

Mr. Lewis: We were not laughing at the people; we were laughing at the mis-interpretation.

Mr. Tonkin: No Minister has money, because the Treasurer has not allocated any funds as yet, and six weeks of the financial year have gone.

Mr. BATEMAN: If I might be permitted to continue. Another matter which is causing a great deal of concern is that of the open drains in my area. As members know, these open drains are breeding grounds for disease, particularly in the dry weather. Weather such as we have had recently is conducive to the development of all sorts of viruses and diseases in an environment of that nature. I do hope that money can be made available to the shires to help them establish a comprehensive drainage system throughout the areas concerned.

I would like to continue on this matter of sewerage for a moment—I seem to be up to my neck in the problem!

Mr. Dunn: You are on the right side of the Chamber!

Mr. BATEMAN: Ever since I have been in Parliament I have been plugging the sewerage problem in my electorate. The position is now made worse because the Perth Shire Council has been given permission for effluent to be dumped in the Gosnells area. I can see that before long we will have all the spare sewage dumped there. The Minister for Works might just as well dump any sewage that he might have. We do not seem to be doing too well at the moment.

I would like to conclude by mentioning the excessive rates which are to be imposed in the Canning and Gosnells areas. These excessive rates have been brought about by the opening of the Canning-Armadale corridor. Since that corridor has been opened the Taxation Department has turned its attention to the question of valuations. One extract I have in connection with this matter reads, "Valuations indicate that the corridor land could be increased by 20 times the original valuation." This is pretty steep, to say the least of it.

Mr. Davies: Who said that?

Mr. BATEMAN: This is the opinion of the Taxation Department on the question of State land tax. To give members some idea of the position I would point out that in the case of one property of nine acres the old assessment was \$3,600 whereas the new assessment is \$40,350. In the case of another property the old assessment was \$13,500 whereas the new assessment is to be \$400,000.

Mr. Dunn: That is the valuation.

Mr. BATEMAN: The assessment of valuation.

Mr. Brady: He will have to pay taxes on that—rates and so on.

Mr. BATEMAN: That is so. They are all the same—20 times the original price. I think it is a disgrace to have allowed the matter to continue for so long and for the department to now drop this bomb-shell on the people.

There is no doubt that this will virtually put some of the people out of their homes; they will have to sell their properties to meet the requirements of land tax and the rates which will be imposed by the shire councils.

I do hope that the Ministers will get together and find money from somewhere to overcome the problems I have outlined. The first essential is to get our priorities in the correct order.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Dunn.

*House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 19th August, 1969

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

### QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

#### 1. ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT

##### *Funds Received and Grants*

The Hon. V. J. FERRY asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Will the Minister please advise details of funds derived from the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act for the year ended the 30th June, 1969, in the following headings—

(a) (i) total amounts collected from each category of contributor (i.e. Interstate hauliers, farmers, hauliers associated with mining, timber, etc.); and

(ii) total funds collected for the year;

(b) amounts and percentages of funds spent in—

(i) the metropolitan area;

(ii) country areas; and

(iii) special grants?

(2) What is the balance of unexpended funds as at the 30th June, 1969?

(3) Will he please supply a list of all local authorities and recipients of any special grants, and amounts received by each of them, from Road Maintenance charges distributions for the year ended the 30th June, 1969, in the following headings—

(a) Metropolitan local authorities;

(b) Country local authorities; and

(c) Main Roads Department expenditure of funds derived from this source in—

(i) the metropolitan area; and

(ii) country areas?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) (a) (i) Segregation of other than primary producers and interstate operators is not practicable but those contributors have paid—

Primary Producers	\$60,870
Interstate Operators	\$218,712

(ii) \$3,102,647.

(b)

	\$	%
(i) Metropolitan Area ..	239,560	7.98
(ii) Country Areas ..	2,724,470	90.72
(iii) Special Grants ..	39,140	1.30

(2) Balance of unexpended funds as at the 30th June, 1969: \$210,794.

(3) 1968-69 Programme of Works—

	Allocation \$	Special Grant \$	Total \$
<b>(a) Metropolitan Local Authorities—</b>			
Shire of—			
Armadale-Kelmscott	2,680		2,680
Canning	300		300
Gosnells	40		40
Kwinana	1,350		1,350
Mandaring (1/2)	1,000		1,000
Rockingham	830		830
Swan-Guildford (1/3)	750		750
			7,450
<b>(b) Country Local Authorities—</b>			
Albany Division—			
Shire of—			
Albany	10,560		10,560
Broomehill	4,710		4,710
Cranbrook	10,290		10,290
Denmark	4,040		4,040
Gnowangerup	26,860		26,860
Katanning	7,460		7,460
Kojonup	12,210		12,210
Nyabing-Pingrup	12,500		12,500
Plantagenet	16,500		16,500
Ravensthorpe	6,680	1,500	8,180
Tambellup	3,560		3,560
			118,870

	Allocation \$	Special Grant \$	Total \$
<b>Bunbury Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Augusta-Margaret River	8,620		8,620
Balingup	3,490		3,490
Bridgetown	4,460		4,460
Busselton	7,480		7,480
Capel	2,850		2,850
Collie	2,100		2,100
Dardanup	880	1,000	1,880
Donnybrook	2,460		2,460
Greenbushes	1,320	760	2,070
Harvey	3,470		3,470
Manjimup	17,160		17,160
Nannup	6,190	1,000	7,190
Upper Blackwood	11,860		11,860
Waroona	3,760		3,760
West Arthur	8,660		8,660
			87,490

<b>Geraldton Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Chapman Valley	7,940		7,940
Cue	1,800		1,800
Greenough	3,570		3,570
Irwin	3,980		3,980
Meekatharra	12,500		12,500
Mingew	4,430	6,500	10,930
Morawa	9,720		9,720
Mt. Magnet	9,950		9,950
Mullewa	9,180		9,180
Murchison	8,850		8,850
Northampton	8,880		8,880
Sandstone	4,000		4,000
Yalgoo	6,090		6,090
			97,470

<b>Kalgoorlie Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Coolgardie	1,120		1,120
Dundas	4,650		4,650
Esperance	19,980		19,980
Kalgoorlie	9,980		9,980
Laverton	4,000		4,000
Leonora	11,300	1,000	12,300
Menzies	6,200		6,200
Wiluna	8,000		8,000
			66,230

<b>Metropolitan Division (Outside Traffic Area)—</b>			
Shire of—			
Chittering	3,980		3,980
Kalamunda	2,550		2,550
Mandurah	1,080		1,080
Mundaring	1,250		1,250
Murray	5,390		5,390
Serpentine-Jarrahdale	2,040		2,040
Swan-Guildford (2/3)	1,510		1,510
Wanneroo	2,710		2,710
			20,490

<b>Moora Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Carnamah	6,150		6,150
Coorow	6,780		6,780
Dalwallinu	16,170		16,170
Dandaragan	13,020		13,020
Gingic	5,570	450	6,020
Moora	11,860		11,860
Prenjori	11,170		11,170
Three Springs	5,880		5,880
Victoria Plains	9,570		9,570
			85,620

<b>Narrogin Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Beverley	7,580		7,580
Boddington	4,090		4,090
Brookton	4,130		4,130
Corrigin	11,200		11,200
Cuballing	5,720		5,720
Dumbleyung	10,000		10,000
Kondinin	15,750		15,750
Kulin	11,410		11,410
Lake Grace	14,650		14,650
Narrogin	6,770		6,770
Pingelly	5,930		5,930
Wagin	5,500		5,500
Wandering	4,240		4,240
Wickepin	8,100		8,100
Williams	5,100		5,100
Woodanilling	3,100		3,100
			123,270

	Allocation \$	Special Grant \$	Total \$
--	------------------	------------------------	-------------

3.

## STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

## Passenger Services to North-West

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Does the Government intend to provide passenger carrying ships for service to North-West and Kimberley ports when the "K" class vessels are withdrawn?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

As already indicated in reply to the Hon. Member's previous question, "K" class vessels will continue to operate for some time.

The question of passenger services would need to be considered in the light of circumstances prevailing at the time of discontinuance of "K" class vessels.

4.

## EDUCATION

## Provision of Teacher Accommodation

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

(1) How many houses are provided by the Education Department for school teacher accommodation for—

(a) headmasters; and

(b) teachers?

(2) How many have been provided in the previous ten years?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) (a) 325.

(b) 174 houses or duplex units for married men.

44 houses for 132 single teachers.

15 duplex units for 67 single teachers.

(2) The information is not available for the period prior to the establishment of the Government Employees' Housing Authority towards the end of 1965. Since then 116 houses and 22 duplex units have been provided.

5.

## EDUCATION

## Subsidy for Teacher Accommodation

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

(1) Does the Education Department provide a subsidy to country teachers who are forced to board at hotels when away from home?

(2) If so, what is the subsidy?

(3) How many increases have there been in the last ten years if a subsidy did exist?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) A country teacher paying board in excess of \$14 per week, and provided suitable accommodation at a

	Allocation \$	Special Grant \$	Total \$
<b>Northam Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Bruce Rock	8,420		8,420
Cunderdin	7,990		7,990
Dowerin	7,710		7,710
Goomalling	4,640		4,640
Kellerberrin	7,900		7,900
Koorda	6,240		6,240
Merredin	8,720		8,720
Mt. Marshall	11,720		11,720
Mukinbudin	7,020		7,020
Narembene	11,780		11,780
Northam	5,460		5,460
Nungarin	3,690		3,690
Quairading	8,670		8,670
Tammin	3,980	940	4,920
Toodyay	4,220		4,220
Trayning	4,840		4,840
Westonia	3,210		3,210
Wongan-Ballidu	14,030		14,030
Wyalkatchem	6,060		6,060
Yilgarn	5,440		5,440
York	5,670		5,670
			148,850

<b>Carnarvon Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Ashburton	2,000		2,600
Carnarvon	4,440		4,440
Exmouth	200		800
Marble Bar	2,040		
Marble Bar		26,000	28,040
Nullagine	1,500		1,500
Port Hedland	1,300		1,300
Roebourne	800		800
Shark Bay	700		700
Tableland	1,500		1,500
Upper Gascoyne	3,800		3,800
			44,880

<b>Kimberley Division—</b>			
Shire of—			
Broome	700		800
Halls Creek	3,000		3,000
West Kimberley	3,300		3,300
Wyndham-East Kimberley	2,590		2,590
			9,690
<b>Total, Country Local Authorities</b>			802,360

<b>(c) Main Roads Department—</b>			
(i) Metropolitan Area	242,533		242,533
(ii) Country Areas	1,950,827		1,950,827
			2,193,360
Unallocated			108,330
1968-69 Programme			3,110,000

2.

## TOWN PLANNING

## Resumptions in Wembley

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) Is it planned to resume land along Grantham Street in Wembley?

(2) If so—

(a) what land will be resumed; and

(b) will the Minister Table a plan of the proposed resumptions?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) and (2) No—although some vacant land in Grantham Street has been purchased, with a view of eventual widening of the road, there are no proposals for resumption.

lower cost is not available, is entitled to an allowance if his salary is below \$2,900 per annum.

- (2) The allowance is an amount not exceeding \$10 per week.
- (3) Three—the most recent applying from February, 1969.

## 6. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Geological Advice to Farmers and Graziers*

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

- (1) How long has geological advice and assistance been available to farmers and graziers for the purpose of boring for water?
- (2) How many availed themselves of this advice yearly for the previous ten years?
- (3) Are there any records available as to the success of boring for water due to this geological advice?
- (4) If so, in what particular districts?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Some form of geological advice has been available to landholders since the Geological Survey Branch was established 73 years ago, and in 1962 a Hydrology and Engineering Geology Division was established within the Geological Survey Branch. Within that division a section was created whose exclusive function is to advise farmers, graziers and landholders on ground water prospects.

The procedure is that the landholder makes an application on a prescribed form and pays a nominal fee of five dollars. A geologist, specializing in this class of work, then inspects the property, recommends favourable areas for testing with bores or advises against drilling, whichever is necessary. A written report is forwarded to the landholder.

- (2) Inspection statistics are available only from 1963 onward. The number of private properties inspected are as follows—

1963—46.  
1964—52.  
1965—85.  
1966—95.  
1967—90.  
1968—164.  
1969 (to August)—64.

- (3) No records are maintained as to the success or otherwise of the service provided. This is due to the fact that landholders very seldom forward information on the drilling results, although they are requested to do so. Another factor is that boring contractors are not obliged to supply bore

records. It is therefore not possible to give figures relating to the degree of success obtained.

It is obvious from the continued demand for the service that landholders are satisfied with it.

- (4) Bore sites have been selected by Mines Department geologists from time to time in most parts of the State and reports of successful bores drilled on these sites, have been received from such widely separated areas as—

East Kimberley.  
Gascoyne-Minilya.  
Coorow-Carnamah-Perenjori.  
Moora-Dandaragin.  
Westonia-Southern Cross.  
Kondinin-Narembeen.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 14th August, on the following motion by The Hon. J. Heitman:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

May it please Your Excellency:  
We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

**THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY** (South Metropolitan) [4.48 p.m.]: I could spend some considerable time discussing several matters which concern me very much and which we are entitled to discuss during a debate such as this one, but I will confine myself to about three or four points.

Something which concerned me very much in the Governor's opening Speech was the very minor reference—if there was any reference at all—to what the Government intends doing on behalf of the farming community in view of the tragic weather being experienced in the agricultural areas. I may be speaking ahead of turn, but I do hope that Country Party members in this House will tell us, as did Mr. House, of the disabilities encountered; because although I have been living in the city for a number of years now, I have had a fairly wide experience in farming areas, and I am still a country lad at heart.

Instead of people debating who is going to pay for food and water for starving stock surely it is possible, in this moon-space age, for the Minister for Agriculture to convince Cabinet that the Government should make this food available where it is required, as soon as possible.

This should be made available with the belief in mind that the farming community of Western Australia is, at least, honest. After the fodder is made available to these areas to give the farmers a chance to save their stock—and, particularly, their blood stock—the Government should then be working out how it will be paid for.

The other evening I saw a television film of the Merredin area. I know this area as well as I know the inside of this Chamber, and I also know many of the farmers who were farming when I was a lad up there. As I was watching the coverage, it occurred to me that when sheep do not fetch 50c a head at the Merredin stockyard, then a very important economic stage has been reached in our community.

Whilst the principle of robbing Peter to pay Paul is probably as old as the Bible itself, it still stands good in practice. I have had experience of this. I consider that, for the future economy of this State, the stock has to be saved, even if it means the Government has to shut down for the time being on some project—main roads or anything else one likes to speak of, including even the schools.

I can well remember the droughts of 1914-18 in the Merredin area and also in the Ongerup area. The people in Ongerup were the most unfortunate in the State, because the drought, which lasted for four years, was followed by some of the heaviest floods that had ever been known in the area.

Surely there is some financial genius in the Government who can say, "All right, if there are 10,000 starving stock in an area we have to get sufficient food to try to save 9,000, and, if we cannot save 9,000, then we must try to save 8,000." The Government should not wait for three, four, or five weeks, as it has been doing, to decide who will pay for the food and how it will be made available.

These days, I spend most of my time in the city and do not go into the country very often. Nevertheless, as I said before, the solution seems to me to be a case of the Treasury finding some way of robbing Peter for a certain period of time to pay Paul. I have had this experience in my own family affairs, as some Ministers of the Crown will know.

The second point I wish to mention is that the Governor's Speech practically precludes the farming industry from any benefits at all in the coming financial year. Mention is made of the progress which is taking place in other areas of the State. We know about this and are happy to see it taking place. However, I still think that the economy of the State is tied up fundamentally with primary production. For what it is worth, as an Opposition member I appeal to somebody in the Treasury

to confer with agricultural leaders to find some way of making finance available to get the food on its way to the affected areas.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you think we have been doing?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Water is another problem. The Minister for Works is now making a valiant attempt, I would say, to locate water in the drought areas. Sometimes I blame the farmers themselves for a shortage of water. Mr. President, I remember that many years ago you spoke, as a private member, from the floor of the House, and pointed out that a very large proportion of the farmers did not set out to make provision for water to carry them through dry periods and that they depended too much on the Kalgoorlie water supply pipelines. I consider that any money which is spent by the Government, by the farmers, or by anybody else, on boring for water must be money well spent and, within a short period after the total cost is met, it must be repaid with very great dividends.

The third point I wish to mention is connected with flora and fauna. When the Minister for Mines was replying to Mr. Cloughton on the question of the conservation of both flora and fauna, I interjected—some might say "rudely"—to ask a question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is rude to interject.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: In reply to my question, the Minister agreed that Mr. Cloughton was, in fact, suggesting to the Minister for Mines, as such, that the Minister should see that the question of conservation is covered in any agreements which come forward. Mr. Cloughton was suggesting that provision for conservation should be included in any agreements which are being completed with mining companies for the mining of any type of ore, no matter what, and that the Minister for Mines, as such, should be expected to take on this responsibility. However, we know how keen the present Minister for Mines is on the beauty of the countryside and the preservation of animal life in the State.

We have the situation at Jarrahdale where an alumina company is mining for bauxite and where, as the Minister said, the company is carrying out reforestation. In my opinion, this is very good so far as flora is concerned. However, what about fauna? Once fauna is disturbed and leaves an area, it takes many years before it will return. Last year Mr. MacKinnon arranged a parliamentary visit to the Tuttaning field day.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Pingelly.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Tuttaning is the name of the reserve. A person in authority at the reserve pointed out that

one small animal requires quite an enormous area in order to subsist. Therefore, I hope that some notice will be taken of what I am saying, although at this stage my worries may be slightly premature.

An article appeared in *The West Australian* on the 14th August under the heading, "300 acres of park pegged for minerals." It says, in part—

A mineral claim for bauxite has been pegged on 300 acres of parkland and a recreation reserve in the Bullsbrook-Chittering area about 30 miles from Perth.

I do not want to read any more of the article. However, the hills along the escarpment in this area feature a comprehensive variety of vegetable life in the way of flora, and there is much fauna there, too.

The new park which has been opened near Bullsbrook, and which is only 22 miles from Perth, is one which is being well patronised by tourists. Much of the area of land between the road to Toodyay and the road into Walyunga Park has already been taken up for farming and now another section of it is, in fact, proposed to be taken up for mining.

I am not concerned about the Government, the Ministers, or any particular individual. As the chairman of the watchdog committee of the A.L.P. for the preservation of flora and fauna in Western Australia, I am concerned about ensuring, in every way possible, that we can assist the Minister and the committee interested in the preservation of flora and fauna to obtain and retain as many parklands and reserves as possible and to ensure that they are kept in their natural state.

I understand from a big mining magnate that he will have no trouble mining his bauxite deposits north and north-west of the Toodyay Road in the Bullsbrook area and transporting the ore to Kwinana for refining. He is the owner of an enormous tract of land in this State and in the future the development of it will bring great economic benefit to Western Australia. However with this project, which will be on the escarpment 30 miles from Perth, I am of the opinion that a greater burden of responsibility will be thrown on the shoulders of both the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna and the Minister for Mines if these parkland areas are granted for mining purposes. At least the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna should be present at all negotiations before agreement is reached.

I consider that during the last five years tremendous advances have taken place towards the preservation of our flora and fauna, and I sincerely hope that I will not live long enough to see large mining companies conducting their operations within

30 miles of Perth and destroying the flora and fauna on the escarpment. The principal concern is in regard to fauna, because whilst there can be a regeneration of flora, very often the fauna does not return once an area has been laid waste.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are receiving excellent co-operation and consideration from the Minister for Mines.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I do not doubt that, but whilst 300 acres may not be regarded by a farmer as a very large piece of land, in the area in question it is of great importance for the preservation of flora and fauna. Therefore, I am pleased to hear the Minister making that statement. I would expect such an assurance from him, and I am sure he is sincere. I feel it is my duty to bring this matter before the House, because it is one of the joys of my life to travel into the country and into those parts where flora and fauna abound.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Knowing your concern, I can assure you that what I have said is correct.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: There are two other matters on which I wish to speak this evening. One is in regard to the members of the teaching profession in this State and the situation in which they were placed a short time ago. That problem has now been solved because the Teachers Union has, for the time being, reached a compromise with the Government on salaries, and so far so good. However, what seems to be the principal complaint voiced by members of parents and citizens' associations and the teaching profession is the varying standards of teaching among the States of the Commonwealth. This was also raised at a conference of teachers held in New South Wales last January.

I feel I am expressing the points of view of both the members of the Federal and State Labor Parties and those of the Liberal Party when I say that if we do not make some attempt to train more teachers—particularly those who can teach the higher grades—our education system will be in jeopardy. I consider the stage has now been reached where it is beyond the capacity of the State to train additional teachers, and I am in favour of a proposal put forward by the Federal Labor Party that an inquiry on a national level should be held into our education system on the same lines as the inquiry that was held into the universities throughout the Commonwealth.

I have noticed that the Commonwealth Government intends to take steps, bit by bit, to ease the situation. However, I have every reason to believe that the situation will not improve greatly so far as the individual States are concerned unless the

Commonwealth Government comes to the party with sufficient finance to assist in the training of teachers and to raise their standards and improve their status in the community. So far as I am concerned the status of a teacher is on the same level as that of a doctor or a nurse, because each and every one of them is practising for the benefit of mankind.

I think a start could even be made with the preschool child. In the past 12 months the State Government has increased the subsidy payable for a proposed kindergarten from \$3,000 to \$4,000. This does not appear to be a very substantial increase, but to a committee that is trying to raise funds for a \$20,000 kindergarten centre every bit of additional money is extremely welcome. As I have said before, in the next five years the Government will find that it will have to do something about subsidising the cost of training kindergarten teachers. The stage has now been reached where parents have to provide something additional per child—something over and above the contribution that is necessary to erect a kindergarten building.

I am greatly concerned about the kindergarten in Willagee. Apart from the cost of the building, the parents will have to find \$1.90 per child per week at least to ensure that each child can continue attending the kindergarten. This means that those in charge of the administration of kindergartens are always most grateful when they receive a further subsidy from the Government.

However, overall, the education system throughout the Commonwealth should receive substantial assistance from the Commonwealth Government in the same way as medical schools and universities are assisted. Of all the problems in the education system, the greatest is the overcrowding of classrooms both in State and independent schools.

Without casting any reflection on his advisers, and despite what the Minister for Education has said, one still finds that, in many instances, there are 45 children or more in one class under one teacher. Such a situation exists in Calista, Spearwood, and in other parts of my electorate. The main reason is that there are not sufficient teachers available and, as a result, the group system has been introduced to reduce the numbers of each class. We now find one teacher teaching a combined class of third and fourth grades, fifth and sixth grades, and so on. Two grades are being taught in the one room by the one teacher. That is, instead of having a number of classrooms in which fourth, fifth, and sixth grades are being taught, this group system has been introduced to solve the problem that now exists.

The system is very unsatisfactory both to the parents and to the children. Further, it is not very fair to the members of the teaching profession. I can speak on

about five or six subjects in this House, but it would be impossible if I, as a teacher, tried to teach five or six subjects to the students in one class. Therefore, I think it is entirely unfair that a teacher should be asked to teach two or three grades in the one classroom.

The Hon. E. C. House: Whom do you blame for this? The administration?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The whole cause of the trouble is lack of finance; and, in my opinion, the Commonwealth should provide the money to solve the problem. I believe that within three years the Commonwealth will take over the training of teachers; and, according to what was said at the teachers' conference held in New South Wales in January last, the teachers are looking forward to the time when this will take place.

I now wish to talk about housing. We are still being supplied with figures to show that so many housing units are being built throughout the State every year, but no figures are being produced to indicate how some of the people are expected to pay rentals of \$20, \$25, and even \$30 per week for flats or home units in high-density buildings. I must go along with Mr. Clive Griffiths on what he has said about high-density buildings. The people who live in them are obliged to exist in conditions which almost bring them to poverty; because despite the fact that we are supposed to be living in an affluent society, any person with a family who is earning, say, \$70 a week or less and who is obliged to pay \$20 or \$25 a week in rent, is certainly living under difficult conditions.

So I will castigate the Government time and time again on this point, because I believe it has allowed the housing situation to get out of hand believing that private enterprise will build sufficient units to ensure that people are properly housed. Sufficient units may be built to accommodate the people, but what about the man who is on a low income? He can only approach the State Housing Commission to obtain accommodation for himself and his family. I have said before, and I will say again, that the State Government has failed in its duty ever since it allowed the Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) to tell it that he could not make any more money available for housing in this State, because there were insufficient building tradesmen to use up the money asked for. Why could not the Government have said to the Prime Minister, "You provide us with the money to do the job and then see if we do not have a sufficient number of building tradesmen for housing"? When Mr. Griffith was Minister for Housing I bet he would not have sat down and taken that from the Prime Minister.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are not allowed to bet.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: When I am in Perth I live in one of these apartments of which you speak and which I acquired recently and I find it very pleasant and suitable for my needs.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You are living in it of your own free will, but other people who are living in them are not.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I lived in one of these housing units, too, and when I first occupied it I was paying six guineas a week rent, and despite the fact that not a threepenny piece had been spent on it, the rental of that flat, when I left, was nine guineas a week. Actually, it was only one long room divided and it had sanded walls, although I will admit it was very comfortable. It is now occupied by a woman and her four children, and she is paying \$24 a week for it. In paying such a rental, how can she possibly feed her children in a proper manner? I feel that the Minister for Health will have a problem on his hands shortly by having to accommodate such people in the hospitals.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about a dog? One is not allowed to have even a dog in one of these units.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not want a dog.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I can stand being shot at on occasions and I like to shoot back at other people myself sometimes. In view of what has been happening in my district in regard to takeovers over the last 15 years, I would like to quote a very interesting article published in the *Daily News* in September, 1949.

Before I read this document, which is not a very long one, I would point out that in my province alone I know of at least four areas in which I have tried to obtain help from the Government for people who have been shut out because of increasing industrialisation around them. This article of September, 1949, headed "Save the small business," reads as follows:—

One of the most vital factors in the fight against socialism is the continued existence of small business. The big corporations entice nationalisation and it is for this reason that the small business must be fostered and extended.

In recent years, because of controls and regulations, it has been more difficult for the small man with a small capital to commence business on his own and it is not unlikely that these difficulties are the result of premeditated policy by the Labor Party to prevent the growth of the most valuable group of opponents to socialism.

The small business is a vital factor in the economic life of the community. It serves a purpose which is outside the scope and capabilities of the larger business units. It very often offers more personal satisfaction to employees and enables its owner to develop the initiative and ability.

Because the small business man has the opportunity to develop his talents and because his personal ownership teaches him to accept responsibility for his own judgments, he is most necessary to democracy.

His position in the business world and the community make him suspicious of the opinions of the herd—a fundamental requirement of the socialist State. He examines the evidence, as it were, before agreeing or disagreeing with the argument put forward and because of this factor, he can be relied upon to safeguard the privileges of the individual which socialism is so keen to destroy.

The conflict between free enterprise and socialism is too often considered to be a battle between "big business" and the advocates of socialism. The real fight will lie between small business and socialists.

Ninety-six per cent. of Australian factories come within the category of "small business" and they are a formidable barrier to nationalisation and socialism provided they present a united front to those who would sell out to the enemies of democracy.

Small business preserves the real human factors both in owners and employees which enable democracy to function. Democracy is a compound of the human virtues and failings.

Socialists would liquidate the virtues in destroying the failings. Small business—the corner shop, the small factory, the market garden and the transport service—are the best bulwark against the socialist aggression of the Labor Party.

In the coming years Australia might well say: "Thank God for the corner store." It must not be forgotten that England became the home of freedom for nearly 100 years because it was a nation of small shopkeepers.

(This space has been purchased by the Liberal and Country League to express its views.)

That article was written in 1949 and the situation has changed so completely that today the small businessman—the man who runs the small corner shop—does not mean a thing or amount to a cracker so far as the present Government is concerned. The small businessman gets walked over and



squashed out. Roads are built and his business is virtually taken from him. But what compensation does he get? Nothing.

There is the situation of a factory which was started many years ago by a family in Fremantle. For years it was a family concern and it grew into one of the biggest biscuit manufacturers in the Commonwealth, supplying biscuits to every part of Australia—I refer to Mills & Ware. But what happened to it? Big business came in and took over the concern and now, to get a job at that factory, a person has to go through a security check.

Take the case of a person named Waddingham, who has a shop at Naval Base, near Kwinana. This shop is on the corner of the old Rockingham Road and Milton Street. When a big industry was established in that area not only was the road closed, but also fences connected with the industry were built right up to the front door of the shop. But these people cannot get 3c in compensation. One of the biggest land agents in Fremantle mentioned the case to me some years ago. I went to the Minister for Industrial Development, and I tried everything I could to get compensation for them, but without any success. The small businessman who had been supplying hot pies and lunches for the men who worked nearby was able to get nothing. However, these people are still struggling because they will not allow this Government to put them out of business completely, although they are very close to it at the moment.

Previously I have referred to a market gardener named Caratti. He was a food producer but his land was taken over for the Cockburn Cement Company. That land was taken by this Government. I know of another case of a small shopkeeper whose business has gone by the board because of the encroachment of big industry. The members of this Government ought to say, "Thank God for the corner store"!

What about the case of the small shopkeeper at West Midland? I realise that this area is outside my province, but I know of the case. When the West Midland Railway Station was closed a wire fence was put virtually around his shop and people who wanted to patronise him had to walk a quarter of a mile around the fence to get to it. But although he tried, this man could not get 3c compensation. I know that Mr. Brady and Mrs. Hutchison tried to do something for him, and probably Mr. Griffith also, when he represented that district, tried to do something for him, too. However, those members were not successful, so this Government ought to talk about the small businessman and how important he is.

I am very upset to think that the small businessman does not mean a solitary thing to the Department of Industrial

Development or to this Government, other than as a means of getting extra taxes, and these taxes are rising all the time, particularly in regard to the land these small shopkeepers own or occupy. The increased valuations are brought about simply because some oil company has paid a fabulous price for a block of land nearby on which to build a garage. Also, many corner stores are put out of business because some oil company wants to build a garage on a corner site and the owner of the property sells it over the head of the small man. The corner shop is pulled down and the garage is built. I think I had better sit down, otherwise some Ministers may not like to hear what I have to say.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No. Carry on!

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [5.24 p.m.]: I wish to preface my speech on the Address-in-Reply with some words which I think are well known to every member in this Chamber, those words being "Death, where is thy sting?" I use the words because I believe they are most appropriate and pertinent to the subject matter of the speech I intend to make this afternoon, this subject being death duties taxation.

The Act was last amended in 1966, and I would like to quote some extracts from the Minister's second reading speech on that occasion. These extracts can be found in *Hansard* No. 3 of 1966 at page 2431. The Minister said—

We have taken the Victorian Act as the model for this legislation as to the grouping of beneficiaries and the incidence of duty on each group. The scales of duty proposed in this Bill conform closely to the average of the New South Wales and Victorian rates. This ensures that the effort required from the citizens of this State is no less than that required from the citizens of those States.

I have taken the opportunity to circulate among members a sheet showing figures for State probate duty. I think every member has a copy.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I wondered how I came by this.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I think I should add to the last words I have just quoted that very well-known and commonly used phrase, "You're telling me"; and I think members will agree with me when they follow my argument. The Minister went on—

The overall effect, nevertheless, is one of slightly lower severity over the whole field than at present.

Further on the Minister said—

However, it is necessary to increase the rates applicable to parents, brothers and sisters and, more so, for

strangers-in-blood and other beneficiaries in group four, because of the loss of revenue which will result from the concessions extended to the beneficiaries in group one.

If one has a look at the loss of revenue resulting from the concessions extended to beneficiaries in group one—and this can be followed by looking at the sheet I have circulated—one will see that with some of the smaller estates—up to about \$70,000; and they are small estates on today's figures, and in a State like this—there were some small reductions in probate. However, when one has a look at the estates which are above a figure of \$70,000 one finds that the death duties payable start to increase by thousands of dollars. This is where the sting comes in.

If members will look at the sheet I have provided they will notice that during the years 1961-62, and 1962-63, and even right up to 1965-66, the total amount of death duty collected by the State was fairly static. Admittedly, in 1965-66 it increased by \$918,000 as compared with the previous year, but over those years to which I have referred, the figure was fairly static. Then if we have a look at the following year, for 1966-67, we will see that there was a further increase of \$841,000—that is, over and above the increase of \$918,000 for the previous year—the total amount for 1966-67 being \$4,765,000.

In the following year, 1966-67, there was a further increase of \$435,000; but in 1968-69 there was a staggering increase of \$1,164,000, the total amount of death duties collected for that year being \$6,364,000. In my opinion, that is a fantastic increase bearing in mind the words used by the Minister—"because of the loss of revenue which will result from the concessions extended to the beneficiaries in group one." The figures show what has happened with probate over those years, and we have to consider the reason for the increase.

First of all, we have to ask ourselves whether there has been an increase in the number of estates being assessed for probate duty. If members have a look at the figures on the sheet they will see that the increase in the number of estates assessed has not been responsible for this increase of more than double in the amount of estate duty collected by the State; because from 1962 to 1969 there was an increase of only 974 in the number of estates assessed. In 1961-62 the figure was 3,777, and in 1968-69 it had risen to 4,751. It can be seen that the number of estates assessed was not a factor in the big increase in the amount of probate duty collected by the State. That is fairly obvious.

I now turn to what the other reasons may be. There was an increase in the value of the estates generally. This could have come about in three ways: firstly, by the upgrading of values by those responsible for reaching the final balance of an estate; secondly, by the increase in land values; and, thirdly, by the impact of the 1966 amendment to the Act. I believe that these three factors are responsible for the big lift. The increase in land values has made a big difference. After the 1966 Act became operative there was an increase in the total amount collected in probate duties of \$841,000 over the previous year on 563 additional estates. In that year the average for estates rose to \$1,014, which included small estates.

This trend was followed in 1968 and 1969 when the average for each of those years was \$1,126 and \$1,339, respectively. I would say that this was not coincidental, and is an indication of substantial increases to follow. Therefore, at this stage I feel some check should be made on the incidence of death duties to prevent them from becoming too high. As Mr. McNeill pointed out the other night when discussing this subject, the burden upon beneficiaries is such that within a short space of time we will find that properties will be split up—some have already been—to try to meet probate duties. If this continues to happen, some farms operated by family men will go out of existence. It will not be possible to carry them on if the present trend continues.

In most cases it is impossible for people with an estate to obtain sufficient insurance cover for probate duties. For example, if in 1962 a farmer or a businessman took out an insurance policy to cover the considered value of his estate, and this was followed by the present phenomenal rise in probate duties, two situations could arise—either the extra cover necessary would become too expensive for the return from the person's business or farm, or he would be too old to be able to obtain cover. The latter case applies particularly to farmers. The result is that when a farmer dies his beneficiaries have, somehow or other, to scratch up the money required for probate by borrowing from a bank, if possible, or by selling some of the assets of the property, such as land, stock, or machinery, in order to try to carry on that property.

Is this the way for people in Western Australia to be treated? Is it right that we should force people into the position of having to break up their properties and estates that have been built up over many years by hard work and the application of no small amount of brains and no small amount of shrewd business methods? What is going to happen if something is not done?

The other evening Mr. McNeill indicated that the Federal Government has seen fit to make some concession under its

probate duties Act as a result of representations from various groups. I was pleased to hear Mr. McNeill say that the Liberal Party had been following this matter up, because this is a subject that has been followed up for some time by the Country Party. I am glad to find that we have some allies—some who will support the Country Party in regard to probate duties. Members of the Country Party may have been under the wrong impression—and I hope we have been—because this is a matter that concerns all parties. It should be followed through to try to obtain some reduction in probate duty.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This time you got some help from them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are you standing on a box at the moment?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, I do not think I look any taller than usual! When the Minister introduced the amending Bill in 1966, he stated in his second reading speech that the scales of taxation were based on the Victorian Act. He was quite genuine in what he said, but I think at that time one fact was overlooked, even though the increases were based on the Victorian Act. I do not think the person who framed the Bill went far enough into the Victorian probate duties Act to see what relief was granted by that legislation, particularly to primary producers, the price of whose land was soaring.

We all know that the return from capital invested is low. This situation was given consideration in Victoria. It is recognised that the *per capita* return on a farm is about 4 per cent., which is very much lower than the return on capital invested in practically any other type of business.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you say 4 per cent. gross?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, 4 per cent. net. Many other businesses show a return of 10 per cent or more; so there is a big difference between the two figures. This is something that was considered in Victoria. In other words, it was appreciated that the return to a farmer from the produce of his land was insufficient to enable him to meet the rising costs of probate. Thought was given to this and other factors, as a result of which Victoria passed its Probate Duty (Reduction) Act in 1962. This Act provided for a rebate of 30 per cent. of probate duty payable on land used for primary production. This was a genuine and helpful move in easing the burden of probate as far as the primary producing industry was concerned.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Even so, it is very difficult to combat the effects of two or three deaths in quick succession in the one family.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes it is. In that case, one is up against a separate problem, which is a fairly big one. As we all know, in some instances there is a big difference between this State and the other States in regard to quick succession, but overall, the difference is not very great. However, it affects a great number of people, and I think we should have another look at the quick succession provisions as well.

I have some comparative figures for Victoria and Western Australia in regard to death duties, which I will quote to give members an idea of the difference in the amounts paid. For instance, in Victoria, where the final balance passes to the widow, widower, children not 21 years of age, wholly dependent adult children, or widowed mother, and the final balance is \$40,000, the amount of duty payable is \$2,520, after the 30 per cent. rebate in regard to farming land. In Western Australia, under the 1966 Act, the amount payable on a final balance of \$40,000 is \$3,450. The difference in that instance is not quite \$1,000. In regard to a final balance of \$72,000, after a rebate of 30 per cent., the amount paid in Victoria is \$5,142, as against \$8,910 in Western Australia. As we go up the scale the amounts paid are greater.

When the figure is over \$200,000, the rate paid in Victoria is 22½ per cent. of the final balance, while in this State it is 25 per cent. One can imagine what the position is in regard to an estate valued at \$350,000, which, after all is said and done, is not a huge estate. In the case of such an estate, in Victoria the amount payable is \$56,700, while in Western Australia it is \$90,000.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What you are saying is that the difference between 22½ per cent. in Victoria and 25 per cent. here represents a 30 per cent. reduction in duty?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In Victoria, at 22½ per cent., the duty on a \$360,000 final balance is \$81,000, but after allowing for the reduction in connection with primary production, this amount is reduced to \$56,700. However, in this State the beneficiaries have to pay \$90,000, which represents a huge difference between the Victorian and the Western Australian figures.

The Hon. E. C. House: Quick succession would not help it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: There would be no property left in a short time with probate duty of this magnitude. I agree with the action taken in 1966 to provide for an easing in the amount of duty paid in regard to small estates.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have you looked at the quick succession duty in Victoria?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes I have, and there is not a great difference between the two.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I have an idea the position in Western Australia is better.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is slightly better in Western Australia than in Victoria. Since the Minister has raised the question I will state the position. Our Act provides for a total rebate of the tax if six months or less elapses between successions. Fifty per cent. of the tax is rebatable if the second death occurs between six months and one year, and the rebate reduces by 10 per cent. a year over the next four years.

The Victorian law is more severe, in that a rebate of only 50 per cent. of the tax is allowed if the second death occurs within the first 12 months. The rebate reduces by 10 per cent. per annum in the next four years in the same way as our own Act provides for. Although there is a difference, I consider that it is not a great amount. However, that is not the case when one compares the probate duty generally paid in the two States. I agree that in Western Australia the provisions in regard to quick succession are better than in Victoria, but against that we have to consider that in Victoria there is a 30 per cent. rebate on land used for primary production.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would think that the difference between quick succession in Victoria and Western Australia is just six months.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I admit there is a difference in favour of Western Australia, but quick succession duties do not play such a big part in this State.

I think I have presented the true picture; and since the introduction of the 1966 Act, death duties payable in Western Australia have gone sky high. The figures for the previous years from 1962 to 1966 prove my point. During those years the amount collected by the State was fairly static, but during the past three years the amending Act has been responsible for a big lift in the amount payable by way of death duties.

I believe the Government should give urgent consideration, this session, to the introduction of provisions similar to those which operate in Victoria. As I stated, in Victoria a 30 per cent. rebate is allowed on land used for primary production. That provision would help to relieve the beneficiaries of a very big burden where probate duty was concerned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Act is not responsible for the increase in the amount of duty received. The increased value of the estates is responsible for the increase. The Act has remained the same since 1966.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: But I am comparing the amount received now with that received in the years before the 1966

Act. The value of the land has not risen only since the introduction of the 1966 Act. The value of land started to rise long before that time, and farming land has not shown a phenomenal rise in value since 1966. The value of farming land did rise prior to 1966, but it was not reflected in probate duties.

I have attributed some of the rise to the increase in the value of land, but a great deal of the rise is attributable to the 1966 amending Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The point I was trying to make is that the application of duty, percentage-wise, is static according to the Act. If more money is received each year it is because the value of the estates has risen.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I have admitted that. However, the increase has not been to the same degree as the rise which has occurred in probate duties. If the five years prior to 1966 are compared with the following three years, it will be seen that an upsurge has occurred. This upsurge has not only been due to rising land values, but most of it—particularly in farming areas—has been as a result of the 1966 Act. When the figures are compared it will be seen that there has been a very big increase.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The last Act has placed a greater burden on the individual?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Definitely.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I thought the honourable member would get some help from Mr. Wise.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In 1957 an estate worth \$50,000 was taxed at \$5,547. An estate of the same value in 1966 showed a reduction in the tax of \$526. The probate on an estate worth \$100,000 is down to \$7,760. For an estate worth \$160,000 the probate duty is up, and for an estate worth \$200,000 it has gone up by \$3,642. The children who are carrying on farms after their father or mother—or both—has died are being stung.

Comparing the duty payable in 1957 with that payable in 1966, on an estate worth \$50,000 there was a drop of \$526. On an estate worth \$100,000 there was a drop of \$224, and on an estate worth \$160,000—not a big estate—the duty had gone up by \$324. With an estate worth \$200,000 the duty is up by \$5,692.

I cannot be convinced that increased land values have been responsible for such increases in probate duty. The small estates do not affect the total figure very much because there are quite a number of them, and they would pay only a very small amount. However, when it is seen what the beneficiaries of some of the larger estates are paying, it will be realised that those estates have received no relief at all under the 1966 taxing Act. Those estates

have been hit to leg. The situation was bad enough before 1966 and I believe the Government should give consideration to introducing amending legislation. There should be a similar reduction to that allowed in Victoria.

According to what Victorian members of Parliament have said to me, the allowance has not affected Treasury figures to a large extent. I have worked out, roughly, that if a 30 per cent. rebate were allowed on the total amount received for death duties—as distinct from increased land values—it would amount to only \$654,000. However, a 30 per cent. rebate would give relief to those people who need it. They would not have to sell the properties to meet the probate duties.

I think this is quite a reasonable request to put to the Government. If a State like Victoria can make the allowance of a 30 per cent. rebate then we should be able to do the same. The situation was visualised in Victoria in 1962 because of the inflated and rising value of land. After all is said and done, even if the land was valued at \$28 an acre some years ago, and today it is valued at \$160 an acre, no more money is made from that land today.

Probate is being assessed on a valuation which is false. That is why I believe the Government should take steps to introduce a relief measure such as was done in Victoria, and which has been operating for the past seven years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The 4 per cent. net profit on agricultural land is not a true figure?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I did not say that; that is a generally recognised figure. It is 4 per cent. net on the total investment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: A 3,000-acre property worth \$180,000 would make a minimum of \$7,200 net?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, that is about the figure today.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I did not think it would be as much as that.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Possibly not, but that figure has been recognised over the past four years. It could possibly be less today. As I was saying, I believe the farming community should be provided with some relief. It will not cost the State a large sum of money to provide the relief so that the properties can be carried on as family units. A property carried on as a family unit is a better proposition for the State than having large companies coming in and buying the farms.

I will leave those thoughts with the Government and I trust I have not spoken in vain. I must admit the Minister's comments did not sound very encouraging. However, I hope that what I have said will sink in.

I now wish to make a few comments on a situation which is occurring in our State-on-the-move. I refer to the problem of the pollution of waterways—streams, lakes, and dams. Industrial development is taking place throughout our State including, of course, country areas. In conjunction with that development deep sewerage has been installed in many country towns. In some cases the deep sewerage systems and the septic systems drain into lagoons. The lagoons are considered part of the sewerage system.

In my opinion this is not a very satisfactory type of sewerage system, because when a lagoon is used the water which flows from it is really nowhere near pure. That water is polluting the streams, lakes, and dams and it is a problem which has to be considered.

I have noticed that the Commonwealth Government is spending quite a large sum of money on the installation of a sewerage system for the Northam military camp. I have not looked over it personally, but I have seen it from the road. That set-up would leave the country towns sewerage systems for dead. The so-called "lagoon system" is not very satisfactory.

I have had quite a bit of trouble, personally—as have my neighbours—with the sewerage system which was installed at Wundowie. That system is of the lagoon type. Even at this stage effluent from that sewerage system is coming down a stream which flows through Noble Falls and on to the Swan River. This effluent is in the stream and it is not very pleasant to live next to it. I am speaking not only for myself, but also for my neighbours who suffer from the effects of the pollution. We have had a fair amount of trouble from the effluent from the Wundowie iron works. That problem has just about been solved but now we have the problem of the sewerage system at Wundowie township.

I have been in touch with the Medical Department, and that department finally pushed the problem across to the Public Works Department, from whom we did not get very much satisfaction. The Public Works Department stated that the laboratory tests carried out on water from the stream were quite satisfactory. I can be bamboozled with figures concerning laboratory tests, because I do not know much about them.

The local shire has sent samples to the department—taken by the health inspector—but the department will not release the figures relating to the tests. If this situation continues I am sure that my neighbours will try to force the Public Works Department to take some salutary action.

If the effluent continues to flow into the stream those people will be within their rights, because the present situation cannot continue. However, this sort of thing

will continue to occur right throughout the country unless we are prepared to install sewerage systems which operate effectively. We should preserve our waterways in this State.

The installation of sewerage systems is a matter which should be given the greatest attention, and the Government should take full cognisance of the situation to see that pollution does not occur. With those words, I support the motion.

*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*

**THE HON. R. THOMPSON** (South Metropolitan) [7.30 p.m.]: I rise to support the Governor's Speech. Whenever I attend an opening of Parliament, however, I wonder what good purpose is served by opening the session in this fashion each year. I think it is sufficient that Parliament should be opened after the election of a new Government, because over the years I have sat in this chair and looked at the gallery where I have seen the same civil servants, members of the judiciary, and other important persons who attend year after year. These people usually sit and listen to the Governor's Speech which, after all is said and done, does not amount to very much in the true sense, because it merely reiterates what has happened in the past and tells us of the legislation which will be introduced in the ensuing year. I do not say this with any political end in view but in all sincerity. I might add that we do not hear of all the legislation that is likely to be introduced, but only of some of it.

I think we should have a serious look at the position to see whether it would not be sufficient to have such an opening of Parliament once every three years. I do not think the expenditure incurred on opening day is warranted, particularly when we are so short of so many things in this State, quite apart from the fact that civil servants and other important people must give up their valuable time to attend the opening of Parliament.

I was rather amazed at one of the statements made by Mr. Heitman when he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech. When speaking about the State education system Mr. Heitman said—

It was interesting to listen to the account of the growth of this State over the past decade, and the importance the Government has placed on education by increasing revenue expenditure by 207 per cent. during this period, and the building of 471 classrooms last year. Despite these and other improvements in education, one still hears of there being a crisis in education.

At one time those in the teaching profession were well respected in the community as being dedicated to their work, and they were admired by most. This image has lost ground, despite the many aids to education supplied

by both the Education Department and the parents and citizens' associations. This makes one feel that perhaps professional trouble-makers are employed by the union to encourage discontent with the education system in this State.

I think this statement was regrettable in the extreme, because in my view the teaching profession of Western Australia has not lost any status whatever; at least not through any fault of its own.

We all know that as most teachers leave college they go to the country where they are forced to live under the most primitive conditions, and this seems to raise in the minds of people the thought that they are third or fourth rate citizens; the feeling seems to be engendered that they cannot be much good. It is this sort of attitude which has resulted in teachers losing status in the country areas; an attitude which is brought about by the conditions under which they are expected to live.

Mr. Heitman says it makes him feel that perhaps professional trouble-makers were employed by the union. I have not contacted the Education Department or the Teachers Union on any matter, but I did seek from a person who is on the executive the names of the officers of the Teachers Union. The person to whom I refer came to my home on a matter quite unconnected with education and I took the opportunity to ask him the names of the staff of the Teachers Union. I was informed that the general secretary is Robert Darragh, the assistant general secretary is Trevor K. Lloyd, the research officer is Colin B. Fraser, and Fred W. McKenna is the correspondence and interviewing officer. The union is about to appoint an editor. Apart from the above it has a staff of eight girls. The president of the union is not paid and the work done by the executive is all voluntary.

I would like to ask Mr. Heitman whether he considers that any of these people are paid trouble-makers, because they are the paid staff of the Teachers Union. If a person starts to fight for better wages and conditions in the industrial sphere he is usually branded a "Red," or a militant, or, as being under somebody else's influence.

This sort of thing has been going on for years. I consider that for the first time during its existence the Teachers Union has become an effective organisation. The reason for this is that it is the younger teachers who want some action taken, because it is they who have to put up with the dreadful conditions that are experienced in connection with classrooms, accommodation generally, and particularly with regard to the mixed and overloaded classes with which they have to contend in the metropolitan area.

I do not think it is either fair or reasonable that an aspersion should be cast upon the officers of the Teachers Union who, I

believe, are quite honourable men. It is not right for an insinuation to be made that they could be paid trouble-makers.

Mr. Heitman has the right to reply to this motion and I would like him to clarify the position, because it is completely unfair that this sort of thing should be left hanging over the heads of the officers concerned.

As I said, I have not been in touch with the Teachers Union at all, but a colleague of mine received the following letter dated the 4th August, 1969, from the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia:—

*re Mr. J. Heitman's speech, 31/7/1969  
Legislative Council*

Once again we are given a number of bare facts in isolation, with no relationship to other matters.

For example, in 1958/59, the estimated expenditure on the Education Department from the Consolidated Revenue Fund was \$15,685,200. In 1968/69 the estimate was \$44,325,000, an increase of 182.59 per cent. However, during the same period estimated expenditure on Mines rose by 164.49 per cent., North-West Department by 210.91 per cent., Fisheries Department by 348.16 per cent., Medical Department by 225.83 per cent., Public Health Department by 211.79 per cent., and Native Welfare Department by 335.51 per cent., to name but a few. I cannot see that the 207 per cent. quoted (apparently this includes all education expenditure, not necessarily within the portfolio of Mr. Lewis) is anything to be overjoyed about in comparison with expenditure in other fields.

The 471 classrooms built are comprised of the following:

Primary	283
Secondary	140
Technical	19
Teachers' Colleges	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>471</b>

54 of these were built with Commonwealth funds.

The actual increase in primary and secondary classrooms built between 1967 and 1968 were 17 primary and 6 secondary (see *Hansard* p. 2770, 25 March). These were to cope with a student increase of 5,000 to 6,000 children.

I would like to know on what great educational background Mr. Heitman places his statements—

- (a) that teachers have lost respect in the community

- (b) that they are no longer dedicated to their work

- (c) that they are not admired by most.

Perhaps he could also tell us of the "many aids to education" supplied by the Education Department. Most of the responsibility seems to fall on the Parents and Citizens' Associations, which creates inequalities and completely negates any suggestion that no fees shall be paid in primary schools (S11, Education Act). This is only another form of fee paying.

As for the Union employing professional trouble makers, I think this can be left to you, but perhaps Mr. Heitman would like to publicly name these people?

Enclosed are copies of letters to the Government Employees' Housing Authority and the Education Department regarding the housing situation at Morawa, the town not named, but certainly the one referred to in Mr. Heitman's speech.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) COLIN FRASER,  
Research Officer.

On the 29th July, 1969, the General Secretary of the Teachers Union wrote to the Director-General of Education as follows:—

I refer to your letter 411-54 of 11th July, 1969, concerning teacher accommodation at Morawa.

I have to advise that Mr. Lloyd, the Assistant General Secretary, has visited Morawa and inspected Yarallah House. He has reported that this house is quite inadequate for the accommodation of seven single persons for a number of reasons which he discussed with the President of the Morawa Shire. In the first place there is no privacy for the tenants except in their own bedrooms. These are quite small, 10' x 8' furnished with wardrobe cum dressing table and bed. There is a single lounge so entertainment on an individual basis is impossible and study facilities are almost non-existent. Cooking arrangements are difficult. Finally it must be pointed out that only one tenant has access to the landlord except through a third party.

While the Union is appreciative of the interest of the Shire in this matter we consider that the whole venture was not properly planned and that considerable improvement will have to be effected before full tenancy can be expected.

Yours faithfully,  
General Secretary.

On the 20th July the General Secretary of the Teachers Union wrote to Mr. R. Christie, the Chairman of the Government Employees' Housing Authority. The letter states—

Dear Mr. Christie,

I refer to your letter of June, 10, 1969, concerning teacher accommodation at Morawa. The situation there has been investigated by Mr. Lloyd, Assistant General Secretary of the Union. Apart from travelling time it took Mr. Lloyd almost half an hour to resolve the problem concerning the Headmaster's house. Approximately twenty minutes of his time was spent with Locke's in Geraldton to arrange the immediate despatch of the curtains and about ten minutes was spent with the Headmaster telling him of this.

Mr. Lloyd also reports that Mrs. Dowglass is not a well woman and that the state of her health was largely responsible for her husband's attitude in this matter. His endeavour was to ensure that his wife would not be called upon to undertake any undue exertion or responsibility in connection with moving into the new house and that so far as possible the house would be complete in all details when they moved in.

Mr. Lloyd also investigated the accommodation provided by the Morawa Shire for single women teachers and others. While Mr. Lloyd commends the Shire for its co-operation he considers that it is unreasonable to expect so many tenants to occupy a house where facilities have to be shared. This is particularly the case in view of the design of the house and the inadequate provision of basic ablution, laundry and kitchen fittings, the impossibility of entertaining on an individual basis and the absence of study facilities.

Mr. Lloyd has discussed the matter with the President of the Morawa Shire Council. He has also undertaken that the Union's view will be conveyed to the Shire when his report has been considered.

Mr. Lloyd would be happy to discuss the accommodation with you if you so wish.

Long before Mr. Heitman made his speech in this House the Teachers Union had raised the matter, not only with the Shire of Morawa but also with the Government Employees' Housing Authority. I remember interjecting when Mr. Heitman was speaking and was giving the facts as he knew them about this house being left empty and waiting for the curtains to arrive.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is still empty.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It might be still empty, but we have to take all factors into consideration. Why is it empty? Is it because of Mrs. Dowglass's ill health?

The Hon. J. Heitman: I would not say it is. Mrs. Dowglass has to shift. This is a better house than the one she is now in. If she does not want to move, should the house not be handed over to some other tenant?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Is the honourable member sure that the undertaking that the house would be completed before she moved was complied with? An unfortunate situation has arisen; and the right and proper thing for Mr. Heitman to do is to give us an explanation, particularly for the purpose of taking the name of the Teachers Union off the smear heap.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Why did you not go to Mr. Christie and ask him his opinion? If you had done that you would have both sides of the story.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of late my health has not been very good. I would have liked to do many more things than I have been able to do. I am concerned about the Education Department. I do not know who I am to blame for all this. I do not know whether it is because the department is not telling the Minister; or, if the Minister is being told, he is not taking action.

I am in fairly close contact with the schools in my electorate. The Spearwood School has a particular problem, because of the nationalities of the pupils and the overcrowding in the classrooms. There are up to 48 pupils of mixed grades, comprising sometimes five nationalities, in a class. It is not fair or reasonable to say that a teacher should be able to teach five different nationalities separated into grades four and five in a class consisting of 48 pupils.

Is this one of the reasons the children are not receiving the education, and why the teachers—in the eyes of Mr. Heitman—are losing the respect of the community? Is that the fault of the teachers? Let us look at the facts and at the grouping of classes in the Spearwood School. Let us see what the department is doing to rectify the position. This year four new classrooms will be built at the school. Admittedly there is the old school building which was vacated about 15 months ago, and which has since been reoccupied. This school building is about 90 years old. We find that the department will erect four new classrooms at the school to be ready for the 1970 school year. I told the Minister at a deputation that we needed 10 new classrooms; but we find that only four will be provided. These classrooms will accommodate children of several nationalities.



It has been proved that in this area there are approximately 1.85 children of school age to each new home. At present there are 117 dwellings and 21 housing units under construction; another 20 dwellings and 51 flats have been approved; and plans for a further 30 dwellings and 10 flats have been submitted to the shire for approval to build. That makes 167 dwellings and 82 flats in the course of construction or approved for construction. The total is about 250 units of accommodation. If there is only one child to each home that will result in over 60 pupils to each classroom that will be built. Under such circumstances the teachers will come in for ridicule.

The Hon. J. Heitman: All you are trying to do is to twist my argument.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I know what the honourable member said. He ought to be ashamed of what he said.

The Hon. J. Heitman: I am very proud of what I said. I can give you much more evidence, if you want it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I suppose if one is a hatchet man, one is proud to be a hatchet man. It is a sorry state of affairs to see people, who are fighting for improved conditions, being branded.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This reminds me of what you said about Mr. Kelly when you were speaking in the debate on the arbitration Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I had the courage to tell Mr. Kelly to his face, long before I said what I did about him in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You had the courage to say what you did say to him while he was in the gallery.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I told him to his face, and I would tell him that again.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I only thought I would remind you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister need not remind me, because I know it only too well. Let us look at the turnover of teachers at the Spearwood School. In the 1967 school year that school had seven new teachers, but not one of them is still teaching at the school at the present time. Three of those teachers resigned, three were transferred, and one was sacked. That school had three different headmasters in three years. Some of the children in grades five and six had one teacher up to April this year, but since then they have had four other teachers and two supply teachers. So in this year the class comprising the fifth and sixth grades has been taught by seven different teachers. Is this fair or reasonable? Should parents and teachers not show some concern about such a state of affairs?

We have to bear in mind that under our education system the teachers are

marked at the end of each year as to the progress they have made and as to the ability they have displayed in the classroom, for the purposes of determining promotions. Under these circumstances is it reasonable to expect that teachers will be marked fairly; or to expect that they can do justice to the children? This is not an isolated case. Most classes in the school have been reshuffled this year, because the enrolments are increasing all the time. As enrolments rise, the express desire of the Government that not more than 40 or 41 children should be in a classroom results in the grouping of classes. I say it is not fair for pupils to be placed in grouped classes, particularly pupils in the fifth and sixth grades. Grouping of grades might be all right when the children are in grades one and two, but when they reach grades five and six it is shocking for them to be in grouped classes.

The latest issue of the *The W.A. Teachers' Journal*, which most members receive, contains the following on the front page:—

Saturday, July 10, 1920.

Mr. H. G. Wells on Teachers' Salaries.  
To the Editor of the "Teacher's World."

Dear Sir,—

As an old teacher I would sympathise with the demands of the London teachers anyhow. They are treated meanly, overworked, underpaid and insufficiently respected. But there are much wider grounds than that for my support of their appeal for better pay and increased numbers.

General Education is the foundation of modern civilised community; everything else rests on that—public peace, economic prosperity, progress, health. And you cannot have that foundation safe and sure unless you have a much larger staff of able teachers per thousand pupils and unless you maintain the general quality and vigour of those teachers by fair and sufficient pay.

Cheap teachers mean a jerry-built social system. To sweat your teachers is to prepare a revolution.

Yours sincerely,

H. G. Wells.

What H. G. Wells wrote in 1920, some 49 years ago, is very true of and apt in Western Australia today.

I could go on for no end of time dealing with the facts and figures I have been able to obtain from the various schools in my electorate. Calista and Orelia are growing areas and insufficient provision is being made by the department for this growth. It was revealed in answers to questions in another place that the Orelia school will be six or seven classrooms short

to service the Orelia and Calista programme. However, so much for education.

I was very pleased to receive the traffic infringement regulations sent to members so that we might study the fines which will be payable by those who wish to fill in the appropriate document, sign it, and pay the fine on the spot for an offence committed. I could spend quite a lot of time on these regulations, but two, in particular, require attention. The first is item 4, regulation 706, which reads—

Pedestrian propelling perambulator, etc. abreast of another vehicle on footway.

I think this is quite stupid and hopeless because I do not think that any traffic inspector or policeman in Western Australia would be game enough to accost a mother, or two mothers, and fine each one \$2. Why should we have such a regulation?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Some of those women can be dangerous.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The honourable member should remember that his mother once pushed him in a pram.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I don't know whether we had one. We couldn't afford one.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It could have been dangerous to the honourable member if his mother did not have one.

I think this regulation is humorous to the point of being ridiculous. Because a woman has borne children—and we want more children—and is pushing one of them in a pram, leisurely down the street, an officious policeman or traffic inspector can pull her up and fine her \$2 if she contravenes this particular regulation.

The other regulation with which I wish to deal is item 38, regulation 1804(a), which reads—

Driving vehicle on freeway at less than 35 m.p.h.

I would like to see a patrolman, or the whole force, on the freeway at 8.25 a.m. or 5.15 p.m. trying to get the traffic to travel at 35 miles per hour! If motorists are not travelling at a speed greater than 35 miles an hour on the freeway they are, under the regulations, subject to a fine of \$5. This is one of those petty regulations which could be enforced when there is no-one else on the freeway. It is sad that, until we have sufficient freeways and roadways on which to move the traffic, we should have a regulation such as this to penalise motorists.

Then we come to item 11, regulation 1305, which reads as follows:—

Playing games or riding roller skates or vehicles with small wheels and no efficient brakes on a road.

This is referring to roller skates or scooters, and probably the old type of trolleys the children used to make. With these they used to get on top of a hill and drive down it. They are not made very often now and are not seen on the roads. This is probably an old regulation, but under it children can be fined \$2.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is the trolley season. There are dozens of them around. The children always make them at this time of the year, every year.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the Minister were a policeman or a traffic inspector, would he like to go up to a kiddy and tell him he must pay \$2 for the offence?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am wondering whether you can give me an example of when such a fine was imposed.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is the point I am making. I do not think this regulation would ever be enforced, and therefore it is ridiculous.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would be enforced if the children were indulging in this practice in St. George's Terrace.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think the children are a little more clever than we think sometimes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes. They make sure they keep out of the way.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I now come to the main point with which I wish to deal. In effect, children can be fined because there is insufficient public open space available. This brings me to a question which is close to me as a ratepayer; not that I am involved in any scheme under which my property will be affected. The only way I can be affected is by extra rating which I and every ratepayer in Fremantle will be called upon to meet as a result of a town planning scheme.

In accordance with the town planning Act and the metropolitan region town planning scheme, each local authority within the metropolitan region must supply a plan for its area within three years of the coming into operation of the metropolitan region town planning scheme. Sufficient time is allowed the shires to apply for an extension if through any difficulty they are held up and are prevented from putting a planning scheme into operation. However, under the Act, when a scheme is presented it is necessary for it to be submitted to the Minister for his preliminary approval. Up to date some shires have presented a scheme, and others have not.

On the 28th February this year, Fremantle was granted preliminary approval for its town planning scheme. Having had a look at the text covering the scheme, and the plan and areas concerned, I was shocked to find that in the main no provision had been made for road widening in areas where GR4, GR5, GR6 and warehousing development is to take place.

One street—Douglas Street in South Fremantle—is zoned for GR6 development. The total width of the roadway reserve is

20 feet. Although high-density development is to be allowed here, the text does not provide for road widening; likewise in the rezoning for warehousing. Those who know the Fremantle area where the tram used to run to South Beach on the western side will know the area to which I am referring. It is impossible in those streets for two cars to pass safely. One car has to pull up and the other has to scrape the kerb to get past. This is in an area which will be used 100 per cent. for factories or warehousing when the scheme goes through.

The ratepayers have not been told of any provision for streets to be widened to cater for the heavy haulage and, possibly, interstate haulage and huge prime-movers which will be using the area. This proposal has raised a large number of objections from the residents of Fremantle. I was very reluctantly brought into this matter, but now I am pleased I was because I can see the absolute uselessness of having a local authority prepare a scheme which is called a metropolitan region town planning scheme without letting the residents concerned know what land they will lose.

Speculators who have taken options on properties there in the hope that they will be able to obtain zoning for flats when the scheme goes through have since obtained inside information as to how much road widening will take place and most of them have let their options lapse.

I consider that before the Minister gives preliminary approval to a scheme it should be a condition that all its provisions are taken into consideration. An eminent planner was asked to give an opinion on the plan and text. A solicitor was also asked and, I would say, he is the most highly respected solicitor on local government matters in Perth. The planner, incidentally, was not the one who was in trouble with the Perth City Council. I can assure the Minister of that. The planner said—

1. The Town Planning Scheme makes provision for high density residential development in the establishment of GR4, GR5 and GR6 Zones.

2. If land is zoned for high density residential development all public open space, shopping and other amenities and facilities should be planned on the basis that the bulk, if not all, the land zoned for high density residential development will be used for that purpose.

3. Insufficient provision is made in the Scheme Plan for Public Open Space, Shopping and other amenities and facilities which will be necessary for the increased population in the area by reason of the high density development.

4. When the land has been developed for high density residential

purposes it will be too late then to make provision for the necessary public open space and other amenities and facilities.

I read in this morning's paper that the Premier (Sir David Brand), upon his return to Western Australia stated that more open space is needed in Perth.

I think that Fremantle would be classed as the second city in Western Australia, and yet under the Act the council must provide a town planning scheme which is not a town planning scheme, but is purely and simply a rezoning scheme. Under that scheme only one area of land—and that is because it is vacant—has been zoned for public open space. Probably it will be used for a school because of the objections to the school sites.

I consider that the Minister and officers of his department should examine the texts prior to giving approval to such a scheme, because the texts are most important. Further, we have found that this text, in particular, contradicts itself. People who have purchased blocks of land at great expense alongside their houses for the purpose of storing crayfish pots and fishing gear will be debarred from storing their everyday working tools or implements on property which they have developed for that purpose once this scheme comes into operation and the rezoning takes place.

I think also that the Minister should not take Fremantle out of context. Ratepayers in Fremantle might be paying Peppermint Grove rates but we do not want Peppermint Grove sophistication. If Fremantle is to be replanned, it should be replanned in a thorough manner and not through a haphazard rezoning scheme that makes provision for practically nothing other than flats and the slums of the future.

The solicitor whom the interested people approached said—

This is purely and simply a rezoning.

This information was given in May. He went on to say—

No regard has been given to road widening or pattern to carry the higher density of rezoning. The same applies to public open space, other amenities or lines of communication.

Further, he said—

(4) The Local Government Act, 1960, sections 4 and 5 makes the Municipality of Fremantle Act, 1925, still valid. Section 2 of the Municipality of Fremantle Act provides that if the Council widen the road they can do what they like with the land either side. This is further set out in section 3 of such Act.

In conclusion, he said—

Once higher and defined zonings become a *fait accompli* the Council

have unlimited powers and every ratepayer would have the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads.

In answer, the Minister could say that the Municipality of Fremantle Act only allows for what is provided under section 361 of the Local Government Act, where land on either side of a road which is acquired for that particular purpose can be used for any purpose whatsoever.

Now I come to the most vicious and obnoxious piece of legislation that I have ever read. To make quite sure that I was on safe ground, last week I asked the Minister whether or not the Municipality of Fremantle Act of 1925 could be used in relation to this town planning scheme. The Minister said, "Yes, before and after." I asked a further question with regard to what provision was made for road widening, etc. The reply which he gave was similar to the opinion given by the town planner. The Minister said, "The Town Planning Board has no requirements as to road minimum widths."

The next statement by the Minister is probably one of the most surprising that I have ever heard; namely, that road widenings or closures can be provided for under the Municipality of Fremantle Act, 1925, which, it is considered, can be effectively operated in conjunction with the town planning scheme.

We find that no mention of the Municipality of Fremantle Act is made in the text or in the reasons advanced for the scheme, which provide that the scheme will be done in conjunction with and have the force of law of the Town Planning and Development Act and the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act. That is fair enough. I have no argument with that. However, what is the purpose of a town planning Act if it does not make provision for these things? Are the ratepayers simply to be treated as dummies? Do they not have any say as to what will happen to their land? Are they not entitled to know whether 19, 20, 30, or 40 feet of their land is to be resumed under a secretive Act, which very few people have ever heard of?

This can happen and, although I have not checked it out, I imagine the City of Perth Act and the Municipality of Fremantle Act are practically the same.

When I say the Municipality of Fremantle Act is obnoxious and diabolical, I mean it; because, under it, land can be taken without payment of compensation. There is no provision for appeal. This is confiscation in the worst sense. It is high time the Act was erased from our Statute book. If the Minister has a close look at it, I think he will agree with me that it should not be on our Statute book. Certainly there is no just reason for the application of the Act; because all that needs to be done by a local authority can be

done under the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, under which the Minister is the resuming officer, or under the Public Works Act. These Acts govern resumptions for such purposes. Also, the Local Government Act gives power for the resuming of land.

I think it is worth while reading section 2 of the Municipality of Fremantle Act. It says—

2. Whenever the Municipal Council of Fremantle (hereinafter referred to as "the Council") may decide that it is necessary or expedient to acquire land under the provisions of section two hundred and seventeen, section two hundred and nineteen, and section four hundred and thirty-eight, subsection (1), of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), for the purpose of opening, extending, diverting, altering, or increasing the width of any streets or footways, the Council shall not be confined to the acquisition of such land as is actually required for such purpose, but it shall be lawful for the Council to acquire or take land on either side—

I emphasise the word "take." To continue—

—or on both sides of the proposed new street, or extended or widened street, for such a depth as the Council shall think fit.

This means that if the council does not want to pay compensation, it does not have to acquire the land but can take it, if it so determines, and there is no appeal if the council does decide to take it.

It is stated in section 3 that if the council wants to acquire the land, it may do so. If the person concerned is not satisfied, the matter can be referred to arbitration.

Consequently, under section 2 of the Act land can be taken; under section 3 land can be acquired and, only then, can it be referred to arbitration. There is no appeal against the decision.

Members will see that I am correct in saying that this is an obnoxious Act. I consider it is a reflection on the State to have such Acts on our Statute book. As a solicitor said, people have the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads all the time. I ask the Minister to look closely at this Act and also the City of Perth Act as well as any other similar Act which could be used against unsuspecting ratepayers.

This is only one of many town planning schemes which will be put into operation. The Minister might have six or eight schemes projected at the present time; I would not know.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Town planning schemes vary according to the size of the town.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, but the town planning scheme to which the Minister is referring is not the one that is required under the legislation. The one that is required under the legislation is the one which Fremantle has now submitted for preliminary approval. I want to know what part the Minister plays and what responsibility he takes on himself before giving his signature to such a planning scheme. What right does a ratepayer have other than to lodge an objection? Further, how can he object when he is completely misled by council officers at public meetings?

Some misleading statements were made at a ratepayers' meeting on the 12th May. In answer to a question about the proposed school sites the town planner of the City of Fremantle said, "The Education Department may acquire school sites. Council have not accepted it." This may be true. However, I question that statement, because it is on the plan; it is covered in the text; and it has been sent to the Minister for preliminary approval.

Nevertheless, the town planner's words to the ratepayers were—

The Education Department may acquire school sites. Council have not accepted it.

I know that objections have been made. Yet the scheme has been forwarded to the Minister and, if he puts his signature to it, the school sites are in. The town planner also went on to say—

The Government overrules the council when it comes to these matters.

When it came to the question of what would happen to people's houses, he said—

You need never change the use for which you have put your land to.

We know this to be completely untrue, because the text lays down a land usage, and the non-conforming rights on land are taken into consideration. A person has to make application for non-conforming use of land. Even so, if the land is not used for a period of three months for the purpose for which the non-conforming permit was granted, then the person loses that permit and the land must stay vacant until it is used for the purpose which is laid down in the zoning. In South Terrace in Fremantle at the present time there would be at least a dozen empty shops which are zoned as business sites. Three months after this scheme or rezoning comes into operation the shops will have to remain empty until such time as they are demolished or are used for the purpose envisaged under the zoning scheme.

Another statement by the planner was—

The Education Department cannot use your land unless you sell it to them.

Those were his exact words. To make such a statement is misleading people, and apparently these officers do not have access to various Acts of Parliament. Every member of this House knows that such a statement is not true. As soon as the planner made this statement I challenged it, but evidently he and others like him do not study the relevant legislation, and the words in the text, because they convey misleading information to the ratepayers who are responsible for providing the money from which their wages are paid.

If the council wanted any block of land for a school site it would soon resume it and evict the owner from his premises. The text says—

The only thing you can do to your house or property without council approval when this rezoning takes place, is erect a back or side fence.

That is the only improvement one is permitted to make to one's property, and one has Buckley's chance of obtaining from the council any approval to make additions. I have complained about a dozen times in this Chamber that, as a result, in some instances values of properties in an area affected are depressed to such an extent that the premises have to be pulled down and the equity in them, which represents the life savings of the owners, is lost. Even when compensation is paid to the owners of properties that are resumed by the Education Department, any other Government department, or by a council, the value of the properties is so depressed by the effect of the resumption order that the compensation payable is insufficient for such owners to purchase homes in other suburbs.

So when a Bill to amend the Town Planning and Development Act was presented to Parliament in 1965 I thought it was good legislation, although I was critical of some parts of it. I now want to know the purpose of the legislation. What rights has a ratepayer under the Local Government Act? I have studied that Act and I find that a ratepayer has only one right—to call a ratepayers' meeting if he can obtain 50 signatures to a petition and submit it to the local authority. At such a meeting the ratepayers can pass a resolution and talk until they are black in the face, but the councillors are not obliged to act on the resolution. In fact, in this instance, when a ratepayers' meeting was held, the council refused to discuss the plan with the ratepayers at any stage. I was disgusted with the attitude adopted by the council at this meeting.

The ratepayers present at the meeting discussed many objections, but the councillors said that the scheme would not be withdrawn and they refused to hold a referendum of the ratepayers, the reason being that all ratepayers affected by the scheme had the right to object to

it. This is quite true, but as only one-third of the area will be affected by the rezoning, how can the people residing in the remaining two-thirds of the area legitimately object to the scheme?

I am speaking this evening for the unsuspecting people who will be affected by the scheme. They are under the impression that their land will not be rezoned. However, when provision is made for public open space, for the widening of roads, and for other facilities in the district, how will these people fare then? If the population of this area is to increase by 120 per cent.—although those responsible for the scheme do not seem to know what the percentage increase will be—what will the council do then? It is estimated that 20,000 more people will be living in high-density accommodation within the area, so what provision will be made for kindergartens and for playing areas? At the moment no provision for such facilities is being made.

The question of finance must also be considered, because it will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to widen the roads by at least one chain in order to carry the increased traffic. However, no provision has been made to widen roads. At the moment the ratepayers are quite unsuspecting, because they are under the impression that they will not have to meet the cost of such improvements. However, they will soon find that their rates in the future will be proportionately increased to finance the widening of roads and the provision of other facilities that will be necessary with an increase in the population of the district.

It is beyond me how the Minister could make the following statement:—

There are no minimum widths required for roadway reserves within the Fremantle City Council's Town Planning Scheme, since the Scheme is concerned with land use.

I cannot understand the Minister making such a statement. If it is correct, why do we have a Town Planning Board? Why do we ask any town council within the metropolitan area to submit its town planning scheme to the Town Planning Board so that it may conform with the metropolitan region town planning scheme? Does not that scheme provide for public open space? Of course it does! Therefore, should not a town council planning scheme provide for public open space? How will the council accommodate the additional number of vehicles on the roads if this zoning plan is approved?

If the Minister cares to accompany me, I will be only too pleased to show him some of the roads which are practically only laneways, and in places where he says the roads will not require to be widened. The roads will have to be widened, otherwise we may as well do away with the Town Planning Board. If it is good enough for the Fremantle City Council to replan its area and not make provision to widen

the roads, why should we place restrictions on any other council that seeks to rezone the area it controls? I suppose we could make the area that is to be rezoned like a village, and have 20-foot laneways between rows of houses.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Like Hong Kong.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: It would stop speeding anyhow.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It might, but one finds if one is driving a car in one direction along one of these roads, and another car approaches in the opposite direction, one has to back up about 150 yards to allow the other car to pass. Of course, if it is a truck that is approaching from the opposite direction, one is immediately forced to back up, because the truck will certainly not give way. If the Minister continues to insist that the Municipality of Fremantle Act can be used for this purpose, I am of the opinion that, in effect, this is the same as using a double-headed penny against the ratepayers. In many instances no information whatsoever is supplied to them by the city council. However, when they seek information and obtain it, it is usually incorrect or misleading.

The position seems to be that the city council does not understand its own Act. Should it not be a prerequisite that correct information should be supplied to the ratepayers so that they may ascertain how land will be acquired for the purpose of widening the roadways? I want to know from the Minister the true function of the Town Planning Board. What is the purpose of submitting these town planning schemes to the board? The Act provides that if a council does not submit a town planning scheme to the board within a certain time, or is not granted an extension of time, the Town Planning Board can take steps to replan the area and claim the cost of the replanning from the council.

In this instance I wish this had happened, because if the Town Planning Board had planned the area it might have been planned properly and not in the shabby manner in which it has been planned. I think it is a disgrace.

I support the motion before the House and I sincerely hope and trust the Minister will return this town planning scheme with its accompanying text to the council so that it may be resubmitted in proper form and in true perspective. If this is done the ratepayers will be given an opportunity to object if they so desire, because a proper plan will show the provision for public open space and all the facilities that may be necessary, such as the widening of roads.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government).

*House adjourned at 8.43 p.m.*