

not in the position of being able to negotiate. I have had personal contact with one man who has given me certain facts and has said that I may quote them. This is what I am doing.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I could make an offer of \$200,000,000 tonight but I would not be able to substantiate it tomorrow.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I could not take the honourable member's word on that.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I have said sufficient. I advise the Committee that the Bill should not pass tonight.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I do not know the form in which the offer to which the honourable member has just referred was made to the Government—either verbally or in writing—if, in fact, an offer was made at all. I have never heard of it. I have heard somewhere along the line of the 86 per cent. of the Angela deposits which was mentioned.

The Government decided against whatever Mr. Hancock had to offer on the advice of officers in the Mines Department. If the offer was in the terms stated by the honourable member, I do not know why it has not been made public; but, after all, offers made by other people have not been made public. This is a matter of business between the department and the firms concerned.

The honourable member's final remark was that the Bill should be thrown out. I can only urge the Committee to ensure that it passes. So far as the Armco offer is concerned, I am advised that the company has rights to prospect for only one year. The results will determine any arrangements for a steel industry entered into with Armco.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and passed.

### **NATIVES (CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS) ACT REPEAL BILL**

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and transmitted to the Assembly.

*House adjourned at 8.21 p.m.*

## **Legislative Assembly**

Thursday, the 19th August, 1971

The SPEAKER (Mr. Toms) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### **BILLS (4): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

1. Dried Fruits Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. H. D. Evans (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.
2. Mental Health Act Amendment Bill.
3. Suitors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.  
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Bertram (Attorney-General), and read a first time.
4. Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Bertram (Minister for Railways), and read a first time.

### **REPORT ON SHARE HAWKING**

#### *Printing*

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn—Attorney-General) [2.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Sixth Interim Report of the Company Law Advisory Committee on Share Hawking, laid upon the Table of the Legislative Assembly on the 20th July, 1971, be printed.

By way of a brief explanation I would point out to members that normally these interim reports are printed and tabled in the Parliaments of the other States. The people concerned being aware that the Parliament of Western Australia was sitting sooner than those in the east, and it being their desire to have this interim report printed as early as possible, I was requested to move to have it printed; hence the motion.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.23 p.m.]: I would appreciate comment from the Attorney-General as to the reason for this motion. Frankly I cannot see the import of it. Do I take in that action is being taken in this way to avoid the question of libel or something of that kind; hence its introduction into this Parliament to provide a medium through which the report can be printed and circulated as a public document, and also to have the protection of this House?

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn—Attorney-General) [2.24 p.m.]: The answer to that question is in the affirmative. I am striving as best I can to follow as nearly as possible the procedure adopted in other States.

Question put and passed.

## TOWN PLANNING: CORRIDOR PLAN

### *Appointment of Consultant: Motion*

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.25 p.m.]: I move—

This House is of the opinion that— whilst prepared to accept the principle of an appropriate examination of the so-called "Corridor Plan for Perth" if the Government has reservations about it—the Government should be condemned for its action in appointing a consultant whose hostile views towards the plan were already known to the Government.

Firstly, I want to express my appreciation to the Premier for the opportunity to introduce the motion at this time, as was arranged when we agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders yesterday; and also to the Deputy Premier who, when some changes were made because of the different sitting hours, reorganised the notice paper to make this possible.

I want to explain that this motion is introduced to condemn the Government for the breach of what we regard as a vital principle; namely, the employment of a consultant to make a study of and to report on an important plan, which plays a vital role in the life and the environment of the people in this community, when it was well known to the Government that the gentleman concerned had committed himself publicly in a way which was hostile to this particular corridor plan.

I want to make it very clear right from the start that the Opposition does not question the right or the propriety of the Government in seeking to obtain an independent opinion, so that this plan could be subjected to further study, and a report which could be considered by it if it has reservations either about the corridor planning principle or about the plan in detail. There is no argument about this so far as the Opposition is concerned.

We have accepted the fact that it is the right of an elected Government, if it so desires, to bring in some outside opinion. We also accept the fact that because the preparation of the corridor plan has been the work of many people over long periods of time, it does not of necessity make that plan sacred. Here again, there is no argument so far as the Government and the Opposition are concerned.

In fact, I am always a little cautious when experts agree, and I am reminded of a statement which I think was attributed to Sir Winston Churchill, but this was not original so far as he was concerned. The statement was: people should beware when the experts agree, because when they did they were sure to be wrong. I think he wrote an essay around this theme explaining that when everybody agreed on a subject there was less research and study of the problem, and that

often things of importance were overlooked. So, on this occasion we are not questioning for one moment the right or the propriety of the Government to seek competent outside opinion for the purpose of studying and reporting on this corridor plan, if the Government has reservations about either the concept of the planning, or the detail of the plan.

However, the crucial point is that if the Government has such reservations we believe it is duty bound to select somebody with competence and, above all, with the independence that is necessary to study this matter in an objective way, and then to bring forward a report which can be considered in balance with the views originally expressed. There are many such people around.

This matter is of such vital importance to the people who live in Western Australia at the present time, and those who will be living here in the generations to come, that, if necessary, we have to look beyond the confines of our own local community. I do not suggest that we have not the people here with the competence or the intelligence that is necessary. If need be, and if the Government has reservations, then I believe we should think very long and hard before we actually make any decision on the selection of somebody to undertake this independent study. We should make sure that we obtain someone who is sound, experienced, qualified, and above all independent; and he should not be precommitted to a particular point of view. I think this aspect of precommitment is very important.

Just imagine if we were to carry this procedure into the field of law! If one of our magistrates stood up at a "Pleasant Sunday Afternoon" function and expressed some rather powerful views about the Premier, myself, or some other member of this Chamber, and subsequently we found ourselves arraigned before him the next day, we would not feel cheerful; in fact he would not be allowed to hear the case. The magistrate would have to have a degree of independence in respect of this particular matter; he would not have been committed publicly previously in his views on the matter and about the person charged.

In the case before us it would not have been so bad had the Government not been prewarned about the views of this particular consultant. The Minister was warned; the public was warned. The public knew about this gentleman's views at that particular time. In spite of that the Government saw fit to make the appointment. This is a very bad aspect of it. It could happen that the Government might select a consultant, and after appointing the consultant in all good faith it could transpire that he developed a particular bias in respect of a technical or professional point of view. Of course, the

Government would not be expected to read the mind of the consultant. However, in this case the Government engaged a man who had committed himself publicly in opposition to the report. In fact, he was scathingly hostile to it, and in a few moments I will quote some of his public references in relation to the corridor plan.

Knowing the consultant's point of view, the matter did not end there. The Minister concerned gave his patronage to a publication which very strongly denounces the corridor plan. So it is not a question of it being an accidental appointment, or an appointment made in good faith without knowing this viewpoint. The Minister apparently knew of the text of the publication which is headed, *Perth Break Through or Break Down*, and was written by the consultant. According to Press reports the Minister had seen the text of the publication, not days, but some weeks before its actual publication. That means, in effect, that he saw the publication some weeks before the appointment because if I remember correctly the actual appointment coincided, within a matter of a day or so, with the release of the publication.

Whether or not the rest of Cabinet knew of the publication, of course, is something I do not know: Cabinet alone can answer that particular point. However, the Premier has said publicly that he did not know of the publication, but that he agreed with the appointment of the consultant. In fact, he still agrees with the appointment of the consultant even though he will now know about the book and, no doubt, have acquainted himself with its contents.

We believe that whether or not the Premier knew about the book, and whether or not any other Minister knew about the book, its existence and also the views of the particular consultant should have been known by the Minister concerned.

I assume the appointment followed the normal course. The Minister would have made a recommendation to Cabinet, and would have put forward his case. Cabinet would then have decided to go along with the recommendation. If Cabinet did not know the details, because they were not contained in the Minister's minute—or otherwise—then, of course, this does not absolve the Minister from the responsibility to inform the rest of Cabinet.

At this juncture it is well to have a look at the publication. I am certain, in my mind, that the Deputy Premier and Minister for Town Planning did not know he was to figure on a publication such as the one I have in my hand. Had he known he would have had second thoughts. It is rather a good picture of his face but his body is distorted. I understand from Press comments that the distortion is meant to represent a certain meaning.

Mr. Graham: No, that is an exact replica of the corridor plan.

Mr. COURT: It is meant to imply some form of distortion.

Mr. Graham: I know it is.

Mr. COURT: I was rather interested to see the magnificent portrait of the Deputy Premier in such a distorted pose. If I was in his position I would take out a writ for libel.

Mr. Graham: I have not the vanity of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. COURT: Let us not become involved. I am saying that had I not approved of such a portrait before it was published I would certainly require a complete withdrawal. Also, I would have taken some action because of the inference which could be drawn from the words used by the Minister.

I do not accept the explanation which has been given by the consultant for using these particular words. I give him 10 out of 10 for trying to find an explanation for those words, but I do not accept the explanation. If he made the comment to the Press "off the cuff" he should be given 10½ out of 10, if that is possible.

Mr. May: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should send a letter to Harry Black.

Mr. COURT: Yes, perhaps we should send it to him—my union secretary—for comment.

The very name of the publication *Perth Break Through or Break Down: A Crisis in Regional Planning* is hostile criticism. The book claims to be a publication to help public discussion based on a recent concentrated study of the problem.

I want to invite the attention of members to those very relevant and pertinent words in the publication, which are as follows:—

A Publication to help public discussion, based on a recent concentrated study of the problem . . .

Those words are significant because they do not say that it is a superficial study of the plan and the problem, but it refers to a "recent concentrated study" of the problem. This is probably more significant than most members might think on first hearing the words. Did this mean that the consultant was being engaged to undertake a serious study of a plan which he had condemned? We were given the impression that his studies were to start as of now. However, he has already admitted publicly that this study has taken place, so he is not making comments idly. The consultant states—

1. The new Minister for planning and industrial development is right to question the logic of zoning and the "Corridor Plan".

Not only the detail of the corridor plan, but the whole of the zoning concept which we in this Parliament have accepted long since. No-one has come up with anything satisfactory to demonstrate there should be a change. The alternative which the consultant contemplates is rather frightening. He went on—

2. The present system of planning has become crude and outdated. Better, workable methods are available. Safeguard, strategy, structure and performance planning have proved effective.
3. "Corridor Plan" is a vague cliché. The report of that name is unrealistic, inconsistent, and unimaginative. Better planning is urgently required.
4. The aim to limit the city workforce is a threat to the growth of the city, untenable and unnecessary.
5. The M.R.P.A. led Australia with its Regional Planning in the sixties. With initiative that lead can continue in the seventies.

That is not just doubt about the plan; that is straightout hostile condemnation of it. If he condemns the plan in view of its region and concept, and the method by which it was brought to being, then that means, of course, there is also a condemnation and castigation of the Commissioner of Town Planning, his chief planner, and all those who work with him. In my knowledge those people worked hard and long on the plan to bring it to completion.

I did not always agree with the planners, and I am sure they did not always agree with me on too many things. However, they were dedicated to their work and worked hard and long on this job, and were prepared to fight for their principles.

Mr. Graham: I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition agreed to such an extent that he tried to get rid of the Minister for Town Planning so that he could change his policy.

Mr. COURT: Who did?

Mr. Graham: You did.

Mr. COURT: Whoever told you that?

Mr. Graham: Reference was made to it more than once. You tried to do that but the Country Party would not let you.

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Premier has a most vivid imagination! I can tell him quite categorically that that happens to be completely untrue. The Premier of the day—now the Leader of the Opposition—would no doubt tell the Deputy Premier the same thing.

Mr. Graham: The dogs were barking it.

Mr. COURT: It is untrue, for a number of reasons.

Mr. Jamieson: Get back to reading the book.

Mr. COURT: The Minister for Works wants to extricate the Deputy Premier from his problem.

Mr. Jamieson: I thought the Deputy Leader of the Opposition might read the paragraph which appears on the back of the book.

Mr. COURT: I think that is vulgar and does not do any great credit to the man concerned, who wants to give us a more "sensitive form of planning". He speaks about "a finer life," yet he puts a thing like that on the back of his pamphlet. I do not indulge in that sort of thing and I do not think it becomes the author of the pamphlet to do it. He might think it is funny; I do not.

Mr. Graham: That is what was painted on the—

Mr. COURT: There are times and places for all sorts of things.

Mr. Graham: The Reverend Court of Nedlands!

Mr. COURT: I would not mind if I were elevated to that position. If some of us had more courage and moral fortitude, perhaps we would try to do something for the church.

Mr. Graham: You assume just about every other portfolio.

Mr. COURT: I am sure if there was a portfolio for religion it would not be given to the Deputy Premier; because, (a) he would not want it, and (b), they would not want him.

Mr. Graham: It would be a mutually satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. COURT: The holder of the portfolio would need a degree of independence.

Mr. Jamieson: He would need a degree of divinity.

Mr. COURT: On the first page inside the cover of his book the consultant refers to the method of approach. He says—

Blaming is an inefficient method of pinpointing weaknesses. To understand the full context of a situation leads logically to a more efficient pattern. This is the P.E.E.R. Institute method used in this report. It is an expression of discussions of many people over the last six years. I thank them all.

I come back to the point that these are not statements which have been made spontaneously and off the cuff; they have been thought out. The author has now seen fit to culminate his present thinking and studies in a very hostile condemnation of this plan. He refers to the fact that zoning is outdated, and to the need for a more sensitive method so that people's real needs are made the bases for decisions.

If one stops to think and divorces this from some very high-sounding words, one comes to the conclusion that he not only wants development based on urban sprawl—which I understood planners throughout the world had condemned long since—but he also wants to have our planning undertaken by a series of pressure groups. On reading his pamphlet one comes to the conclusion that his desire to allow development to react to the local need could lead to a situation that would get out of hand.

A strong group in a local authority or in an area under Government control could make up its mind to bring about a certain state of affairs, and it takes some very strong administrators and people in public life to be able to resist such groups. Therefore, we cannot lightly treat the fact that if we follow the suggestions of this gentleman we will finish up with a series of pressure groups.

I know that at the moment zoning has some limiting factors. One of them is it is very arbitrary—areas are allocated for industrial purposes, residential purposes, high rise flats, and all sorts of development—but the fact is that zoning, by its very nature, is restrictive to a certain extent. In my understanding, modern planners believe that with a better educated public, local authorities, and Government they can use the zoning system.

Mr. Graham: And better educated Oppositions.

Mr. COURT: I think the Government felt it had a very well educated Opposition last night.

Mr. Graham: Wrong again!

Mr. COURT: And a very responsible one. I come back to the point that the zoning principle, with all its limitations, is the best one we have been able to devise up to present time, and I think it is more the management of the plan—which I will deal with later—than the actual planning itself that creates problems with the zoning system.

I will not go into great detail as regards this pamphlet, although it is relevant. Among his other comments he expresses the view that under the present system it is a question of the tail wagging the dog. He says the M.R.P.A. has not got the power to defend itself against some of the more powerful departments. I do not know whether he is having a shot at the Minister for Works, but he speaks about "powerful commissions and departments" and "buckpassing." He even becomes involved in the Swan bauxite refinery. Then he speaks about "the corridors of death". It is very—

Mr. Jamieson: Picturesque, to say the least.

Mr. COURT: —picturesque and dramatic language. When one studies this pamphlet—as one must, because of the situation that has developed—one can only say that this is extravagant, intemperate language that does the cause of town planning no good whatsoever and only throws it into disrepute. Those who conceived this plan and brought it forward are now virtually accused of creating these "corridors of death" and having a lack of sensitivity.

Then we come to the public transport sector. As I read the pamphlet, at a time when we are saying, "Get people off the roads," the author is advocating that we put more people on the roads. To my mind, the great problem that faces Governments and transportation agencies throughout the world in the future is to get people off the roads rather than on to them.

The author makes one or two suggestions as to how transport can be handled; they are mainly directed towards having more people working in Perth. By virtue of the remarks I made at the beginning of my speech on this matter, I acknowledge that one does not accept the figure of 90,000 as being the right one for the optimum number of people working in Perth, but the advisers of the Government of the day and the present Government had to come up with some figure on which they could base the corridor plan and the P.R.T.S. report. They had to fix a figure from which to start to plan and work.

I believe that most of us took the longer view in this matter. I will be quite frank and say that I felt 90,000 was only a working figure, and that in the course of time the figure would be increased. It is a matter of history throughout the world that a city is built to hold so many people and, because of the human instinct to get together, ultimately there are more people in a particular area than were planned for.

It is not, in itself, a very critical figure, but the principle enunciated by the author is rather worrying, inasmuch as he is trying to change the concept of limiting the number in the city proper and introduce an entirely new concept. Perhaps he is right, but in view of the way he has committed himself in this matter, and in view of the hostility with which he has committed himself, I do not believe he is the person who should undertake this examination on behalf of the Government—bearing in mind that he would also be undertaking it on behalf of the people in the State, because people have to live in the areas.

I come to the last point I want to mention in connection with this pamphlet; that is, the question of sprawl. I must admit I am completely confused. Some years ago, this gentleman gave me a very convincing explanation of why urban sprawl had to

be avoided at all costs. He was so convincing about it that I said, "That sounds sensible to me." I must admit I had not been indoctrinated into the corridor concept and some of the other things for which high-falutin phrases are used, but I accepted the fact that the urban sprawl—which was the "in thing" to condemn at the time—should be avoided when decisions were being made by Ministers—particularly those involved in developmental portfolios. But apparently things have now changed. It is like economics; we get a new catchphrase every day.

Mr. Graham: What do you mean by the term "sprawl"? I think we should get our definitions straight. Would you say a city which stretches 100 miles to the north and south, as contemplated in the corridor plan, is a sprawling city?

Mr. COURT: My understanding of sprawl is that it is something which flows out like ink in water and it just grows like Topsy because that is the convenient and easy way to do it. As I understand it, this is what occurs if we just let things happen.

Mr. Graham: You believe, then, in ribbon development stretching 100 miles from one side of the city to the other?

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Premier unwittingly has been reading my mind because when this corridor plan was first enunciated I went to one of the very prominent old town planners of this State who did a lot of work for the Government and who is now active here, interstate, and overseas and I said to him, "It is only 10 years since you were telling me about the curses of ribbon development. Is not corridor development an adaptation of that?" I received a simple, fourth-standard lesson on why corridor development is not ribbon development. I understand that corridor planning is not the type of ribbon development we used to deplore, such as occurred in Victoria Park.

Mr. Graham: It is very many times longer.

Mr. COURT: It is orderly planning of a series of environments—or something of that nature—and it could go for more than 100 miles.

Mr. Graham: Yes, the orderly development of ribbons.

Mr. COURT: No; that is not the concept which was put to me. At the time my first reaction was exactly the same as the Minister is expressing now. I would have imagined that in the course of his activities during the last five months the Minister would have studied this matter in much more detail than his attitude suggests, and I would have imagined he understands what is meant by corridor development. However, the gentleman who converted me from urban sprawl—if I needed converting—to this more

modern concept of corridor planning now says "urban sprawl is not a horrible alternative to 'corridor planning.' Both can make sense and look good. Neighbourhoods with continuous linear parks and reserves can turn tedium into treasure hunt and sprawl into tasty spread." I love that language. It really gets me in.

I think I have said enough about the pamphlet to indicate that quite apart from any other public utterances arising from the appointment or from Press interviews the consultant has, by his own words, made out a case as to why he should not be appointed to undertake this particular task in the form that we understand it to have been assigned. In other words, why pay \$5,000 for something one can get for 30c; and, what is more important, one does not have to wait until January to get it.

I would like to know the feelings of the M.R.P.A. people. I understand from the comments of the Minister which have appeared in the Press that the commissioner (Mr. Lloyd) knew that this appointment was to be made. He was told about it, but I do not know whether he was consulted about it. However, the other members of the authority were not told of it and I should imagine they are most unhappy about the appointment. If I was in their professional position—and realising the dedication they have shown towards their work, and the great hopes they held for their plan—I think I would be justifiably upset.

I do not think they can object at all to the fact that the Government might say that, owing to reservations it had, it wished to obtain a competent, independent authority to have a look at the matter, to set out its point of view, and to come up with an independent report. But that cannot be done because the consultant already has made his views clear.

I would like to know from the Minister just what was the reaction of the members of the M.R.P.A. because I understand they have completely and unanimously supported the corridor plan. I should imagine that, having made their submission to the Government, and having made it public, the officers would feel hurt that this method of approach has been adopted. Knowing them as I do, I cannot imagine that they would have objected to an independent report.

The other point on which I would like some information from the Minister is this: What is to be the Government's attitude towards the P.R.T.S. report? I am mindful of the fact that when the report was first released, and it is indeed a comprehensive document, prepared in a painstaking manner—

Mr. Jamieson: Put it away, quick.

Mr. COURT: I know the Minister is embarrassed because Mr. Chamberlain said it should be placed in the nearest pigeonhole.

Mr. Jamieson: I think I might have said that.

Mr. COURT: I know Mr. Chamberlain said it officially, so I presume that is the official doctrine. When this document was widely circulated the then Leader of the Opposition—now the Premier—reflected his spontaneous thoughts on the report by saying that the plan was sensible, imaginative, and practical. Seeing that it was off the cuff to my mind it was not a bad comment, and it indicates that the then Leader of the Opposition personally supported the plan. I might add as an aside that the comment came as a breath of fresh air to us because any Government wonders how a plan will be received by the public, and if the Opposition says it is sensible, imaginative, and practical, then the Government knows that on at least one matter there is unanimity of thought. However, I understand the Labor Party has since changed its thinking on this matter.

For reasons of its own which have not yet been disclosed, the Labor Party does not propose to proceed with the plan, and we think the Minister should let us know what is the policy of his Government in respect of the P.R.T.S. report; because it is very much intertwined with the work to be undertaken by the consultant—if the Government proceeds with the appointment. Whether one likes it or not, the fact is that the P.R.T.S. report could not be produced without close consultation with the M.R.P.A. corridor plan, and when we accept one, in many respects we accept the other.

I understand that when this was explained by Dr. Nielson at a university function the consultant who has been appointed by the Government spoke in most laudatory terms in respect of this concept. Of course, once one accepts this transport concept one also accepts the corridor plan concept because they dovetail together. I hope the Minister will be able to give us some information on this aspect because as I see it at the moment there is a danger of interminable delays in planning and we could finish up with chaos, confusion, and uncertainty in our planning.

The next point about which I think the Minister has a responsibility to give the House an explanation is this: What will be the attitude of the Government when it receives the report from the consultant? If the consultant says the corridor plan should be scrapped or amended in some way in regard to important details, what will happen? Are we to bring in somebody else to rethink the whole matter and redesign it, or are we to ask the M.R.P.A. and the staff of the Town Planning Department to undertake the work? Are we to bring in some independent consultants? We cannot expect the poor chaps whose plan has been cast aside to carry out the work of the new man

with great enthusiasm. Are we to start this matter all over again; because if that is to be done there will be not only uncertainty, but also interminable delay. This is yet another point I believe the Government must explain to Parliament.

I believe the Government has been less than frank with us in regard to the reasons for its taking this action. The Minister concerned expressed in very clear terms immediately after his appointment that he was not very keen on the corridor plan and that is when concern was generated in the mind of the public because when uncertainty occurs planning is thrown into discredit and, in some respects, it can be thrown even into discard.

The Minister seems to be very sensitive about this issue. For instance, he has expressed himself very strongly about the qualifications of the consultant. We all know the consultant. He has been in this community for some years. Ever since he has been here he seems to have taken up the role of bucking the official viewpoint to a degree that many people question his motives. I know it is not a bad thing if people do challenge the official viewpoint from time to time, but the criticism has to be constructive and if it is levelled too often in the role of a local "stirrer" such a person loses credibility and the impact of what he does ceases to have the same effect and the same value in the community as it would otherwise have.

Mr. Graham: I think you are revealing your true character. You were going for the assassination of two people last night in Parliament and you are doing a somewhat similar thing this afternoon. I think that is pretty typical.

Mr. COURT: How can we discuss this matter of great importance without referring to the role of the person concerned?

Mr. Graham: You are not referring; you are reflecting on his integrity, his behaviour, and everything else.

Mr. COURT: This is the person who is publicly hostile to the corridor plan and the Minister has made him a consultant to advise the Government.

Mr. Graham: So therefore that makes him a public rogue, does it?

Mr. COURT: Who said he was a public rogue? The Minister, in the Press, has made a public issue of the fact that he is concerned about his integrity. Many statements have appeared about filthy lies being spoken of the Minister and he has protested so much he has made it a public issue.

Mr. Graham: I am still waiting for you to make statements outside Parliament that I am dishonest.

Mr. Graham: Lots of people have been saying it.

Mr. COURT: Who has been saying that?

Mr. COURT: People say lots of things about us, too. If the Minister feels strongly about these statements I think he should pursue them and identify the people making them.

Mr. Graham: That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. COURT: In public life this sort of thing is on all the time.

Mr. Graham: Criticism, yes.

Mr. COURT: Criticism and vilification, and I admit all sorts of things go on. If a person continually stops in his tracks and reacts as the Minister does, he must expect to hit the headlines. He even appeared on a dramatic billboard!

Mr. Graham: I can see that there are undertones of jealousy. The member for Nedlands is always there, but he missed out once or twice.

Mr. COURT: If the Minister wants to be in that atmosphere he can be in it alone. There was one statement to the effect "I do not own a grain of sand in the corridor" that was made by the Minister, but I do not know that anybody said he did. He also made reference to "filthy lies" being told about him. I do not want to get involved in this, but I would point out that we on this side of the House have never made such statements, despite what the Minister may say.

Mr. Graham: You show me where I said that anybody on your side of the House said that.

Mr. COURT: The Minister made a remark in answer to an interjection which was something like, "Why don't we say it outside?"

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Williams): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. COURT: Very well, Sir. I will return to the remarks I was making about the consultant who has been appointed to advise the Minister.

If we weigh this appointment in proper balance we will find that in the estimate of the public and in the estimate of most people in this place, it was a most unfortunate appointment. I thought the man concerned had settled down in the community to play a constructive role for a while. When he first came to this State he was involved in a great deal of controversy, but in recent times he has been playing a constructive role in the community and I was even getting to like the bloke. He is a breezy sort of person. He has some very

constructive ideas and some very provocative ones, and it is most unfortunate that—

Mr. Graham: It is a most unfortunate expression you have used. Gorton said that about Johnson and both are now figures of the past. He said, "I like the bloke."

Mr. COURT: I did not want to put the "fix" on the poor fellow. I make the point that it is unfortunate he has become embroiled in this matter. It always seems that when he has a major publication coming out he gets involved in this sort of controversy. Perhaps it is not a bad way to get some publicity for the book. I am not referring to the 30c pamphlet.

The Minister in one of his statements criticising the corridor plan referred to the distance a worker would have to travel from his home to his place of employment. This is a matter about which the Minister should think very seriously because often part of the economy of some of these overseas countries is such that they endeavour to have their employees living as close as possible to their place of employment. However, in these countries they are now adopting a new concept. They want to ensure that the environment in which people work is in fact a pleasant one, because they have now come to realise that, in the right circumstances, this brings about a sharp upturn in productivity.

Mr. Graham: That is not in dispute, anyhow.

Mr. COURT: I cannot find the Press cutting I want to bring to the Minister's attention in which he was reported as saying, in answer to a question by the State Executive of the A.L.P., that there was no plan for an industrial area in the Swan Valley. As I understood the Minister's answer, he gave an assurance that there would be no industrial area established north of the city. Perhaps I will find the Press cutting before I conclude.

Mr. Graham: I said there was no plan for an industrial area in that locality.

Mr. COURT: It is my understanding that there is. My understanding is that a series of areas will be created to bring about decentralisation of industry.

Mr. Graham: My statement was made in respect of what is called the Swan Valley area.

Mr. COURT: I will accept that as being a logical answer, because at the time the question by the State Executive of the A.L.P. was directed to the Minister in respect of the Swan Valley area. However, another issue was raised in that if the refinery went into that area now proposed by the Government it would finish up being a major industrial area.

The point I am trying to make is that I would like to feel the Government would, in fact, endeavour to encourage the right type of development north of Perth. I



have now found the Press cutting I was looking for and I will quote it to the House. It is taken from the *Daily News* of Tuesday, the 17th August, and it reads as follows:—

**Industry—'No Plan'**

There was no plan for a general industrial area in the vicinity of the Swan Valley alumina refinery, said the Minister for Industrial Development, Mr. Graham.

Mr. Graham was answering a question from the executive.

The executive had asked Mr. Graham if plans existed for an industrial area north of the city and in the vicinity of the proposed refinery.

The executive referred to in that article is, of course, the State Executive of the A.L.P. Therefore I presume the Minister's answer related to the refinery area and not to the area north of Perth. I thought the Minister would be seeking decentralisation which, correctly practised, means that it applies both in metropolitan areas and in rural areas. It is just a question of degree whether the distance is 200 miles, or 10, 15, or 20 miles.

I believe the Government has a very serious question to answer if it is not to be condemned for taking this point of view. It is unfortunate that when a person gets involved in appointments of this kind he also gets involved in the reputations of individuals, but I think most people understand that this is not a question of the man's personal professional capacity; it is just a question of the peculiar nature of the circumstances of an appointment in which the Government has allowed itself to be committed.

I come back to the basic point on which I started. Here is a professional man of international repute, and we are not questioning his qualifications at all. However, he has said categorically that he opposes the plan. He is hostile to it and he has made the most scathing criticism of it. He has absolutely condemned it. But now he has been appointed to make a study of it and report to the Government. How can he report except in the way it is known he feels?

He has already committed himself to an entirely different type of planning; and we on this side are very worried as to where we are going. If in five or six months he submits an entirely different concept of planning which means a complete rethink of all the work done, a confusing situation will arise. How do we know that if a different plan is produced, another Mr. X will not be engaged by another Government to do the same thing all over again?

By all means submit the plan to scrutiny. Let it be studied by independent people who are competent and experienced—but, above all, submit it to some-

one who is independent and not to a person who has publicly committed himself in condemnation of it. I therefore commend the motion to the House.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta—Minister for Town Planning) [3.12 p.m.]: I was interested to hear what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had to say for the very reason that I wanted to find out whether he had a substantial argument in favour of the proposition he placed on the notice paper some days ago. Needless to state, in common, no doubt, with yourself, Mr. Speaker, I was bitterly disappointed.

**Mr. Court:** We have heard you start that way before.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition himself was so concerned about this matter that notwithstanding the fact that an announcement was made on the 4th August he had to await the promptings and stirring from other sources before he moved into action on the 12th August by giving notice of his intention to move this resolution, very cleverly squirming around the notice paper to ensure a week or so would elapse before it was debated.

**Mr. Court:** We do not dictate the notice paper.

**Mr. O'Neil:** The Government arranges the notice paper.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Let us consider the attitude of the previous Government to this its child—known as the corridor plan. If one has regard for the document itself—and it is quite a volume—one will see that it was submitted by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority in November, 1970, and the then Government was so proud of it that no public mention whatever was made of it. It was left with the new Government within its first couple of weeks in office to be confronted with this plan which finds so much favour with the present Opposition.

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority—and let me say this is no reflection on the authority; I am merely putting the record straight—comprises 12 persons of whom only one is a town planner. I think the record ought to be put straight here because the concept we are asked to accept is that there are 12 persons who are skilled and academically qualified in the matter of town planning. It is perfectly true that they have access to advisers who have these qualifications, but the authority itself is composed in the manner I have indicated, and there is no need for me to go through the process of pointing out the various interests they represent.

In any event, under its authority a plan was produced—a concept for the development of the capital city of Western Australia to extend over a long period. It

was to be a pattern and I presume the intention was that it would be proceeded with and that that would be it. To be perfectly frank—and I have said this before—if the plan is accepted, in my view within a period, short or long, the features of the plan will destroy themselves; because I cannot believe that forever and a day we can have cow paddocks seven miles from the heart of the city whilst at the same time we are extending the confines of that city 50 miles north and 50 miles south of the centre. To me it does not make particular sense, but I am a layman as is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Court: You will see sheep within two or three miles of many great cities of the world and they have been there for thousands of years.

Mr. GRAHAM: Lots of other things are to be seen there, too, but the deputy leader is, I suppose, as skilled a town planner as am I.

This was a concept submitted to the Government; it is the responsibility of the Government to make a decision, and in due course it will do so. This plan has the support of professional advisers—those employed by the Town Planning Department which has access to authorities throughout Australia and other parts of the world.

The plan has been criticised and supported. Some people have supported it with reservations, but most people have been confused and do not understand it. Amongst those who expressed some reservations about it, or opposition to it—use whatever word we like—was a gentleman called Councillor Paul Ritter, a town planner. There is nothing secret about the whole proposition. Indeed, the statement I submitted to the Press contained these words—

Mr. Ritter is known to have reservations regarding the corridor proposals.

I went on to say that he would have no limitations imposed on his inquiries and findings, and that he was at perfect liberty to draw whatever conclusions he liked following his intensive and analytical study.

He has been engaged so that the Government will have authoritative, professional advice in favour of the scheme and authoritative, professional advice against the scheme. Who can determine the merits of the subject without having heard both sides? What purpose would be served by calling in someone else merely to give a blessing to what has been produced? The Government has, of course, committed the cardinal sin of wanting to be fully informed on all aspects of the case, for and against!

Mr. Court: We are not questioning this at all. We are questioning the way you have gone about it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government has a sense of responsibility. This plan will make an impact upon the lives and the fortunes of countless thousands of people now and in our day, as well as in the years to come; and for this reason it is desirable—indeed, it is a duty and an obligation—that the Government make absolutely certain that before this document or concept receives official blessing, the whole of the facts and circumstances are known. This of course is something which it would appear is foreign to the concept of the late Government—

Sir David Brand: It is not.

Mr. GRAHAM: —for which reason this motion has been produced.

Mr. Court: We go along with that concept, but we are objecting to the method you have used.

Mr. GRAHAM: What does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mean by that?

Mr. Court: You are bringing in someone who is publicly committed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will have some reservations about that observation if he will contain himself for a few more minutes.

Mr. Court: You will need to be very good.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have appointed a person with the highest academic qualifications. That cannot be denied. He is a professional man who is internationally acclaimed. That cannot be denied. He is a man who has written technical volumes which have been universally acclaimed and accepted. That cannot be denied. He has been invited to submit papers and give talks to many countries of the civilised world. He has been called to give his professional advice to public authorities both in Australia and in other parts of the world. This is the person who is being traduced under parliamentary privilege by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Court: He is not being traduced at all. Why don't you be fair and stick to the facts? We are complaining about the principle. I never mentioned his name at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am complaining about the lack of principle. One would have thought that this was an entirely new development. In round figures, for the three years to the 30th September last, the late Government spent no less than \$5,000,000 obtaining the services of outside people. Indeed, I was astounded, shocked, and horrified to learn that in the remaining five months of office of the late, unlamented Government—that is, from the

1st October to the 3rd March this year—another \$1,000,000 of public money had been spent in the way of consultation.

I have made a list of some of the high-faluting names and titles given to these excursions by outside people who make checks on matters which are the prerogative of Government. I have them here as I have taken them from the official list. There have been inquiries, studies, reports, examinations, investigations, research, surveys, consultations, planned preparation, advice, analyses, reviews, determinations, feasibilities, viabilities, evaluations, organisational studies, and a whole host of others without any titles.

Mr. Court: That is normal.

Mr. GRAHAM: In less than three and a half years these have cost the taxpayers \$6,000,000.

Mr. Court: You would not have avoided one of these had you been the Government. I went through them yesterday as a matter of curiosity. If you deny these things, you deny projects such as the standard gauge, the Ord River, and a dozen wonderful schemes.

Mr. GRAHAM: All I can say is that he who is without sin should cast the first stone. The Government spent \$6,000,000 in three and a half years for outside consultations.

Mr. Court: You never cease to amaze me. No-one is questioning the cost.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, I have told people, including some of the newer members of this Parliament, of this cost and they said it is unbelievable, absurd, and could not be true. It is a public scandal.

Mr. Court: What are you talking about?

Mr. GRAHAM: The sum of \$6,000,000 which was spent in three and a half years by the previous Government on outside consultations.

Mr. Court: I suggest the Deputy Premier should be careful, because I intend to ask him questions about the ones he would not have gone on with.

Mr. GRAHAM: A great deal of our expenditure is being incurred in consequence of what the previous Government did. We find it is inescapable and unavoidable.

There is a suggestion, of course, of some bias—that Mr. Ritter will not properly engage himself in this study. Mr. Speaker, you and I know he is a professional man of standing and would not and could not run the risk of doing other than prepare an analysis which is capable of being defended by town planners, architects, and other specialists in their particular spheres who are concerned with this problem.

Sir David Brand: Has he not run the same risk by what he has already published?

Mr. GRAHAM: He published a short document for the purpose of arousing public discussion and in that respect I should say he has been eminently successful. Even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this afternoon posed as a town planner and told us of various forms of development—

Mr. Court: I did nothing of the sort.

Mr. GRAHAM: —and why scheme A is preferable to scheme B. I prefer to await the report of Mr. Ritter. The Government will have regard for its contents measured against the report submitted by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

Mr. Court: Those poor fellows at the M.R.P.A.

Mr. GRAHAM: I like this "but" effort on the part of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who says he does not object to there being an inquiry, "but." Then, of course, he went about his business. We have seen many instances of that in comparatively recent times.

We were informed that a vital principle was involved. We were told that here was a man who has developed an attitude towards a question and the Government has had the temerity to engage him, knowing his general approach.

Mr. Court: You finish up getting a tame consultant this way. That is the allegation you leave yourself open to.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will have the right of reply later.

Mr. GRAHAM: Without departmental officers to prompt him and if I remind him, I wonder whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will be able to recall that his Government engaged a distinguished gentleman to give it further advice on the inner ring road concept which was submitted by the same body, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. The late Government called in a person of no less standing than Professor Gordon Stephenson who, prior to his appointment, had announced his attitude towards that scheme. He was fully in accord with it. He came out fully in support of the scheme again after he carried out his study at the cost of many thousands of dollars, which cost I have not had time to check; otherwise I would quote the exact figure.

Meanwhile, a gentleman by the name of Ritter had expressed his opposition to it. Strangely enough, history has been written and all the points submitted by Professor Stephenson have either been deferred or discarded. Consequently, appointing somebody who has an opinion is a sin when committed by our Government, but it is not a sin when committed by the previous Government. The important difference, however, is that the previous Government was a little jelly-like and wobbly at the knees. It wanted some propping up and

sought additional fortification. In this case, our Government is seeking an opposite view so that it may be like any magistrate or jury and, after hearing the case pro and con, be in a far better position to give a determination than could otherwise happen.

I wonder, too, whether the memories of the late Government have been exceedingly short in another respect. That Government, which the public dispensed with a few months ago—

Mr. Thompson: After 12 years.

Mr. GRAHAM: —called in an American firm of architects by name of Owen, Skidmore, and Malle, who prepared a scheme for the development of the Perth Railway Station site.

The SPEAKER: I think we are starting to drift a little from the motion.

Mr. GRAHAM: If you will allow me two more sentences, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that this illustration is more apposite than anything else I have said. It will be straight down the line.

Mr. Thompson: The railway line?

Mr. GRAHAM: The corridor. This firm came up with a concept which was condemned publicly at a meeting in the Perth Town Hall. This was the night of the foundation of the New Heart for Perth Society at which a gentleman by the name of Paul Ritter expressed his complete opposition to the concept of the proposed development. Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, shortly afterwards the then Government appointed Mr. Paul Ritter to investigate and make a report at a fee of \$2,000. He completed his report in 10 days.

Mr. Court: What are you complaining about?

Mr. GRAHAM: These are the people who are complaining that Mr. Ritter has adopted an attitude and, therefore, is unfit to undertake this study.

Mr. Court: An entirely different set of circumstances.

Mr. GRAHAM: This study should take about four or five months and the fee payable to Mr. Ritter would be \$4,000 plus an additional amount up to \$1,000 for any publications or tables which may be involved. The carping critics at the present moment are the people who appointed the same individual. At that time he had declared his attitude in the same circumstances as now, yet they paid him \$2,000 for 10 days' work. Could hypocrisy—

Mr. Court: An isolated single question; quite different from this instance.

Mr. May: What a ripper!

Mr. Court: An isolated single question.

Mr. GRAHAM: The biter is well and truly bit. Lengthy essays appearing in the official files match accurately the

essay appearing on the notice paper. This would indicate that the moment the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is separated from his records and files his mind is a blank. He entirely overlooks the fact that what he now criticises is exactly the same decision as that made by the Brand-Court Liberal Government.

Mr. Court: No, there was an entirely different—

Mr. GRAHAM: There was no criticism on the part of the Opposition on that occasion. I am wondering whether there is something sinister in this criticism. Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suspect something will occur to upset his plans if a well-documented contrary opinion is produced?

Mr. Court: I have no plans at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition afraid that an analysis of the proposals will overwhelmingly point to developments in another direction?

Mr. Court: You could be more specific. You are the one who is complaining about people making these so-called innuendoes, scurrilous lies, and so on. You are making a nasty insinuation now. I have no plans, thank goodness.

Mr. GRAHAM: Once again the honourable member's logic leaves him. I have said if anybody has a complaint, let us inquire into it. Let them make the charges.

Mr. Court: You make the charges to us.

Mr. GRAHAM: All we are saying is let there be an inquiry. There seems to be a sensitiveness in all directions about a full and complete inquiry undertaken by somebody who has some doubts or reservations about the scheme.

Mr. Court: We have not opposed an inquiry into the plan. We have made this clear; it is even in the motion. You are getting excited about nothing. You are getting to be like your leader; he has these inverted pyramids which start to sway.

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Nedlands is at it again.

Mr. Jamieson: We have had this pyramid swaying.

Mr. GRAHAM: The facts speak for themselves. Surely there is nothing new or novel in this type of inquiry. Perhaps this plan embodies the finest concept possible for the future development of the Perth metropolitan area. Perhaps it embodies a tragic set of circumstances for the citizens of today whose properties are affected and the citizens of tomorrow whose lives may be affected.

This is an important decision for a Government to make, and therefore it should be welcomed that the Government

is anxious to obtain the fullest information without fear and without favour when it approaches the tremendous task and responsibility of making an order. After all, the plan was made available to the public some five months ago. There has been free discussion and there has been no restriction placed upon members of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority or on the Town Planning Department. Officers have been free to lecture groups, societies and organisations, to explain the plan in detail and to state its virtues as they see them.

This Government has nothing to hide. This Government does not want to make a biased decision. This Government wants to be in a position to make a decision worthy of responsible Government; that and no more. It has chosen a person of international standing to undertake this inquiry and because the Liberal Party does not like him it criticises the whole inquiry.

Although I have mentioned it earlier, to keep the record straight I must repeat that after Mr. Ritter publicly proclaimed he was opposed to a proposition put forward by the previous Government, he was nevertheless given a fee to undertake a study, prepare a document, and submit proposals for an alternative development. Let us forget the personalities; on that occasion Mr. Ritter was proved to be right. The recommendations and proposals that he submitted were accepted by the Brand-Liberal Government.

Mr. Gayfer: Liberal-Country Party Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Brand-Nalder Liberal-Country Party Government, if we give it its long title.

Mr. Gayfer: I just want to see you smile again.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have had direct association with town planning for a period of less than six months. I am aware of the impact that town planning decisions can have upon the lives and the livelihood of the people. There would be very few members of this House of any political party who have not appealed to me, as the Minister in that short period, to exercise my judgment in order to provide relief. These people did not preface their letters with words that the decision was made by highly-qualified competent officers of integrity, and therefore I should demur in seeking to take contrary action. There was no suggestion of that whatever. There were great water works, teardrops on their correspondence, pleading and begging that I should intervene in order to do something to relieve the plight of these people whose affairs had been interfered with by decisions of constituted authority.

I can say that in addition to a softening of the policy previously in existence, there has been a more generous and accommodating attitude over the last six months

than previously existed. I can say that more sympathy and attention has been given to people affected by town planning decisions. If this is the course followed in respect of a single individual, how much more necessary is it that the Minister for Town Planning, the Government, and finally members of this Parliament, should have all the facts available to them in order to make the right decisions.

It would be a simple matter for you, Sir, or for myself to have regard for the terrain, or the maps which are unfolded before us and to make decisions based on them and to suggest wonderful concepts. I think it is necessary, however, that the human aspect should have some rights in the matter, because it is somebody else's property that is being affected; somebody else's rights which are being eroded; or somebody else's home, livelihood, future, or family, which is being affected. All these human aspects must be taken into consideration.

The attitude of this Government—to date anyhow—has been that whilst those are not the only factors that are involved they do, nevertheless, play a most important part. Accordingly, when we look at the broad outline of the proposed corridor plan, I am as certain as I stand here, and party politics aside—and I do not know the individual feelings of every member on this side of the House—there must be certain doubts in the minds of members as to whether this is a feasible proposition; whether it is feasible to have these long arms approximately 100 miles from north to south; to have the city developing in that form with two other spurs, one to the east and one to the south-east. I repeat: it may well be proper and it may well be the ideal concept, but I do not feel or know that at the present moment.

I am not the person who will make the decision—if this is to be the decision; and if there are to be any great modifications the matter will, ultimately, come to Parliament. The Government has done nothing wrong. The motion before us should, in fact, be commending the Government for seeking alternative professional advice to provide it with the other side of the story in order that the Government might be better equipped to make a final decision. Mr. Ritter—notwithstanding the slurs cast on him by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Court: No slurs were cast.

Mr. GRAHAM: —is a man who is internationally acclaimed; a man who is familiar with Perth, its climate, its people, with its environs and with every other facet of the city. This being so we should forget about the political issue which is before us at the present time.

In view of what I have said it can be construed that the motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was conceived, not because it was felt there was

anything wrong—because the move came more than a week after the announcement was made—but because the Opposition, desperately thrusting in every direction, thought that here it had found something; it felt that if it kept on firing darts for long enough one might eventually hit the bull's eye.

The submission made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is completely out of bounds, and just in case there should be any doubt about the matter, I inform the House I oppose the motion.

**MR. HARTREY** (Boulder-Dundas) [3.44 p.m.]: It appears to me that the mover of the motion to a considerable extent, and the Minister who spoke to the motion to a somewhat lesser extent, have lost track of what is really intended in the motion.

The motion is a vote of censure, not of Mr. Ritter, but of the Government for doing something which the Government has been very wise and very right in doing.

Mr. Court: I thought we had made that clear.

**Mr. HARTREY:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition justly deserves the high reputation he has earned in this House for his equable temperament and his equitable principles. He has not, however, at all enhanced that reputation this afternoon by introducing this motion.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has fallen into the pardonable, but gross error, of confusing the functions of the judge with the functions of the advocate.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.06 p.m.*

**Mr. HARTREY:** When the very welcome tea suspension arrived I had just charged the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with falling into the pardonable but gross error of confusing the functions of a judge with the functions of an advocate. The honourable member specifically alluded to legal procedure, and asked what would we think of a magistrate who on a pleasant Sunday afternoon occasion stated very strong views about a certain legal matter, and then we had to appear before him as accused persons charged with the offence against which the magistrate was so prejudiced. Of course, that is not a fair analogy at all.

Mr. Court: I said it would never happen.

**Mr. HARTREY:** Magistrates in such cases must be impartial, but advocates would be all the better for not being impartial. Some of us might have had the good fortune to read the book by Lord Macaulay on the life of Warren Hastings. Those who have may remember that Warren Hastings was impeached by the House of Commons, and that his trial lasted a historic seven years. When the House of Commons appointed the managers of the impeachment—that is, the

prosecutors who organised the impeachment on behalf of the House of Commons and arraigned the accused before the House of Lords—the Commons refused to accept Sir Philip Francis as one of the managers, on the ground that he had a personal grudge against Warren Hastings.

Lord Macaulay, who years later became an eminent member of the House of Commons, pointed out that this was a foolish decision, because it had never been regarded as any disqualification of a prosecutor that he genuinely believed in the guilt of the accused; in fact, this is a qualification, whereas it would be a great disqualification in the case of a jurymen or judge.

We have before us the question of which form of development should be adopted by the Government, and ultimately I suppose industrial development depends upon the decision of the Minister. If he has expressed a bias and a completely narrow-minded view already it might perhaps be proper for the House to censure him for having prematurely expressed that view.

However, we have before us a motion to censure the Government for having turned to an advocate of a different sort of development from that which the previous Government apparently favoured, so that both sides might be adequately presented to the judge. One of the first principles of good legal procedure is expressed in the Latin phrase *audi alteram partem*—or “hear the other side.” What we are being criticised for by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is for doing just that very thing.

We have all read in weighty tomes the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's views on the corridor plan. I certainly have no qualification which would enable me to determine whether the corridor plan is good or bad; and certainly I have no information to which I can pay any attention in order to form an expert viewpoint. However, if I know that a man of outstanding qualifications—I say this because in the House the other afternoon when the qualifications of Mr. Ritter were read out by the Minister, it must have taken him fully 60 seconds to go through the list of qualifications—and with a very good practical knowledge of the immediate environment with which we are dealing has a different opinion from that expressed in the weighty tomes of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, then I think it is very admirable that the Government should hear the other side. If the Government knows there is available a very capable man who is convinced of the truth of the other viewpoint, he is just the kind of man to be appointed.

Mr. Court: This is not a question of a man being on trial, but of getting a technical opinion.

Mr. HARTREY: Obtaining an opinion from one side is valuable, but obtaining two technical opinions representing diametrically opposite points of view may quite easily be of much more value. For the sake of argument let us assume that in the study of medicine there are conflicting theories on the causes of hypertension. The prevailing theory is that this might be due to a deficiency in the kidneys; but someone might come forward with the idea that it has little to do with the kidneys, but is more concerned with heart action or the cholesterol content of the blood. I would not like to pass an opinion on a subject like that, but if I had to make a determination as a judge I would want to hear competent opinions from both sides, representing the different points of view. It may then be possible for me to weigh up, to listen to, and to appreciate the specialised knowledge that has been conveyed to me; and I may then be able to make a determination based on that opinion.

Mr. Rushton: There is no criticism of that in the motion.

Mr. HARTREY: That is exactly what the Minister is doing. He has said this: "I know the case for the corridor plan. I do not know the case against it, but Mr. Ritter does. I will ask him to go into the matter, to give me a technical and detailed account of what his theories are, and to justify it with his conclusions and his facts. If he is able to persuade me I will drop the corridor scheme, but if he is not I will adhere to it." That is the proper thing to do, and that is the correct judicial course to follow. For a man of the judicial temperament of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to accuse the Government of doing the wrong thing in this case is not equitable or in line with the opinions he has espoused and for which he is famous. It is not necessary for me to say anything more on that score.

Mr. Ritter has the courage of his convictions. He has been criticised, because he has used poetic language. If the capacity to use poetic language is a disqualification in town planning, I would like to know the reason. Any streak of interest in the arts, and anything which is intelligent or emotional in a professional man, should be encouraged. I do not know whether it is necessary for a town planner to possess any sense of beauty, but I think he should. In my view a talent for poetic language shows an instinct for beauty.

I think it is very nice if one can convert an urban sprawl into a tasty spread. It shows that the person who framed the idea has enough imagination to convert stodgy language into attractive language; and he might have enough imagination to convert stodgy urban development into attractive urban development. Such talent in an architect is much needed in Perth

in these days, because everywhere we look we can see gigantic skyscrapers being constructed, like matchboxes or children's blocks in design. If only those concerned with the design of these buildings have anything like the imagination of Mr. Ritter, as appears from his words, the city of Perth will look more beautiful, and perhaps will become more functional.

I think the consultant must be very grateful to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the magnificent boost he has given to the sales of the book. If I ever write a book I shall ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to make a speech in Parliament denouncing it.

Mr. Court: We will have to work out a royalty basis.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARTREY: We might even do that. However, we would not be able to let the Minister know of our intentions because he might get sensitive.

I do not think it is necessary to waste any more time, but it was only fair that the House should regard this motion in its true perspective, and not be led astray by the exchange of personalities between members, or certain alleged insinuations. There has been some suggestion of allegations regarding a reputable and highly-qualified town planner.

I ask the members to please realise that this is a simple censure motion on the Government for doing what it has to do, in engaging a competent man to represent the other side of the case and to put that case before Cabinet for determination.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Harman.

(Continued on page 898.)

## QUESTIONS (22): ON NOTICE

1.

### GRASSHOPPERS

#### *Infestation*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the grasshopper outbreak in the northern agricultural regions reached plague proportions?
- (2) What action has been taken by the Government to stop the pest from spreading?
- (3) Has any other district reported an infestation?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Serious outbreaks have been found over 30,000 acres in northern agricultural areas. Inspections are still being conducted, but it is probably too early to know how extensive final outbreaks will be.

- (2) The area is being surveyed and arrangements made for necessary aerial and ground spraying. This will commence as soon as seasonal conditions are favourable, which is expected to be in two or three weeks time.
- (3) Other areas are also being watched, but, so far, no large infestations have been reported.

2.

**NATURAL GAS***Dongara: Availability*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Now that the gas pipeline from Dongara to Pinjarra has been completed, when will this natural gas be available to the metropolitan area?
  - (2) What plans are there for gas to be made available for domestic use in Pinjarra?
  - (3) Has consideration been given to providing Mandurah with this service?
- Mr. JAMIESON replied:
- (1) W.A.N.G. Pty. Ltd. has not yet advised a firm date, but it is expected to be during December, 1971.
  - (2) Natural gas will be reticulated in the housing area of Carcoola.
  - (3) No.

3.

**TRAFFIC LIGHTS***Albany Highway-Dorothy Street*

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

In view of the many warnings by the business people of Gosnells that a tragedy would occur at the Dorothy Street crossing on Albany Highway unless traffic lights were installed, and in view of the fact that a fatal accident has occurred on 17th August, 1971, will he immediately investigate the possibility of erecting traffic lights in order to prevent further accidents?

Mr. MAY replied:

The fatal accident which occurred on 17th August happened at a pedestrian crossing on the highway opposite Pages store some 450 feet away from the Albany Highway-Dorothy Street intersection.

There are many intersections in the Metropolitan area with a higher priority for the installation of traffic lights than the intersection of Albany Highway and Dorothy Street.

4.

**WATER SUPPLIES***Additional Major Reservoirs*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Are Wungong and a second Canning dam amongst the next three major storage reservoirs to be built in the metropolitan region?
- (2) If not, when is it estimated these dams will be needed?
- (3) Where will the next three major reservoirs be built and in what priority?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Not yet determined.

5.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION***Cockburn Sound: Discharge of Gypsum*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Is gypsum being discharged into Cockburn Sound?
- (2) Under what conditions is this discharge permitted?
- (3) What is the quantity of such discharge?
- (4) What is the expected effect of this discharge upon the ecology of the Sound?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) C.S.B.P. have the right to discharge gypsum into Cockburn Sound under the provisions of the Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Agreement Act, 1964. The Act states that the gypsum shall be discharged into eight fathoms of water and that the quantity in any one day shall not exceed 350 tons. Furthermore, that the discharge will be through pipes laid and maintained by the company at its expense and that the company will be responsible for any dredging which may become necessary because of the discharge of gypsum into the Sound.
- (3) Approximately 250 tons a day.
- (4) Nil.

6.

**SCHOOL TEACHERS' TRIBUNAL***Duties of Chairman*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What are the duties of a chairman of the school teachers' tribunal?



- (2) How many days or part thereof did the chairman spend in discharge of his various duties in 1970?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) He is responsible for the administration and organisation of the tribunal and for the determination of matters relating to salary appeals, promotion and decisions affecting teachers' service.
- (2) The chairman is a full-time paid officer of the tribunal but during 1970 he spent approximately 20% of his time on duties as a Stipendiary Magistrate.

7.

## TEACHERS

### *Employment of Non-Certificated Personnel*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Education:

How many persons are employed in Government schools as teachers and yet have no teachers' certificate in respect of the following categories—

- (a) primary—  
 (i) male;  
 (ii) female?
- (b) secondary—  
 (i) male;  
 (ii) female?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

No statistics giving this information are kept by the Education Department and the figures could be obtained only by an examination of almost 8,000 individual files.

Although no actual figures are available, it is known that the number of uncertificated teachers employed is very small. No uncertificated teachers are now accepted for employment and those at present employed are, in the main, teachers in such categories as commerce and manual arts who possess special skills required by the Department and who are working towards certification.

8.

## EDUCATION

### *Racism: Steps to Combat*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Education:

As 1971 has been declared by the United Nations Organisation as the year to combat racism, what special efforts have been made by the Education Department to fulfil this aim?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

All schools are being issued with a "*Kit on Racial Discrimination*" containing pamphlets prepared and approved by the United Nations Association of Australia.

9.

## HEALTH

### *Vegetables: Level of Insecticides*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

Is there any check on the level of artificial poisons in vegetable matter intended for human consumption and which may be the result of pest control measures?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Yes.

10. *This question was postponed.*

## 11. COMMONWEALTH AND STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

### *Interest Rates*

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

(1) Is it a fact that—

- (a) henceforth, loan funds made available under the Commonwealth and States Housing Agreement will not be at concessional interest rates (i.e., 1% below the long term bond rate); and
- (b) a cash non-repayable grant will be made available to States in lieu of the interest rate concession?

(2) If so—

- (a) what will be the interest rate charged to borrowers on home builders account, advances from building societies, and other approved institutions;
- (b) what amount of money can this State expect to be allocated this year from the cash non-repayable grant; and
- (c) what sum of money would represent interest payment of 1% (i.e., the concession) on loan funds made available this year under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Yes—both points are substantially correct.
- (2) (a) to (c) Due to the fact that the Commonwealth Minister for Housing and State Housing Ministers are meeting in Canberra

on Friday next, 27th August, to discuss the propositions put forward by the Prime Minister in his budget speech, it is not possible to give a reasoned answer to the Member at this stage.

If I could add, I have conveyed to the member concerned, and the Country Party spokesman on housing, all the information on this matter which the Government has available at this stage.

## 12. SOIL CONSERVATION

### *Hills Districts*

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In order to guard against erosion is it his intention to promulgate regulations under the Soil Conservation Act with respect to the clearing and/or cultivation of rural land in the hills country, such as the lower midlands and Darling Range areas?

- (2) If so, when?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Not at present.

In the Darling Range rural areas, during 1969-70 some clearing was carried out on steep slopes which might have become an erosion hazard. The matter was brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Soil Conservation in 1970 when inspections and investigations were carried out. The areas concerned are being kept under observation.

## 13. TRAFFIC

### *New Zealand Control System: Report*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has a study and report been made, by an officer of the Traffic Department, of the New Zealand traffic control system?

- (2) If so, would he table a copy of the report?

- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) A study of the New Zealand traffic control system is currently being prepared by a former officer of the traffic branch.

- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

## 14. *This question was postponed.*

## 15. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

### *Clinical Staff Executive: Report*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Concerning the report of the clinical staff executive of the Royal Perth Hospital which was

tabled on Thursday, 5th August, 1971, would he please confirm that the statement "1971 saw the appointment of the first Western Australian graduate to a local Chair, that in Pathology" is accurate?

- (2) If "Yes" would he kindly name the professor?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) Answered by (1).

## 16. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

### *Admission and Discharge Procedures*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Since my speech to the Address-in-Reply, has there been any—

- (a) improvements in the interim discharge summaries procedure;

- (b) changes in the admitting procedure of patients from the casualty department at Royal Perth Hospital?

- (2) If so, what are the improvements?

- (3) What measures will be taken to maintain these improvements?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.

- (b) No.

- (2) An additional copy of the interim discharge summary is prepared so that one copy can be posted to the referring doctor and one copy given to the patient to pass on to his general practitioner.

- (3) Staff are reminded from time to time of the importance of the prompt completion of interim discharge summaries. The medical administration make regular checks to ensure that the procedure is being properly carried out.

## 17. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

### *Registrars and Residents: Increase*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

Would he please supply me with the reasons why—

- (a) the number of Royal Perth Hospital registrars has risen from 46 at 30th June, 1968 to 93 at 30th June, 1971; and

- (b) the number of Royal Perth Hospital residents has risen from 48 at 30th June, 1968 to 60 at 30th June, 1971?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(a) and (b) The general answer is—

- (i) increased work load;
- (ii) improved service to patients;
- (iii) training and using more specialists.

A more detailed answer will be given direct to the Member following research, which will take time.

## 18. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

### *Excessive Intake*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) While the benefits of fluoridation of water supplies in suitable circumstances is widely recognised, does he consider that the Government is fully discharging its responsibility to inform the public of the dangers of excessive intake of fluoride, brought about, for example, by taking fluoride tablets in a district where the water supply already contains an adequate concentration of natural or artificially added fluoride?
- (2) Since an excessive intake of fluoride is known to cause discolouration of children's teeth, and possibly other undesirable effects, does he propose to take any action, apart from statements which have already appeared in the press, to warn parents against giving fluoride tablets to children residing in—
  - (a) areas where the natural fluoride content of the water is known to be high;
  - (b) areas where the concentration of natural fluoride in the water has not yet been ascertained by analysis, but may be high;
  - (c) areas where the fluoride concentration in the water supply has recently been increased artificially by fluoridation?

- (3) What action does he intend to take to warn parents against continuing to give their children fluoride tablets, if they have moved into a district where the water supply is fluoridated from a district where the water is not fluoridated, and is he aware of instances where the dental signs of excessive fluoride intake (fluorosis) have resulted from parents making this mistake?

- (4) Does he propose to standardise the concentration of fluoride in water supplies at one part per million for all areas of the State and all seasons of the year, or will climatic conditions, which vary widely throughout the State, be taken into account?
- (5) Will he consider the desirability of declaring dental fluorosis a condition which dentists and medical practitioners are obliged to notify to the Commissioner of Public Health?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) to (c) Publicity is given through the press, infant health sisters, dentists, doctors and licensed vendors of fluoride tablets, on the desirability or otherwise of giving fluoride tablets to children in respect to the local fluoride content of the water.
- (3) No case of fluorosis has been seen arising from the circumstances described.
- (4) Concentrations are standardised without regard to seasonal variations.
- (5) As all grade 1 children have a dental inspection by the dental or school health services, notification is not considered necessary.

19.

## HIGH SCHOOLS

### *Fourth Year Enrolments*

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Education:

What were the fourth year enrolments in—

- (a) Government high schools;
- (b) independent secondary schools,

for 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971 (as at a month convenient to the department)?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

	Government High Schools	Independent Secondary Schools
February		
1971	5,183	2,437
1970	4,305	2,208
1969	4,149	2,167
1968	3,669	2,053

20.

## ABATTOIRS

### *Meat Trading*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does any trading of meat or meat products take place at—
  - (a) Midland abattoirs;
  - (b) W.A. Meat Export Works, Robb Jetty?

- (2) If so, what quantities are involved and the total amount of moneys involved?
- (3) What institutions purchase meat or meat products from either facility, and at what cost?
- (4) Is any meat sold on a "private" basis and, if so, from which abattoir, what was the amount involved, and the number of individual sales?
- (5) What qualifies any person to purchase meat or meat products on a private basis from these facilities?
- (6) Should such trading take place, is it on a profitable basis?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) The Midland Abattoir Board itself does not trade in carcase meat, but wholesale operators do.
- (b) Yes.
- (2) No information is available on sales by wholesale operators at Midland Abattoir. Meat and meat products sales at W.A. Meat Export Works were 2,073,438 pounds for the year 1970-71 and moneys received totalled \$1,028,973.

- (3) Not applicable as far as Midland Abattoir Board is concerned.

W.A. Meat Export Works supplied 106 Government hospitals, institutions and police lock-ups in metropolitan and country districts during the year 1970-71. The income received was \$934,973.

- (4) Some meat is sold to private individuals at Midland where the person concerned has made an arrangement with a wholesale operator. The amounts involved are not known nor are the number of individual sales.

Sales take place from W.A. Meat Export Works. During the year 1970-71 these were 19,000 in number. The amount involved was \$94,000.

- (5) As far as Midland is concerned the person may be employed there or have employment which regularly takes him there and he makes arrangements with a wholesale operator.

At W.A. Meat Export Works employees and some other clients are supplied.

- (6) It is not known whether this trading is on a profitable basis or not at Midland as the Midland Abattoir Board is not involved.

At W.A. Meat Export Works it is profitable.

## 21. WATER SUPPLIES

### *Mundaring Weir: Cost of Water Treatment*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

What is the cost of treating water pumped from Mundaring Weir?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

0.23 cents per 1,000 gallons.

## 22. EDUCATION

### *Mt. Helena High School*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many classrooms exist at the Mt. Helena high school?
- (2) How many additional classrooms will be added to the school before it is fully developed?
- (3) What is the present school population?
- (4) What percentage of this population comes from each of the following areas—
  - (a) Mundaring;
  - (b) Darlington;
  - (c) Sawyers Valley;
  - (d) Glen Forrest?
- (5) How many students will be accommodated at the school when it is fully developed?
- (6) How long is it expected to take to reach full capacity?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Eight standard classrooms, a library, a typing room, an art room, a science laboratory, a science classroom, a home economics centre, two manual arts centres and a technical drawing room.
- (2) Additions will be dependent upon enrolment growth.
- (3) 395.
- (4) (a) 23%.  
(b) 13%.  
(c) 3.5%.  
(d) 12.4%.
- (5) The full development of the school will be dependent upon the future growth of the district, but the optimum number for a fully developed senior high school is 1,250.
- (6) This is dependent upon the rate of growth in areas which contribute to the school.

# QUESTIONS (6): WITHOUT NOTICE

## 1. GRAIN ALCOHOL SCHEME

### *Feasibility*

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is today's issue of the *Daily News* correct where it reports that the Minister had talks with representatives of a business consortium investigating the feasibility of a grain alcohol scheme in this State?
- (2) To what stage has such a survey advanced?
- (3) Does the consortium expect to embark on such a venture in the near future?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question and inform him as follows:—

- (1) A discussion with the businessmen referred to was held this morning.
- (2) The Herbert Corporation/Phillips Petroleum representatives have completed a preliminary survey of the prospects of the economic viability of a grain alcohol additive scheme to the first stage of a three-stage project.
- (3) The group is proceeding with further studies but is not able to put forward a feasible proposition at this stage.

## 2. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

### *W.A.G.R. Vehicles*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Approximately what proportion of road maintenance tax paid by W.A.G.R. in 1968-69 to 1970-71 inclusive would have been paid from the operations of vehicles in the Bunbury-Busselton-Collie area?
- (2) Is it considered that these vehicles do as much damage to roads as vehicles of similar size operated by private contractors?
- (3) Will these vehicles continue to operate after January 1972?
- (4) As the operations of W.A.G.R. vehicles in the cartage of mineral sands will have an unfair advantage over private contractors will he guarantee to take action to have W.A.G.R. vehicles contribute towards the cost of maintenance of the roads in this area?

- (5) If so, in what way?
- (6) If not, for what reasons?

Mr. MAY replied:

I thank the member for Bunbury for notice of this question. The answer is as follows:—

- (1) An analysis of W.A.G.R. returns to segregate operations in the Bunbury-Busselton-Collie area would involve considerable research. Even then it could not be ascertained how much of this related to ilmenite carting as returns do not disclose the type of loading.
- (2) It is natural to assume that similar vehicles would cause the same degree of road damage irrespective of who operated them.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No.
- (5) Answered by (4).
- (6) (a) All Government department vehicles would—if this principle is accepted—have to contribute on a comparative basis.  
(b) The implications of 6 (a) would have to be considered by the Government.

## 3. SOIL CONSERVATION

### *Hills Districts*

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In answer to question 12 on today's notice paper, the Minister dealt at some length with the situation in the Darling Range area. Does his reply also refer in equal measure to the lower midlands—especially the Chittering shire?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:  
To clarify that point: Yes, it does.

## 4. ABATTOIRS

### *Meat Trading*

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to part (5) of question 20 on today's notice paper, would the Minister give greater detail regarding the qualifications of persons purchasing meat on a private basis from the W.A. Meat Export Works, Robb Jetty?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:  
Yes, I would be happy to do that. In the first instance, it involves employees who are associated with

the meatworks. It also applies to persons who have direct dealings with the meatworks, which can occur in a number of ways. If the honourable member so desires, I can provide him with a more detailed account.

## 5. FARMERS

### *Vehicle License Fees*

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

I apologise for not giving prior notice of this question, which arises from a question asked yesterday by the member for Mt. Lawley in regard to the concessions applicable to farmers' vehicles. The question asked was—

What vehicle license concessions apply to farmers' vehicles?

The answer was that half the fee applied for the first truck.

In the Premier's second reading speech on the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Repeal Bill he said the new concessions would be the same as the existing concessions. Would he explain what the new concession will be on a farmer's first truck?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I think it is not unreasonable to ask the honourable member to put the question on the notice paper.

## 6. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

### *Clinical Staff Executive: Report*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

The Minister's answer to question 15 on today's notice paper was "No." Does that mean he will not answer the question or that it is not an accurate statement?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

It means that the statement contained in the letter given to me by the medical staff is not correct.

## TOWN PLANNING: CORRIDOR PLAN

### *Appointment of Consultant: Motion*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [4.36 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion moved by my deputy leader. I have had some doubts about the wisdom of the corridor plan. I concede the argument put forward by the Deputy Premier that he could not see why we should have long corridors extending 50 miles from the centre of the city when we had cow pastures within a

few miles of the city. However, I have recently had the corridor plan explained to me by Dr. Carr, of the M.R.P.A., and I thank the Deputy Premier for allowing Dr. Carr to explain the plan to various organisations. In this regard, the Deputy Premier could not have been more fair.

I was particularly concerned about the corridor plan in relation to a couple of urban developments that have taken place in recent times. I refer to Forrestfield and High Wycombe. I asked Dr. Carr why he—or the M.R.P.A.—supported the principle of the corridor plan when these two isolated areas had been allowed to develop. His answer was that if these developments had not been commenced prior to the setting up of the M.R.P.A. they would not have been permitted to commence because they are contrary to the principles of corridor development.

He said, however, that because they had started it would be necessary to allow them to grow to a size which would justify the provision of the various services necessary to support an urban development. He said Forrestfield would grow to support a population of 15,000 and High Wycombe would support a population of about 12,000. Those figures were based on the provision of a high school. That is the criterion that was used.

I think there will always be a tendency for pressure to be brought to bear on political parties and Governments to break down any plan such as a corridor plan because there will always be people who say, "Why shouldn't we have this land, so close to the city, developed?" As far as I can see, the land at the foothills of the Darling Range is ideal for building purposes. There will always be pressure brought to bear in an attempt to break down any plan which precludes people from developing such ideal residential land. I consider there is some danger of the system failing.

I do not suggest that a second opinion should not be sought as regards the principle of corridor development. I do suggest, however, that the Government was unwise in selecting a planner who had committed himself to opposition to the scheme. I do not suggest that the planner concerned is not competent; I believe he is a well qualified town planner who has had a great deal of experience. But I think it was unwise of the Government to appoint him after he had published a booklet in which he declared his opposition to the corridor plan. However, I support the principle of taking a second look.

I would like such a review to be made in regard to another matter on which I have been speaking to this House in recent times; that is, the proposal for the State Electricity Commission power line. On the night I went to hear Dr. Carr explain the corridor plan, he mentioned that there

would be three-chain highways here and two-chain roads there, and I asked him where were the five-chain reserves on which the State Electricity Commission power lines were to be constructed. My question completely embarrassed him because he did not know the answer. For that reason I believe we ought to inquire into the proposed future planning of the various Government instrumentalities and services.

I have some sympathy for the staff of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the Town Planning Department because they are experts in their field and they have spent a considerable amount of time and effort in preparing the corridor plan. It must be a blow to their sense of pride to have somebody appointed to review what they have done, when that person has already committed himself to opposition to the plan. It must be extremely embarrassing for them.

Mr. Graham: That was the regular pattern when the Liberal Government was in office—\$6,000,000 worth in three and a half years.

Mr. Court: On the recommendations of departments, by the way.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am speaking about this particular appointment. I think there would have been available to the Government planners from elsewhere in Australia or from overseas who were not committed to a particular line of thought and who would have given an independent view of the proposals that have been put forward by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

Mr. Graham: It could have been equally embarrassing to the M.R.P.A.—if the staff is sensitive.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not think it would have been because the planner who has been appointed has already committed himself to a line of thought in this regard, which was published in a booklet costing 30c. The Government will pay him up to \$5,000 for the same opinion. I am only a layman in regard to this matter, as are also the people in the street who have asked, "What is going on here? Why pay up to \$5,000 for an opinion that can be bought for 30c?"

Mr. Graham: An opinion and an analysis are two totally different things.

Mr. THOMPSON: Possibly, but it is difficult to justify to the man in the street.

Mr. Graham: I am trying to justify to the man in Parliament House.

Mr. Jamieson: What street was that?

Mr. THOMPSON: Haynes Street, Kalamunda.

Mr. Graham: That tips the scales.

Mr. THOMPSON: The opinions of people in the hills areas are probably suspect because they do not like power lines.

Mr. Jamieson: They are just suspect.

Mr. THOMPSON: I support my deputy leader on this motion, and I will confine myself to those few remarks.

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [4.45 p.m.]: I would like to say a word or two about Councillor Ritter. I think his name was brought up by the Deputy Premier and I would like to say, firstly, that nobody was more excited than I when Councillor Ritter was appointed to the position of City Planner, nor could anyone have been more excited than I about the way in which he went about his work. Nobody was more sorry than I when he was prevented from carrying out the work he had been doing so well.

As was ably pointed out by the member for Boulder-Dundas, the question we are debating today is not the question of whether or not any form of censure should be brought against Councillor Ritter; it is the question of a censure motion brought against the Government for the appointment of Councillor Ritter as a consultant. I do not intend, as others have done, to become involved in a subject about which I know nothing; that is, town planning. I think a few members have confessed their ignorance of that subject today.

I wish to state that any suggestion of any charge being laid against Councillor Ritter has emanated from the Deputy Premier. No suggestion of an unethical approach has come from this side of the House; it came from the Deputy Premier. No mention of Councillor Ritter's qualifications came from this side of the House; that question also was raised by the Deputy Premier. No mention of the inadvisability of securing an opinion was made by members on this side of the House; once again that question was raised by the Deputy Premier.

Let us consider the motion and see what it says. I will not read out the complete motion. The relevant part states—

... the Government should be condemned for its action in appointing a consultant whose hostile views towards the plan were already known to the Government.

I am sure those words do not say that Councillor Ritter's views should be condemned. They say that the action of the Government should be condemned.

In reply to a question without notice asked by the member for Dale on the 5th August, the Minister for Town Planning said—

It was known, by me at least, that Mr. Ritter had certain reservations himself and that therefore, having regard to the qualifications which he possesses and are recognised internationally, he would be fitted, particularly being familiar with the local conditions, in every respect to analyse the

proposals, and if he felt so disposed, as appeared likely, submit to the Government his report containing reasons why in his judgment there was something faulty with the scheme.

In other words, the Deputy Premier was saying that Mr. Ritter is to be used as a devil's advocate. In some respects, if one was to follow part of the logic of the Minister that might sound reasonable; but then he went on to say—

I would point out that there are no limitations or restrictions whatever placed on that gentleman. He is free to arrive at whatever decisions he likes in whatever form.

On the one hand the Minister said at great length that he wanted the information from Councillor Ritter because he was opposed to the scheme, and he wanted to obtain a balanced view. But then he said that Councillor Ritter is free to arrive at whatever decisions he likes in whatever form. I have no argument with that, but the Minister is asking for a report. It seems to me that when the past Government wished to have a theory expanded upon it was quite in order to ask Councillor Ritter to do the work; but it is a totally different matter to ask him to report on something he has already reported upon. I will not insult the intelligence of the Deputy Premier and Councillor Ritter by suggesting for one moment that the booklet produced by Councillor Ritter contains his complete views on the corridor plan. The booklet is only a resume based on what surely must be a tremendous amount of study and research.

I do not think Councillor Ritter is the sort of person who would go to press with a booklet like this without doing his homework. But, having done his homework, it seems incredible to me that the Government should now say, "We know you have written a book and that it is based on a tremendous amount of study and research, and we know the summary of your work. Now go away for a while and, for \$4,000 or so, come back with what must be already in your mind." That is what we are questioning—not the qualifications of Councillor Ritter or whether a second opinion should be obtained, but simply that the Government is asking for something it already has.

The member for Boulder-Dundas referred to the judicial temperament of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What of the judicial temperament of the Deputy Premier who spent half the time of his speech condemning the corridor plan and then, on the other hand, saying he wants to be convinced by a balanced argument? I cannot see any logic at all in that. I am on my feet merely to make the point that the Opposition made no reference at all to the qualifications of Councillor Ritter. The condemnation came from the

Deputy Premier. I do not think he answered the challenge from this side of the House as he claims to have done.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.51 p.m.]: There is very little to reply to because the Deputy Premier apparently decided that the best weapon of defence was offence and he therefore launched himself into one of his tirades to which we are so accustomed. Again he introduced the name of the consultant and endeavoured to build up an atmosphere of criticism, ridicule, and other unpleasant things; whereas, in fact, we tried to avoid that sort of thing. We were careful not to involve the Minister in any allegations, although he is the one who put forward much propaganda in the Press about filthy lies, scurrilous attacks, and the like.

There is little in the speech of the Deputy Premier about which one can comment. I hoped he might come up with something which was positive, concrete, and constructive which we could analyse in an effort to find some worth-while reason for the Government departing from a principle which had already been laid down—and we believe that is what happened.

I want to make the point that the motion comes back to the basic question of the appointment of a consultant who has publicly committed himself to a line of conduct and opinion and who could not possibly—unless he turns a complete somersault—come up with any report or general principles other than those he has enunciated to date. That is the real reason for the motion. We could have left out the reference to the Minister and to the consultant, but it would have been most difficult to discuss the matter without those references. My opinion of the matter—and it still arrives at the same conclusion—is that it is a basic question of the appointment of a person who is already committed.

The Minister, as is his wont in these matters, tried to infer some motive on our part in our challenge of the appointment; but we have not challenged a study of the plan. I have no interest involved—if I am not careful the Deputy Premier will have me saying the sort of thing he has been screaming in the Press—and I have no axe to grind. It does not matter to me which way the plan goes—whether up, down, or sideways—and it ill-becomes the Minister to make those nasty inferences although, admittedly, they were made in the heat of the moment when he worked himself up.

One of the points he thought was his trump card in this matter was the fact that the previous Government—I think it was my colleague the member for Mt. Lawley—engaged Mr. Ritter to do a job for the Government, and the Deputy Premier



tried to build around this a set of circumstances which were not at all analagous with this situation. I want to make it perfectly clear that the Skidmore plan to which he referred was not paid for by the Government but by the W.A.D.C. people. At the time there was great criticism that the plan had been prepared by a firm of American architects and consultants and was not commented upon by somebody with local experience. Now, the subject of discussion at that time was an isolated one.

Mr. Graham: You chose to get advice from a person who had declared his attitude already.

Mr. COURT: He had not written a book.

Mr. Graham: He had declared his attitude at a public meeting.

Mr. COURT: I would not know anything about that. It is news to me that he publicly declared his attitude.

Mr. Graham: It was known to the Minister.

Mr. COURT: Maybe, but I am leading up to the fact that that situation is not at all analagous with the present situation. We had a firm of American architects who were preparing a plan at no cost to the Government and criticism was made that the study was not made by people with local experience. The Minister, on the advice of his departmental officers, then engaged Mr. Ritter.

Mr. Graham: I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had better stop guessing.

Mr. COURT: I am not guessing. I have checked up on this.

Mr. Graham: Not on this point. I know the facts.

Mr. COURT: I have my own recollections of the particular question, so if the Minister is resting his case on it, it is a very weak reed on which to lean. I do not think any other point in the speech of the Minister calls for comment.

Mr. Graham: Your bomb turned out to be a squib.

Mr. COURT: No, it did not. The Minister shouted, ranted, and raved, and that is why my colleagues found it hard to speak because the Minister gave them nothing to speak against.

Mr. Graham: There is nothing to say in favour of your motion.

Mr. COURT: The member for Boulder-Dundas proceeded to give us a learned discourse on the role of advocates. I do not question what he said at all; but if I was up before a judge the last person I would retain to defend me would be a person who knew nothing about my case and who did not believe in what I

believed. Before engaging an advocate I would ask him outright whether he knew about the type of case concerned and whether he shared my beliefs. It is a totally different situation when a person is charged with doing wrong and is up before the beak, and naturally in that case one would obtain an advocate who knows something about the particular law and the particular offence, and who is dedicated to one's cause. But this is not a question of anyone being on trial. It is a question of obtaining information about an important plan.

The Minister almost used my own words when he talked about affecting the life of everybody in this and the next generation. That is the very argument we put forward; that we need to have somebody who is capable and independent in this matter and, therefore, we believe that a person who has declared his views—and declared them in strong and scathing terms—is hardly qualified to do this job in the way we want it done. We want to come up with a report which the Parliament, the Government, and the public can consider and weigh in the balance against the views of the M.R.P.A. There are plenty of people who could do this job—and do it effectively—and who would command the respect of the M.R.P.A., the Parliament, the Government, and the public.

So it is in this atmosphere that we have moved the motion. The Government has not put forward a case as to why it should not be condemned for breaching a basic principle, and I hope the House will support the motion.

Mr. Graham: I bet your leader is not very proud of you.

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

## Ayes—19

Sir David Brand	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Rushon
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Lewis	Mr. E. L. Young
Mr. McFarlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Nalder	(Teller)

## Noes—20

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bertram	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Brown	Mr. Moller
Mr. Burke	Mr. Norton
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Graham	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Hartrey	Mr. Harman
	(Teller)

## Pairs.

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Davies
Mr. Ridge	Mr. Eickerton
Mr. Stephens	Mr. Cook
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Jones
Mr. Reid	Mr. Lapham

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

# LAND TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

## Recommittal

Resumed from the 17th August.

## In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Norton) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4: Section 10 amended—

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after the member for Dale had moved the following amendment:—

Page 2, line 29—Delete the word "paragraph".

Mr. RUSHTON: This is the last opportunity I have to appeal to the Treasurer's sense of fair play and to ask him to reconsider the intentions that he previously indicated. To prove my case I would use his leader's argument. The Treasurer has asked: What justification would there be to permit a person residing in a mansion on 10 acres of land to be exempt from the payment of land tax? In answer to that question I can put forward a substantial argument the other way. A person who at present owns a block of land under half an acre in area with a mansion erected on it will pay no tax, but a person who has a block of land that is only a fraction over half an acre, on which is erected an ordinary home in which to house his family, will have to pay the tax. This is an incredible situation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: If he has only a humble home he will not be liable to pay the tax.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Treasurer, although he has shown a keen interest in this land tax question, seems to have no understanding of this point of view. I disagree with the Treasurer's previous indication as to how the tax should be imposed; that is, to raise it by a percentage each year. This would not fit in with reality. That is the point that is concerning me. Therefore I ask the Premier to give some guide to the Treasurer.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Treasurer does not need any guide.

Mr. RUSHTON: Well perhaps he can give some guide to the Premier.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Nor does the Premier need any guide.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will run through the points that were made by the Treasurer. He has said that he does not want to bring in the person who owns 10 acres of land with a mansion on it. I am not asking for that. I am making an appeal for the man who owns a block of land just over half an acre on which only a modest home is erected. I want him to be considered.

The next point raised by the Treasurer was that to remove a limit of half an acre would encourage owners to claim

exemption for large areas on the fringe, and so on. This is unsubstantiated for the very reason that the man on the fringe who owns a one-acre block valued at under \$10,000 qualifies for exemption, anyhow. I think all people have to be considered, and that argument is not reasonable.

The next point made by the Treasurer was that an unsatisfactory relationship would result between the department and the taxpayer. In my opinion this Bill will create an unhappy relationship between taxpayer and taxpayer, because a man living in a mansion on half an acre or under would pay no tax and a man living in a modest home on a block of land just over half an acre will be liable for the payment of tax.

The Premier then made the point that the revenue cannot be calculated. In my view it is about time the revenue was calculated if we are to introduce this sort of legislation. Surely some clear indication should be given to the Treasurer as to how much revenue is expected.

The Act already states that exemptions are granted from the payment of land tax on blocks of land up to \$50,000. However, do not let us confuse the issue; total exemption is only up to \$10,000. The tapered adjustments are up to \$50,000. Under this Government's legislation the person with a \$50,000 house who would otherwise be paying \$500 would be exempt, but another with a property worth just over \$10,000 would pay the tax.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Under the legislation passed by your Government in 1970 a man who owned a house erected on land not exceeding half an acre, the unimproved capital value of which was \$10,001, paid land tax. Did you object to the former Treasurer?

Mr. RUSHTON: I have answered that previously. The legislation passed by our Government contained equality of values. Properties of equal values paid equal taxes, and a person with a mansion assessed at \$50,000 unimproved capital value paid a proportion of tax. For many years that has been the basis of our thinking. This discrimination was not in existence before, but it is now.

The Premier said the Act empowered the commissioner to enter into mutually accepted payment arrangements. This provision is made to meet cases of hardship, and is not relevant to my argument. The Premier asked: What justification would there be for exempting from payment of tax by person who owned a mansion on 10 acres of land?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How many times have you spoken on this clause?

Mr. RUSHTON: This is my third and last time. Surely the member for Canning and others opposite should be urging

the Government to support my amendment, because many of their electors are involved. I am sure this amendment is of concern to the electors of Toodyay. If the Treasurer does not agree to the amendment then he does not understand what it is about.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member has one more minute.

**Mr. RUSHTON:** If the Treasurer agrees there is something in my argument then he should defer the consideration of this measure in order that he may consider all available information. In the interests of those who have a genuine case for consideration he should defer the matter, with a view to removing the discrimination that will arise.

**Mr. T. D. EVANS:** The other evening, more so than this afternoon, the member for Dale adopted a hammer and tongs approach. I do not intend to retaliate by adopting a similar approach, or by offering him a cold shoulder. I have been waiting for the opportunity to answer at least three questions which he has asked.

The first is this: What will be the revenue result of this measure, if it is passed? My information is that until reassessments have been made—and these will be made when applications have been received and considered—the revenue result will not exceed \$20,000. In moving his amendment the member for Dale asked me to explain the other tax which is tied in with the land tax, and of course he was referring to the metropolitan region improvement tax. These two taxes are assessed together where the land is located in the metropolitan area.

The honourable member asked a second question: What is involved in relation to blocks of land which are above half an acre in area? I am sure he will agree that it is difficult to answer this question with any degree of precision, without a great deal of research, because land holdings vary in size. In the metropolitan area alone there would be very many blocks above half an acre in area.

However, I assume that the member for Dale is only interested in blocks of land on which the owners are residing. They vary in size, particularly on the outer fringes of the metropolitan area, from a quarter-acre to as high as 30 acres. In a few cases they exceed 30 acres.

It is therefore not possible to make an assessment of the cost of exempting all those blocks of land unless sufficient time is available to undertake the necessary research.

**Mr. Rushton:** That is a poor argument.

**Mr. T. D. EVANS:** The member for Dale supported the Brand Government which in 1970 enacted section 8B of the

Land Tax Assessment Act. On that occasion he did not espouse the arguments which he has introduced in this debate when the problem facing the people residing on areas exceeding a half-acre was just as real and acute as it is now. The Brand Government decided that the line had to be drawn somewhere, so a line was drawn and the member for Dale was satisfied with it.

**Mr. Rushton:** It was based on equal values.

**Mr. T. D. EVANS:** The proposal of the present Government only relates to blocks of land which do not exceed half an acre, and it is estimated that the revenue cost will not exceed \$20,000. The member for Dale is quite aware of my reply to his arguments at the second reading stage, because he referred to them this afternoon, so it is not necessary for me to retrace them.

I do say that if the member for Dale is prepared to submit to me at a later stage specific details of any of the anomalies to which he has referred, which he claims will arise, I will have them examined sympathetically; and, if necessary, a further amendment will be made to the law to remove any undesirable features which might be revealed. I doubt whether any undesirable features will be revealed; however, I give that undertaking.

I submit the clause should be agreed to, without the amendment proposed by the member for Dale.

**Mr. THOMPSON:** I am very pleased the Treasurer has made an offer to the member for Dale to submit cases of hardship that will arise from this piece of legislation. I could refer to a number of blocks in the Shire of Kalamunda.

**Mr. Graham:** That would apply to you, too.

**Mr. THOMPSON:** I will refer them to the Minister. I want to relate the situation in which I found myself fairly recently. I lived on an acre of land in Mundaring and I built my house in such a way that the block could not possibly be subdivided.

**Mr. T. D. Evans:** Are you aware of the other amendments in the Bill?

**Mr. THOMPSON:** Yes; but how is that going to affect people in the area in Gooseberry Hill known as the Knoll? I am referring to those who have an acre of land which is not able to be subdivided, but the value of which will probably be in excess of \$10,000, because of the nature of the land. Will they get sympathetic consideration from the Minister?

**Mr. T. D. Evans:** I think all taxpayers receive sympathetic consideration.

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

## Ayes—20

Mr. Blaikie  
Sir David Brand  
Mr. Court  
Mr. Coyne  
Dr. Dadour  
Mr. Gayfer  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Lewis  
Mr. McPharlin  
Mr. Mensaros

Mr. Nalder  
Mr. O'Connor  
Mr. O'Neill  
Mr. Runciman  
Mr. Rushton  
Mr. Thompson  
Mr. Williams  
Mr. R. L. Young  
Mr. W. G. Young  
Mr. I. W. Manning  
(Teller)

## Noes—20

Mr. Bateman  
Mr. Bertram  
Mr. Brady  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Burke  
Mr. Davies  
Mr. H. D. Evans  
Mr. T. D. Evans  
Mr. Graham  
Mr. Hartrey

Mr. Jamieson  
Mr. May  
Mr. McIver  
Mr. Moller  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Toms  
Mr. A. B. Tonkin  
Mr. J. T. Tonkin  
Mr. Harman  
(Teller)

## Pairs

## Ayes

Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Ridge  
Mr. Stephens  
Mr. W. A. Manning  
Mr. Reid

## Noes

Mr. Fletcher  
Mr. Bickerton  
Mr. Cook  
Mr. Jones  
Mr. Lapham

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MENSAROS: I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 1—Delete the word "only" and substitute the word "principally".

During my second reading speech I enumerated a few of what I thought were inequities in this Bill. I believe that the intention of the whole Bill, including this clause, is to give land-tax-free occupancy to genuine one-home owners whose dwelling house is used only for residential purposes. However, if the provisions of this clause are carried out strictly, those people who use their homes to a very small extent for other than residential purposes will be excluded from the exemption, and I do not think this was the intention. I am referring to small subcontractors in the building trade who nearly all have some office accommodation in their homes. They require this for the taking of orders and answering telephone calls and so on. Medical men employed, for example, with the university also use their homes to some extent in connection with their work as they are allowed some private practice. A dentist, for instance, would have his surgery apart from his home, but then in his home he could have a small room set aside for use in emergencies.

Even if the authorities were prepared to turn a closed eye in such instances, those concerned could not honestly indicate in their applications that they used their dwellings for residential purposes only.

The same thing would apply when a joint tenancy was involved. The wife may sell home-made pottery pieces or she may undertake sewing for other people. On the other hand she may give language or piano lessons. However, as soon as any wife does this she immediately disqualifies the joint tenants from the exemption.

In fact, according to the letter of the law, it would be sufficient to exclude the owner from the exemption if a plan, which had been approved by a local authority, showed a study. We could take the case of a public servant, or a private employee, who takes work home. In the strict sense of the word such people would not use their residences only for domestic purposes. Obviously, the intention of the Bill is not to penalise that type of person, but such a person would perjure himself if he claimed that he was using his house only for domestic purposes. If the Committee agrees to my amendment, then people such as those I have mentioned would enjoy the benefits which, obviously, they were meant to enjoy.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The word to which the member for Floreat objects is already to be found in section 8B of the Land Tax Assessment Act. I agree that if something is worth doing, it is worth doing well, and if something is worth expressing, it is worth expressing well. The spirit of the legislation is to apply proposed exemptions to certain people who use certain premises for residential purposes. It is not the intention to apply a hard-and-fast rule that the premises must be used for residential purposes, and for no other purposes at all.

I agree that to express this in a clear manner, the word "only" could well be deleted and the word "principally" substituted. The member for Floreat can be assured that he has convinced the Treasurer, and I support the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. COURT: I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 7—Insert after the word "other" the word "assessable".

I hope the Minister will see fit to accept this as being merely a drafting error. I believe it was intended that this should apply. We could have the case of a retired farmer living in the city with his farm still in his name. Under a strict reading of the Bill as it is now drawn that farmer would attract tax on his home at Nedlands, Subiaco, or Applecross.

I have had a look at the definition and I find that the anomaly could go even further. A person could be paying only \$10 for leasehold land anywhere between Esperance and Wyndham and he would be automatically excluded.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I accept the amendment, and assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that such was the case. It

was never intended to introduce the problem which could arise if the word was not inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported, with amendments.

### **FIREARMS AND GUNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR. MAY** (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Secretary for Labour in a memorandum under date the 14th August, 1970, directed to the Commissioner of Police, pointed out that the Australian Government was required to submit a report under Article 19 of the I.L.O. Constitution to the governing body of the International Labour Office during 1970 concerning discrimination in employment and occupation which forms I.L.O. Convention No. 111.

One matter which came under their notice referred to the Firearms and Guns Act, 1931-69, wherein certain aliens are discriminated against in the issue of firearms licenses—that is contained in sections 8(3) and 10(3).

These sections of the Act appear to discriminate against the Asian and African races inasmuch as these individuals are required to have specific approval from the Commissioner of Police before the issue of a firearm license can be made.

The Commissioner of Police in his absolute discretion may withhold such consent. There is no right to appeal under the Act for those people whereas all other persons of European nationalities and Australian Aborigines have a right to appeal to a police or resident magistrate when the Commissioner of Police refuses them the issue of a firearm license.

Although no incidents of any Asians or Africans having been refused a firearm license under this specific section have been recorded, it is felt that to conform with Article 2 of the United Nations International Covenants on Human Rights this particular section of the Act should be repealed.

It is also pointed out that the previous Minister for Police agreed to this section of the Act being repealed but in view of the extensive legislative programme his Government was already committed to at this particular time the matter was deferred until the present parliamentary session.

It is considered desirable to conform with the agreement between Australia and the General Assembly of the United Nations which was adopted on the 21st December, 1965, and for this purpose the amendment to repeal section 8(3) of the Firearms and Guns Act was formulated.

**Mr. Lewis:** What is the situation regarding Aborigines?

**Mr. MAY:** They have the right of appeal.

**Mr. Lewis:** Australian Aborigines?

**Mr. MAY:** Yes.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr. W. G. Young**.

### **ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 12th August.

**MR. LEWIS** (Moore) [5.46 p.m.]: This is a simple Bill inasmuch as it seeks to amend section 15 of the principal Act by the addition of two subsections. The purpose is to enable the Midland Junction Abattoir Board to trade. Although "trade" is a simple term, it can be quite broad indeed in its implications, but I shall develop that point as I go along.

The Minister was fairly brief in his second reading speech, which covered just over one page of double-spaced notes. Apparently the Minister felt this was adequate to explain a fairly simply worded measure.

Present developments at the Midland Junction Abattoir which are nearing completion consist of extension to the slaughtering and processing facilities, and considerable extension to the storage facilities. The total capital cost is something over \$2,500,000 and the extensions were authorised and commenced by the previous Government. I believe the work being carried out is a tribute to the Midland Junction Abattoir Board, its management, and staff.

This recent development was prompted by the necessity to meet much stricter export standards which are now required by the Department of Primary Industry and to help cope with the increasing numbers of stock which are now being marketed.

To give members some idea of this increase, I will quote from the annual reports of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board tabled by the Minister. These show that the number of sheep and lambs stocked in Western Australia has increased from 30,160,000 as at March, 1968, to 32,900,000 at the same time in 1969, and 33,600,000 at the same time in 1970. To cope with the increasing numbers, the extension of the slaughtering facilities was certainly very necessary.

The upgrading to export standard was equally necessary, because an ever-increasing percentage of processed carcasses and edible and inedible offals are now being exported. Edible offals are, of course, the heart, brain, liver, kidneys, etc. and inedible offals are tallow, and meat meal, etc. The reports show that of the

processed carcasses, boneless edible offals amounted to approximately 13,000 tons in 1967-68, comprising 37 per cent. of the total processed in that year. The quantity increased to 18,000 tons—45 per cent.—in 1968-69, and to 24,000 tons—55 per cent.—in 1969-70. That is the last period for which information is available.

Mr. Nalder: Did the board sell export edible offal?

Mr. LEWIS: The board itself did not export it. Edible offal has been exported by the processors or the buyers who purchase stock, have them slaughtered at Midland, and have the carcasses and offal processed at the works. In other words, those figures represent the quantities which the works processed on behalf of other people.

Mr. Nalder: Did they also export inedible offal?

Mr. LEWIS: Yes. I believe that might have been done on the board's own account. I am not sure whether tallow is exported on processors' account. However, in my view that is not a very important point. There must be a balance, and I believe it has been the aim of the abattoir board to achieve a balance.

Extra slaughtering to cope with the demand means extra slaughtermen. Extra slaughtering also means extra processing facilities because something has to be done to the by-products. I repeat that an increasing percentage—which is now over 55 per cent.—is being exported mainly to the Middle and Far East. Extra processing means extra storage facilities must be provided to hold the stock awaiting shipment. As the works grow larger provision must be made against glut periods and storage space must be provided for carcasses—even those for local consumption. Extra slaughtering also means more meat inspectors. That is an important point.

I understand that the ratio of inspectors to sheep slaughtered is about one to 300. The ratio for lambs is much less because lambs are not subject to some of the glands that infest sheep. Therefore, when there is a shortage of inspectors the daily or weekly kill must be reduced accordingly. I understand that last week the metropolitan abattoirs at Robb Jetty and Midland were down on their kill by some 18,000 sheep because of the shortage of meat inspectors. That figure may be inaccurate. I am not now casting any blame on any particular works or any particular administration, but when there is a shortage of inspectors the output of the industry falls. I think I should remind the House that in order to meet this demand for meat inspectors towards the end of last year the previous Government instituted a training course. There were 40 candidates in the school and the out-turn was 38, which is a fairly good percentage. It was agreed

that during the 12 weeks of the course they should be paid maintenance of \$50 a week.

It was hoped that a second course would commence about June, and that we would be able to obtain finance from the Commonwealth for the course. There were grave doubts as to whether we would get it but the State Government of the day agreed that if finance was not forthcoming from the Commonwealth the State would carry the financial burden of the second course. The second course has been delayed.

Mr. Nalder: Were most of the applicants farmers?

Mr. LEWIS: At one stage there were well over 300 applicants for the 40 vacancies in the first school. Many of the applicants were from the country—not only farmers but also other people who had lost their jobs because of the rural recession and were looking for alternative employment.

Mr. Nalder: Were they given preference?

Mr. LEWIS: Yes. The point I want to make is that the Government is organising a second school for meat inspectors with a reduced intake of 30.

I urge the Minister to give close attention to this aspect because I understand that as a result of the first out-turn of 38 some of the more experienced meat inspectors who were already operating were immediately sent out of the State to serve in other parts of the Commonwealth. It was also not possible to grant annual leave to some of the meat inspectors last year. There was a move at least to delay their leave because of pressure of work, and they ran the risk of breaching the Public Service regulations, under which they are obliged to take their leave within a certain time. At one stage the suggestion was made that the works should close down for a week or two. However, that problem was surmounted temporarily.

There is a great need for more inspectors, particularly in view of the suggestion that a further abattoir will be established. I also understand that the export standards for the European Economic Community might be even higher than those now applying for the United States, which will necessitate much closer inspection. The ratio might rise above one to 300 for each inspector. I urge the Minister to give close attention to this aspect because to some degree the number of inspectors affects the output of the works.

Theoretically, at least, the output of the works is to be stepped up from 8,000 sheep to 12,000. I understand the chains for this increased output will be in operation at the end of this month—subject, again, to having the required number of inspectors. I am informed there is grave

doubt that it will be possible to use the facilities to the full extent owing to the shortage of meat inspectors. It is aimed to develop the processing and storage facilities in order to make the abattoir more economically viable.

As most members know, from perusal of the annual reports, the operations of the abattoirs have resulted in some losses in recent years. We now want to correct the losses. Anything that can be done to use the facilities to a greater extent must have a beneficial effect on the profit and loss account.

We therefore hope some brake will be applied to the ever-increasing killing costs, which have now reached the point where it is quite unprofitable for a farmer to send in a sheep which is not in the best condition—this is because of transport costs, and so on, compared with the return he would get for such an animal. This is a serious situation. We must do whatever we can to put a brake on the rising costs of killing.

Despite the increased facilities now being provided and the 50 per cent. extra out-turn, the works are expected to cope with the increased numbers for another two years only. By that time further works, preferably privately owned, will be needed. So early planning and early commencement of the construction of these extra works is becoming urgent.

I mentioned before that the Bill consisted of two proposed subsections. I refer to the proposed new subsection (3) which reads—

On and after the coming into operation of the Abattoirs Act Amendment Act, 1971, to the intent that the assets of the Board and the services of the Board employees may be utilised to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the making of profits or the producing of revenue, the Board, subject to the Minister, is authorised to carry on any trade. . .

It would seem to me that the first half of this proposal is quite extraneous. It does not mean anything to me. It states—

. . . that the assets of the Board and the services of the Board employees may be utilised to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the making of profits . . .

With the best intent in the world the board may continue to make a loss, but that is beside the point. The real purpose of this subsection is to give the board authority to carry on any trade. It goes on to state—

. . . to carry on any trade that in the opinion of the Board can conveniently be carried on in conjunction with the preparation and processing of meat.

The Minister in his second reading speech referred to that in rather different terms. I quote from a portion of the first page of the Minister's speech, which reads as follows:—

Should the measure now before the House become law it would allow the Board, where it was considered necessary, to purchase livestock, process and sell it on the open market, and do other such things as may be required by a trading concern.

The Bill does not say anything about purchasing stock, but it does use the word "trade." The Oxford dictionary defines the word "trade" as a business or a livelihood carried on by a tradesman. It also describes "trade" as an exchange of commodities for money. Presumably this includes the sale of services and this is what I am querying.

The Minister's speech would imply that the board may purchase livestock, process it, sell the product on the open market, and do such things as may be required of a trading concern. At that point one could be excused if one stopped and shied a little bit at the idea of selling the product on the open market and doing such things as may be required of a trading concern. My mind immediately reverts to the period about 1914 when there were State meat shops and State fish shops, and many other State trading concerns. I think most of us would prefer not to return to those days. However, this is the inference to be drawn.

I would ask the Minister in his reply to the debate to reassure the House on these points. I appreciate that the Midland Junction Abattoir Board and also Robb Jetty sell by-products such as meat-meal—which is in increasing demand—but I would not like to see the Government set up retail shops.

I would also like to quote a passage at the conclusion of the Minister's speech. This reads as follows:—

Members will be aware, of course, that the board will be subject to direction from the Minister, and any undesirable developments in trading operations could be controlled by the responsible Minister.

Perhaps the Minister anticipated that we might be suspicious about this and set out to allay our fears on this point. The Minister may refer to this also in closing the debate.

Regarding the purchase of livestock, this could be a desirable feature of this amendment. I do not anticipate that the Midland Junction Abattoir Board proposes to appoint a buyer to go to every sale and purchase livestock. However, I can visualise a situation developing as other

abattoirs are established in the metropolitan area and the facilities at Midland are not fully occupied. Therefore it would be economically possible to use the facilities at Midland to a greater extent. At this stage the board may purchase some sheep or stock to slaughter there.

I would hope that, instead of putting a buyer on the market, such a circumstance would provide an opportunity for the board to engage in treating or killing on a weight and grade basis, either directly on a grower's account, or on a grower's account through his agent. I think this will enable the board to carry on without having to incur the expense of a buyer. An experienced buyer is paid a fairly high salary. He must be experienced, otherwise he could make some costly mistakes; and he must be employed fairly regularly in order that his employment is an economical proposition. It would not pay to employ such a man on sweeping or cleaning up around the place in between the rare occasions on which he was called upon to buy stock. I put it to the Minister that he should consider the method of buying on a weight and grade basis.

I have placed an amendment on the notice paper to limit the operation of this Bill to a period of two years. My reason for doing so is that the Minister has indicated already that he proposes to introduce legislation to establish a lamb marketing authority, and we want to be sure that the Bill before the House will not unduly impinge on the operation of the proposed authority. We propose that the Bill should be effective for two years in order to give the authority a chance to become established and obtain experience. Then, if the Minister feels that this legislation should continue in force, he can introduce a Bill to re-enact it.

Leave granted to the member for Moore (Mr. Lewis) to continue his speech at the next sitting of the House.

*Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 8.25 p.m.*

### MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Returned*

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

### NATIVES (CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS) ACT REPEAL BILL

*Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Bertram (Attorney-General), read a first time.

*House adjourned at 8.27 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 24th August, 1971

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

### MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Assent*

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

### STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENTS

*Approval of Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator*

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [4.34 p.m.]: I have to report the Clerk has received the following letter, dated the 20th August, 1971:—

I refer to your letter dated 18th August, 1971, and now attach Amendment made to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council on Tuesday, 17th August, 1971, duly signed by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor and Administrator.

(Signed) JOHN F. P. BURT,  
Lt. Colonel,  
Official Secretary.

### QUESTIONS (3): ON NOTICE

#### 1. CARAVAN PARK *Karratha*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What is the legal capacity of the caravan park at Karratha?
- (2) How many caravans are there at this time?
- (3) How many caravans have been asked to leave the park because of overcrowding in the past month?
- (4) How many caravans have advised the caretaker that they are awaiting entry?
- (5) (a) What are the future plans for caravan facilities to cope with the influx of workers and settlers with their families; and  
(b) when will they be implemented?
- (6) (a) Will caravans be permitted to park on industrial and/or domestic sites whilst waiting for the provision of facilities; and  
(b) if not, what arrangements have been made to cope with the influx of settlers?