

In addition to the five in liquidation, the remaining seven are as follows:—

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Still continuing .....                                   | 3 |
| Sale of Companies (Tax Losses to new shareholders) ..... | 2 |
| Struck Off by Registrar as defunct .....                 | 1 |

In course of above .....

That is the information which the honourable member requested of me. I do not propose to say anything further except to reiterate that from time to time I believe amendments to the Companies Act will be necessary.

For the information of members, I would like to explain the moves which take place in regard to amendments to the Act. First of all, the proposed amendments are considered by the officers and the Registrars of Companies from each State. Then they are dealt with by the Attorneys-General. The Standing Committee of the Attorneys-General is a body of people of completely mixed political thought, but I must say I have never had the privilege of being a member of a committee that approaches the problems of a country in a more open-minded manner than does this committee.

I would go so far as to say there is little of anything in the way of political consideration given to decisions made by this committee. No doubt Ministers will take into consideration their own set of circumstances pertaining to their particular State. This, I find, is predominant in all matters where States are represented by their Ministers; but the total objective is the main thing. It is in the interests of the whole; and in this case the investing public were the prime consideration.

I have pleasure in putting forward this Bill and trust it will be dealt with now in Committee. I am grateful to the two members who have spoken and for the support they have given to the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*House adjourned at 10.4 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 19th October, 1966

| CONTENTS   | Page |
|--|------|
| <b>BILLS—</b>  |      |
| Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill—3r. ....  | 1529 |
| Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—Report                                    | 1530 |
| Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Act Amendment Bill—Returned .....                | 1588 |
| Perth Medical Centre Bill—3r. ....   | 1530 |
| Strata Titles Bill—Returned .....  | 1568 |
| <b>MOTION—</b>   |      |
| Barracks Archway : Removal .....   | 1530 |
| <b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>  |      |
| Albany Harbour—Transport Cargo Terminal : Provision                                  | 1527 |
| Basic Wage : Rent Component .....  | 1527 |
| Bricks : Supplies and Shortage .....   | 1528 |
| <b>Education—</b>  |      |
| Languages : Students, and Courses Provided .....                                     | 1527 |
| Muresk Agricultural College—Deputy Principal : Qualifications and Retirement .....   | 1528 |
| Electoral : Enrolment Figures for Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council ..... | 1526 |
| Fauna and Flora Reserves : Firebreaks .....  | 1524 |
| Helena River Bridge—Scott Street : Provision of Pedestrian Way .....                 | 1525 |
| State Schoolboys' Football Team : Rail Travel Concession .....                       | 1526 |
| State Ships—North-West Service : Number of Vessels, and South-bound Passengers ..... | 1528 |
| Taxation : Relationship to Increases in Wages and Living Costs .....                 | 1526 |
| <b>Water Supplies—</b>   |      |
| Bickley Brook Catchment Area : Proclamation, and Land Releases .....                 | 1525 |
| Desalination of Water—Osmosis Process : Costs  | 1525 |
| Victoria Dam—Water Catchment Pollution Signs : Removal from Private Property .....   | 1525 |
| <b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—</b>   |      |
| Darriell Beamish Case : Availability of Report .....                                 | 1529 |
| Ord River Scheme : Commonwealth Financial Assistance .....                           | 1529 |
| State Schoolboys' Football Team : Rail Travel Concession .....                       | 1529 |

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

## QUESTIONS (16): ON NOTICE

### FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVES

#### Firebreaks

1. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Lands:
  - (1) Who is responsible for the clearing of firebreaks around fauna and flora reserves?
  - (2) Is he aware of the great potential fire hazard these are to adjoining farms when no firebreaks are made?
  - (3) What is the area of the fauna and flora reserve near Ajana?
  - (4) How many miles of firebreak would be necessary to go around this reserve?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) Where flora and fauna reserves are not vested in any authority, they are within the scope of section 34 of the Bush Fires Act, which authorises adjoining owners to take steps to protect their property.

- (3) Class "A" Reserve No. 27004, west of Ajana, is set apart for "National Park," and contains approximately 358,000 acres.
- (4) The perimeter of Class "A" Reserve No. 27004 is approximately 116 miles.

2. *This question was postponed.*

#### DESALINATION OF WATER

##### *Osmosis Process: Costs*

3. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has his department received any information on the distillation of sea water by osmosis?
- (2) If "Yes," has it any estimates of the cost of—
  - (a) the plant required, and
  - (b) the cost per 1,000 gallons?

Mr. COURT replied:

I had prepared an answer to this question, but it was not conclusive enough because I did not have all the information. I have now obtained all the information and, with your permission Mr. Speaker, I will read it out, as distinct from the information in the originally prepared answer—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Available literature for portable units suggests a cost, in the United States, varying from 1,500 U.S. dollars for a unit with a capacity of 1,000 to 1,500 U.S. gallons per day up to 75,000 U.S. dollars for a plant with a capacity of 100,000 to 150,000 U.S. gallons per day.
- (b) Reliable information is not available but the process shows promise and consideration is being given to the purchase of a small portable unit to test all relevant aspects.

I should add that the Public Works Department does keep itself right up with the latest trend in connection with this type of process.

#### VICTORIA DAM

##### *Water Catchment Pollution Signs: Removal from Private Property*

4. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Works:

Further to my question of the 14th September regarding the erection of water catchment pollution signs, would he ensure that any such signs erected on private property are removed?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Yes.

#### HELENA RIVER BRIDGE

##### *Scott Street: Provision of Pedestrian Way*

5. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any consideration been given to the provision of a pedestrian way being added to the bridge over the Helena River in Scott Street, Helena Valley?
- (2) If "Yes," what decision, if any, has been made?
- (3) If "No," could he have the problem investigated with a view to obviating the serious traffic hazard, especially for school children obliged to use the bridge?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) The Main Roads Department has been approached by the Mundaring Shire Council for the construction of a footwalk on this bridge. This structure was built in 1934 by the local authorities and is their responsibility. However, consideration will be given to the provision of funds in the 1967-68 programme.

#### BICKLEY BROOK CATCHMENT AREA

##### *Proclamation, and Land Releases*

6. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Can he advise the names of the parties in the proclaimed catchment area for the dam to be built on Bickley Brook below the confluence of Munday Brook who procured their land as the result of a decision by the authorities of the day that the particular land was not required for water catchment purposes and was released for registration in fee simple?
- (2) When was the area concerned—
  - (a) originally proclaimed as a water catchment area;
  - (b) released;
  - (c) reproclaimed as a water catchment area; and under what Act or Acts was this done?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Mr Read, Mr John Moffit, and Mr R. J. Giles.
- (2) (a) Upper Bickley—16/2/1912.  
Lower Bickley—18/8/1923.
- (b) No land was released from the catchment area, but some of the previously resumed land was sold in 1941 and 1942.
- (c) Answered by (b).

# STATE SCHOOLBOYS' FOOTBALL TEAM

## Rail Travel Concession

7. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

In regard to my question of the 31st August, 1966, re rail concession fare to a boy under 15 years of age, will he please consider the request made in respect of a child over 15 years of age?

Mr. COURT replied:

I have been informed that a boy who has attained 15 years of age is ineligible for selection in the State schoolboys' football team.

## TAXATION

### Relationship to Increases in Wages and Living Costs

8. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:

In view of the answer given on the 11th October, 1966, on direct or indirect taxation collected in Western Australia, is the increase proportionate to the increase in wages and/or cost of living from 1960 to 1965?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The increase per head of population in direct and indirect taxation collected in Western Australia between 1949-50 and 1964-65 was 133 per cent. compared with an increase over the same period of 171 per cent. in average male weekly earnings for the State and 128 per cent. in the consumer price index.

## ELECTORAL

### Enrolment Figures for Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council

9. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What were the enrolment figures for each of the Legislative Assembly districts as at the 30th September, 1966?
- (2) What were the enrolment figures for each of the Legislative Council provinces as at the 30th September, 1966?
- (3) What were the aggregate enrolment figures as at the 30th September, 1966, for—
  - (a) metropolitan area;
  - (b) North-west, Murchison, Eyre area;
  - (c) agricultural mining and pastoral area?
- (4) What are the statutory quotas for (a) and (c)?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The undermentioned are the enrolment figures for each of the

Legislative Assembly districts as at the 30th September, 1966—

|                  |        |
|------------------|--------|
| Balcatta         | 16,347 |
| Bayswater        | 16,065 |
| Beeloo           | 12,583 |
| Belmont          | 13,304 |
| Canning          | 12,728 |
| Claremont        | 10,690 |
| Cockburn         | 13,698 |
| Cottesloe        | 10,887 |
| East Melville    | 13,733 |
| Fremantle        | 11,333 |
| Karrinyup        | 14,323 |
| Maylands         | 10,929 |
| Melville         | 12,546 |
| Mount Hawthorn   | 11,051 |
| Mount Lawley     | 11,132 |
| Nedlands         | 11,058 |
| Perth            | 10,132 |
| South Perth      | 12,089 |
| Subiaco          | 11,179 |
| Swan             | 11,785 |
| Victoria Park    | 10,668 |
| Wembley          | 14,665 |
| Albany           | 6,866  |
| Avon             | 4,889  |
| Blackwood        | 5,102  |
| Boulder-Eyre     | 6,033  |
| Bunbury          | 6,231  |
| Collie           | 5,378  |
| Dale             | 7,105  |
| Darling Range    | 7,576  |
| Geraldton        | 6,256  |
| Greenough        | 5,228  |
| Kalgoorlie       | 5,325  |
| Katanning        | 5,252  |
| Merredin-Yilgarn | 4,733  |
| Moore            | 5,697  |
| Mount Marshall   | 5,146  |
| Murchison        | 4,894  |
| Murray           | 5,669  |
| Narrogin         | 5,444  |
| Northam          | 5,739  |
| Roe              | 6,293  |
| Stirling         | 5,623  |
| Toodyay          | 5,722  |
| Vasse            | 5,533  |
| Warren           | 5,001  |
| Wellington       | 6,361  |
| Gascoyne         | 2,133  |
| Kimberley        | 2,667  |
| Pilbara          | 1,901  |

- (2) The undermentioned are the enrolment figures for each of the Legislative Council provinces as at the 30th September, 1966.

|                    |        |
|--------------------|--------|
| Metropolitan       | 53,946 |
| North Metropolitan | 56,386 |
| North-East         |        |
| Metropolitan       | 63,215 |
| South Metropolitan | 51,310 |
| South-East         |        |
| Metropolitan       | 48,068 |
| Central            | 15,774 |
| Lower Central      | 16,074 |
| Lower West         | 18,261 |
| South              | 18,782 |
| South-West         | 15,636 |
| Upper West         | 17,181 |
| West               | 20,403 |
| Lower North        | 7,027  |
| North              | 4,568  |

- (3) On the figures for the existing Legislative Assembly districts the estimated aggregate enrolment figures, as at the 30th September, 1966, for the three areas as now defined under the Electoral Districts Act, 1947-1965, would be:—

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| (a) metropolitan area                            | 272,925 |
| (b) North-west—<br>Murchison-Eyre<br>area        | 8,709   |
| (c) agricultural,<br>mining and<br>pastoral area | 141,088 |
| Total  | 422,722 |

- (4) On the estimated aggregate enrolment figures shown in (3) above the quotas for the areas (a) and (c) calculated in accordance with the statutory provisions of the Electoral Districts Act, 1947-1965, would be:—

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| (a) metropolitan area                            | 11,866 |
| (b) agricultural,<br>mining and<br>pastoral area | 5,878  |

#### BASIC WAGE

##### Rent Component

10. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Labour:

What are the respective amounts allowed in rent in the compilation of the basic wage for—

- (a) 2-bedroom timber constructed homes;  
2-bedroom brick constructed homes;  
2-bedroom brick veneer constructed homes?  
(b) 3-bedroom timber constructed homes;  
3-bedroom brick constructed homes;  
3-bedroom brick veneer constructed homes?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The figures as required are not available. The Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics only makes available final figures for movements in the consumer price index.

The regimen for the consumer price index is made up of over 250 individual items divided into five groups, including housing, and is designed to measure the extent of movements in price levels between certain points of time.

The Bureau of Census and Statistics simply advises the Industrial Commission of the movement in the "All Groups" index, and this in the past has been converted to monetary amounts.

The bureau does not disclose details of particular data collected as this is obtained on a confidential basis.

#### ALBANY HARBOUR

##### Transport Cargo Terminal: Provision

11. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Does the Government intend to erect a transport cargo terminal in association with harbour works at Albany?  
(2) If so, when is it anticipated that work will commence?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No.  
(2) Answered by (1).

12. *This question was postponed.*

#### EDUCATION

##### Languages: Students, and Courses Provided

13. Mr. DURACK asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many State high school students have entered for the 1966 examinations in—  
(a) Junior;  
(b) Leaving?  
(2) How many students in State high schools are being given courses for the 1966 Junior Certificate in—  
(a) French;  
(b) German;  
(c) Italian;  
(d) other foreign languages?  
(3) How many students in State high schools are being given courses for the 1966 Leaving examination in—  
(a) French;  
(b) German;  
(c) Italian;  
(d) other foreign languages?  
(4) Are any State high school students entering for either Junior or Leaving examinations in—  
(a) French;  
(b) German;  
(c) Italian;  
(d) other foreign languages, without being given any school course in the subject?  
(5) If "Yes," to (4), what are the numbers in each case?  
(6) What does the Education Department consider to be the necessary qualification to teach a foreign language in State high schools?  
(7) What is the Education Department's policy in regard to encouraging trainee teachers to ac-

quire qualifications to teach—

- (a) French;
  - (b) German;
  - (c) Italian;
  - (d) other foreign languages?
- (8) How many Teachers' Training College students are at present studying to major at the University in—
- (a) French;
  - (b) German;
  - (c) Italian?
- (9) Is he aware that there is in the community a considerable demand for courses in Italian, indicated by the large enrolment for adult education classes in Italian?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The Education Department has no record of the number of entrants for public examinations.
- (2) (a) French—1,359.  
(b) German—222.  
(c) Italian—None.  
(d) Other foreign languages—None.
- (3) (a) French—342.  
(b) German—190.  
(c) Italian—None.  
(d) Other foreign languages—None.
- (4) and (5) Not known.
- (6) University degree, including language units, or completion of some degree units, including language units.
- (7) The Education Department encourages trainee teachers to obtain qualifications for language teaching, particularly in French and German, but it permits study of Italian. Other foreign languages are not yet offered at the University.
- (8) (a) to (c) At present 15 students are completing a major in French, six in German, none in Italian. Also there are 38 students studying a second-year unit in French, 30 students studying a second-year unit in German, nine students studying a second-year unit in Italian, and 82 students studying a first-year unit in French, 68 studying a first-year unit in German, and 17 studying a first-year unit in Italian, but it is not known at this stage how many will complete majors in these subjects.
- (9) Apparently there is some demand but previous attempts to introduce Italian into a few Government high schools have not attracted sufficient students to warrant continuance. If it can be shown that there is a sufficient demand in a high school, the department will endeavour to meet it.

## BRICKS .

### *Supplies and Shortage*

14. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

- (1) Is the supply of building bricks for all purposes satisfactory at the present time?
- (2) If not, in what categories are bricks in serious short supply?
- (3) What steps, if any, are being taken by those concerned to overcome any problem which presently exists?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Wirecuts, pressed bricks, extruded facing bricks, and sand lime bricks.
- (3) One major manufacturer will have in production next month an additional tunnel kiln capable of producing a further 25 million bricks per annum. Another company is also in process of installing a tunnel kiln which is scheduled to be in production in March, 1967. It is anticipated this will increase output by 16 million facing bricks per annum. A sand lime brick producer is investigating the installation of a fully automatic machine, which, if proceeded with, will be in production in mid-1967.

## MURESK AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

### *Deputy Principal: Qualifications and Retirement*

15. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What are the qualifications of the deputy principal at Muresk?
- (2) How long will it be before he retires from the staff (due to age)?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The qualification of the assistant principal at Muresk is B.Sc. (Agric.)
- (2) Will reach retiring age of 65 years on the 17th January, 1976.

## STATE SHIPS

### *North-West Service: Number of Vessels, and South-bound Passengers*

16. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What State Shipping Service vessels will be in operation on the north-west coast during October, November, and December, 1966?
- (2) What number of passengers will each ship convey from the various north-west ports to Fremantle?
- (3) What is the number on the waiting list of people resident in the

north and desirous of coming south during the abovementioned months?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) In correlation to question (2) it is deemed the information requested is of relevance to the homeward voyages (southward return) of the cargo/passenger vessels during the months nominated and these are as follows—

Homeward return from Darwin via N.W. ports to Fremantle (scheduled anticipated dates of departure ex Darwin)

|               |                    | Due Fremantle      |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| M.V. Koojarra | 22nd October       | 1st November       |
| M.V. Kabbarli | 5th November       | 16th November      |
| M.V. Koojarra | 20th November      | 8th December       |
| M.V. Kabbarli | 9th December       | 19th December      |
| M.V. Kangaroo | 13th December      | 23rd December 1967 |
| M.V. Koojarra | 31st December      | 11th January       |
| M.V. Kabbarli | 14th January, 1967 | 26th January       |

(The M.V. Kangaroo is currently on a round-Australia voyage and resumes normal north-west voyages ex Fremantle the 26th November, 1966.)

M.V. Koolama is presently in Hong Kong undergoing elongation and it is expected will be returning to the north-west coast on her homeward run approximately the 26th December, 1966.)

- (2) All accommodation on the homeward voyages has been allocated north-west residents and seriatim to the voyages listed in answer to question (1) passengers to be conveyed to Fremantle are:—

|          |          | Berths Booked | Wait List for berths |
|----------|----------|---------------|----------------------|
| Koojarra | 22/10/66 | 59            | 7                    |
| Kabbarli | 5/11/66  | 37            | 10                   |
| Koojarra | 29/11/66 | 59            | 39                   |
| Kabbarli | 9/12/66  | 37            | 15                   |
| Kangaroo | 13/12/66 | 94            | 67                   |
| Koojarra | 31/12/66 | 59            | 45                   |
| Kabbarli | 14/1/67  | 37            | 21                   |

- (3) The total wait listed up to and including Kabbarli January return = 204. The relative periods for which bookings requested, but wait listed are detailed in answer to question (2).

### QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

#### ORD RIVER SCHEME

##### Commonwealth Financial Assistance

1. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Premier: Has the Prime Minister yet advised him of the Commonwealth Government's decision on the financial assistance for the completion of the Ord River dam scheme?

Mr. BRAND replied:

We have had no advice of any kind on the decision that the Commonwealth is alleged to have made on the Ord River.

### STATE SCHOOLBOYS' FOOTBALL TEAM

#### Rail Travel Concession

2. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

Will he check the accuracy of his answer given to me this afternoon to question No. 7? It is on the correctness of the advice that he was given that I am seeking clarification.

Mr. COURT replied:

With pleasure. I will have the matter rechecked. When I received the answer myself I was not satisfied with it, so I sent it to be checked. However, if it will satisfy the honourable member I will have it checked again.

### DARRYL BEAMISH CASE

#### Availability of Report

3. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

I would like to preface my question by saying the Premier agreed earlier this week to receive the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and myself for the purpose of discussing with him the Beamish case. This afternoon the Premier has laid upon the Table of the House a report in connection with that matter, and I would like to ask him whether he could, in the very near future, have a copy of the report made available to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and a copy to myself, in order that we might study the details of the report before we have the interview with the Premier?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The Minister for Justice has some extra copies. I do not know how many, but we will do everything we can to get at least one or two copies immediately for the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Hawke: Thank you.

### FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### Third Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [4.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [4.45 p.m.]: When dealing with this matter last night I mentioned to the Chief Secretary, who is in charge of the Bill, that I felt the contributions made by the local government authorities to the Fire Brigades

Board were, in effect, rather excessive. The Minister told me he had agreement from the local government authorities and from all parties concerned in connection with the formula which operates regarding the apportioning of funds to the Fire Brigades Board by these particular bodies. In fairness to him, he also mentioned that the local government organisation early on had suggested that there should be a reduction, but, when he laid down the formula, he received no objection from that organisation.

I suggested during the Committee stage that possibly the reason was that the organisation might feel that had it objected, the amount could have been increased. I spoke today to an official of the organisation, and I understand from him that a meeting of the executive was held on Monday night and those on the executive feel very strongly that the amount should be reduced at least to the same amount as is subscribed by the Treasury; that is, the subscription should be reduced to 16 per cent. I understand that they put this proposition forward to the Government at the time. They felt when they received the reply from the Minister that he did not intend to alter the amounts and that if they were to press the matter any further it may come out worse for them.

Apparently my guess was right. They thought it was probably better to leave things "as is", rather than have the contributions any higher. I asked how they felt about the 10 per cent., 10 per cent., and 80 per cent. proposition, and was informed that the executive was in agreement with it but felt the Government would probably not agree to it. The executive is very strongly of the opinion that the local authorities should not contribute any more than the Treasury does, which is 16 per cent. In that event, the Treasury would contribute 16 per cent. and the local government authorities 16 per cent., and the remainder would be contributed by the insurance companies.

I would again ask the Chief Secretary handling this Bill to see his way clear to accept an amendment along those lines and have it dealt with while the matter is before the Legislative Council. I know that the Chief Secretary is absent on business today but, I am sure, the Minister for Lands, who is handling the Bill for him will, in his usual, competent way, hand the matter on.

**MR. BOVELL** (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [4.49 p.m.]: This matter was fully debated last night. The Chief Secretary indicated that the proposal had been fully examined before the preparation of the Bill, and agreement was completed on the matters concerned.

As far as any consideration of the proposal of the member for Pilbara is concerned, I know the Chief Secretary will

have a look at it, but beyond that I can give no undertaking.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## **PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE BILL**

### *Third Reading*

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

## **FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL**

### *Report*

Report of Committee adopted.

## **BARRACKS ARCHWAY**

### *Removal: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 18th October, on the following motion by Mr. Brand:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Barracks Archway should be removed so that Parliament House and its surroundings can become the focal point of the western end of St. George's Terrace.

**MR. CROMMELIN** (Claremont) [4.52 p.m.]: I should say from the outset, so that there will be no doubts in the minds of members, that I am in favour of retaining the archway. I listened very carefully to the Premier yesterday when he spoke and gave his views on this matter, and I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my satisfaction at the way in which he put the case.

There is one thing I do not like, and that is for any persons, or pressure groups, in their wilder moments to cast aspersions on any man, whether he is a member of Parliament, the Premier of the State, or anybody else. In that respect, I take strong exception to the remark made to the effect that the Premier is adopting an arrogant attitude in this instance.

I say that advisedly. I have been a member of Parliament for a few years now—10½ years to be exact. When I first came here with a lot of tremblings and fears, I never dreamt for one minute that I should have the privilege of calling the Premier and, indeed, all the Ministers by their first names. I have noticed throughout the years I have been here that when members on this side of the House and members on the other side have made an approach, no matter at what hour of the day or night, to the Premier—or to any Minister—to speak to him behind the Chair, or out in the corridor, the request has never been refused.

As far as I am concerned, outside of this House—and inside of this House, except perhaps on a Government policy speech—the Premier has never shown signs of arrogance. Although my opinions in regard to the archway vary from his, I must

emphasise that no notice should be taken of the words which were said in connection with arrogance.

Mr. Norton: Who said them?

Mr. CROMMELIN: The honourable member reads the paper and he heard the comment. I would like to go back over some little period of time to the point when this question of the demolition of the archway was first raised. I read in the Press that the Cabinet—or, at least, the Government—had decided the archway should be demolished. Fairly soon after this decision was published, I received numerous phone calls, not so much from my electors as, indeed, from friends, who pointed out to me that they were surprised because they knew full well my view on this matter many months ago and that was that I was in favour of its retention. Their concern was as to why I, as a member of the Government, should vote to pull it down.

This is a misapprehension throughout the whole of this State; when one reads of a Government decision, immediately one thinks it is a decision of every member of the Liberal and Country parties who sit on this side of the House. It is a fact that, in legislation, most of us support the Government once we have been told of its intentions. However, we read about this matter in the Press, and consequently we accepted the Government's decision as it was. We did not support it. With the exception of the two members who have spoken, we have not, up to this time, expressed our views or cast our votes.

Soon after that decision was reached by the Government, the Premier advised the public of Western Australia that he had persuaded the Cabinet that the demolition would not take place immediately, but he would allow the archway to stand until such time as he could judge the reactions of the public on the question—and such has been the case ever since.

For a few moments, I would like to refer to the television discussion which some of us viewed, and to some of the people who were involved in the discussion. I think the first speaker was Bishop Riley and, having heard him, the Premier in his comments appreciated Bishop Riley's gracious remarks. The Premier realised that Bishop Riley was speaking from a sentimental point of view; and, of course, why should he not speak from this point of view? At one time he went to the old—as it was in those days—High School, which had been the hospital for the Barracks. Indeed, I myself also attended at that old building before the movement to the new school took place. Of course we have a sentimental remembrance of the old hospital—or, more correctly, the school. On behalf of the Historical Society, Dr. Cohen gave his views as well as he was able.

On the other side of the panel, there was Professor Stephenson, who is quite an expert, I understand, and a town planner of repute. However, I would like to say that the town planner of today will get no credit in 50 years' time. The mistakes he makes now will be held against him for many long years. In any case, one could not expect Professor Stephenson to support the retention of the archway, because the Premier read out in his speech that it was creating a traffic problem. I cannot agree with that because it is fairly obvious there will be no traffic problem in that respect. I do not think for one moment a town planner would agree to the archway being retained if it constituted a traffic problem, because this would directly negative his own policy and his own ideas.

One of the other speakers on the panel was a Mr. Norton from the Art Gallery, who showed various films of the arch from many positions. Mr. Norton did not impress me very much, because I have very strong opinions in regard to some of the public money which Mr. Norton has spent and in regard to some of the things he buys. These things may appeal to a lot of people but they certainly do not appeal to me. One of these pieces is lying outside the Art Gallery now and, of course, we do not know how much it cost.

I think town planners do their best at all times, but I sometimes feel that to some extent they are inclined to put their views to the Government with, perhaps, an overbearing manner. They do this because they are firmly convinced they are right; but perhaps they do so having regard to the problems which they, as town planners, have to face up to.

Might I suggest that the Government, having regard for some of the thoughts which come from the ordinary citizens of this State, could have a policy on town planning. The Government could, if it had such a policy, curb, to an extent, some of the town planning we have to face up to today. Although this has nothing to do with the problem we are discussing, I might add that today we are in the position of being deprived of the right to buy a jar of cream, but why I know not.

I will not refer to the poll that was conducted by *The West Australian* newspaper, or to the street poll that was taken, but I intend to speak on the second poll, the figures for which were 49 per cent. in favour of the archway being retained and 35 per cent. in favour of its being demolished, and 11 per cent. represented people who held no opinion. The question of shifting the archway to another site did not enter the poll.

If we were to add two noughts to each of those figures, imagining that they were the voting figures for candidates at an election, the figures would be 4,900 for the successful candidate, 3,500 for the un-



successful candidate and 1,100 informal votes; and, having checked some of the election results, those figures are fairly accurate. In my own electorate between 9 per cent. and 11 per cent. of the electors did not vote at the last State election; and, of course, if I received 4,900 votes at such an election I would be declared the winner. So, on the figures that were obtained, the people who conducted the poll have proved satisfactorily that the majority of those who gave their opinion are in favour of the archway being retained.

Mr. J. Hegney: From where did they pick the voters?

Mr. CROMMELIN: I do not know, but I know the result of the first poll that was taken was accompanied by a list of the districts in which people were approached, and those districts included places such as Midland and Dianella—places I do not know.

Mr. Graham: You do not know Midland?

Mr. CROMMELIN: Yes, I know Midland, but I did not know the names of some of the other districts that were listed. However, no vote was taken in places like Dalkeith, Nedlands, or Peppermint Grove when the first poll was conducted. Had they taken a poll in those districts, the number of people voting for the retention of the archway would have been greater than it was.

Mr. Court: Do not speak for Nedlands.

Mr. CROMMELIN: Very well, I will not speak for Nedlands, but I might even be right in what I have said in regard to the result of a vote taken in Nedlands.

Mr. Hawke: Only one person can speak for Nedlands.

Mr. CROMMELIN: In his speech, the Premier stated that he and his Government are strong supporters of the Historical Society. This is quite true. I have no doubt that they would be in favour of preserving our old buildings, but their support only gives the Historical Society more strength to nominate many of these old buildings for preservation and this, of course, does not impinge on the feelings of the public to the same extent as has the suggestion to demolish the archway.

In *The West Australian* of Friday, the 14th October, are published two photographs which I presume were Government sponsored. They were taken from the median strip in front of Newspaper House with a camera fitted with a telephoto lens. To study them is quite interesting, because the first photograph shows the archway standing in front of Parliament House. The second photograph also shows Parliament House, but with trees superimposed in the position where the archway now stands. What I take to be the wall forming the outside of the proposed cutting for

the Mitchell Freeway is also shown in the second photograph.

In comparing the two photographs, one showing the archway obscuring Parliament House and the other showing some trees obscuring Parliament House, the only difference is that the archway obscures four more windows than do the trees. So, from the front of Newspaper House in St. George's Terrace, Parliament House would lose little in appearance if the archway were retained. If the proposed trees were to grow as high as the archway is now—and some trees would—the difference between that portion of Parliament House that would be obscured by the archway and that obscured by the trees would not be very great.

There is no doubt that when a question such as this is being considered people become very emotional, and just before the climax is reached the number of people who become worked up greatly increases. I have never been the type that has been influenced by pressure from any group or person. As I said earlier, my mind was made up on this question a long time ago, and to the ordinary member a matter such as this is not as serious as some groups may think.

I am astonished by the fact that when the Premier introduces his Budget speech in this Chamber and announces he intends to spend for the current year \$200,000,000, there is never anyone in the public gallery, yet on this question, which is non-political and of no importance so far as the expenditure of money is concerned, we find that there is a number of people sitting in the gallery.

Having recently returned from a trip overseas, the member for Balcatta would know that since the war, when hundreds of thousands of buildings were devastated by bombing, the people of the European countries have done their best to restore them to their original condition if they had any historical value. In many instances, of course, it was impossible to bring them back to their original condition because before the war some of the buildings were hundreds of years old and the architecture was very ornamental, and there are not today tradesmen with the same skill as that possessed by tradesmen in years gone by. Therefore, there would be no chance of re-erecting many of the old historic European buildings along the same architectural lines with a view to restoring their original condition; but the people in those countries are doing their best.

It has been said by some that we could not possibly compare the Barracks Archway with some of the buildings or archways in Europe; that it could not be compared with the Marble Arch or the Arc de Triomphe. Of course, no such comparison could be made. The buildings in Europe cost a great deal more money to construct

than did the Barracks Archway. In any event, I do not think the people in Paris or the residents of London would agree to the Arc de Triomphe or the Marble Arch being demolished, and I know full well the member for Balcatta would agree with me that the traffic hazards around the Marble Arch are among the worst in the world; it is almost impossible to negotiate the traffic that surrounds the Marble Arch.

Mr. J. Hegney: The traffic round the Arc de Triomphe is worse than round the Marble Arch.

Mr. CROMMELIN: The people in those cities would never allow those buildings to be demolished. In many of the little villages in England, which are hundreds of years old, crosses, which are greatly valued, have been erected. They mean nothing to some people, but to the villagers they mean a great deal. Anne Hathaway's cottage has, no doubt, been visited by millions of people over the years. It is only a small, simple cottage, but it is the sentimental value behind it that counts. People travel hundreds of miles to see it because it is classed as being among the historical English buildings.

There has been so much controversy over the Barracks Archway in Perth that I have here a photograph of Lambeth Palace for members to peruse. As members know, Lambeth Palace is the official residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, when I look at the photograph of it, the similarity between the Barracks Archway and the archway of Lambeth Palace is very great.

Mr. W. Hegney: The archway is inside Lambeth Palace.

Mr. CROMMELIN: The archway is behind and at the side of the palace. The archway itself is nothing. It is purely and simply an entrance to the courtyard of Lambeth Palace. I would remind members that this structure is situated in a district which is composed of working people and is much different to the area in the vicinity of the Barracks Archway. Yet the people would never contemplate demolition of the archway at Lambeth Palace.

It is also extraordinary that when visitors come to Parliament House they inspect the exterior and the interior of the building, but I have noticed particularly they spend more time in the corridors admiring the pictures of the old buildings which have been preserved in the south-west, and in other parts of the State. I shudder to think what the Minister for Lands would say if a suggestion was made to bulldoze some of the old homesteads in the Busselton district. Therefore, the interest of people in the pictures which hang on the walls of our corridors indicates that they are extremely keen to ensure that the State's oldest buildings are preserved.

In his speech the Premier said that Parliament House should be the ultimate

in the view from St. George's Terrace looking west. He also said it was a pity that the Parliament House building could not have been completed in accordance with the original plan. Everyone is aware that Parliament House, as originally proposed, could not be completed because of cost. In comparing the appearance of the Parliament Houses in other States, I point out that Parliament House in Brisbane is a fine old building, situated on the corner of a street, and opposite is a hotel, and there is a motel further down the road. However, no-one criticises the Parliament House in that capital city because of its situation. In Sydney the Parliament House building is extremely old and was previously the Government Hospital. The Parliament House in Adelaide is a charming old building close to the railway station and it has three hotels opposite.

Mr. Graham: What is wrong with hotels being near it?

Mr. CROMMELIN: Nothing; and there is nothing wrong with the situation of Parliament House in Adelaide, either. The same applies to Parliament House in Melbourne. That is a most attractive building despite the fact that it is not isolated. So I cannot agree with the contention that Parliament House in this State as it is, and completely bare, is the wonderful attraction we think it is. The interior of the building is very good and has many pleasing features, but the exterior is very plain. There was not a great deal of thought given to the front of the present Parliament House when consideration was given to its completion. In my opinion, with nothing to break the view from St. George's Terrace, Parliament House appears to be extremely bare.

Therefore we have the choice of planting trees with landscaped gardens and fountains between the front of Parliament House and the cutting for the Mitchell Freeway, or we permit the Barracks Archway to remain on its present site. In that respect the Premier said if the archway was retained it would be improved in a way that was deserving of its importance by its surroundings being adorned with trees, gardens, and perhaps fountains. If the archway was retained on its present site, the planting of trees nearby would detract, to some extent, from its present height. That would be an improvement that could be effected by landscape architects with aesthetic ideas who can put into effect plans to detract from the height of any building by improving the appearance of its surrounds.

So, with all sincerity, I maintain that the archway, being one of our extremely old buildings, should be retained. It is part of the State's history, which means something to the people of Western Australia but which to the people in England would not be considered very important; because England has so many historical buildings that, no doubt, our Barracks

Archway, to the English people, would pale into insignificance. There are many people in Perth who also hold the same views, but there are also many others who do not get a great deal of satisfaction from looking at the modern buildings which to-day are constructed principally of glass, concrete, and steel.

They are all the same; there is nothing attractive about them. With the modern age, comes the modern building. I can think of nothing more monotonous than to go down St. George's Terrace and see nothing but buildings such as I have described. But in the case of some of the old buildings like the Technical School and the Palace Hotel the monotony is broken down, and that is what the public enjoys: something away from the modern day construction; something which goes back to the olden days.

Finally, might I say that I made up my own mind long ago that I would do my best, in my small capacity, to have the archway retained. I think the majority of the people who have been quizzed about the matter want the archway retained. Once it is taken down and demolished it can never be put back. So we should have very serious thoughts before we agree to the demolition of the archway, which is one of our old historical buildings.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta) [5.16 p.m.]: My view on this subject is, I think, pretty well known; but in case it is not I here and now declare that I support the motion, and its objective, which is to demolish all that remains of the old Public Works Department building.

First of all, let me say that, in my considered view, there has been a lot of heat fomented in connection with this matter; and a great deal of time and energy has been spent by a number of people who, unquestionably, are well-intentioned. I say that with all sincerity, whilst at the same time deploring that in a number of instances they have chosen and endeavoured to be rude. I should imagine the viewpoint of those opposed to such people is entitled to at least as much respect as they would hope their views would receive.

Having been here more than a few weeks, the fact of people agreeing or disagreeing violently, or otherwise, is not a novel experience. I preface my general remarks by saying that I am appalled that so many good citizens should be applying themselves so vigorously to this question, when they could, in my view—and it is my emphatic view—be far better employed in giving attention to matters such as good young Australians being conscripted for service overseas, for a cause which is frowned upon by about 130 out of the 135 nations of the world.

I would have hoped, also, that instead of being concerned about an old building—and more about that anon—there would

have been indignation far more volubly expressed with regard to the Government's avowed intention—which of course appears before us in the form of a Bill—to render a definite injustice to the working people of this State, while allowing gains and profits to go on in an unbridled fashion.

I suggest, therefore, there is a sense of proportion which is lacking. Australian lives and the welfare of Australian citizens apparently count for nothing, but it would appear that what happens to an old building is of prime concern. A great deal of this, no doubt, is because of the news space which has been devoted to this matter. It would almost appear that the most important matter to Western Australians, whether in the international or the national sphere, is whether the remnants of this old building should remain or whether they should be removed.

Again I say that people have got things in a perspective which is completely and utterly divorced from reality and proper values. Let me say too—and the Government would be the last to deny it—that this situation has developed, and the matter is being referred to Parliament, because of an indecisiveness on the part of the Government itself, whose duty and responsibility it was to have made a firm decision.

In the course of the lifetime of a Government there are far more important decisions than having an archway, or having no archway, which are made by it without reference to Parliament. The Government apparently has found itself in something of the nature of a predicament, and therefore this question is placed before us for resolution.

I have already stated that I favour the demolition of the archway, just as I would favour the demolition of this Government. I only wish the latter were as simple as casting my vote. But irrespective of my party-political views, and what might be my view on the transcending importance of certain matters measured against this, as a citizen who has had the honour of being a member of Parliament for quite a lengthy period, I feel this matter must be determined on the merits of the case.

Very often, as I indicated a short while ago in another place—not at the other end of the building, but certainly in another place—Governments and Parliaments are called upon to make decisions which do not necessarily accord with the views of the people, and which do not receive the approbation of the people. Unpopular steps, however, are very often necessary in the public interest.

I would hate to think that because of some caprice on the part of any members a wrong decision might be made in respect of this question; because, whilst it is unimportant compared with other matters, it is nevertheless important to the City of Perth, to St. George's Terrace, to the environs of Parliament House, and

the rest. Perhaps the words "Parliament House" can, in part, explain the attitude of some people who appear to derive sadistic pleasure from poking their fingers in the eyes of members of Parliament, or of the parliamentary institution, or of the Government of the day—whatever Government it might be—and who find this, therefore, as a heaven-sent opportunity, because the remnants of the Public Works Department building are sitting in the grounds of Parliament House.

This is not a matter of a lack of a sense of proportion, or an over-estimation of our own value, because you, Sir, and I are but a passing phase. Parliament is an institution which is, notwithstanding various jokes which are made in connection with it, dear to the hearts of all freedom-loving people of all democracies. Wars have been declared for the purpose of preserving the democratic rights of people freely to make their own determination. Surely, therefore, the symbol of democracy, which is Parliament House, irrespective of its qualities from an architectural point of view, is something which is worth preserving; something which is worthy of as prominent a position as it is possible to give it.

With that thought in mind, this site was selected. By deciding, therefore, that the remnants of the old building should be removed, we are but giving effect to the original concept. Some members have been influenced, or are likely to be influenced, by certain polls that have been taken, because they have certainly quoted the results of such polls. The only poll that means anything to Parliament, and to parliamentarians, is surely the poll which is held either in accordance with Statute, or because of special legislation which is passed for the purpose of ascertaining the public will.

It is true that certain organisations claim that, with a small margin for error, the results of their polls can be regarded as being accurate. I have done a little polling myself in order to ascertain the position. I have not done it in any general way; but I have taken the opportunity—as I did on Saturday last—to obtain the opinions of certain people.

There was a large gathering of people at a sporting function, and while I was speaking with a couple of them I asked them their views on the matter and found that they accorded with my own. I remarked it would be interesting to find out what other people thought, so I approached half a dozen of them. Five of those people were in favour of demolishing the archway, while the sixth favoured its retention.

I went back to separate groups, and of 23 persons who were approached, one was in favour of the archway being retained; but he confided to me that though he felt it should be demolished, it could be some

embarrassment to the present Government if it were left there, as it would be a reminder of the fact that one David Brand had wanted to demolish it.

I have gone to other groups, and the result has been somewhat similar. One out of seven wanted the archway retained, and so on. I have stated quite honestly the result of the inquiries I have made in the matter. I stated in a session held by a television station last Monday fortnight that to my recollection I had not received a single communication in respect of this matter from any constituent of mine; and my electorate is numerically the largest in the State.

Mr. O'Neil: I have received two as a result of your invitation.

Mr. GRAHAM: That may be so. I was informed by people afterwards that I had really stuck my neck out, and that I would receive a deluge of communications one way or the other. The next morning I received a telephone call from a lady. We had a very amicable discussion, and she indicated to me that she and her husband felt that the archway should be retained. Since then I have received a letter from one person only in my electorate, and that was not couched in very gentle terms. Apart from that I have received two other letters and a telephone call.

While all this has been going on, and while people have been so concerned about it and it has been considered such an important matter, I have received two communications from my own electorate and six from the entire State of Western Australia.

Mr. Bickerton: Any in favour of demolition?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have indicated the position with regard to those who were in favour of demolition, and I have not been out seeking them.

Mr. Bickerton: Your communications from your electorate have been 100 per cent. in favour of retention.

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Pilbara apparently was not listening. I said I had two communications only from my electorate, and the people who wrote felt that what was left of the building should remain. Therefore I indicate that the great majority of the people obviously are not very concerned about it; and from my experience in speaking to people—and I do move amongst the people a terrific amount—I would say that the majority seem to feel that the archway, as it is called, should go.

I can well appreciate the viewpoint of those anxious to preserve the old historic buildings in any country. However, there must be a measure of rhyme and reason in this. I claim no fame for being the originator of the statement, but Professor Stephenson said that the historic buildings

in Western Australia are being erected to-day and will be erected to-morrow, as well, of course, as some that were erected yesterday. In the various countries of the world the historic buildings are not those erected in the last 137 years; they are buildings which have been constructed over the centuries and which have, for one reason or another, assumed an importance and accordingly are preserved; not all of them, of course, because that would be impossible.

Because one feels that on account of certain considerations the building immediately in front of Parliament House should go, surely that does not indicate such a person is a vandal or has no respect for the history of Western Australia. When Western Australia is 3,000, 4,000, or 5,000 years old, if we could only return we might be surprised to find out what buildings are then regarded as being souvenirs of the past.

If we forget about the Old Barracks building for one moment, I think we could devote some attention to the house in which John Curtin lived. I do not know whether there is a lack of enthusiasm there because he did not spring from the right family—speaking of social class, now—but, after all, he was the first Prime Minister from Western Australia and was the wartime Prime Minister who mobilised the resources of this nation when Japan was barking at our shores.

The house in which he lived then, and which was still his home when he died, has, in my lay view, no particular claim to distinction because of any architectural feature. Indeed, there are many hundreds, if not thousands, of homes somewhat akin to it in the metropolitan area at the present moment. One by one, they will go on account of the ravages of time, and growth, and development; but surely there is special significance attaching to the particular house I have mentioned that means something to us to-day; and surely it will mean something to us in the days to come!

Therefore, I think some people need to bring some of their history and thinking up to date and not be of the opinion that the only buildings that have any value are those that were erected in the last century, because there will be many more centuries in the history of Western Australia.

I am unable to understand why suddenly the old Public Works Department building has attained the proportions, which it has in the minds of some people. I well remember as a public servant having to go to that building from time to time, and it was shockingly inadequate for the purpose for which it was used. I do not think any public servant, highly or lowly placed, was proud of the building. The Governments of the day certainly were not, because they found it a convenient place above which and on which to erect signs of one sort or another; and altera-

tions and appendages were made from time to time.

Even though some of our famous public servants worked there and designed and laboured in the interests of the State, I do not think there was any sense of pride in the building they occupied. They would have preferred to be elsewhere under decent circumstances. It is only now, when a decision is about to be made and the building looks like being threatened because of modern development—to wit, a freeway—that suddenly the archway has become a sacred cow and becomes possessed of all sorts of virtues in respect of which previously nobody cared a fig!

In the minds of some people, this is the only piece of history that remains in the centre of the City of Perth. That, of course, is far removed from the truth. Earlier, I indicated that many of us, for party-political reasons, or for a whole host of other reasons, could decide that our attitude will be one from which we may derive some personal satisfaction, or one that will satisfy certain people who are friends and who have been pressing heavily because they feel keenly about this matter. But I return to the point: There is a responsibility devolving upon us.

This Parliament House was placed in its present position for a reason; and the reason would not be for the remnant of an old building to act as a screen between the city and Parliament House. Surely it is more fitting that the focal point, or the terminus—if I may express it that way—of St. George's Terrace should be an open area.

Shame upon the member for South Perth, who is anxious to make a speech now, but who can do so presently. He did not support the move of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who wished that the eight lanes of traffic thundering past Parliament House should pass in subterranean fashion, instead of through an open cut which this Government has decided upon. I trust that some succeeding Government will take action to see there is a vast area of soft grass available to the public, with gardens, shrub treatment, and all the rest of it, so that the view from the city will be pleasing to the eye, rather than that this remnant should be left.

After all, this is not a matter of retaining the Old Barracks, because about 90 per cent. of the barracks is gone. It is a question of retaining a small portion of it; and, as everybody knows, the rear portion or western aspect of that remnant will be entirely new. It will be 1966 or 1967 vintage, because it will have to be covered almost completely with a new facing of bricks of similar design to the other side.

To that extent, of course, it will in no way whatsoever be part of the original or resemble the original, but it will be an irritant between the city and this prominence.

I mentioned this matter before, and it is of some personal concern to me that most of us, perchance, could cast a vote because of a desire to enjoy a little sadistic satisfaction here and there. This whole issue calls to my mind somewhat vividly the couple of debates we had in connection with an aquatic centre in King's Park, so often referred to as the pool in the Park. I well remember one member in this Chamber saying that so long as he had strength in his body, breath in his body, or whatever it might have been, he would not allow one tree, one bush, one twig, or one blade of grass to be interfered with.

Mr. Jamieson: Flora or fauna?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is today a Minister of the Crown and is the Minister who has a considerable amount to do with Kings Park. I suppose many hundreds, if not thousands, of trees have been bulldozed during the past several years.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, as no doubt you do, a member of this Parliament who decided he would vote against the pool in the Park in order to mark the metropolitan members, because the metropolitan members had voted for the closure of certain railway lines in his district, and this was his way of getting even.

Mr. May: That is fair enough.

Mr. GRAHAM: Fair enough, of course; and this is the answer: That person is no longer a member of Parliament. I remember another member who said that if he voted against the pool in the park it would then ensure it would be constructed in his electorate. Mr. Speaker, it was not. I remember another member of Parliament who said, "Charlie Court is in favour of it; that is enough for me. I am against it."

Mr. Hawke: That was a fairly sensible thing to say, too.

Mr. Court: You should have added, "Between Charlie Court and Harry Howard."

Mr. GRAHAM: So those of us who recall those days can recall with interest some of the wider factors that caused members to arrive at their decision. In respect of this matter, therefore, my plea is that all members, whether they agree or disagree with the motion, will make their decision having in mind what they consider to be the best interests of the City of Perth, and the environs of this place. I have no doubt they will do that, because none of us surely has a monopoly of a proper sense of propriety. I think I need say no more than that.

This is not an archway that was constructed as an archway to commemorate an occasion or as an example of the architecture of one associated with earlier history. This was never constructed as an archway; it was a gate that led behind a building. The building is now no more. I do not know whether there is any particular architectural beauty about the archway. The President of the W.A.

Chapter of the Institute of Architects is apparently of the opinion that the cause of architecture would be better served by its removal.

The responsibility is now that of Parliament. As I have already indicated, after listening to the views that have been submitted—and there have not been too many of them—I am firmly of the opinion that there would be no offence whatsoever to society if the proper course were adopted and this motion were agreed to and effect given to it.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [5.45 p.m.]: I rise to speak briefly against the motion which the Premier has introduced. The motion reads as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Barracks Archway should be removed so that Parliament House and its surroundings can become the focal point of the western end of St. George's Terrace.

Approximately six weeks ago I spoke about the activities taking place at the western end of St. George's Terrace when I was opposing the Freeway cutting, 35 feet deep and 100 yards wide, being put through in front of Parliament House.

I did not then get any support from the Government side with regard to my desires to make the western end of St. George's Terrace worth while. On that occasion I expressed the view that if we could have the Freeway in a tunnel, and covered by a park, I would be prepared to see the archway stay where it is. In those circumstances I think it would be in an appropriate site and would be of some value to the community. Even though the resolution to have the Freeway in a tunnel was not carried, I still favour the idea of leaving the archway where it stands because, to some extent, the majority of people who want it to remain there are sincere and wish to have a link with the past through this particular building.

As the member for Balcatta has said, more than 90 per cent. of the building has been demolished. Surely it would be a reasonable compromise to leave the 10 per cent. that remains in the form of the archway. I believe history is associated with this building and I can foresee that in the future people will recall history by being able to refer to the fact that the memorial of the archway remains where it is. To those people the archway will resemble the history of the past.

I can recall reading quite recently in one of the papers that the famous engineer responsible for the goldfields water supply, Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, planned the whole of the scheme in the building referred to as the Old Barracks. No doubt many other prominent buildings in this State were planned and designed in that particular building. In my opinion it is wrong to remove the whole structure and have no

record of the location where such famous men became associated with public buildings.

As far as I am concerned I am prepared to be with the minority in this particular instance—if the Premier feels we are in the minority. I am not going to say very much on this point, but the polls indicate that we are not the minority; we are the majority.

I agree that it would be much better to have the archway in a setting of lawns and shrubs and gardens. I agree with the member for Balcatta that the day will come when the Freeway, which will ruin the western end of St. George's Terrace, will be placed in a tunnel.

I wish to read to the House some correspondence I have received in connection with this matter. As late as this afternoon I received at Parliament House, a telegram worded as follows:—

Mr. John Brady,

Parliament House Perth W.A.

General meeting favours retention archway on site. Letter following.

National Trust

Organisations such as the National Trust, the Historical Society, and similar bodies, have been encouraged by the Government in recent years to carry on with the good work of preserving and restoring old buildings. Surely if the National Trust feels it is desirable to retain this building in the area where it stands we should support it and encourage it. The Historical Society and the National Trust are similar bodies, and the members give their services free and very often at expense to themselves. I think those people should be encouraged in their work.

I want to read a letter to the House because, to some extent, it expresses the point of view of an expert. I will read it slowly so that the merit of it will sink into the minds of members. The letter was written by a man who knows something about this subject, and who is widely travelled. The letter is from J. Russell Baxter, 126 Waterhall Road, South Guildford, W. A., and is dated the 18th October, 1966. It is addressed to Mr. J. J. Brady, M.L.A., J.P., Houses of Parliament, Perth, W.A., and reads as follows:—

Dear Mr. Brady,

Barracks Archway

I enclose two newspaper cuttings.

The first is a letter I wrote to the West Australian in which I supported the preservation of the only remaining visible link with an epoch in the history of your State—the arched gateway to the old Pensioners' Barracks.

May I ask you to plead in the pending debate for its preservation and not for its destruction.

Town planners whilst promoting and stimulating change in the city image have also a great moral responsibility

to the people in protecting the city image and resisting changes which will rob this image of its historic associations.

Perth is known all over the world (among other things) for its unique situation and its river image, which it is rapidly losing to the freeway image. Before the character of Perth is submerged by freeways and their concomitant structures, surely the people must be given a voice and consulted on the character of the city they want Perth to become.

Planning is for people and Perth belongs first and foremost to the people. It was the social forces together with the economic forces which created Perth, just the same as any other city. Politicians must therefore pay due regard to social history.

The second enclosure deals with publicity and I feel sure you will find great wisdom in the words of "Lincoln." They are worthy of quotation at the right time in the debate.

Good Luck.

Yours sincerely

J. Russell Baxter

J. Russell Baxter is a lecturer in the W.A. Institute of Technology, and the School of Architecture and Town Planning. He is one of the experts in this particular matter and has travelled widely. When I first knew him he was an employee of the Town Planning Board. A letter which he, in conjunction with another gentleman, wrote to *The West Australian*, is as follows:—

Sir,—In a paper entitled "Conservation and Control in Built-Up Areas" Lord Holford, past-president of both the Town Planning Institute and the Royal Institute of British Architects, discussed ways and means of identifying and preserving historic values in town and country.

He said: "This is the moral responsibility of trusteeship, of handing on to the next and future generations an estate that has not been impoverished by neglect or prejudice.

"Every generation discards some values from and adds some values to its inheritance. But the real crime against posterity is knowingly to destroy the living records and associations of a town on the assumption that the next generation will have no use for them."

Many people are apathetic about their city. Fortunately, however, there are many who believe that historic buildings represent social history and that historic association is more important than architectural merit or vista.

Surely it is the duty of the present generation to recognise that conserva-

tion is wise policy and that the Barracks arch should be retained for posterity.

Yours, etc.

Russell Baxter and Bruce Tomlinson, lecturers, W.A.I.T. School of Architecture and Town Planning.

A second enclosure was a quotation from Lincoln under the heading, "Publicity" and is as follows:—

Lincoln is credited with saying . . .  
 "... Public opinion is a very great force—it is indeed almost everything. With it nothing can fail; without it nothing can really succeed. Consequently he who moulds public opinion and sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed. . .

I felt it was desirable to read the telegram from the National Trust and to read the letter I received and the newspaper cuttings. They came from people who do know something about the subject with which we are dealing, and those people are in favour of retaining the archway for its historic value to future generations. To that extent, I feel I can go along with them.

There are some people who say the archway will, to some extent, detract from the magnificent Parliament House building which was foreshadowed or foreseen by some of our earlier pioneers and engineers. Anybody who has taken the trouble to go down St. George's Terrace and look at the archway, or who has looked at the pictures which have been shown on TV and which have appeared in illustrated articles, will see that, in fact, the archway does not detract in any way at all from the Parliament House building.

To some extent, one gets the impression that the archway is one of those magnificent structures which one can see on various important buildings throughout Australia, particularly on the residences of governors and governors-general; and which can also be seen on ambassadors' buildings in various capitals, and so on.

By leaving the archway where it is, it will to some extent cover the terrible cutting we are to have immediately in front of Parliament House: the cutting known as the Freeway. Even if it is only to hide the Freeway and to stop people from looking into a cutting when they reach the western end of St. George's Terrace, it seems to me the archway will be doing a service there while, at the same time, doing a service to those people who see some historic link in the building.

In conclusion, I would say that at Port Arthur in Tasmania, for many years the buildings have been allowed to go into disrepair and to fall to pieces. However, in recent times a decision has been made to

bring the buildings back to their original state as soon as possible and to preserve for future generations some of the history of Port Arthur and Tasmania generally.

I think there is something to be learned from history; and, with any profession, when one does one's basic training, one has to study the history of that particular profession, whether it be law, chemistry, medicine, architecture, or any other. I think a study of history points out the mistakes of the past, and even the Barracks Archway reminds us of some of the bad mistakes that were made in our early colonial days. Some of those mistakes we never want to see repeated, particularly some of the mistakes that were made at Port Arthur.

Unfortunately there are some people who bob up from time to time and who have the feeling that they want to stand over others but, if they can be reminded of history by such places as the Barracks Archway and the buildings at Port Arthur, I think they would have second thoughts about their desire to be dictators—to stand over people, and to push them around.

I am proud of the democratic institution that is the Parliament of Western Australia, and of the building in which it is housed. I feel the archway will not detract greatly from the building but will, to some extent, add to its appearance, because there will be the contrast between the old and the new side by side. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I want to see the Premier's resolution for the demolition of the archway rejected, and I feel confident members will vote to reject it.

**MR. GRAYDEN** (South Perth) [6.3 p.m.]: I was delighted to hear the sentiments expressed by the member for Swan. I hope many other members on that side share the views he holds.

**Mr. J. Hegney**: What about members on the other side?

**Mr. GRAYDEN**: Because if they do I feel sure the motion will be defeated and, if it is, then the Barracks Archway will be retained.

The Premier's statement yesterday, that if there is any indecision on the part of Parliament on this question then, as far as he is concerned, the Barracks Archway will remain, is a welcome breath of reason in a pretty sordid affair. I was delighted to hear this statement. It means the Premier divorced himself from the responsibility for any decision in regard to the archway, and placed the ball fairly at the feet of the members of this House.

If members vote for the motion they will have to accept the responsibility for their actions; if they vote for it and permit the archway to be demolished then, I suggest, they will, without any question, have committed an act of vandalism unparalleled in the history of Western Australia. I would go further and say



they would be exhibiting a contempt for a responsible opinion, which is foreign to most people's concept of Christian values. That is what I think about the question; and as I go along I am sure I will be able to establish that point.

Mr. J. Hegney: Christian virtues.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister for Works would not do that, surely!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I find it remarkable that there should be any suggestion about demolishing the Barracks at this particular time. I happened to walk into the Public Library only three or four days ago and, as I went through the doors, I was immediately struck by a display of photographs exhibited there. One of the photographs naturally caught my eye because at first glance I thought it was a photograph of the Barracks. This photograph shows the actual focal point of Hampton Court Palace in England. This building has been built with the same type of red bricks as were used for the Barracks; but those who have seen the Hampton Court Palace tell me that bricks used are not of the same standard as those used for the Barracks Archway.

This building in England has two towers and an archway and is of approximately the same size as the Barracks building towers and archway. If the photograph were shown to the general public of Perth, and the wings of the building could be blotted out, half the people could be pardoned for thinking it was an actual photograph of the Barracks Archway.

Mr. Davies: The member for Balcatta sent me a post card of that archway when he was in England, because it reminded him of the Barracks.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is the focal point of Hampton Court Palace.

Mr. May: Is there an open-cut there like we have here?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I would like to read the caption which is underneath this photograph, which is one of a set displayed in the Public Library. It is headed, "Heritage in Trust" and reads as follows:—

Picture set prepared for British Information Services by the Central Office of Information, London, 1965. Hampton Court Palace:

A Royal Palace whose magnificent apartments and lovely gardens are among the finest examples of well preserved historic buildings and formal parklands in Britain.

Further down, the following appears:—

In Britain today, development and preservation go side by side.

These pictures show examples of historic and beautiful buildings and areas of unspoilt countryside which survive, despite the demands of a growing population, expanding industry, and technological developments.

The protection of this natural heritage is the concern of both official and voluntary bodies. Through their vigilance and ingenuity much has been saved for the enjoyment of present and future generations. By their efforts to encourage wider interest in architectural standards, they contribute to the onward march of Britain's progress.

It is extraordinary, to say the least, that whilst the Government of Western Australia is contemplating the demolition of the Barracks Archway, the British Government is sending out sets of photographs, such as the one I have mentioned, to various parts of the world with a view to publicising the historic buildings of Great Britain. In doing so, those in charge of this publicity have in mind the tourist value of these old buildings to Great Britain and also that such publicity creates an infinitely better image of the United Kingdom.

The authorities in that country think so highly of their historic buildings that they have forwarded these photographs to all parts of the world; and, whilst the photographs are being exhibited in our Public Library, we are simultaneously debating a motion for the demolition of the Barracks Archway, which is so similar in appearance to the Hampton Court archway that people could be excused for mistaking a photograph of that archway for the Barracks Archway in Perth.

In my opinion, the Government has been badly misinformed and misled by its advisers and also, in some instances, unfortunately, by its own officers, in respect of the Barracks Archway question. Yesterday evening the Premier said that the Government had been given advice by two responsible bodies in this State and also by Professor Stephenson. The Premier referred to the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Authority and to the W.A. Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. Prior to this he had referred to the views expressed by Professor Stephenson.

Professor Stephenson expressed his views on the fate of the Barracks Archway. They were published in his report on town planning which was made 12 years ago. Many people conversant with the work performed by Professor Stephenson at that time possibly held similar views, but they have since changed their minds because the whole concept of, and the planning for, the area has been completely changed. In the vicinity of the archway, and at the rear of Parliament House, has now been erected a huge Government office building. Work is already in progress for the construction of the Mitchell Freeway and all sorts of other alterations have taken place. So the views expressed by Professor Stephenson 12 years ago do not carry much weight today.

The Premier quoted one of the statements made by Professor Stephenson, and to refresh the memories of members I will quote it again. It is as follows:—

For vital traffic needs and for general improvement of the City, the Old Barracks, an inadequate and obsolete office building, together with the temporary buildings adjacent to it, should be displaced. Although there may be a sentimental attachment to the Old Barracks, which for reasons long since passed was placed in a commanding position, it is not a building of distinction or architectural merit.

Those are the views of Professor Gordon Stephenson, one individual in the employ of the Government. Possibly I could quote the views of 20 eminent world authorities which are diametrically opposed to the views held by Professor Stephenson.

I understand that one honourable member this evening will be quoting the statements made by many eminent world authorities and, in the circumstances, I will not quote them, with the exception of one. This statement is by Professor Denis Winston, an architect planner and landscape architect of world consequence, and it appears in the publication *Western Heritage* on the cover of which appears a photograph of the Old Barracks similar to that which is on the cover of the telephone directory. His statement reads—

The Old Barracks to me is a most interesting example of 19th Century Gothic Revival architecture. The beautiful color and texture of the brickwork is most unusual for Australia. The Old Barracks terminates St. George's Terrace most delightfully, and as the years go by I think the people of Perth will treasure the building more and more.

That is the view of an eminent world authority which is diametrically opposed to the view expressed by Professor Gordon Stephenson.

Mr. Lewis: When did he write that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know, but I could find out for the information of the Minister. I would also add that the Minister would no doubt be rather surprised to hear some of the statements that have been made by other eminent world authorities on the Barracks Archway. Some members in this Chamber will find it difficult to reconcile those statements which will be quoted this evening with the views expressed by Professor Gordon Stephenson. I continue to substantiate my claim that the Government has been misinformed and misled by its officers on this question. It is nearly 6.15 p.m., and I will ask you Mr. Speaker, if this is a convenient time for me to conclude this portion of my remarks before the tea suspension.

The SPEAKER: It is a minute before 6.15, but because of the circumstances, I will leave the Chair until 7.30 p.m.

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

Mr. GRAYDEN: Before tea I was saying that to demolish the Barracks would be an act of vandalism, and members who voted in favour of this motion would be exhibiting contempt for responsible opinion, and this was foreign to most people's concept of Christian values. I stated how at the same time as there was a move to demolish the Barracks in this State, the British Government through the British Information Service was displaying in Perth photographs of historic buildings of England—buildings which greatly resemble the Barracks.

I then went on to say that the Government had been misinformed and misled by its own officers on the question of demolishing the Barracks; and I read out to the House a statement by Professor Gordon Stephenson in which he disparaged the Barracks. He said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for South Perth is repeating the arguments he used before tea, and that is a contradiction of Standing Orders.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am trying to refresh the minds of members. Let me turn to the next point. When the Premier moved the motion yesterday he said he had been advised by an extremely competent authority; he was referring to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. The Premier said—

I also point out that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority came right down on the side of the Government and said that the archway should be removed in order that we might proceed with the original plan. That authority set out the position very clearly, and the publicity in connection with the matter reads as follows:—

Perth's top planning body—the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority—has decided to recommend to the Government that the archway be removed.

The authority's decision and the arguments supporting it will go to Town Planning Minister Logan tomorrow.

He is expected to place the report before State Cabinet next week.

Premier Brand said today that he had not received a report on any decision by the authority on the archway.

M.R.P.A. is Perth's most influential and broadly representative planning authority.

The Premier went on to say—

The authority clearly stated in its report that the archway should go; and more recently, Mr. Finn, of the Chapter of Architects, indicated publicly that his organisation felt the archway should be removed in order that we might continue with the original plan. Therefore, surely the Government cannot be criticised for accepting the advice of such professional organisations as those to which I have just referred and not forgetting that the original proposals of Professor Stephenson included a recommendation that the archway should be removed.

Those are not authorities at all. I have before me the membership of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and this will give members an idea of how skilled it is to pass judgment on a structure like the Barracks. It comprises 11 members, and they are as follows:—

The chairman who is appointed by the Governor.

Five members, each one appointed by the Governor.

A member being a mayor or councillor of the Municipality of the City of Perth who is nominated for appointment as a member by the council of the municipality and appointed by the Governor.

Four members each representing one of the groups of local authorities in the schedule to the Act, who shall be a mayor, councillor or member as the case may be of one of the local authorities set out in the group which he represents.

The five Government appointed members of this authority are the Town Planning Commissioner, the Commissioner of Main Roads, the Chief Engineer of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department, the Surveyor-General, and a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures. Then there are the four appointees of the various local authorities.

Could anyone, in his wildest moments, claim this was an authoritative body capable of passing an opinion on a historic building such as the Barracks? On the authority is also a member of the Municipality of the City of Perth, and I understand that the present representative is Mr. Curlewis. This is held up as an authority which should be acclaimed by us. That is absolutely rubbish, because there is not one academically qualified member amongst all the representatives capable of passing judgment on a matter such as this, and I am including the Town Planning Commissioner.

Mr. O'Connor: Do you consider he is not qualified?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not say that at all. I have the greatest admiration for the

Town Planning Commissioner as an administrative officer, but there is a tremendous difference between an administrative officer and one who is qualified in landscaping or town planning. I do not think that Mr. Lloyd would suggest he is highly qualified in town planning, or landscape architecture.

I repeat that on the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority there is not a single academically qualified member; yet this is the authority which is held up as being the supreme body in Western Australia to pass judgment on the Barracks. I can well imagine how the Government came to its original decision on this matter if it was receiving advice from a body such as that. I go further and say that the manner in which this body tendered advice to the Government is open to question, to say the least.

When a matter of this kind is being considered by the authority, the normal procedure is to submit it to a technical sub-committee or sub-committees. In turn they make a recommendation to a body known as the advisory committee, and the advisory committee then makes a recommendation to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

In this instance the procedure was not followed. I am led to understand that the decision was made by the main body itself, and the usual procedure was just brushed aside; because if it had been followed it would have meant that individuals, such as the City of Perth Town Planner, and others, would have been called in to take some part in framing the decision. Here we have the authority firstly brushing aside the accepted procedure on an issue such as this. Notwithstanding the fact that the authority consists of laymen, with the possible exception of the Town Planner—and his qualifications on town planning are limited—some members in this House expect the Government to be influenced by its decision.

That body has misinformed the Government on this issue, just as Professor Gordon Stephenson misinformed it when he said the Barracks was an obsolete building of no consequence. As members will recall, I quoted world authorities to establish that they have a very high opinion of the Barracks. I have dealt with two authorities which were quoted by the Premier—firstly, Professor Gordon Stephenson, and then the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

I now pass on to the next authority, because the Premier mentioned the W.A. Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. He said that Mr. Finn of this institute of architects indicated publicly that his organisation felt the archway should be removed in order that we might continue with the original plan. I saw that statement, as did most members.

Mr. Finn's statement was published in *The West Australian* recently, and I ask

members to listen carefully in the light of what I intend to explain shortly. His statement, which appeared on the 17th October, is as follows:—

Mr. G. W. Finn, W.A. president of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, said yesterday the government should not be influenced by the result of a token poll on the future of the Barracks arch.

The poll was only an expression of opinion by lay people with no knowledge or understanding of the subject, Mr. Finn said.

The architectural design of the arch was not good and contributed nothing to cultural standards.

#### Platform

To retain the arch it would be necessary to form an isolated level platform which would destroy the landscaping design of the area.

The arch was completely out of scale with the development of the area and this would become more apparent as taller and larger buildings replaced existing structures at the west end of St. George's-terrace.

Mr. Finn said the aesthetic value of the arch as a focal point for St. George's-terrace was questionable. Parliament House would be better.

Preservation of the whole Barracks building would have been worth considering if it had been possible, but preservation of a part had no significance.

That is the opinion of Mr. Finn, the retiring president of the W.A. Chapter of the Institute of Architects. In this statement, Mr. Finn states that he speaks for the W.A. Chapter of the Institute of Architects, and yet, strangely enough, that chapter has never considered this question. How then can his statement be placed before members of Parliament with a view to influencing their opinion when it does not represent the views of this organisation; because the organisation has not, in fact, even discussed the matter?

I want to go a bit further on this particular point, because it is a pretty important one. The statement which Mr. Finn made was published in *The West Australian* last Monday. Last Monday night a meeting of the institute was held—the annual meeting, I understand—and Mr. Finn retired and Mr. Geoffrey Summerhayes was elected the new president, together with a new committee.

When the Premier spoke on this matter he was obviously under the impression that the opinion expressed by Mr. Finn was the opinion of the W.A. Chapter of the Institute of Architects; but, in fact, this was not its opinion. Last Tuesday members of this institute were so irate at the statement that I have just read that they attempted to discuss the matter

by moving a resolution. However, the motion was declared out of order because it was not on the agenda.

Architect after architect—each one of them a member of the institute—has rung me up complaining of the arrogant attitude of the retiring president. They bitterly resented the attitude he adopted when he stated that the poll was an expression of opinion by lay people with no knowledge or understanding of the subject. They also bitterly resented the fact that he spoke on behalf of the members of the institute when he had, in fact, no authority or mandate to do so.

Let us consider the position for a moment. When the Premier spoke he told us that the Government was guided by the views of three authorities—Professor Stephenson, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and the W.A. Chapter of the Institute of Architects. I have pointed out that the view of Professor Stephenson is different from the view of many well-known overseas architects. I have pointed out that the people who comprise the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority are laymen; and I have pointed out that the views of Mr. Finn do not represent the views of the W.A. Chapter of the Institute of Architects. In other words, every authority the Premier has mentioned on this particular subject has been discounted.

This is an extraordinary situation, especially as on the opposite side of the fence are authorities of tremendous standing advocating the retention of the Barracks Archway. Need one go further on this particular point than the Historical Society? Here in Western Australia for many years we have had the Royal Western Australian Historical Society, a body of individuals who are going out of their way to preserve buildings and objects of historical importance. The Historical Society very early in the piece made it quite clear that it desired the Barracks to be retained. Although I have the comments of the Historical Society, I do not intend to read them. Suffice to say that on many occasions in the past the society has stated that it wants the archway retained.

We can go further than the Historical Society. We can point to the National Trust, an organisation formed in Western Australia by interested people in about 1959. A couple of years ago this Government gave statutory form to the National Trust, because it had such a tremendous regard for its aims. What does that trust want to do on this issue? It wants to save the Barracks Archway. I would like to quote some of the words of members who spoke in support of giving statutory power to that body, because it would indicate the attitude of members towards that body. However, on this occasion, because the views of those on the trust are contrary to the views of some here, those on the trust are to be ignored.

We can go still further. In Australia is the Australian Council of National Trusts to which all States belong, with the exception of South Australia. The president of this council was in Western Australia some months ago, and the trust has considered this issue and has expressed its opinion that the archway should be retained.

But we can go beyond these three authorities—the Historical Society, the National Trust, and the Australian Council of National Trusts. We can go beyond them and point to the Perth City Council. Surely on an issue of this kind the Perth City Council should have some say. Surely the views of its members should be of some consequence. The members of the Perth City Council have considered this question, and what do they think about it? They voted 19 to 4 in favour of the retention of the archway. Since the vote was taken, another member of the council has returned from an overseas trip, and if another vote were taken now, it would result in a vote of 20 to 4 in favour of the retention of the archway.

In slightly different circumstances, this vote would have been 21 to 3. It just so happened that one member of the council had already cast a vote in another organisation, and he did not feel inclined to go back on it. Nevertheless, the vote was still an overwhelming one in favour of the retention of the Barracks Archway, and yet the Government is ignoring it.

These are the authorities which state that the archway should be retained. I have already explained to the House the credentials of those who say the archway should be demolished. We can discount all the credentials of those people, and can point to bodies such as the National Trust, the Historical Society, and the Perth City Council, all of which say that the archway should be retained.

I want to say that I will not regard this as a very fair vote tonight, if the vote is taken tonight. I must again say how gratified I am that the Premier has made it clear that members will be completely free to vote as they wish on this matter. He has made an unequivocal statement to the effect that if Parliament is indecisive, the Barracks Archway will stay. We applaud that statement and welcome it. Nevertheless, it will still not be a very fair vote, because we will be starting off with nine members in favour of demolishing the arch, and those nine are the nine members of Cabinet in this House. How can we have a fair vote in those circumstances? Nine members of Cabinet will vote behind the Premier on this issue and will vote for the demolition of the Barracks.

Several members interjected.

Mr. Brand: What would your attitude be if Cabinet had been in favour of the retention of the archway?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: We know Cabinet will do this, because the Premier made it quite clear during a television interview that the members of the Government are 100 per cent. behind him.

Mr. Brand: What is wrong with that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Let me explain the situation for those of the public who might be listening. Unfortunately, a lot of people believe that the Government comprises the supporters of the Government including those who sit on the back benches; but, of course, it does not. The Government is the Cabinet.

The Premier has made it quite clear that his Ministers are 100 per cent. behind him on this issue. Is any one of them going to cross the floor in those circumstances? Of course not! They will vote 100 per cent. behind the Premier, and those who want to retain the archway are therefore going to start off nine votes behind.

Mr. Brand: Any one of the Ministers here is quite free to cross over if he so desires.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I quite appreciate that, but I say this: They are not going to.

Mr. Craig: The only reason is because they stand behind the Premier and believe he is right.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Perhaps we might be able to induce one or two of them to change their opinion. They may be important votes and may change the result.

Mr. O'Neil: You are not persuading us.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We are talking about the Cabinet. It is an extraordinary thing, I think, that in this Parliament there is a division of opinion, as there is in the public; but no division of opinion exists in the Cabinet.

Mr. J. Hegney: How do you know that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is a pretty unusual state of affairs.

Mr. Hawke: A very good point!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Here is a body in which there is no division of opinion, but in every other body a division of opinion exists. It indicates one thing, and that is that if the members of the Cabinet really hold that view, they are pretty well out of touch with the feelings of the man in the street.

Mr. Hawke: Have been for years!

Mr. GRAYDEN: There is no division of opinion in the Cabinet. That is a fact, say what we like. It is possibly the only body in Western Australia in which there is no division of opinion on this matter.

I want to say that one of the unfortunate aspects about this matter is that a decision to demolish the archway would be completely irrevocable. This is not a matter like fluoride where, if another Government is in power six months, six years, or 20 years hence, the policy can be changed.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. GRAYDEN: This is not a decision which can be rescinded. Once this decision is taken and the Barracks Archway is knocked over, it will be gone for ever.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAYDEN: When that is done Western Australia will have lost a historical building of tremendous consequence. Statements have been made to-night to discount the historical importance of the archway, but how can this be logically done? How can those concerned really believe what they say. I have displayed a photograph of Hampton Court Palace, and I have indicated what the British Government and people think about it. They think so highly of it that they display these photographs throughout the world. That building was erected in the 15th or 16th century, long after civilisation came to Great Britain.

When was our Barracks Archway erected? It was first commenced in 1860, 31 years after Perth was founded. In those circumstances, is this not of tremendous consequence? Historically the Barracks Archway must be infinitely more important to Western Australia, because of that fact, than is Hampton Court Palace, or any of the other buildings we hear of in Great Britain, to the British. There is no question about it. In 1,000 years' time this archway will be of infinitely greater consequence to Western Australia than is Hampton Court Palace to Britain. In those circumstances, how can anyone in this House play down its historic value? I think they are committing a tremendous injustice when they voice sentiments of that kind.

I want to go further and say that this building has been criticised from an architectural point of view—it was criticised by Professor Gordon Stephenson. I am not going to repeat what he said, but members will recall that his remarks were disparaging in the extreme. I am not going to repeat what I have already said, or read from authorities again, but I quoted from authorities to indicate what they thought of the Barracks, and they thought extremely highly of it. Before the tea adjournment, I mentioned that I had not stressed that particular aspect too much because I knew there was another member in this House who was going to speak shortly and who would quote what some of the eminent authorities throughout the world have said in respect of it.

From an architectural point of view, it is regarded as being the keystone in a group of colonial brick buildings in Perth which are unique in Australia and which add so much to the character of Perth. This is regarded as being the keystone of this group of buildings which include the Cloisters, Trinity Church, Wesley Church,

the Cathedral, the Perth Town Hall, and other buildings of that kind. All sorts of references can be made to eminent authorities who say that, architecturally, this is a desirable and a picturesque building. On the aesthetic quality of the building, again there can be no argument.

Earlier tonight we heard the member for Balcatta say that from a town planning point of view it was desirable that there should be a great vista and that people should be able to look at Parliament House. I am curious to know on what authority he makes that statement, because I am given to understand that it is a fundamental principle in town planning that town planners get away from the long vista with a single focal point.

I repeat, town planners get away from it, because they regard it as terribly undesirable that someone should start walking in a street such as St George's Terrace, and be virtually able to see the whole of a building which is the focal point, for the entire length of the vista. Town planners say that in those circumstances when one approaches the building it becomes an anticlimax. In that situation, town planners go out of their way to put something in the foreground to mask the main focal point and to hide it somewhat so that there is an air of mystery about it. This is a fundamental principle in town planning and in landscape architecture in particular. We have heard it said that it is desirable that there should be this great bare vista with this building in the background.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

#### *Extension of Time*

Mr. RHATIGAN: I move—

That the honourable member's time be extended.

Motion put and negatived.

#### *Debate (on motion) Resumed*

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [8.3 p.m.]: I regret the Government would not support one of its own members on an extension of time. I thought the member for South Perth was just getting to the most interesting point of his speech, and it is a matter for regret that he was not permitted to continue.

At this stage let me say I am not the following speaker who is going to quote some eminent authorities—I have no authorities to quote on this occasion. I have worked it out that, if every member in this House spends 10 minutes on the debate, we will not get home until about 3 o'clock in the morning; consequently I intend to be as brief as I can.

I remind the House that during the Address-in-Reply debate, which was in the second week of the session, I took the opportunity to say that originally I had been in favour of the complete demolition of the Barracks buildings; but, hav-

ing seen the archway standing as it is now, I have been forced to change my mind, because, to use the words of the member for South Perth, I think it forms a very suitable mask to the square design and, indeed, the blackness of the present building of Parliament House.

I think all members of this House would acknowledge that in its present state, the archway is probably as bad as we could possibly ever hope to see it, and the Government will need to spend some money—and I suggest, quite a reasonable amount of money—on its restoration. As I said before, it will need to be floodlit, and some kind of an approach will have to be made to it. A plaque will be needed in order to tell the visiting public what it is all about, and some vast restoration will be necessary in regard to the brickwork.

I feel that all of this is warranted because of the very good reasons which have been quoted by the speakers who have preceded me and who are against this motion; which means, of course, that they are in favour of leaving the archway where it is.

I thought the Premier, in advancing his argument in support of his motion, was not as good as he usually is. I apologise for not having heard all the Premier said, because I was called away to the telephone on several occasions, but from what I heard of his speech I gathered his only authority was Professor Gordon Stephenson, and he quoted three references from the *Plan for the Metropolitan Region, Perth and Fremantle, 1955, Report* which I now hold in my hand.

I must say that the quotations the Premier made are not taken out of context—they are exactly as they appear in this report. The Premier was not using an old political trick, as many of us have at times, of taking quotations out of context. These quotations are precisely as the Premier gave them and as one would interpret them after reading the full chapter.

I am quite certain that the Government does not favour everything that Professor Gordon Stephenson recommends, but, on this occasion, it suits the Government to accept his recommendations with regard to the Barracks. Indeed, the Government does not intend to follow up all of Professor Stephenson's recommendations, because there are quite a number of them which are not acceptable to the Government. I refer particularly to the recommendation to make Government House a museum and to build a new Government House in King's Park. This is one recommendation which I think neither party would be prepared to tackle.

Professor Stephenson was not prepared to leave the Barracks standing, because he said it was of little consequence. In the report to which I have referred there is

a caption to a photograph of some of the areas in and around Fremantle. Facing page 192 of the report, there is a photo of the Roundhouse. The caption reads—

An historic and admirable terminating feature closing the vista down High Street—it is suggested it should be retained.

This is the complete opposite to the argument which he is taking with regard to the Old Barracks. He says that Parliament House should be the end of the vista down St. George's Terrace, but in Fremantle, he says of a very old building, which is one for which we all have some sentiment—that is, the Roundhouse—that it should be retained to finish the vista in High Street.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What conclusion do you draw from that, may I ask?

Mr. DAVIES: I am just pointing out that his opinion in regard to old buildings is adjustable. He takes one building and suggests it is a suitable one to leave but, in another instance, he suggests another old building should be pulled down completely. Of course, he talks about traffic and the problems caused to traffic if the archway remains.

At page 177 of this report there is a picture and sketch of St. George's Terrace. This picture shows St. George's Terrace, the Old Barracks, and Parliament House as it was in 1955 before a progressive Labor Government had started the extensions to Parliament House. There is a sketch drawn to show what is intended in the future and, no doubt, this represents Professor Stephenson's ideas.

Of course, the sketch which he shows does not depict any deep cutting, as is now proposed; it shows the traffic flowing almost at road level; and, at the top of St. George's Terrace at the intersection of Malcolm Street and St. George's Place, he shows a very high needle monument which looks to be perhaps 100 ft. high and is somewhat reminiscent of the American War Memorial in Canberra. A series of steps leading up to Parliament House is shown, and these steps are provided so that there is a means of progress for the public all the way from the Terrace to Parliament House. I am quite certain Professor Stephenson is looking at it from a completely different angle to the way we are looking at it. On this occasion, I feel there are very good reasons why we should disregard the recommendations he has made.

I said earlier tonight that, in a previous speech, I had already given my reasons for supporting the archway staying where it is. I only hope the Government will accept the various opinions which have been enunciated on many occasions in this House by way of question and debate. I only hope the Government will accept the findings of the various polls which have been held, and these were commented on

at some length by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition last night. I believe the results of these polls are very important and they must be given every consideration. Because of the closeness of the polls that have been conducted up to date and because, as the member for South Perth said, of the obvious division and difference of, and split in, opinion by members of Parliament themselves, I believe the archway should be left where it is.

In company with previous speakers, I feel it is a matter for regret that the motion had the addendum to it—or, that, in fact, half the motion stated that the Barracks Archway should be removed so that Parliament House and its surroundings could become the focal point of the western end of St. George's Terrace. Because of the inclusion of those words, if for no other reason, I could not vote for the motion, even if I were in favour of the archway being demolished. I do not hold myself, or Parliament, in such high regard that I believe we should dominate St. George's Terrace.

For the reasons I have stated, I very much regret I cannot support the Premier on this occasion.

**DR. HENN (Wembley)** [8.12 p.m.]: I do not propose to speak at any great length on this motion, but not because it is not an important one. I feel it is of great importance. However, in this House we have other matters to discuss which I believe to be of even greater importance. Nevertheless, I would not like this motion which has been introduced to be discussed without my having contributed a few words to it.

I do not propose to say anything at all spiteful about any person and I do not propose to say anything unpleasant about any Government department; nor do I propose to say anything nasty about the Barracks Archway, because I am rather fond of it, too!

When discussing this matter outside of this Chamber, I have heard that people are inclined to become emotional when they talk about the Barracks Archway, the Barracks, and similar topics. I would like to know what the harm is in becoming emotional. Some of the greatest human deeds have been done in moments of emotion, and some of the cruellest acts of life have been perpetrated after cold calculation. I think a little emotion in the human brain is a very good thing. I am not suggesting that anyone has become emotional about the Barracks, but I have heard it said. I just want to say here that I think it is rather unkind of the opponents of those who support the archway's retention to say such a thing; because, later on, I will refer to one or two organisations and people whose work and aim it is in life to preserve and care for old buildings, monuments, houses, and the like. I shall refer to those organisations which are in existence in Western Australia.

However, there are similar organisations in other countries, and one country which comes readily to mind, of course, is England, where the work that historical societies and similar organisations have to perform in looking after historical buildings is very important indeed, not only because of the great number of them, but also because of the changing circumstances in Europe and in England. Today these buildings are passing from private ownership into the possession of other people and a decision has to be made on the ultimate fate of the buildings.

Therefore the task of these organisations is possibly more arduous than the work performed by the W.A. Historical Society and the National Trust, to mention but two of the organisations that perform such work in Western Australia. This does not mean to say that they are not performing an extremely important job. I shall refer to those organisations at a later stage.

At the outset I regret that the wings of the Old Barracks building had to be removed; and I would have regretted the removal of any part of them. I have made some inquiries from people who have knowledge of architecture, the building of roads, and so on, and I know, too, that everyone has his own opinion and is quite entitled to it. From the research I have made I believe it might have been possible to preserve a large part of one wing, and certainly equal parts of both wings, in constructing the Mitchell Freeway, which will pass by the site of the Barracks Archway. However, I will not dwell on that aspect, because it is similar to spilt milk and there is no point in speaking to it. Nevertheless, from the architectural and historical point of view I regret that the wings of the Barracks Archway had to be demolished.

My own views on the question were determined some months ago. I must admit that one does not give attention to matters such as this every day or perhaps at the right time, but so far as I am concerned my mind was made up many months ago, so I cannot be accused of the hysteria of which many people have been accused in considering this matter.

In many countries we find examples of old and new architecture in buildings which lie side by side, and, although the architectural periods are vastly different and could lead one to say that, in a sense, they were anachronistic, one could certainly not say they were incongruous. Great Britain is studded with such examples of architecture in historic buildings in places ranging from the north to the south and, in my view, they make the perfect historical picture. I know that progress has to be made, but we should be mindful of the past when we look to the future.

In 1956 a statement was made by Sir Denis Winston who is Professor of Town and Country Planning in the Sydney Uni-



versity. Before making a short quotation from a statement he made I would remind members that it was made in 1956, so it cannot be said that the professor was emotional or hysterical at that time. He said—

The Old Barracks to me is a most interesting example of 19th Century Gothic Revival architecture. The beautiful color and texture of the brickwork is most unusual for Australia. The Old Barracks terminates St. George's Terrace most delightfully, and as the years go by, I think the people of Perth will treasure the building more and more.

In 1959 a statement was made by Lord Esher, the President of the Planning Institute of Great Britain, and a former Vice-President of the Royal Institute of British Architects, and the following is a short quotation from his statement which he made during a Press interview:—

The mellow beauty of Perth's colonial buildings such as the Barracks and The Cloisters is most distinctive, and of great interest architecturally. It is similar to many of the brick buildings of Tudor England, which are carefully preserved and cherished. Wherever in an Australian city you have groups of old, charming buildings, then you must keep them.

Replying to a speaker who suggested that the Old Barracks in Perth should be turned into an annexe to the museum, he said the Government should be brought around to preserving it from this point of view. A city should have a past, and the younger it is the more important it is to hold on to its historical buildings . . . The few old buildings of character and charm that exist in Australian cities are doubly important because of their rarity, and are one of the few features these days that make one city different from another.

Lord Euston, an adviser on historic monuments to the British Government and Chairman of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, London, said this—

On my recent visit to Perth I could not help becoming aware of the controversy over the retention or demolition of the Old Barracks.

Speaking from the viewpoint of a visitor with no previous knowledge of this city, I should like to express the hope that at least the towers and archway of the Old Barracks will be preserved.

They seem to me to create a most valuable focal point at the end of St. George's Terrace, the removal of which would surely be regretted in years to come.

Again he said in another Press interview held a couple of days later—

It is unthinkable to remove one of the very few old buildings in Perth . . . Its brickwork is beautiful. The Gateway with two short wings should stay.

Finally, before leaving this State, he made the following statement:—

I should like to express the hope that at least the towers and archway . . . will be preserved. They seem to me to create a most valuable focal point, the removal of which would surely be regretted in years to come.

That was said by Lord Euston, an adviser on historic monuments to the British Government. Prior to making that quotation I quoted the statement made by a former Vice-President of the Royal Institute of British Architects (Lord Esher), and the statement made by Sir Denis Winston, Professor of Town and Country Planning, Sydney University.

The final quotation I would like to make is from a short statement made by Dr. Reyner Banham, eminent English architectural critic and joint editor of the *Architectural Review*, journal of the British Institute of Architects and one of the world's leading architectural journals. He said—

The city of Perth . . . really made a tremendous impression on me. It's not only that marvellous setting of the Swan River . . . but the quality of the city itself—the long stretch of St. George's Terrace, the main street . . . running up at the end to the Old Barracks—the perfect closure to a street of that sort.

Finally he also said, during a lecture he made at the Perth Town Hall—

The Old Barracks performs a useful townscape function in closing one end of St. George's Terrace . . . it reduces an otherwise unlimited view and keeps the street space tidy. A building further back could not perform the same function.

I regret that I have had to weary the House with those quotations, but I think they are important because the men who made the statements really know something about architecture and the value of historic buildings. I do not mind anyone holding any opinion he likes on any subject, but when I am told that my views or the views expressed by my electors are not right because they are different from those held by other people, I object strongly. On a question such as this it is only fair to quote the arguments both for and against. We heard the other side of the argument from the Premier when he opened the debate, and I understand both his and the Government's points of view. However, I want to be quite clear that I do not agree with the point of view held by the Premier, for the reasons I have

tried to give in the short space of time I have been on my feet.

I did not refer to the Barracks Defence Council, another organisation that is worthy of consideration and respect when expressing an opinion on this matter. That council, in no uncertain terms, has stressed its view that it thinks the Barracks Archway should be retained. The Royal Western Australian Historical Society is playing its part in an effort to have this old building preserved, and it will continue to act in a similar way for the preservation of other old buildings in the future, because there will be more of them.

During the last few weeks I kept wondering whether the National Trust would say something on this subject, knowing that it is an extremely important body and is of great value to Western Australia. Like other members, this morning I received a telegram from the National Trust, and I am extremely pleased to be able to support its views this evening and hope the views of this organisation, expressed in the telegram, prevail when the vote is taken on this motion.

As to the opinion polls which have been conducted on the Barracks Archway, I do not profess to be a mathematician but when I read that 49 per cent. voted in favour of the Barracks Archway being retained, and 35 per cent. voted against, I imagine that the 49 per cent. wins; but I will not comment on whether a woman voted or a man of 28 years voted and that because of this the poll taken was of no value. To my way of thinking the result shown by the poll is sufficient for me to say it indicates that the majority of the people who were questioned, at any rate, wanted the Barracks Archway to remain.

I was rather pleased to receive a letter from the Town Clerk of the Perth City Council, because when one has an opinion of one's own, one battles along hoping it is the same as the opinion held by the majority of one's electors. That is why I am elected as a member of this House; to represent the electors of Wembley. But it is very difficult to ascertain from one's electors, on occasions, what their views are. It is not their fault, and I do not think it is altogether the fault of the member of Parliament, because on another matter, which was under discussion in 1962, and which was again discussed in this House yesterday—you probably know to what I am referring, Mr. Speaker—I called a meeting in my electorate to try to gauge public opinion on this subject.

I advertised that the meeting would be held, and I had pamphlets printed and placed in the letterboxes of many hundreds of houses. The meeting was to discuss fluoridation. Seven people attended, and four of them came from south of the river; and you know where my electorate is situated, Mr. Speaker. As a result I was

unable to find out what was the majority opinion of the electors of Wembley; and that was in 1962.

Nevertheless on this occasion I am quite certain I know what the majority of my electors are thinking, and I know what the majority of the people in Perth are thinking.

Mr. Lewis: How do you know?

Dr. HENN: I said I am quite certain. That is my opinion. The Minister has interjected because probably he has just cottoned on to what I am saying and no doubt has not been following my remarks carefully. So I repeat that there is a majority of the people who hold the opinion that the Barracks Archway should be retained. I have referred to various most reputable organisations including the Barracks Defence Council; the Royal Western Australian Historical Society; and the National Trust; and I was saying that the Perth City Council had forwarded me a letter.

I do not think we can ignore the majority opinion of the Perth City Council which the town clerk told me was passed on the 19th September this year, and I quote from a letter written by him—

... when it was resolved that the City of Perth support the request made by the Barracks Defence Council that the demolition of the Barracks Archway be deferred until the Mitchell Freeway and associated works have been completed.

If I was wavering at any time in this matter, and I have not been, I think that resolution would have decided me to vote against this motion. Accordingly I am most grateful to the town clerk for sending me the letter to which I have referred.

I have made every endeavour to find out what my electors are thinking, and I feel quite certain that they are not in any way hysterical. They are quite calm; they are certainly not suffering from emotionalism, any more than anyone else either in this House or outside of it.

Mr. Rhatigan: They even have a good doctor!

Dr. HENN: I do feel that the majority of them would wish for the Barracks Archway to remain.

Finally, I would like to say that we are going through an age of rapid development in Western Australia. I would add that if it were not for the efforts of the coalition Liberal-Country Party Government we would not be going through this era of great prosperity.

Mr. Hawke: Error!

Dr. HENN: I suggest we keep our feet on the ground; and, with the progress that has been made, and with the materialistic talk we have heard, we should also give attention to our moral values, to our spiritual values, and even to our historical values.

**MR. DURACK** (Perth) [8.33 p.m.]: Like the member for Wembley I intend to vote against this motion but, in doing so, I wish to commend the Premier for giving the House the opportunity to discuss this most important subject, and for introducing the motion into the House.

As a supporter of the Government it is a matter of regret for me to find myself unable to support the Premier and the Government on this issue. But, of course, it is also a matter of some consolation to me to find there are other members on this side of the House—other colleagues of mine in this House—who have the same views—an experience which I did not have to the same extent when I last differed from the Premier and the Government, except, of course in two notable instances.

I feel one must look at this issue as an individual and as a member of Parliament. When one is considering one's attitude to the preservation of the archway, I feel, as an individual it is essentially a matter of choice; and I have no hesitation in deciding what my own choice is in the matter.

When one looks at this as a member of Parliament, I think there are other considerations, and I feel that perhaps reason and argument play a more notable part in one's decision. I am very happy to find that my own choice in the matter is also supported by reason and argument, which I have endeavoured to bring to bear upon this issue as a member of Parliament and as a person who is called upon to make a decision in the public interest.

People feel various reactions in regard to the preservation of this archway. Some people wish to preserve it for historical reasons, while others wish to preserve it because they feel it has great architectural interest, architectural merit, or character. Yet others, I feel, wish to preserve it for purely sentimental reasons.

I frankly confess that my own feelings, as an individual, are probably much more of a sentimental character than of any other kind. I, however, do feel that when one, as a member of Parliament, comes to consider this issue, and when one tries to assess the arguments for and against, one must give weight to perhaps more substantial matters than simply one's own sentiment.

On that point I think the issue of preservation, and the responsibility we have in Government and in Parliament to preserve buildings for historical reasons, is probably paramount as an argument. We have heard it said—the Premier said it, as did the member for Balcatta—that to-day we are making history; that what we are doing to-day is just as important from the point of view of history as that which has been done in the past.

I do not disagree with that view at all. I entirely accept that what we are doing to-day is of great importance; that it is of historical importance. But I feel this

argument misses the point of history in relation to this issue. Of course what we are doing to-day is of historical significance. All human activity is of such significance. But in order to understand history, we must be able to see it over a wide perspective.

History is the sequence of human events over a long period of time; and, in order to get that picture straight at any particular point of time, we must be able to look back and be able to use various materials whether they be documents, buildings, or any other form of evidence on which judgments can be made and pictures recorded.

That is why it is important that every generation should make attempts to preserve some features of the architecture of a previous generation as well as of its own. It is, I think, a striking fact in the modern world that there is a great realisation of this necessity and this obligation on the present generation.

In other countries of the world, particularly in the European countries, there is very elaborate legislation designed to preserve buildings of historical value, so that one can, at any particular point of time in the future, see this sequence of the activity of past generations.

That is not only a matter of human sentiment, but it is also a matter of jolly good business; because it is a notable fact that the greatest tourist potential, and the greatest tourist activity, resides in Europe, and in those countries which do pay such great attention to such matters. Also in those places where there are buildings of perhaps no architectural merit, or no particular architectural interest, they are of value simply because they are there, and because they have been there for centuries. They are of value for that reason and for that reason alone.

Unless, therefore, we do approach our decisions in this generation with that in mind, then future generations in this State and in this country will not have a benefit which they should never have been denied.

Another argument which I think is most important, and which has been touched upon, is that of public opinion. It is quite apparent—and I do not think it is worth reiterating—that such expressions of public opinion as have been obtained do indicate that the majority of people in the metropolitan area—and I think it is reasonable to assume in the State—favour the retention of the archway. For my part, however, I do not believe that this issue should be decided simply on the basis of a majority opinion. I believe that even if there was only a minority opinion in favour of the retention of the archway, or of the retention of any particular building, unless there was some vital purpose required in the public interest for its removal, the Government should retain it for the reasons I have already advanced.

I cannot see for one minute how the public interest in this matter could possibly outweigh the very strong sentiments and the very strong feelings that quite a number of people have for the retention of this archway.

I do not wish us to debate this matter entirely with a view to the archway. I would like the House to look at this motion as an example of a much broader issue which I have already outlined, that issue being one for the preservation of buildings of historic interest in the community. It disturbs me when I know that planners and road engineers have approached the matter of the Barracks Archway from an entirely different point of view and with an entirely different philosophy. The Premier has fallen back on the authority of these people in support of his motion; and I have the greatest respect for the problem that he and his Government have to face.

I have the greatest respect for the sincerity of the Premier in connection with this matter, but I feel that he and his Ministers have too readily accepted the advice of these persons on a matter of this kind. I believe the experts—the road engineers, town planners, and so on—are there for a somewhat different purpose. We have these experts the same as we have lawyers, doctors, or anybody else who has some expertise in a particular field. They are there simply to tell the client what can be done and how certain things can be done; but the ultimate choice and the final decision must rest with the person to whom that advice is given.

I think we in this State, in recent years, have too readily accepted the advice that has been given by the experts; and in this field the Government has confused the actual issue of employing the experts. The particular matter before us is really one of the preservation of the Barracks. In the wider sense, I believe that is the particular issue and that the experts simply went into the planning of a freeway, and this part of the city, on the basis that the Barracks were of no value or importance, and entirely expendable.

I do not believe for one minute it was a matter of engineering necessity that the whole of the Barracks had to go. I am quite satisfied some part of the building could have been preserved if the engineers and the planners had been told it was important that they should be preserved. That is why I feel that in the future these sorts of vital issues should be brought to Parliament. I commend the Premier for having brought this particular point to Parliament; and I hope that in the future this kind of issue will always be brought to Parliament and debated in the same open atmosphere as is the case with this issue.

We have established that principle in relation to reserves, to Kings Park, and now in relation to the river; and I trust

sincerely we have, by our proceedings tonight, established it also in relation to the preservation of historic buildings in our State and in our city.

**MR. W. A. MANNING** (Narrogin) [8.49 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words on this subject. However, I believe a lot of the words that have been said up to date have been quite unwarranted. I feel a subject like this is a matter of opinion. People are entitled to their opinions. I respect other people's opinions and I expect them to respect mine.

Our opinions are usually influenced by circumstances; and it seems that a great deal of interest is being displayed by the public on this particular subject. A few days ago we disposed of a sum of \$50,000,000 in a few minutes and neither the Press nor anybody else took any notice of it; but a subject like this, which is more personal, arouses great interest. Perhaps that is a good thing.

I would like to add my commendation to the Premier for enabling this matter to be publicly discussed with a view to obtaining an expression of opinion. That, in itself, was a recognition that he and the Government thought the public and Parliament should have something to say on the matter. If that were not the case, we would not have had this opportunity tonight. So although I differ from the Premier and the Cabinet on the way I shall vote, I feel they have done the right thing in giving us this opportunity.

There is no doubt that there is a good deal of public support for the retention of the archway. One reason is that if we retain the archway as it is, there will be an opportunity to make another decision in years to come, if that is desired. However, if the archway is destroyed, there can never be any reversal of the decision. People in the country are interested in this subject because they are proud of their capital city. The Narrogin Town Council supports the idea of the archway standing; and many people have expressed the desire that the remains of the building should be retained.

I do not intend to support my reasons by quoting what other people have said, or quoting other authorities. That sort of thing during this debate has become worn out. I have a few points of my own I wish to raise. The important factor, apart from any others that have been mentioned, is the tourist value of the archway. From a tourist point of view it is an attraction that is of interest. There is the leaning tower of Pisa. It is possible that should be pulled down. But that has not been done, because it is a tourist attraction. There is the Eiffel Tower in Paris. It is a monstrosity and was almost pulled down as soon as it was put up, but it is now one of the greatest tourist attractions in Paris, simply because it is a monstrosity.

Mr. Cornell: I can think of a couple of better ones.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In the State of Western Australia we are endeavouring to attract tourists, but we lack many of the old buildings and features that the older countries have. With this archway, I would say we have something which is peculiar in its construction. Some members would say that is a good reason for pulling it down, but I say it is a good reason for leaving it, because it is vastly different from any building that can be seen anywhere else. It is peculiar in its position. There is no doubt about that, as is obvious by the amount of controversy we have had. It is peculiar in its history. No other building in this State has the peculiar history of that building. So, because of its peculiarities, it should remain as a tourist attraction.

I do not intend to mention any other reasons why it should remain, as the meat has already been taken off the bones. I do not know how the archway can be built up and renovated, but the Premier has given an assurance that he will endeavour to do the right thing if it is decided that the building shall remain. I have no doubt he will do his best.

It is hard to picture what it will ultimately look like, but perhaps if some of the rooms were finished off we could bring in Madame Tussaud with wax figures wearing the particular uniforms of the day, to give people an idea of the purpose for which the building was originally used.

I do not know what the future holds, but I accept the Premier's assurance that the right thing will be done in accordance with the decision of Parliament. I have much pleasure in indicating that I intend to vote against the motion.

**MR. DUNN** (Darling Range) [8.56 p.m.]: At the outset I would indicate to the Chamber that I intend to vote against the motion. I would also like to state that nobody could possibly insinuate or advance the opinion that this matter has not been treated fairly by both the Premier and the Cabinet. It is beyond my comprehension how anybody could state that. I cannot think that the problem could have been treated in a fairer way.

It is not my intention to recapitulate all of the events concerned; but, without exception, the Premier has gone along with the proposition of giving everybody the best possible chance to assess the situation. I want to make this quite clear by reading an extract from a publication entitled *Western Heritage* by Ray and John Oldham to those who suggest that the Premier and the Cabinet tried to bulldoze this matter through. They should have been guided by the remarks in appendix C, which states, "A list of historic buildings recommended for preservation by the W.A. Historical Society." In regard to the Barracks, this publication states—

Historical significance: example of colonial construction long and important Perth landmark.

Recommendation: retain on present site until the completion of the Houses of Parliament.

With completion of Houses of Parliament, remove all building except the Gateway, if that can be suitably included in the layout. If the Gateway must eventually be removed re-erect elsewhere as part of some public building or as a gateway.

That is the recommendation of the W.A. Historical Society, and I want it recorded in *Hansard* because I believe it gives the complete lie and a perfect answer to those have accused the Premier and the Government of endeavouring to bulldoze their way through this problem. I also want to record very firmly that the treatment this problem has received could not have been fairer, otherwise we would not be debating it here tonight.

The reason I am not going to support the motion for the removal of the archway is that within the limits available to me, as far as the Darling Range electorate is concerned, I have endeavoured to ascertain what the people want, and I must come down with the very firm conviction that the people who wish this archway to remain have made their wishes quite clear, whilst nobody on the other side seemed sufficiently interested. Therefore, if I am going to represent them democratically, I must vote against this motion, which I am accordingly going to do. However, I deplore the insinuation that the Premier and the Government have used bulldozing tactics.

In conclusion, I would remind the Chamber that certain people would do well to study the Criminal Code, because it is a serious offence indeed for anyone to intimidate a member of this Chamber. Some of the things said to me, and some of the letters received by me, would incriminate certain people, but I do not intend to do anything other than mention the matter tonight. I feel those people would be well advised to take heed in regard to their future actions in dealing with members, particularly if they are strongly in support of a particular proposal.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [9 p.m.]: I am taking part in this debate as the member for Northam. This is a non-party subject, and consequently I am not participating as the Leader of the Opposition. On the facts of the debate, the leader of the opposition to the motion would undoubtedly have been my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

In my own electorate I have heard expressions of opinion from six people. Among the six was one woman, and she

was very strongly in favour of retaining the archway in its present position. The man with her was very strongly against it. They were, at the time, husband and wife, and, as far as I know, they still are.

Mr. W. Hegney: Perhaps they are arch enemies!

Mr. HAWKE: The other electors who voiced an opinion were in favour of demolishing the archway. So, out of almost 6,000 electors, I have received expressions of opinion from six people. If I were smarter at mathematics I would give the percentage of my electors who have made their views known to me.

At this stage, I think I should read the motion to the House. It is as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Barracks Archway should be removed so that Parliament House and its surroundings can become the focal point of the western end of St. George's Terrace.

If this is the only reason—or even the best reason—which the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues are in a position to present to us in support of the motion, it is a reason which does not appeal to me at all. I am not very much concerned about the outside appearance of Parliament House at all. My great concern with Parliament House is what is done inside of it by members of Parliament, and what goes out of this Parliament in the way of Statutes to which the people of the State have to conform in their everyday living.

On that account, too, I am not at all excited as to the view the people might have in the future years when coming up the Terrace and seeing the archway, if it still remains. I believe the archway, if it does in fact still remain, will be very much improved in appearance compared with what it is now. I should certainly hope so with regard to the view we get from up here at the present time.

Therefore, my feelings in this matter are very calm. I could not possibly get excited about the proposition either way. Therefore, I have listened very carefully to the arguments which have been put forward by the Premier on the one side and the member for Balcatta, and by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other members on the other side. The most prominent feature of the whole situation is the attitude adopted consistently, in recent weeks at any rate, by the Premier on behalf of the Cabinet in declaring the intention of the Government to test public opinion on the issue.

Finally the Premier, on behalf of the Government, employed a firm of experts for the taking of a Gallup poll, or a public poll, whichever way one might care to describe it. Unless the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues intended, when they made that decision and arrangement, to honour the expression of opinion from the

public, it would appear to me the employment of this firm to take the test poll was a move which was not sincerely and genuinely based.

I give the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues credit for believing their decision was sincerely and genuinely based. Whether the Premier and his colleagues expected the test of public opinion to provide a result far different from what it did, I am not in a position to say. However, the result of the poll was clear-cut. As I remember, 49 point something per cent. were in favour of retaining the archway in its present site; 34 or 35 per cent. favoured its demolition; some 4.5 per cent., I think, were in favour of preserving the archway—but, as a first preference, not on the present site—and 11 point something per cent. did not have an opinion one way or the other.

If we analyse the figures for and against the retention of the archway, leaving out, as I think we logically must, those who did not have an opinion one way or the other, the result of the public poll was, in my view, decisive. In that situation it appears to me there is a solid duty on the Government to accept that decision. Otherwise, the taking of the poll was a waste of time and a waste of taxpayers' money. I think it is not a fair proposition to take a test poll of the public for the purpose of trying to ascertain the public view, and, because the majority of those voting for, as against those voting against, is not overwhelming, the result of the poll is to be discarded. In my view that is not a fair way of treating the situation at all.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, especially those of us who have had close elections—I have had only one, fortunately, a good many years ago—that one vote is enough to decide the issue. Even if that vote is the returning officer's casting vote, that is enough; it is decisive. From the point of view of the defeated candidate, it is overwhelming.

Mr. O'Neil: The member for Mt. Hawthorn reckons it is.

Mr. HAWKE: After giving this matter very close and careful consideration, I find I am against the motion on two counts. The first count is that the reason given in the motion for the demolition of the archway is not convincing to me. I could not care less what people coming up St. George's Terrace see; whether it is the outside of Parliament House or the front of the archway, or nothing at all. Perhaps I would prefer to see a beautiful garden where the archway now stands.

As far as the drivers of motor vehicles coming up St. George's Terrace are concerned, I want them to see the roadway and pedestrian traffic surrounding them. I do not want those people looking at the outside of Parliament House or admiring the archway, if it is still there.

A member: What about the passengers?

Mr. HAWKE: The passengers can look at what they like and at whom they like. The second point is that the Government calmly and deliberately chose to test public opinion on the issue—and the decision to test public opinion was surely for the purpose of allowing public opinion to decide the issue. In addition, I would say that I think it is not a subject which, in all the circumstances, should have been brought to Parliament.

I am inclined to think, although I do not go all the way in this, the Government has brought this motion to Parliament because the public opinion test poll did not produce the result which the Premier and his colleagues thought it would produce, and hoped it would produce. Briefly, therefore, for the reasons I have given, I am not able to support this motion.

MR. ELLIOTT (Canning) [9.12 p.m.]: I seem to have enjoyed a singular, even unique, experience in the matter before the House. We have heard a good deal about public opinion, and the various types of public opinion polls. We have also heard that members have found it very difficult to obtain the views of the people who reside within their electorates.

To set the record straight, I will tell the members of the House something which may cause second thoughts in a lot of places and might illustrate the amount of support for the retention or otherwise of the Barracks.

I felt that to reach a decision on where I stood in this particular matter, my task was to try to present, as well as possible, the view of some 12,000 people whom I represent in this Chamber. I felt that politics were in no way involved in this particular matter, and there were no factors involving public safety. Nor was there any great expenditure of public moneys. For those reasons, and because it is one's duty where possible in such circumstances to try to interpret what the people in one's area wish him to do, I decided to take a public opinion poll of my own.

Over a period of some 10 days, I went to six suburbs within my electorate.

Mr. Cornell: Are there six pubs in your electorate?

MR. ELLIOTT: That is a happy thought from the member for Mt. Marshall. The result I obtained from those six visits was astonishing. I spoke to 343 people and, unlike the Gallup polls, I did not just ask a question. After recording a vote, I talked with the people concerned. I talked to 343 people, which represents, as closely as I can assess, something like one in 35 of all the people in my electorate.

The result I obtained, I am sure, will surprise the Barracks Defence Council. Of the 343 people to whom I spoke, 242 voted for the demolition of the archway, and a total of 101 voted for its retention.

Getting back to the point I made, that this was not a Gallup poll or a public

opinion poll, in the accepted sense, when I talked to the people afterwards I found, I think it is quite safe and honest to say, that of the 242 who wanted the building demolished, more than half—or at least half, anyway—did not really care one way or the other. When I said that I questioned 343 of them, there were actually 344 but, try as I might, one man absolutely refused to say anything, and about 8 or 10 per cent. of them were not interested enough to answer the questions I put to them after I asked their opinions. It was difficult to get many of them to answer questions, but when I asked them, "If you were in my position and it was your job to cast a vote, what would you do?" 242 of them said, "Knock it down because it will cost money."

The other 101 wanted the archway to remain and they wanted it to such an extent, and with such a ferocity, that I find it hard to draw a parallel with it. I think perhaps a tigress protecting her cubs, or a mother protecting her young is about the best parallel I can draw to it.

Mr. Hawke: What about a grand final football match?

MR. ELLIOTT: I understand the member for Northam was a star in his day. I feel, therefore, that the case presented both by the Barracks Defence Council, and the recruits which it has mustered, and of the Government, would have been far better had they been able to say what would happen if their case were agreed to. I suppose the members of the Barracks Defence Council are finding some dissatisfaction in the trend of the discussion here tonight, and perhaps they are beginning to hope that the archway will remain. I would have found much more interest in their case had they been able to tell us what they felt should be done with the Barracks Archway if it remains.

However, I cannot find any discussion anywhere regarding what ought to be done in this connection. There is no suggestion about the refacing or the other works that will need to be done. At this point I would point out that only last week in this House I asked the Premier could he give me a quote for the facing of the rear of the Barracks Archway, and the construction of stairways to give access to the presently isolated rooms. The reply I received was that for the refacing of the rear of the archway, and for the stairways, the cost would be \$19,500, and, in addition, there would probably be another \$1,500 for landscaping and the planting of lawns in the immediate vicinity of the archway.

I would be interested to know what the Barracks Defence Council feels about the outlay of that sum of money for a start. No doubt some Government money must be spent on less material things, but I cannot help thinking of the number of classrooms that could be built in my electorate for the expenditure of \$21,000.

However, we must pay heed to the need for spending Government money on projects such as this.

Similarly, I feel the Government's case for demolition of the archway would have been far better, and probably would have won more support, had the Government said what it intended to replace the archway with; I think that would have had some influence on the thinking of many people.

However, I suggest that if the archway is retained the Barracks Defence Council, the Historical Society, and others should give consideration to the use to which the rooms may be put. Probably something along the lines suggested by the member for Narrogin could be adopted. I think from memory there are six rooms in the archway, but whether they would be available always, and whether access could be made to them I do not know. However, if it were possible to provide access to them I would suggest the rooms could be made into museums showing the six significant periods of the State's history.

Mr. Hall: Or housing for pensioners.

Mr. ELLIOTT: As you wish! However, if I may sum up my remarks, and probably my views are causing some doubts about how I feel and how I shall vote, I simply say—

Mr. Cornell: Two bob each way.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I will have a bet on this; and I wish I could say the same for some other members in this House. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I find this a subject which does not excite me tremendously. I feel, however, that if there are so many people, whether it be 49 per cent., 33-1/3 per cent., or 25 per cent., who feel as strongly as they do about the retention of the Barracks Archway, they should be given the right to have it. I shall vote accordingly.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [9.21 p.m.]: I desire to say something on this motion but firstly let me indicate that I support it.

Mr. Jamieson: It would have been news if you hadn't.

Mr. COURT: I thought I had better make that clear at the start in case there was any doubt. I wish to say a few words for a number of reasons. First of all, as one who has served under this Premier since the Brand Government came into office in 1959, I want to say I have been most concerned at the way some people have been prepared to make allegations and insinuations in respect of the way the Premier has handled this matter. In all my life I have not known of anyone who is so tolerant and understanding of the views and feelings of other people; and this case has been no exception. In spite of the very heavy burden he has carried in a tremendous period of development in this State's history—the most dramatic

7½ years in the State's history—I have never known him to be too tired or so disinterested that he has not been willing to listen to the most humble member, Minister, or constituent for that matter.

It never ceases to amaze me how he does this sort of thing in spite of all the things that have been said, some of them quite cruel and said in the main by people who should know better. Yet he has never shown any spite or venom about it.

Let us look at the situation when the Premier gave the promise that the archway would be retained temporarily. Not only did he allow for its retention in the demolition programme for the Barracks itself, but he also made sure that the actual archway would be protected. In fact, we were criticised in some quarters for having spent money to make sure that the building was in fact secure.

That was the first instance where he showed his desire to be fair to those who felt strongly about the matter. The second way in which he showed his tolerance was in the temperate comments he has made at all times, whether as a member of a television panel, in Press comments, and in all other ways. The headlines put on his comments are nothing to do with him. But the comments he has actually made have at all times been temperate—much more temperate than my comments would have been had I been in his place.

Mr. Hall: I can hardly believe that!

Mr. COURT: Also, nobody could criticise the fairness of the Premier in his handling of this matter. He has always made it clear, both here and in the party room, that he was not in any way binding members of either the Liberal Party or the Country Party to support him in this motion. He made that clear both publicly and in the party room and no one—Minister or private member—can ever claim that he was not free to vote as he felt he should vote.

The next point I wish to raise is a very important factor, and in this regard some people have been quite cruel in their comments. But the Premier has made it clear, in accordance with his usual generosity in these matters, that if Parliament does not decisively declare itself one way or the other on this issue the archway will be retained and he will see that it is treated in a sensible manner—in other words, he will not be sulky or have a tantrum about it and leave it as it is.

Mr. Elliott: And write letters to the paper about it.

Mr. COURT: Surely this is an indication of a big man and one who has handled this position in an exemplary manner. He has decided that Parliament should say one way or the other whether the archway should be retained or not. As regards the representations and comments that have



been made, I have had very few within my own electorate. However, in other electorates, for some reason or other, people seem to think I am not a bad sort of target for some very insulting letters. As regards some of them I think they should have been handed to the Speaker, and perhaps it is about time some of us were protected from this sort of thing, because we live in a free country and as members of Parliament we should get some protection in this regard. It happens that I am not a professional at this game and perhaps I can be a little more independent in my approach than others may be to some of these people.

However, to get back to the point I was making, whether it has been in Cabinet, in the party room, or in discussions in public, the Premier has handled this matter in an exemplary way. No Minister has been dragooned, as was suggested by one speaker, into supporting the Premier and the motion he moved.

I should now like briefly to refer to the Government's record in regard to historical buildings, and it is not a bad record in spite of what some people say. An imposing list of buildings has been recorded showing the buildings which have been preserved, and the Government's attitude to the National Trust should be remembered. The Government's advance to this body is increasing. A considerable sum of money was spent on the old farm at Strawberry Hill, Albany. Also, a considerable sum is committed for the old Women's Home at Fremantle, and money was spent on the old Arbitration Court and the Newcastle Gaol at Toodyay. Also, money was spent on the O'Connor Museum at Mundaring Weir, and the Government is to support the historic park on the eastern goldfields. That is a commendable and a considerable project. Also there was the Round House at Fremantle.

Do not these people realise what a tremendous amount of work, worry, and money had to go into the Round House in the first place, and later, to make sure that in spite of the disabilities it would bring about in regard to railway operations, it was preserved? Money had to be made available to make the building safe, and this introduced operational difficulties because of the adverse curves that had to be provided. This will cost the taxpayers money forever, or for as long as that particular curve has to be used.

That work has been done cheerfully by the Government and it has acted in good faith in all these cases. It is not a bad record, yet we never seem to hear about those things from those who are active in the particular case we are now discussing.

About 2½ years ago I had the good fortune to be visiting one of the nearby Asian countries and the Prime Minister of that country, who has been very

friendly disposed to this State, and who is a very wise man, was talking to me. I asked him why a country which could not be regarded as rich, and one that was struggling as hard as we are to accelerate its development, should have spent so much on some of its main buildings. His observations were very interesting. He pointed out that the three focal points in that country's building programmes, in a city of which they are justifiably proud, because it is a very modern city, were the Parliament, the national church, and the University.

He said this was a matter of deliberate policy and that the Government was prepared to make sure these three great institutions were given an importance in the minds of young people because of the significance of those institutions in the way of life of the people. Parliament was the symbol of the struggle the country had had for its freedom, and the democracy which it represented. He put that right at the top. The national church was a symbol of the faith of the people, and the University was a symbol of their thirst for knowledge. He also pointed out that as time went on the church and the University would be duplicated and triplicated by future buildings, but not the Parliament building.

The Prime Minister told me that in those three important new buildings his country was prepared to go to extreme lengths, financially, to make sure that the three great symbols were properly represented.

This is one of the things which influences me, and I make no apology for it at all. I know it is good music hall stuff to sling off at politicians and mothers-in-law. Nevertheless, deep down in the hearts of people who understand the system under which we work and live, they realise this institution of ours is the great protection of our democracy. Surely it is the job of somebody to stand up and say that Parliament should be symbolised in a manner that befits its importance to the community.

I wish to make one final comment and that is in respect of antiquity. There is a tendency on the part of some people to think that because a thing is old it must be preserved. I have every respect for age, whether it be in individuals or in things, but we must realise that the question before us has to be kept in the right perspective.

We cannot overlook the original concept of the Parliament House site. If we look at the original report on this particular site it becomes very clear that this was to be the site for Parliament House, and that the Barracks were to go. Had the Government of the day had the money available, and had Parliament House been completed under the original plans within a year or two, or within 10, 20, or 30 years,

the Barracks would have been demolished and no-one would have raised the question, because that was part of the concept at the time.

I do not wish to enter into an argument on the aesthetic side, because my knowledge of art and aesthetics has been commented on very adversely in a number of places, but in my own heart I feel this archway building is rather pathetic. I think it will serve no purpose in trying to achieve the great concept that has been envisaged for this wonderful city of ours.

Having regard for all the circumstances—polls and all thrown in—I cannot bring myself to support the retention of this building to the detriment of the original concept. The concept is what we get back to all the time. This was the original concept of the very people who are held up to us, day in and day out, as the great historical figures of Western Australia. Had they gone on with the completion of Parliament House, and had they lived long enough, they would undoubtedly have pulled the Barracks down so as to bring Parliament House within the proper concept in the planning of the city.

I should make a brief reference to polls. At no time in my memory did we say that polls were to be accepted by the Government. My understanding was that the Premier said very clearly that we would test public opinion. Surely no Government could go ahead with making decisions on matters—whether they be big or small—based on the result of Gallup polls. Where would the Government get to if it did that? This is the place—in Parliament—where such decisions have to be made.

Mr. May: Why did the Government have one conducted?

Mr. COURT: For the reason given by the Premier—to test public opinion.

Mr. Tonkin: To let the public decide.

Mr. COURT: The Premier moved this motion in Parliament, and that is where it belongs. How often have we heard that this or that is a matter which should be decided by Parliament?

Mr. May: It should have been brought here in the first place.

Mr. COURT: Well, it is here now.

Mr. May: After the damage is done.

Mr. COURT: I do not know what the honourable member is referring to when he says, "After the damage is done." He has been given the chance to cast a free vote on this motion. Having regard for all the circumstances and for the original concept of this site, I support the motion.

MR. MAY (Collie) [9.34 p.m.]: In my view the members of this Chamber have a very difficult job in front of them, because on a question like this it is their duty to gauge the feelings of the people in Western Australia—not only those of the people

in the metropolitan area. After several attempts have been made by various organisations to put forward their attitude on this question, we are being called upon to make a decision. Personally I would much prefer this question to be decided by Parliament, because the members represent all the people of the State.

To-night I heard quite a lot being said about sentiment and emotionalism. Heaven help any country which does away with sentiment and emotionalism, because these are the main things which keep the people of any country together. At this very moment I feel some sentiment and emotion for the Premier, because of the job he has to do.

It is not easy for a member to make up his mind on this question. How much more difficult is it then for the person who has a responsibility in one way or another towards what has to be done with the archway. In my speech on the Address-in-Reply I mentioned the archway, and suggested that if the member for South Perth was agreeable it could be taken down and re-erected near where the Old Mill now stands—an historic building which aroused sentiment and emotionalism in the years gone by.

We seem to have got down to taints in regard to the expression of public opinion. I suppose that expression has been confined to the metropolitan area and the majority of people have said that the archway should be retained. We have to respect their views. It is not easy for members, or for the Premier and his colleagues, to do the right thing in respect of this matter. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat appeared to be a bulwark for the Parliament, but there was no need for him to adopt that attitude. We all respect the Premier, and we appreciate the difficulty in which he is placed. The Minister for Industrial Development should have put forward more cogent reasons for the removal or demolition of the archway. Most of his speech was confined to statements which backed up his leader. I suppose to some extent he was entitled to do that.

We are here to discuss what ought to be done with the archway and, for myself, I think it should be left where it is for the time being. After the landscaping of the surrounding area has been effected, and after the open cut has been covered over, we will have a better appreciation of the archway. I agree that now it is a terrible eyesore when viewed from the rear. We should remember those who have pioneered the State and built the Barracks, and the purpose it has served. It is our bounden duty to do that. It is wrong to decide forthwith to do away with the archway. I say it should be retained for the time being. If it becomes an eyesore, as some members seem to think, we will know what to do with it in the future.

In my view the wings of the Barracks should not have been demolished. Some people I know—people from the metropolitan area and not from my electorate—have suggested that the reason for demolishing the wings was to make the archway look more ridiculous. Be that as it may, it does look a little odd; nevertheless it should be left standing for the time being. I do not wish to give the impression that I am committing myself, and to say that some time in the future I will not come to another decision. For the time being I say let the landscape work around the archway be completed and the open cut be covered over before we make any decision to demolish it.

I do not suppose I should be referring to the open cut, although it does come into the picture as it is part and parcel of the whole set-up. What happens to the open cut will probably make all the difference to the final decision on the archway.

My final comment is this: For the time being I will vote for the retention of the archway, but if later on it proves to be an eyesore then I will be a party—in my small way as a member of this House—to the suggestion that it be shifted elsewhere; but I do not say it should be demolished, because already we have destroyed many of the old colonial buildings.

We should remember what the pioneers of this State went through. Those are my views on this matter, and I intend to vote against the motion. I suggest the archway be left for the time being; and after landscape work has been finalised we should see what it looks like before we make a decision on it.

**MR. I. W. MANNING** (Wellington) [9.42 p.m.]: I wish to make a few comments on this motion, particularly as I do not wish to cast a silent vote. At this stage I shall indicate my opposition to the motion, but at the same time I deplore the attitude of many of the critics of the Government on this question and the venom they have used in their criticism, because it was quite unwarranted.

I think the Government was on good grounds when it said that it had always been intended that the archway should be removed. That was part of the plan when Parliament House was completed, and when the wings of the Barracks were demolished. The suggestion of retaining part of the Barracks had not been considered in the early planning, but today there are other considerations, and the question which has been posed to us has arisen largely—and the planners have not taken this into consideration—through the reaction of the public to the demolition of the Barracks.

Today only the archway remains, and it appears to me that the wish of the majority of the people is that it be retained. I agree it will have to be tizzied up, because it cannot be left in its present

condition. The aspect from the rear of the archway is not one which we would care to look at indefinitely.

I understand three public opinion polls have been conducted—one by a newspaper, one by the McNair organisation sponsored by a television station, and one conducted for the Government—and they all show that the majority of people are in favour of retaining the archway.

I am somewhat surprised at the deep interest that has been taken in this matter—even by people in my electorate. While not all those who have spoken to me on this question have favoured the retention of the archway, considerable interest has been exhibited by a large number of people, and I have been considerably impressed by the extent of their interest. I agree with the member for Canning that when a large number of people are deeply interested in this matter, then, to the extent that they are, consideration should be given to their views.

**Mr. Graham:** I hope you feel the same on the arbitration Bill if there are lots of unionists against what you propose to do.

**Mr. W. Hegney:** Shades of 1963!

**Mr. I. W. MANNING:** Looking at the archway itself and the pattern which is taking place in that area, it seems to me it might not be a bad idea if the archway was left there. It divides the traffic and to some extent will blot out the open cut of the freeway.

**Mr. Graham:** Which you put there.

**Mr. May:** You reckon it should be blocked out do you? I agree with you.

**Mr. I. W. MANNING:** That in itself might prove a useful proposition as well as providing an ornament in that particular spot. I see some merit in its retention. I must confess I am partially disposed towards the retention of old buildings if they can be useful. Having regard for the sentiment and the affection people have displayed for this particular building, we might well give favourable consideration to their views and retain it, especially for the time being. Perhaps some Government or other authority in future will choose to take it down, but for the time being, and because of the possibility that it can be tizzied up a bit, as was the Old Mill at South Perth, it should be retained. Even the Premier may in the future agree that it was a good decision to retain it.

Although I deplore the attitude of many of the critics of the Government on this matter, I feel there is a sufficient number of interested people to justify the retention of the Barracks Archway.

**MR. BURT** (Murchison) [9.47 p.m.]: Unlike a number of my cross-bench and back-bench colleagues, I wish to support this motion—emphatically, if I may say so. My reasons are mainly personal and private. I regard the retention of the archway

as not fitting into the general picture of the St. George's Terrace sweep to Parliament House. I feel that the edifice will look incongruous and I do not think it deserves the historical emphasis that is placed upon it by so many people.

I represent a family which has been in this country for a long time and, as a result, I do have a great deal of leaning towards historical features in Western Australia. However, I consider there is a limit to how far we can go when preserving these historical features. By leaving this archway where it is, we will be taking an unnecessary step to preserve these associations which are well and truly preserved in other buildings in Perth such as the Cloisters, St. George's Cathedral, Government House, the Supreme Court, and others. I also have pride in the stately old homes in Adelaide Terrace, although most of them are offices for oil companies and the like today.

When it comes to progress, I feel we have to be broad-minded and alter our opinions if we have any vital ones in that respect and come to decisions which might not be altogether pleasant to ourselves or other members of our families.

I represent a country electorate, and, apart from two instances, I have had no protests on this matter. In fact I have had no other correspondence of any kind in connection with the retention or demolition of the Barracks Archway. In fairness to two of the shires in my electorate, I want to state that they did communicate with me indicating that they fully supported the retention of the archway following their receipt of a circular from Bishop Riley, I think it was. Only two out of the 12 or 14 shires I represent have seen fit to indicate their opinion on this matter. No-one else of the 5,500 to 6,000 people I represent thought it worth while to approach me on the subject except to make facetious remarks about knocking it over.

I have heard a lot tonight about the Gallup poll. I was not in Perth at the time to witness the television interview, but I do not consider a poll conducted among 500 people is a very true criterion of the feelings of people throughout the State. The very fact that a group of people have been zealous enough to press for the retention of the archway points to the apathy of the many thousands of people who do not care a fig about whether the archway stays or goes.

During the debate on the Address-in-Reply I indicated my feelings on this matter. I stated that in my opinion the archway should be demolished and replaced by a fountain of some beauty, typifying the very important part that water has played throughout the State's history. Eventually—and I say eventually, because from the tone of the debate so far it would seem this motion is doomed—I

hope some future Parliament will decide that the archway is not in keeping with the general appearance of the city of Perth, and will have it removed to some other part of the city—and I suggest Kings Park—and replace it with a fountain of beauty which could be designed after calling for suggestions from all over the world. Perth is singularly lacking in fountains, which go a long way towards beautifying cities in other places.

If you will allow me to say so, Mr. Speaker, I feel that Parliament did a great disservice to Western Australia when it voted against the inclusion of a pool in King's Park. I was strongly in support of that proposal. If this motion is lost, then the majority of those in Western Australia will be getting something contrary to their wishes. I deplore the fact that a minority group has seen fit to sway quite a number of members of Parliament, with the result that the archway will be with us for some years to come. It will be the misfortune of a number of us to gaze upon it for quite a long period. As I said earlier, and in conclusion, I hope the sanity of a future Parliament will cause the archway to be demolished.

**MR. HALL** (Albany) [9.54 p.m.]: I desire to make a few comments on this matter, and if I were able—and I know I am not—I would ask this question: How could the member for Albany with so much historical data behind him and a record of working for the preservation of historical monuments, support the demolition of the Barracks Archway? I would like to make that very plain at the outset. I quite agree that the Premier has worries in connection with the shaping of our city. Any problem which has to be faced must be traced back to the monster that has been created and which is responsible for this discussion this evening—and a very open discussion it has been, I might say. The monster to which I am referring is the motorcar—the Frankenstein of today. This monster is creating problems throughout the whole of our community today, not only in Western Australia but the whole of Australia. It will become more and more difficult for any Government to retain our old buildings.

Mr. May: You have your Strawberry Farm, you know.

Mr. HALL: I will come to that in a moment. The member for Murchison touched on the retention of other buildings. I liken this situation to a similar one which transpired in Albany some time ago. Certain people were working one way and others were working against them for the removal of the Horton monument, one of the most historically important monuments in our State. The proposal for its removal was resisted by those with foresight.

That situation is similar to the one we face in connection with the Barracks. The Horton monument was retained and has been beautified, the same as the Barracks Archway can be beautified at the top of St. George's Terrace. The Premier has spent money on many historical monuments, including Strawberry Farm, mentioned by the member for Collie. I am sure, therefore, he will take the same attitude in this matter if the motion is lost.

I would like to make reference to the opening of the old farm by Mr. Paul Hasluck. In doing so I do not mean to be derogatory to our Premier. Much as I might be against his motion, I am not against him as a person. However, Mr. Hasluck kept emphasising the point of hooliganism. He referred to those who destroyed our historical monuments as being hooligans. He emphasised this so much that it made headlines. That man is a very eminent and outstanding Minister, but he had the courage to make that statement. If we accept his statement, how can we destroy the archway?

Another historical building of very many years' standing is the Patrick Taylor cottage. The Royal Western Australian Historical Society has many times resisted the move to destroy this cottage in order to erect a police station and sergeants' headquarters in the very close vicinity. We have had to fight for the preservation of this particular building, as has been the case in connection with the archway and all monuments including the Old Mill. Similar protests were voiced some years ago when moves were afoot to encroach upon portion of King's Park.

These historical monuments provide a definite tourist attraction. I think the Premier would agree that the money spent on the old farm has been worth while because of its value as a tourist attraction. This would apply to any historical monument.

The society has for some time been working for the retention of the old gaol at Albany and recently it has taken it over. The building will be preserved and renovated so that its historical character, together with the etchings on the wall, will be retained for posterity.

I think all of this adds up to the strength of the people who had the foresight to come forward and defend the archway. As I say, they have defended the archway against a monster which is slowly destroying humanity. Of course, I am referring to the motorcar. They are facing up to the position and fighting a war against this monster. It cannot be denied that road access is destroying everything in its path, because of the privilege which has been accepted by the majority that we must have motorcars. Should road access be permitted to destroy history that has been established?

I make reference to the old post office at Albany, which I believe was constructed by convict labour. I do not believe in that type of labour, but the old post office was an illustration of the hardships and the disabilities which had to be suffered, and the humiliation of those particular days. I think the reflection I have cast should prove conclusively that the historical value of our monuments must be preserved.

I say the archway can be preserved, as the Horden monument at Albany was preserved, despite the resistance which took place. In a way this was a heaven-sent blessing in disguise, because the building is slightly out of plumb, and, as a result, the traffic has to slow down at that particular roundabout, as it is called.

Whether the same effect would be achieved through the retention of the archway I do not know, but these two buildings are very similar in character, and in principle, because they represent history. If the surroundings of the archway were beautified, the retention of the archway would leave something for posterity and for the State in general.

**MR. MARSHALL** (Maylands) [10.2 p.m.]: I would just like to say a few words on this issue which is before the House. At the outset I would like to say that I endorse the member for Nedland's remarks with regard to the fairness which the Premier has shown in the handling of this motion. Unfortunately, I am not able to agree with the Premier on this occasion.

I do not wish to go over the ground which has been covered by other speakers, or to reiterate the points they have made. I would like to say that in the number of countries I have had the good fortune to visit during my lifetime, I have found the authorities make it their business to try to go around any historical buildings and leave them intact.

Although I had not completely made up my own mind with regard to the Barracks, I do not feel the vista up St. George's Terrace will be spoilt in any way by the archway remaining.

As a member of Parliament, I definitely decided on this issue after discussion with a large number of my electors in Maylands, the electorate which I represent. I found that a great number of my electors felt the archway should be retained. This definitely decided me, but as I said before, personally, I felt as if it did not really make much difference one way or the other whether the archway was retained or demolished. However, on reflection, because it is a historical building, it would be a good thing to retain it. With those few remarks, I oppose the motion.

**MR. GUTHRIE** (Subiaco) [10.5 p.m.]: As I see it, on this motion, a member is faced with two questions. One is:

What is his own viewpoint? The other is: How should he cast his vote on this particular motion? I mention this second point because I do not consider the member necessarily should cast his vote on this particular motion merely as he personally thinks on the subject of, say, the beauty or the historic significance of the Barracks. He is only one individual in the community, and no greater and no less than any other person in the community. When it comes to casting a vote in this Chamber on motions such as this, I think a member has a great responsibility, and there is a wide variety of matters which he must take into account in reaching his decision. I propose to deal with both aspects.

I suppose it can be said that the case in favour of the retention of the archway of the Barracks is based on two grounds. Permit me to emphasise that the only issue which is at present before this Chamber is the retention of the archway, and not that of the Barracks. From listening to some of the previous speakers I would have imagined the whole of the wings were still in existence and that we, in this House, were debating the desirability of retaining the whole building. In fact, we are only retaining—and this was stated very adequately by the member for Balcatta—the remnant of a building which was once there. In saying that, I mention that I would like no-one to think that I criticise anyone over the removal of those wings, because I am afraid they just had to go.

I have said it many times—and I say it again tonight—that the City of Perth exists as an administrative and business centre for this State. Because a city works and operates, it cannot be retained completely as a thing of beauty; and, unfortunately, sometimes it is necessary to remove old relics. Sometimes we have to face a hard decision and firmly grasp the nettle and destroy old buildings when this cannot be avoided. The wings of the Barracks came into that category, and we are left with the remnant of a building.

The case for the retention of the archway has been placed, as I have said, on two grounds. One is the historical significance; and, secondly, it has been placed on the ground that it will in some way or other, or it might in some way or other—I do not think anyone could be certain, because no-one could know—preserve the aesthetic charm, or beauty, or appearance of the city when one is looking up St. George's Terrace in a westerly direction towards this building.

First of all, I would like to deal with the historical significance; it is stated, and I accept this letter dated the 8th September, 1966, which I received and which bears the signature of C. L. Riley, President of the Barracks Defence Council, and I. T. Birtwistle, Secretary of the Barracks Defence Council, as the reasons why

the people who are the protagonists for the saving of the archway believe it should be retained. This letter sets out what these people believe to be the real reasons why the archway should not be demolished. It is noteworthy that they place their case almost entirely on historical grounds.

First of all, they deal with the original uses to which the building was put. They explain that it was used to house what probably would be better termed retired soldiers rather than pensioners, because as they point out most of these men were between the ages of 35 and 45 when they came out here; they were not, as some people are inclined to conjure up in their minds, doddery old men such as one thinks of with regard to the Chelsea pensioners in England. They were virile active men who came out here as migrants.

It has been stated—and, again, I accept the authority of this paper—that they did not come out here for the purpose of guarding convicts, except whilst they were on the ship. Having come to Western Australia they became migrants in this community. I sometimes wonder, just because the building was the residence of some people, why, for that reason, it became such a historic building in the history of this State.

I suppose I can claim, equally with any member of the Historical Society, that I have studied history to a great degree. I did at least take history right through to third year standard at the University and I have continued my interest in history since. I was one of the founders of the National Trust in this State and attended the first meeting which was held in a house in West Perth. I therefore have great interest in all things historical. On the 7th October last my family celebrated the 174th anniversary of its arrival in this country.

There is, in Tasmania, a house which was built by my great-great-grandmother and which has stood for 145 years. It is preserved as a permanent memorial to the pioneers of that State.

So I am not without sympathy for any building which makes history in this State; and, knowing what I do, I wonder whether the historical case for the Barracks Archway is so sound as it is made out to be if it is considered that the Barracks, or some portion of the Barracks, cannot be justified as being worthy of retention merely because soldiers resided in them.

In this letter I have received from the Barracks Defence Council it is also stated that the second reason for the retention of the archway is that the Barracks were the place where a great deal of major constructional works in this State were, in fact, planned. I do not know whether this letter contains an erroneous statement, but it is said that the Public Works Department and associated departments moved into the Barracks in 1900, and it

goes on to state that out of the Barracks emerged such projects as the Goldfields Water Scheme, the Port of Fremantle, the Ord River scheme, and many other major works.

I cannot quarrel with the statement regarding the Ord scheme, and I must confess that when I received this letter the year 1900 escaped my notice. This afternoon, however, as I walked along the corridors of this House I happened to stop and look once again at the very fine painting of C. Y. O'Connor and I noted the significant fact from it that C. Y. O'Connor died in 1902. I could not but wonder about the accuracy of this statement that these major constructional works were in fact planned and had their conception in that building. So I asked the Clerks of the House to conduct some inquiries with a view to ascertaining from the records available in Parliament House when these projects were, in fact, planned. I have not had time to check the information that was made available to me but I doubt if the Clerks would make a mistake in conducting their inquiries.

From the information obtained I learned that the Fremantle harbour scheme was announced on the 18th March, 1892, and the work was commenced in November, 1892. The goldfields water scheme was announced in 1895 and the work was commenced in 1898. That hardly dovetails with the statement in this letter that it was initially planned by the late C. Y. O'Connor while he occupied an office in the Barracks building. I must accept this letter at its face value, when it states that he did not occupy an office in the Barracks building until 1900.

So I am left with some doubts whether, even on that ground, a historical case can be built up for the retention of any part of this building which is supposed to be of such significance in our State's history. Even if the dates in this letter are wrong, would anybody suggest that other buildings connected with major developments in this State—even if they were iron sheds—should be retained merely for that reason? To me, the argument is very thin.

Mr. O'Neil: They might consider preserving the State Housing Commission building.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They might even do that, as suggested by the Minister for Labour. The member for Balcatta and the member for East Melville might have those offices preserved as a historical building because of their contribution to housing the people of this State.

Mr. O'Neil: I will take down a boxful of white ants tomorrow.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I find there has been too much assumption in the course of this debate in stating that this particular building has a historical background. Consequently, I now turn to the other reasons

which probably have more substance; namely, that the building is evidence of a period of architecture in this State. However, let me point to this fact. It is a type of architecture that was not developed in this State. It is Gothic architecture copied from examples of buildings overseas. It is a matter of opinion whether it is aesthetically beautiful, and upon that point individuals differ.

I am not one of those people who will accept the statement that professional advisers are the people who make decisions on these matters. I have said before and I say again that the role of a professional man is not to make decisions but to give advice, and the layman should be left to make the decisions. Just because a professional man has expressed an opinion one way or the other, that is not decisive as far as I am concerned. I am also painfully aware that professional men disagree with the rarest of abandon, and on this issue the professional men do disagree with the rarest abandon.

I well remember, some years ago, discussing this Barracks question with a well-known and highly-respected architect in this town. He said, quite categorically, that from an architectural point of view the building was not worth saving. He went on to say that he doubted if it would stand for a great number of years and certainly would not stand for centuries. That was his opinion. We know the W.A. Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects has formed the same opinion, but whether that is the viewpoint of all of its members, I know not. But surely it is not the privilege of architects or any other body to say to the public, "This is aesthetically beautiful" and that we have to line up and say, "Yes, Sir."

I regret such an attitude entirely. The people of this State do not have to accept such a statement just because some so-called expert has formed the opinion that the Barracks Archway is beautiful or is not beautiful. Surely the main purpose of a thing of beauty is to give pleasure to the ordinary person in every walk of life. That is the real test of a subject on which people could have differing viewpoints. I can only say that if I were here tonight to cast my vote based on my own opinion, and I was merely recording a vote by referendum, I would say that the case for the retention of the Barracks Archway has not been established to my satisfaction, and consequently I would vote for its destruction.

However, as I indicated at the beginning of this speech, and I repeat now, I do not think that is the proper approach to be taken by a member of Parliament on a question such as this. He should ask himself: What should I do in view of the facts that have been presented for my consideration? What decision should I make? Firstly, I think it is fair to say

he should take into account public opinion. Let me pause at this point to ask this question: What is the public feeling on this matter? It is said that there have been one or two polls conducted and certain opinion has been expressed.

I dismissed entirely the poll conducted by a certain newspaper, because it was fairly obvious that only people who are interested in the question would send in a vote, and there would be quite a definite expectation that the people who were against the archway being demolished would send in their votes or would cast a vote. It so happened that on the day on which the ballot papers were issued I was a guest at a meeting of the Royal Western Australian Historical Society. I observed the moves made by the executive of the society to ensure that their members voted and made to persuade others to do likewise. I do not remember anybody going around on behalf of the Premier or anybody else urging people to cast their vote the other way. So I dismiss that completely.

I now come to the question of the Gallup poll. I must say that I am one who normally takes a great deal of notice of a Gallup poll, and one who accepts the fact that a Gallup poll does express public opinion. But these Gallup polls must be conducted in the manner in which the Gallup poll organisation normally conducts its Gallup polls. It so happens that for many years I have been a subscriber to the Gallup polls, and I have a file of every Gallup poll taken in Australia in the last seven years.

The Gallup poll organisation sends out periodically to its subscribers specimens of questions which it puts to people. The one thing it does not do during these polls is to go out when its questions are tele-scoped, and ask questions which the public expect. It goes out seeking an opinion on camouflaged questions.

It might be of interest to members to know that during the Gallup poll taken on the 30th April, 1966, all told there were something like 20 odd questions put to people. I cannot give them exactly, because they have been broken out under 12 heads.

Consequently the person who is being interviewed is taken from subject to subject fairly quickly. He is not given any warning as to the major issue before the people; in fact, he would not get any warning at all. I might read some of the questions that were put to the people of Australia during the Gallup poll survey 183 which was conducted on the 30th April, 1966.

Some of the questions asked concerned opinions on weekend shopping; opinions on aged and invalid pensions; opinions about alcohol and driving; opinions about non-government schools. A further question concerned Australia, and whether Australia should become a republic. There was

also a question asked as to what views they had on Federal politics; the next was, which political party they supported; a further question was on military training; and so it goes on. There were questions about Vietnam, about Rhodesia, and questions seeking opinions on Japanese cars.

So it can be seen when the Gallup organisation conducts a poll it camouflages fairly closely the real questions it is putting to the people it is interviewing. This poll was one that was conducted entirely in one State; something that the Gallup poll organisation does not favour. The organisation would normally not take a poll unless it were conducted on a national basis throughout Australia, and unless national questions were asked. Again the organisation does not disclose at all to the people who are questioned the particular question in which it is interested. In this way it gets a much more honest opinion.

Speaking as a lawyer, it is very similar to cross-examining a witness. If I had to write out all the questions and show them to the witness in advance, I would not place much reliance on the answers I would get. The intention is to ask questions which are different, and which are likely to catch the witness unawares.

I do not know just what the public feeling is. Like other members I have had seven or eight letters from constituents. The only attempt I have made to assess public opinion at all was at a meeting which was held in my home last Friday evening. At the tail end of the meeting there were nine people present including myself.

Mr. W. Hegney: There was a quorum!

Mr. GUTHRIE: The people concerned did not know my view at all, because I did not indicate it to them, but having put the question to each one of them in turn, I found that four of them were in favour of the destruction of the Barracks Archway, and they gave their reasons; and I might add there was a wide variety of reasons why they were in favour of its destruction. Three of the people were in favour of the retention of the Barracks Archway, and the eighth person said that he would retain it for a little while so that he could have another look at it.

Mr. Bickerton: How did you vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not vote at all. I do not take too seriously the opinions that the member for Balcatta got, because once people know what one's opinion is there is a tendency for one's guests to agree with that opinion.

Mr. W. Hegney: If you were presiding you should have had two votes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was not presiding. I might add that gathering was of a particular group in Subiaco, and the average age of the people would have been



about 60 or over. I daresay the youngest person would have been 52 or 53 years old.

Accordingly it was not a complete cross-section. I am certain that had there been younger people present the vote for the destruction of the Barracks Archway would have been higher. One must also remember that in cases such as this—and those dealing with the pool in the park, etc.—public opinion gets worked up to a frenzy, and consequently one does not get a truly balanced and impartial judgment.

I can only say that so far as I am concerned I feel that the position in regard to public opinion is very undecided and indecisive. I agree entirely that that is so. When I realise, as I do, that the public has also voted on the assumption that certain statements which have been made are in fact correct, I just wonder how much value we can place on them.

Furthermore there is no doubt, and all the letters I have read show, that the people who have written to me are not really interested at all as to whether the archway should be preserved; they are incensed at what they are pleased to call the arrogance of the Government. Three of them said to me, "It is immaterial what you do with the archway; I am opposed to how it is being done." So much for the value of those letters.

I can only say that if I thought it were possible to postpone this matter; if we had an opportunity to put it off and I thought at a later stage when the freeway was completed and the building was still there, it would be possible to get a sane and balanced judgment, I would unhesitatingly favour putting off the evil day for two or three years.

But the more I have listened to the debate, the more I have come to the conclusion that the sooner we decide this issue and get it out of the way the better it will be for everybody. Furthermore the motion appears to be a lost cause. If members are interested, the score at the moment is 12 for and 15 against the motion. So we may just as well decide it and get it out of the way.

But for the fact that the case in my mind has not been established, and because of another fact I wish to mention, I would vote for the retention of the Barracks. Nobody has told me how this building is to be treated. I did see in common with other members—I think the member for Beeloo and the Minister for Local Government were present—a design of the tower as it could be treated making the western face exactly the same as the eastern face. It pictured the structure as a square tower, but when the wings were demolished it was found to be rectangular. That gave a totally different picture.

I take this point of view: As a historian, I say that if historical buildings are to be preserved they should be preserved as they

were, and not as they have been titivated. I have not yet seen a design which seeks to preserve whatever historical value the building possesses, and which does not do some injustice to the building as it was originally. On the whole I consider that as a responsible member of Parliament, even if I am voting on a lost cause, I must vote in favour of the motion.

**MR. CORNELL** (Mt. Marshall) [10.31 p.m.]: One thing that impressed me this evening was the delicate way in which the supporters of the Premier handled this question. Quite a few of them got up and praised the Premier for his handling of the matter, and then proceeded to shoot him down in flames. At least it will be refreshing for him to know that although he is to be knifed by his own supporters it will be a fine and delicately honed blade that does the job.

Whether or not this motion should be before the House is not the point at issue. Personally I do not think it should be. The Premier could be creating a precedent for bringing public issues before Parliament for decision. In the future in matters of so-called public interest that are whipped-up by a minority, it could be claimed justifiably that Parliament should decide the issues and therefore they would be debated in this House.

However, as the question has been placed before us a vote will have to be taken, and the Premier has undertaken to abide by our decision. Although there again if the vote is as close as the member for Subiaco has indicated we might have another indecisive result, in which event the Premier, in his present state of mind, can only do one thing; that is, refer it to the television session, "People in Conflict."

Personally I cannot generate much enthusiasm for this proposition at all. I am not steamed up by the controversy as to whether the structure in its present form should remain, or whether it should go. It is rather a matter of surprise to me that an edifice of bricks and mortar should create such public interest, and that people should become so vociferous about a building of this kind, when they are silent on important matters such as the ballot system for national service in which human life is raffled. That is an attitude which I cannot understand; that people should remain silent on an issue as important as that one, and yet become so vociferous on whether the building on the other side of Parliament House should be retained.

**Mr. Grayden:** The ballot system is a Federal issue and it cannot be debated in this House.

**Mr. CORNELL:** That is a matter of opinion. The ballot system is an issue of considerable importance.

**Mr. Grayden:** Ask the Speaker if he will allow you to talk on it.

**Mr. CORNELL:** The butchering of the Barracks has not left much to be pre-

served, and in its present emasculated state I doubt whether it is worthy of preservation. It is a pathetic, sterile structure at the moment, and like all desexed creatures it cannot give much to posterity.

Had some semblance of the Barracks building remained to indicate what it might have looked like, then possibly there would be some ground for its retention, but I cannot go along with the idea that it is worthy of preservation in its present ring-barked state.

The question of removing the archway in order that Parliament House should not be polluted by its presence is one I cannot go along with either. With the continual erosion of the rights of the States, I think State Governments are living on borrowed time in any event. When this Parliament folds up in about 50 years' time and Parliament House is taken over by the Perth City Council as the seat of government, then Council House will become redundant and there will be agitation to preserve it as a peculiar type of match-box architecture which had a brief vogue in the mid-1960's.

On the question of public opinion, there are about 5,500 electors in my district, but I have received only one letter on this matter. From the point of view of public opinion in my part of the State, I find it just does not exist. The one letter was in favour of the retention of the archway, and I was urged to vote in that direction; so if I agree to regard the letter which I received as an indication of public opinion I would be supporting the retention of the archway. But, strange as it may seem, on this particular issue I go along with the Premier.

**MR. BICKERTON** (Pilbara) [10.36 p.m.]: I do not join in this debate with any enthusiasm. As I see it, this is a battle between the "arch" enemies and the "archangels," and I am not very particular which way the decision goes, although as I stated previously in this House in my view the Barracks should be demolished. Since that time nothing has transpired to cause me to change my mind radically.

One could go into the pros and cons of this question, like many members have done. No doubt you, Mr. Speaker, know by this time all the reasons which have been put forward by both sides, so I do not intend to become an "arch" enemy of yours, because I need your help from time to time. For that reason I will not keep you or the members of this House out of bed any longer than I have to. Although I support the demolition of the archway I must go along with those who say that they very much doubt whether the question should have been brought before Parliament.

Personally I think this is a decision for the Executive. We have been told by the Government on numerous occasions in re-

spect of similar matters that it had a mandate to govern and that it would not be living up to its responsibilities unless it did make decisions. Therefore this should have been a Government decision.

Many members who have spoken against the motion have praised the Premier for the way he has handled the matter. Whilst I intend to support the motion I cannot praise him for the way he has handled it. This motion—it is only a thought of mine—would not have been before us at the present time had the Premier received unanimity of opinion in the coalition Government party room. Some members have said it was a wonderful thing that the Premier decided to give members a vote on this question, but I do not think he did so merely because he wanted to. I am inclined to think along the lines of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that had the ballot figures been the other way, or had there been even a slight margin in his favour to hang his hat on, he would have acted on it and we would have been saved a long debate. Had that occurred I have no doubt the archway would not now be standing.

Some members who have seen fit to support the retention of the archway have also seen fit to regard the Premier as having done a great favour by allowing them to have a vote. To my knowledge my electors have not expressed an opinion, but whether there are some of them down here on holidays who have expressed an opinion advocating retention I do not know. They have not contacted me in any way.

**Mr. Elliott:** They don't know where to find you.

**MR. BICKERTON:** They have not wired me, so as far as my electorate is concerned I have no obligation as to the way I vote. The people with whom I have discussed this matter have said, "Knock it over", but apparently there are other members who have received different answers. I must admit that from those with whom I discussed the matter I received the same impression as did the member for Canning.

With regard to the polls, I was amazed when the figures were released. I did not think there would be that number for the retention of the Old Barracks; and I assume the polls were conducted along the proper lines. I have no reason to think otherwise. So, undoubtedly, there are a lot of people who believe that the Barracks, as they now are—that is, what is left of them—have some form of beauty. Someone may be able to convince me of that before I die, but up to date no-one has been successful. However, that may not be anyone's fault.

As I have indicated how I intend to vote I return to the question raised by the member for Mt. Marshall. No doubt this

is a great precedent which has been established to give members of Parliament a say in this and other matters—a free vote—and we of the Opposition certainly hope we are going to see much more of this from the Premier.

**Mr. Graham:** Not something likely!

**Mr. BICKERTON:** I have no doubt there have been lots of legislation and matters that have never hit the floor of this House because the Premier could not get unanimity. I believe in this case he felt if he were to proceed with his original idea, his only chance was to get the assistance of the Opposition; and that, in my book, is the sole reason why this motion is before the House.

I do not know whether the count of the member for Subiaco is right. I do not know how this motion will go; but I do think the Premier introduced his motion in a strange way when he introduced it with the backing of his Cabinet.

He said there was to be a free vote, and he had the backing of his Cabinet. The matter was mentioned by the member for South Perth that those who intend to vote for the retention of the archway had a big handicap to start with; and I think it would perhaps have been much better, as I said previously, if the Premier had made this an Executive decision. He said he would test public opinion. He has done so; and in my book, public opinion is against demolishing the Barracks; but I did not give the public any undertaking that I would test public opinion—I am speaking purely as an individual and not even on behalf of my electorate. I am submitting my own views and, as I did not give the public an undertaking I would test public feeling, then I intend to vote as I see fit, and that is for the demolition of the archway.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough-Premier) [10.44 p.m.]: We have had a great night. I cannot recall hearing so many speakers on a subject as there have been tonight; and, indeed, so many people who have been wise after events. But let me say it has been a very interesting debate. All the evening there has been a large number of the public present who are vitally interested in the decision. From what I hear the die is cast; and it would appear that the Barracks Archway, as we know it, is to remain.

Let me say that I expected the Opposition would take me to task for what I had done; and in doing so it was rather kind. I was responsible for convincing Cabinet, in the first place, that we should leave the Barracks Archway in order that the people could see what it looked like. This Executive decision was taken in the knowledge that the archway could not stand up and we would have to spend a lot of money on it for this purpose.

I do not hesitate to say I have made tactical mistakes about this matter; but only in the interests of the people. This motion did not come here because of any disunity in the party room. I wish to make it quite clear while I am speaking that there have been plenty of free votes here which the Opposition and ourselves have brought here simply because there was a divergence of opinion in the party room. This is nothing new; and we will have more of it in the future. It is not a precedent, as was indicated by the member for Balcatta. I see very little difference about the free vote we are taking on this as compared with any other free vote we have had in this House in regard to something brought forward by the Opposition when it was in Government, or by any other Government.

We, as a Government, hold no grudge about the decision that is soon to be made. I did indicate when I introduced the motion that we would take any suggestion for the leaving of the archway for two years as a decision to leave it there.

I do not know what private members will think about the situation two years hence, but so far as the Government is concerned the archway will stand there and stand there until the Freeway is completed; and when we are finalising and cleaning up and developing the area, the archway will be treated in a suitable manner, although in what manner, no-one has suggested. However, I can assure members there is no money to spend immediately on the archway to give it a nice backing for us to look down upon from here.

That brings me to the point upon which the Leader of the Opposition made play. He did not consider the attitude about Parliament House as being so important in his mind. So far as the Government is concerned, this building is a very important issue. The motion which I moved was based on the original decision and reason for putting Parliament House here in order that, in accordance with the general concept, Parliament House and its surrounds might be seen from the Terrace and represent the end of the Terrace. This was in the intention of the planners. So there was nothing strange about the motion which I moved; it was just a frank indication of the reason why we believed the Barracks Archway should go.

I would hope those who have claimed in letters to me and who have claimed in advice to me that the archway should remain can suggest how to titivate it so as to make it something of which we are proud, because it is going to be there for all time. People have written to me and said all the convicts went to the Greenough electorate. I do not know whether that was meant to impress me. If they did, they made a fine set of people, whatever their problems in the first place.

**Members:** Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: Let me say we were not impressed by that. I received a letter from one lady who talked about her uncle. I would think that only the controversy reminded her of uncle. I am quite sure about that.

We received a number of letters from the country saying that they should have had a say in the poll. Maybe they should have. I have received letters to the contrary saying that this was a matter for those in the metropolitan area.

If any subject has had a real airing through the Press, which cannot be said to have been impartial about the matter, and through the House and in our party rooms, it is this issue of whether or not the Barracks Archway should go.

I do not want to comment on all the speeches made, but I would like to make reference to the speech of the member for South Perth who did hit the headlines in the country edition of tomorrow's *The West Australian*, as follows:—

Archway: MLA Warns of Government Vandalism.

Mr. May: He will be in trouble.

Mr. BRAND: No. He will not be in trouble. He is in trouble all the time. Nevertheless this was a way of expressing his opinion. It is slightly exaggerated, but it is the sort of comment which the late Sir John Dwyer made when the Pool of Reflection was filled in. On that occasion he said that that was the greatest act of vandalism ever committed, so it is really not anything new.

I would like to defend those advisers, town planners, and all the others who have been referred to by some people as not being the ones qualified to advise us on this matter. Whom do we get?

Mr. Graham: The member for South Perth.

Mr. BRAND: That is right. Professor Stephenson has a record which I believe makes him stand out as one of the world's professional town planners. I do not think there was any reason to belittle him and cut him down as being of no consequence as an adviser, as against any other professor, just because he suggested that the archway should go; and, what is more, he included it in his report. This is the report, as I said when introducing this motion, which was accepted by Parliament. No-one at that stage—not even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who was then Minister for Works—stated that the professor's point of view on the archway was not acceptable.

Mr. Cornell: C. Y. O'Connor was crucified.

Mr. BRAND: Yes, if that is the right way of putting it. But he allowed public opinion to worry him; and, might I say, I sympathise with him.

I was completely amazed—and I must say this—to learn that in the event of a

decision by this House or the two Houses being made to pull down the archway, there was to be an assembly of 7,000 people around the archway.

Mr. Graham: Don't forget the man on the top.

Mr. BRAND: I was amazed also to read that one of the town planners, here especially to plan the City of Perth, was going to jump off the top. In some respects that seemed to have some merit.

The suggestion has also been made that a vigilant watch should be kept in case the Government stole down overnight and pulled the archway down.

Mr. J. Hegney: Bulldozers make a lot of noise.

Mr. BRAND: That is right. We all know how quiet a bulldozer is! Does this not highlight how extravagant some people can get on this issue? I have been taken to task by the Press for not campaigning our cause. We said when we left the archway there that we would allow the public to view it, and we kept right out of the campaign except to clearly state the Government's point of view. From then on there were no Press statements from us and no campaigning; and I believe the Government did the fair thing by everyone in this respect.

I can only say that what I have heard tonight has not changed my mind at all, because I sincerely believe we have an opportunity to plan this city around this area. Whether this building is Parliament House or whether it is the Perth City Council headquarters in years to come, does not matter. We have an opportunity to plan this area and I believe that when two generations have passed on a lot of the history associated with the Barracks Archway will be lost and the archway will remain there purely as a building or an archway—in fact, a gateway—which everyone will have to describe as belonging to the Old Barracks which existed here in days gone by. I believe that the generations to come will find it necessary to make alterations.

However, having counted heads, it seems to me we will have to leave it to them. I have no hard feelings towards anyone who will vote the other way. Those members who have attempted to back me up and have given me support for the way in which I have dealt with this matter I believe did so sincerely and out of loyalty. It was a little embarrassing, but, nevertheless, I feel I was able to accept it because anything done in this regard was done purely to meet what appeared to be a very direct demand for some say in the issue.

Let me say that it is up to this House. If it decides against this motion, then the issue will be finished. If there is any doubt, and the decision is the other way, we shall refer the matter to the Upper House for its consideration; but, in the

event of the motion being lost, this would be all that is necessary.

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

Ayes—18

|               |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. J. Hegney  |
| Mr. Bovell    | Mr. W. Hegney  |
| Mr. Brand     | Mr. Hutchinson |
| Mr. Burt      | Mr. Lewis      |
| Mr. Cornell   | Mr. Nalder     |
| Mr. Court     | Mr. O'Connor   |
| Mr. Crag      | Mr. O'Neill    |
| Mr. Graham    | Mr. Williams   |
| Mr. Guthrie   | Mr. Nimmo      |

(Teller)

Noes—26

|               |                   |
|---------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Brady     | Mr. I. W. Manning |
| Mr. Crommelin | Mr. W. A. Manning |
| Mr. Davies    | Mr. Marshall      |
| Mr. Dunn      | Mr. Mitchell      |
| Mr. Durack    | Mr. Molr          |
| Mr. Elliott   | Mr. Norton        |
| Mr. Evans     | Mr. Rhatigan      |
| Mr. Gayfer    | Mr. Runciman      |
| Mr. Grayden   | Mr. Rushton       |
| Mr. Hall      | Mr. Sewell        |
| Mr. Hawke     | Mr. Toms          |
| Dr. Henn      | Mr. Tonkin        |
| Mr. Kelly     | Mr. May           |

(Teller)

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

(Applause from gallery.)

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no demonstration of any kind from the gallery. There has been some mention tonight about people who endeavour to intimidate members of Parliament. It is an offence against the Criminal Code even to demonstrate, and it carries a three year penalty.

### BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Act Amendment Bill.
2. Strata Titles Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.3 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 20th October, 1966

### CONTENTS

| BILLS—   | Page |
|--|------|
| Companies Act Amendment Bill—3r. ....  | 1571 |
| Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill—Further Report .....                    | 1571 |
| Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill—2r. ....                                    | 1571 |
| Supply Bill (No. 2)—3r. ....   | 1569 |
| <b>MOTIONS—</b>  |      |
| Motor Accident Victims: Compensation—Inquiry by Select Committee .....       | 1574 |
| Underwater Blasting in Cockburn Sound: Inquiry into Damage to Property ..... | 1572 |
| <b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>  |      |
| Cancer Prevention: Suggestions of Dr. Emmerich von Haan .....                | 1569 |
| Knitting Machines—Sale Contracts: Abrogation .....                           | 1568 |
| Workers' Compensation—Van Gelderen, F. R.: Details of Case .....             | 1568 |

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

### QUESTIONS (3): ON NOTICE

#### KNITTING MACHINES

##### Sale Contracts: Abrogation

1. The Hon. H. R. ROBINSON asked the Minister for Justice:

(1) Is the Minister aware that approximately 300 women have purchased by cash or terms, knitting machines costing in the vicinity of \$200, and have signed contracts to supply knitted garments, with the Manchester Style Knitwear Co., or the Double Dee Knitting Co., that now refuse to supply wool or purchase goods in accordance with the contract?

(2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes," will the Minister advise—

(a) has the C.I.B. investigated the complaints, and is any action proposed;

(b) are the companies concerned complying with all the requirements of the Companies Act, or any other legislation;

(c) is it considered a matter for private legal action against the companies concerned?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Evidence available suggests that machines purchased amount to a figure just in excess of 100. There is no evidence available to the police to suggest that the figure is approximately 300.

(2) (a) Yes, and the matter is still under investigation. Action will be taken if and when investigations disclose evidence of a breach of criminal law. Thus far, no such evidence has been disclosed.

(b) Manchester Style Knitwear Co. is registered under the Business Names Act 1962. It is not subject to the provisions of the Companies Act. John Peter Graham, the person registered as carrying on business in that name, may not have complied with the requirements of section 12(2) and 12(7) of the Business Names Act.

(c) This is a matter upon which I cannot advise.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Van Gelderen, F. R.: Details of Case

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

(1) With reference to Mr. Franc. Rob. Van Gelderen, of 23 Downing Street, Norseman, a workers' compensation case, will the Minister furnish complete details of this case as to—

(a) the hospitals in which he was a patient;