TONKIN: I would hope, at this late stage, that the Government—

Mr. Brand: You are not as clever as you think you are.

Mr. TONKIN: —would appreciate there is very considerable disquiet in the community over this proposal and that a delay of even six months would be fully justified if, at the end of it, the Government was able to say, "The theories have been examined; the men have seen what is taking place in Europe and in America; and we are satisfied this proposal is the correct one, or it should be modified to this extent." That is all we are asking.

Mr. Brand: They disagree and we send two more!

Mr. TONKIN: That is all we are asking, and we think it is not an unreasonable proposition.

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

## Ayes—16

Mr. Brady	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Evans	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Bowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May

(Teller)

## Noes—17

Mr. Bovell	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Lewis	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Rhatigan	Mr. Dunn
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Hart
Mr. Norton	Dr. Henn
Mr. Moir	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Curran	Mr. Cornell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Gayfer
Mr. D. G. May	Mr. Mitchell

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 17th September, 1964

### CONTENTS

BILLS—	Page
Administration Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1007
Agriculture Protection Board Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1010
Com. ; Report ....	1011
Cancer Council of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r. ....	1010
Cemeteries Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1011
Com. ; Report ....	1012

## BILLS—continued

Chiropractors Bill—2r.	1007
Criminal Code Amendment Bill—3r.	1007
Electoral Act Amendment Bill—Report	1007
Health Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1008
Com. ; Report ....	1010
Inquiry Agents Licensing Act Amendment Bill—	
Com. ....	1011
Report ....	1011
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1011
Com. ; Report ....	1011
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Intro. ; 1r. ....	1007
Presbyterian Church Acts Amendment Bill—2r.	1008

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

Apple By-products : Imports from Other States	1006
Hairdressers' Registration Board : Fees and Expenses	1006
Roads—	
Kalgoorlie-Broad Arrow Road : Widening and Improving	1005
Roads in South-West Province Shires : Expenditure by Main Roads Department	1006

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

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### KALGOORLIE-BROAD ARROW ROAD

##### Widening and Improving

1. The Hon. G. BENNETTS (for The Hon. D. P. Dellar) asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the 9-foot sealed road between Kalgoorlie and Broad Arrow has badly deteriorated and become dangerous, particularly on the crests at Smithfield and the 17½ mile peg?
- (2) Will the Minister give consideration to widening and improving this road?
- (3) If so, when will such work commence?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes. Some erosion was caused by winter rains, but this has now been repaired.
- (2) £6,800 has been provided on the department's current programme of works for reconstructing and surfacing several sections of the Kalgoorlie-Broad Arrow road to the 17½ mile peg.
- (3) Within the next three or four months.