

than hold up the House at this stage. But I would like to restate that I think it is time we had two sessions of Parliament. Ours is the only State out of step as far as the Commonwealth is concerned. I do not think it is good for the State that we should have this long recess. I am inclined to think that we would all benefit from two sessions. If there is anything at all in the old saying that good Oppositions make good Governments, then I think the Opposition should have the right more frequently to bring matters before the Government than it has at present.

The present session is a long session, as we all know. Towards the end of it members are very touchy. The great Standing Orders under which we operate and which we say we will fight to hold to the bitter end, go out the window. They are automatically suspended and Bills go through in one day. That is a protection of course which one can always use against someone who never wants to touch on Standing Orders lest a man will be robbed of his right to speak. Do not forget that at the end of a session when some 50 or so Bills go through—some of them in a single day—Standing Orders are automatically suspended.

I think that amendments to Standing Orders and a sensible approach to the subject of two sessions of Parliament are possible. The two sessions would have to be restricted in length so that they would not run into one long session. I think the result would be that members of Parliament would benefit greatly and so would the people of the State. I feel sure that our Parliament would be a better place.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Elliott.

*House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 11th August, 1966

| CONTENTS  |       | Page |
|---|-------|------|
| ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : SEVENTH DAY—                                     |       |      |
| Speakers on Motion—   |       |      |
| The Hon. N. E. Baxter   | ..... | 276  |
| The Hon. A. R. Jones  | ..... | 284  |
| The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery  | ..... | 280  |
| QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—  |       |      |
| Lake Grace-Pingaring Road—Kuender Siding : Bituminising             | ..... | 275  |
| Natural Disaster Payments from Commonwealth : Disbursement by State | ..... | 275  |
| Public Service—Professional Officers : Number Non-British           | ..... | 276  |
| Strata Titles—Duplex Houses and Home Units : Legislation            | ..... | 276  |
| Underwater Blasting—Cockburn Sound : Damage to Houses               | ..... | 275  |

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

### QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

#### UNDERWATER BLASTING

##### Cockburn Sound: Damage to Houses

2. The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. R. Thompson) asked the Minister for Mines:

Due to the under-water blasting being carried out in Cockburn Sound, and the alleged resultant damage to State Housing Commission homes in Medina and Calista, will the Minister for Housing have departmental building inspectors effect a survey of all rental houses, and purchase homes in this area covered by State Housing Commission insurance policies?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Minister for Housing advises that as a result of investigations already undertaken it is considered that such a survey is not warranted.

3. *This question was postponed.*

#### LAKE GRACE-PINGARING ROAD

##### Kuender Siding: Bituminising

4. The Hon. E. C. HOUSE asked the Minister for Mines:

When will the section of road near the Kuender Siding on the Lake Grace-Pingaring road be completely bituminised?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The alignment of the 1.2m section of the Lake Grace-Pingaring Road near Kuender Siding is now being finalised. It is proposed to prepare plans and institute resumption proceedings with the view of providing funds in next year's programme.

#### NATURAL DISASTER PAYMENTS FROM COMMONWEALTH

##### Disbursement by State

5. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:

With regard to the amounts of £32,625 and £193,273 being financial assistance to the State by the Commonwealth, under the heading "Natural Disaster Payments", for the financial years 1960-61 and 1961-62 respectively, will the Minister inform the House the full details of the disbursement of these amounts?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The grant of £32,625 received in 1960-61 was a contribution towards expenditure on relief as a result of cyclone damage to Carnarvon during March 1960. De-

tails of disbursements are as follows:—

|   | £   | £      |
|---|-----|--------|
| Housing—  |     |        |
| Repairs .....   | 954 |        |
| Replacement of Tents .....                              | 55  |        |
|   |     | 1,009  |
| Sustenance .....  |     | 87     |
| Furniture, bedding, clothing and personal effects ..... |     | 791    |
| Domestic water supplies (windmills, tanks, etc.) .....  |     | 90     |
| Medical expenses .....                                  |     | 280    |
| Banana growers—Compensation .....                       |     | 30,388 |
|   |     | 32,625 |

The grant of £193,273 received in 1961-62 was a contribution towards expenditure on relief as a result of flood, bushfire, and cyclone damage at various centres and a Commonwealth grant towards restoration of roads. Details of disbursements are as follows:—

|  |       |         |
|--|-------|---------|
| Carnarvon flood—February, 1961—                  | £     | £       |
| Evacuation .....                                 | 7,704 |         |
| Immediate relief .....                           | 976   |         |
| Sustenance—Banana growers .....                  | 3,180 |         |
|  |       | 11,810  |
| Dwellingup bushfire—1960/61 summer—              |       |         |
| Evacuation and fire fighting expenses .....      | 600   |         |
| Immediate relief .....                           | 5,277 |         |
| Sustenance—Fruit growers .....                   | 2,604 |         |
| Fodder .....                                     | 32    |         |
| Freight on fodder .....                          | 297   |         |
|  |       | 8,819   |
| Karridale bushfire—                              |       |         |
| Fire fighting and local committee expenses ..... | 187   |         |
| Immediate relief .....                           | 85    |         |
| Fodder .....                                     | 6,161 |         |
| Freight on fodder .....                          | 5,048 |         |
| Agilment of stock—Cartage and expenses .....     | 319   |         |
|  |       | 11,800  |
| Onslow cyclone—Immediate relief .....            |       | 844     |
| Restoration of roads—North-West .....            |       | 160,009 |
|  |       | 193,273 |

### STRATA TITLES

#### *Duplex Houses and Home Units: Legislation*

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

Is it the intention of the Government to legislate this parliamentary session enabling the issue of titles for duplex houses and home units?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Strata Title Bill will be re-introduced this parliamentary session.

### PUBLIC SERVICE

#### *Professional Officers: Number Non-British*

7. The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) In the Public Service lists of the years 1960 to 1965, do names appear in the permanent officers' lists of professional men who are not natural born or naturalised British subjects?
- (2) If the reply to (1) is "Yes", will the Minister provide the names of

those who were not British subjects?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Only one such case has come to the notice of the Public Service Commissioner and the officer concerned has applied for naturalisation.
- (2) It is not thought desirable to disclose the name of the officer until the result of his application is known.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

#### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 10th August, on the following motion by The Hon. V. J. Ferry:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Speech he has been pleased to deliver to Parliament:—

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

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [2.40 p.m.]: Members who have spoken to the Address-in-Reply debate have covered many and varying subjects. This is a motion on which one can speak generally; one can speak constructively, critically, and, on the appropriate occasion of course, express sympathy at certain times.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the honourable Mr. Willesee on his elevation to Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. We have seen Mr. Willesee in action in this House in the past and I think we all agree that he does a very good job in his position.

I would like to express to the honourable Mr. Wise my appreciation of his services as Leader of the Opposition. I am sure we all agree that it is our hope that we will continue to hear some very impressive and constructive speeches from this honourable member.

Before continuing the main theme of my speech today, I would like, also, to express my appreciation to the Government for the trip which a large number of members undertook to the north-west recently. This was particularly interesting and informative. I am not going to cover any details of the trip to the north-west because there appears to be more or less an unarranged agreement between members not to give a dissertation on the north-west as a result of this trip. However, some members may wish to do so.

In the Speech which we were privileged to hear His Excellency the Governor de-

liver on opening day, reference was made to several honourable gentlemen who took part in Australian public life in Parliament and regret expressed at their passing away. I am sure that all members of this House deeply regret the deaths of Senator Sir Shane Paltridge, K.B.E., Senator Victor Seddon Vincent, and the honourable Hubert Parker, who, for a number of years, was a member of another place and later a member of this Chamber.

When the Speech was prepared—I take this to be an oversight—unfortunately reference was omitted to several other rather prominent gentlemen who were members of the State Legislature. These gentlemen were overlooked—as I have said, by an oversight—and this is no reflection on His Excellency the Governor because His Excellency delivered the Speech as presented.

However, I believe there should be some reference made in this Chamber to the passing of these gentlemen, and I refer to the late Sir Frank Gibson and the late Leslie Craig, who were members of this Chamber for many years and who rendered a very worthy service to the people of Western Australia. I do not think I need to go into their virtues—we who knew them knew what sterling members they were in this Chamber.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: And the late Emil Nulsen, too.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, but as his name was mentioned in another place, I thought that was the appropriate place for reference to be made to it.

In my opening remarks I mentioned that members could be critical when speaking on the Address-in-Reply. It is my intention to be critical on several matters concerning my constituents, and which I feel justified in being critical about.

The first criticism I have to level is in relation to the standard gauge railway line and the work carried out by the contractors under the constructing engineers, Maunsell & Partners. I refer, particularly, to that section of the standard gauge line where the work is being carried out by Thiess Bros. Pty. Ltd. I wish to raise this because of the dissatisfaction that exists among the farmers occasioned by what has happened along the line.

Through their employees, Thiess Bros' bulldozers have ripped up pipelines to farmers' properties and the farmers have never been advised of the company's intentions. The sheep in the area are left without water and, in addition, they can run on to the railway line. This company has also torn down fences with its bulldozers and has never rebuilt them. This action, of course, violates the requirements of the Public Works Act. Under that Act, if anyone opens a fence to enter a farmer's property he should erect a proper swing gate. However, that is what is happening.

In particular cases, I have taken this matter up with the Railways Department

but, despite the fact that my approaches were made over 12 months ago, there are still many items which have not been adjusted. Unfortunately, the Railways Department is in a cleft stick because Thiess Bros., through Maunsell & Partners, are responsible to the farmers concerned in these areas. I would mention that the Assistant Minister for Railways (Mr. O'Connor) has been quite attentive to my approaches in these matters, and he has taken them up with Maunsell & Partners but, unfortunately, with very little result.

Maunsell & Partners have an officer who operates between Northam and Merredin, and further up the line. It is this officer's responsibility to listen to these complaints and to deal with them. However, although he advised the farmers that they could get in touch with him to voice their complaints, when the farmers tried to do so they found that he was as elusive as quicksilver. Sometimes he is in another part of the area; sometimes the farmers cannot contact him by telephone; and, if the farmers write, they find that they must wait many weeks before receiving a reply. In addition, in recent months this officer has been over east and, apparently, no-one else was delegated to take his place in order to attend to these complaints.

This is a very unsatisfactory position. I feel that it does, to a certain degree, reflect upon the Government that contracts and agreements are made under which the Railways Department is not vested with any power to have these matters adjusted and the expenses deducted from the amount paid to the contractors through Maunsell & Partners. It is a very unfortunate situation. As Mr. O'Connor told me, the Government would have had redress upon Maunsell & Partners if that company had, itself, carried out the work. However, the department had no comeback on the contractors.

This is a very bad state of affairs, particularly in view of the fact that the Minister for Railways—if I remember correctly—stated at the time all the agreement arrangements were being made for the laying of the standard gauge railway line that there would be as little disruption as possible to the farming community. Unfortunately, this has not come about. I, myself, have a number of complaints still on my hands which have not been adjusted. So, in fact, do a number of farmers along the line who have just given it away and said that it is not worth while their making complaints because the complaints are not dealt with. They say, "All we have is a lot of worry over these things: we are not getting any satisfaction; we will leave it at that. We will leave it to the others to battle along in an effort to get some satisfaction."

It is rather a pity that these things are not tied up more than they are. I think we all know that under the powers granted by the Crown through the Public Works Act, the Railways Department is vested

with the power to enter a farmer's property. Spoil-holes can be opened up and the soil, or gravel, can be taken from these spoil-holes and used for public works. The farmer has no say as to what portion of his property this may be taken from.

Several years ago, we did endeavour to try to have something done about this but our approaches were unsuccessful. I believe that when the Crown's instrumentalities enter a farming property the owner should have the right to say, "Don't take it from here—the material is just as good over there, so take it from there."

However, this is not the case because the department takes it from wherever it wishes. In addition, legally these spoil-holes should be levelled off and covered over with any residue. Often, of course, there is no residue and no top soil because the spoil-hole has been used to build up the embankments on the standard gauge railway line. In one particular instance, Thiess Bros.' employees entered a property in order to obtain spoil. By taking the spoil, this company has built what it calls a dam. It is a wonderful dam, of course, because one end of it is open to a creek which flows, altogether, for 16 miles.

However, a dam of that type would not water many sheep because the water would just flow in and flow out.

A couple of years ago the Minister for Local Government introduced into this House a Bill to amend the Local Government Act. This amendment was rather surprising because, whereas in the past a local authority could remove gravel or soil from private property for road work within a mile of that property, the amendment introduced by the Minister deleted that provision completely. The Act now provides that if a local authority takes soil or gravel from the property of any farmer he has the right to make a royalty charge. Very often, of course, this right is not exercised, because farmers do not want the royalty, but they should have some right to object to any soil or gravel being taken from their properties when similar soil or gravel can be obtained from Crown land in the vicinity.

The powers granted under the Public Works Act and under Commonwealth Statutes are very broad concerning such acts. A local authority could enter a private property and take gravel or soil from any place it so desired without the owner having any claim for compensation.

The Hon. E. C. House: They should be made to put the topsoil back.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, but in some instances the topsoil is also used for the purpose of making embankments, and there is often little or no topsoil which can be used to cover the scar that is left on the property. In fact, in one instance the ground has been left in such a rough condition and in such a bad state that three machines working over it have not yet levelled it off. I told the Assistant

Minister I would raise this subject in the House and he feels as strongly about it as I do. Therefore, I consider that in the future the contractors responsible should show more consideration to property owners than they have shown in removing gravel and topsoil from the properties to which I have referred.

In February last a terrific windstorm occurred in the Grass Valley-Quellingup area. It ripped roofs off houses, tore down fences, ruined pastures, blew sheds down and, in passing through a fairly wide strip, left intense destruction in its wake. The people who suffered loss as a result of this windstorm have communicated with the members representing the area to see if some assistance could be obtained from the Government. However, in taking the matter up with those in authority the only satisfaction that was obtained was the reply that these people, being farmers, could regard the windstorm as a seasonal hazard and that if they wanted any assistance they could apply to the Rural and Industries Bank for a loan if they were unsuccessful in obtaining it from a private bank. That was the only assistance that was offered.

Such an attitude is very unfair, especially if we take our minds back to what happened following the disastrous Dwell-lingup fire. I learned from a member who represented that area that some of the people who were affected by the fire finished up much better off financially than they were before the fire.

The Hon. E. C. House: What about the payment of compensation for the damage done by the Katanning fire?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That was another instance where compensation was paid to those who suffered losses. This afternoon I asked a question of the Minister for Mines concerning natural disaster payments to those who suffered as a result of the Onslow-Carnarvon cyclone, and the following is the reply I received:—

The grant of £32,625 received in 1960-61 was a contribution towards expenditure on relief as a result of cyclone damage to Carnarvon during March 1960. Details of disbursements are as follows:—

|  | £   | £       |
|--|-----|---------|
| Housing—   |     |         |
| Repairs .....  | 954 |         |
| Replacement of tents ..                                  | 53  |         |
|  |     | 1,009   |
| Sustenance .....   |     | 87      |
| Furniture, bedding, clothing, and personal effects ..... |     | 791     |
| Domestic water supplies (windmills, tanks, etc.) ..      |     | 90      |
| Medical expenses .....                                   |     | 260     |
| Banana growers—compensation .....                        |     | 30,388  |
|  |     | £32,625 |

The grant of £193,273 received in 1961-62 was a contribution towards expenditure on relief as a result of flood, bushfire, and cyclone damage at various centres and a Common-

wealth grant towards restoration of roads. Details of disbursements are as follows:—

|  | £     | £               |
|--|-------|-----------------|
| <b>Carnarvon flood—February, 1961—</b>           |       |                 |
| Evacuation .....                                 | 7,704 |                 |
| Immediate relief .....                           | 876   |                 |
| Sustenance — banana growers .....                | 3,130 |                 |
|  |       | 11,810          |
| <b>Dwellingup bushfire—1960-61 summer—</b>       |       |                 |
| Evacuation and fire fighting expenses .....      | 609   |                 |
| Immediate relief .....                           | 5,277 |                 |
| Sustenance—fruit growers .....                   | 2,604 |                 |
| Fodder .....                                     | 32    |                 |
| Freight on fodder .....                          | 297   |                 |
|  |       | 8,819           |
| <b>Karridale bushfire—</b>                       |       |                 |
| Fire fighting and local committee expenses ..... | 187   |                 |
| Immediate relief .....                           | 85    |                 |
| Fodder .....                                     | 6,161 |                 |
| Freight on fodder .....                          | 5,048 |                 |
| Agistment of stock—cartage and expenses .....    | 319   |                 |
|  |       | 11,800          |
| <b>Onslow cyclone—immediate relief .....</b>     |       | 844             |
| <b>Restoration of roads—north-west .....</b>     |       | 160,000         |
|  |       | <u>£193,273</u> |

If my memory serves me right, I think that, in addition, the State Government found another £25,000 for those who suffered loss as a result of the Dwellingup fire. If I assess correctly the figures that have been given to me I do not think this amount is included in the grant from the Commonwealth. Further, a public appeal was launched and the Lord Mayor's Fund was established from which financial assistance could be obtained by those who suffered loss as a result of the fire. I am not saying that those people who were affected are not entitled to this assistance, but why should the Government make fish of one and flesh of another? Why should a farmer in the wheatbelt get little or no consideration when others who have suffered similar losses are granted assistance?

Some young farmers have saddled themselves with liabilities of £20,000 and £30,000 in taking over properties and they have to pay interest on that money. The houses of some farmers are very old and now that the roofs have been lifted from them by the windstorm it is a waste of money to try to replace them on the remaining structures and, as a result, these people will have to build completely new homes and borrow the amount of money which represents the difference between the cost of a new home and the insurance they receive for the damage to their properties.

This will mean that they will have the added burden of interest payments on the money borrowed for such home construction on top of their existing heavy commitments. Therefore, the least the Government could have done—and the Government could still do so, even today—was to say, "Very well, we will assist you by pay-

ing the interest on the amount of money you are required to borrow to meet the difference between the cost of a new home and the amount of insurance you will receive." Surely that would have been some assistance that could have been given by the Government. It would have amounted to only a few thousand pounds at the most. Surely the Government is not that impoverished that it cannot help these people in view of the circumstances in which they are now placed! I feel very strongly about this situation which, as I said before, means that the Government is making fish of one and flesh of the other.

I want now to speak on a matter which was raised last night by Mr. Ron Thompson when he was speaking on the Address-in-Reply. I refer to the matter of land valuations in the metropolitan region town planning area. I have had some experience in connection with this matter, and have discussed it from time to time with the Minister for Local Government and thoroughly agree with Mr. Ron Thompson that it is high time an independent valuation tribunal was set up.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Hear, hear!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: To explain this in a simple way, if I wanted to buy a property from Mr. Ron Thompson—

The Hon. R. Thompson: You would be battling.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: —and had the right to nominate my brother, father, or a close relative to place the valuation on that property, how would Mr. Ron Thompson feel? He would be hopping mad. There would be no justice in those circumstances. But what happens today? When a person's property is to be resumed, a Government department tells him what he is going to get for it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: My brother's keeper!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes; someone from the department does the valuing and one's property is resumed. One has no say in what price one will receive. Therefore I think it is high time this sort of thing was cleaned up and an independent body established which would decide what was to be paid for a property. I have had a number of instances of resumptions, particularly when I represented what was the original Central Province.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When a man has his property resumed and the Government puts a valuation on it, which he does not accept, do you know what happens after that?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, I can tell the Minister because I have handled some of those cases. If a person is not prepared to accept the price offered, he will be paid two-thirds of the Public Works Department valuation and then the argument starts between the person concerned and the valuation officer in the Public Works Department. The person concerned has to obtain the services of a private valuer,

which costs him £30, £40, or up to £60, and he has to pay for this out of his own pocket. The Public Works Department does not pay this money.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are you absolutely sure it does not pay for it?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Up to date it has not paid for any that I know of.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It has not paid for any I have handled.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It has not paid for any of mine, either.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The department receives a valuation from the private valuer and then strings the matter on and on. The department does not hurry over it and the argument continues, backwards and forwards. The department acts as though it is playing around with its own money. Admittedly it has a responsibility in these matters, but it also has a responsibility to be fair to the people whose properties are being resumed.

I will mention one case that I handled a few years ago. A gentleman had 200 acres of land and he received notice of resumption. He was offered somewhere around £6,500, but he was not prepared to accept it. I took the matter up and my efforts, together with his, resulted in his eventually receiving £8,500 for 170-odd acres. There was a big difference between those two amounts. He was eventually allowed to retain 30 acres as a result of the goodwill of the Minister, whom I approached. That was fair enough, but in the first instance he should not have had to do a considerable amount of work and put up with a great deal of worry in order to obtain a fair and reasonable price for his property. Why not set a fair and reasonable valuation in the first place, instead of trying to whittle a fair valuation down to something that is not reasonable.

As regards another case, the valuation officer placed a valuation on a property and deducted the total value of a water supply to an adjoining subdivision. I know a smaller piece of ground next to this property was resumed and the same thing was done. It looks as though £14,000 was deducted from the price paid for the first property, yet the water supply was not the responsibility of the person concerned.

In my opinion the Government should agree to the setting up of an independent tribunal comprising three, four, or five valuers rather than continue with this "brother's keeper" method. This tribunal could set a fair and reasonable price for properties that are being purchased by the Government from the public. I feel very strongly on this matter.

I intended to speak this afternoon on railway demurrage. I was expecting an answer to some questions on this subject but unfortunately the Minister was not able to obtain the information today. Therefore, I will leave that matter until later in the session. I trust the Government will take some notice of my suggestion for the setting up of an independent

tribunal of valuers; and I trust that in future, in regard to such works as the standard gauge railway, and others, the rights of the individual will be properly protected and people will not have to worry and do work that should be done by the contractors to the Government, or by the representatives of the Government. With those words I support the motion.

**THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY** (South Metropolitan) [3.7 p.m.]: Before speaking to the Address-in-Reply, which gives a member an opportunity to speak on behalf of his district, I wish to join with those others who have paid their respects to the late Hubert Parker, who was, for some time, a member of this House. He served the State for a great number of years and I well remember him when he was Crown Prosecutor. At that time he made a great contribution to this State.

I also wish to refer to the passing of two Federal members, and I would like to pay my respects to their relatives. No-one likes to see a member leave Parliament in that way, but we do not mind beating anyone at election time.

I also wish to join with those who have spoken in a congratulatory manner to Mr. Willesee on his appointment to the position of Leader of the Opposition in this House. I have two matters on which to speak in this regard. I would like to refer to the action of Mr. Wise in standing down from the position of Leader of the Opposition at a time when he still has quite a period left in which to sit in this House. He did this so that a younger man could take his place; and I think it is something that should be practised more in Parliament, and not only in Western Australia. I believe Mr. Wise has set a fine precedent for this kind of thing. We all wish Mr. Willesee the best; and in this remark I include Mr. Dolan.

I have been a crier in the wilderness over grade separation in connection with the standard gauge railway; and whilst I am not going to suggest that the departments have not given these grades a great amount of consideration, I still think more concern is shown towards the two dollar note than the saving of lives.

This could be the third or fourth session that I have spoken on this matter. Whereas the departments have made a move for grade separation, I think the case of Helena Vale bears out absolutely what we have been talking about for a great number of years. People travelling through Helena Vale could never believe that there was once a level crossing there. It is a natural type of country for the creation of grade separation.

I want to mention an article written by Mr. Frank Harvey in *The West Australian* of Monday, the 8th August. I would say that the article is fairly reasonable but there are some points I want to criticise. The article commences as follows:—

A crystal ball technique is being used by planners to solve some of their

difficulties as the standard gauge railway line advances through the metropolitan area.

The problem is whether to put overways and underways—known technically as grade separation—flashing lights . . .

Further on, the article continues—

Unlimited finance or a highly accurate crystal ball would ease most of the headaches.

I am not going to agree that unlimited finance is required. One can travel through all of the Eastern States and one will find that wherever it is possible, even in the most remote areas, there are overways and underways. Perhaps they were built when the cost of construction was less than it is now. Returning to the article, it says—

The decision mainly depends on what is expected to be the traffic flow 15 years from now.

I do not think any person can visualise, or even attempt to guess, or quote the number of accidents that could occur on this particular railway line in the next 15 years. Even if one person's life is saved by traffic grade separation, then whoever is responsible has done a mighty job. The article goes on to say—

The crystal-gazers are the members of the railway crossing protection committee—representatives of the Main Roads Department, the Town Planning Department, the W.A.G.R. and the Police Department.

I ask in all sincerity, why not local government representatives? The standard gauge railway is bringing with it a great number of problems to the various shires in the metropolitan area. At one time I represented the districts of Gosnells and Canning, and both of those shires are coming up against a great number of problems. Mr. Harvey's article continues—

Their decision on whether grade separation is justified depends on a factor known as a warrant.

This emerges from a formula which takes into account the density and speed of rail and road traffic, and the number of rail tracks.

In developing a major project like the standard gauge railway, a long-sighted view is clearly essential.

I could not agree more—a long-sighted view. Now is the time to do something: before the engines start pulling the loads on this line. To continue—

This means that, on strict interpretation of the formula, some of the bridges being constructed are not justified. The rail and road densities which would justify them will not be reached until about 1980.

There are 23 crossings of the standard gauge in the metropolitan area.

On present planning four will be bridges,—

I ask members to bear this in mind. To continue—

—12 will be boom gates and seven will be flashing lights.

I want to interpolate here. The iron ore trains from Koolyanobbing will weigh in the vicinity of 5,000 to 7,000 tons gross weight, and will be three-quarters of a mile in length. They will be travelling at speeds of up to 60 miles an hour. Therefore I feel that to put in only four bridges—there is nothing about underways or overways—in the metropolitan area, where the trains will be travelling, is little short of criminal. That is a harsh word to use but it is criminal and sensational. To continue the article—

Anticipation of future traffic densities, however, indicates that 12 of the 23 will be revised as follows:

Of the 12 boom-gate crossings, one (Albany Highway)—

Who would ever dream that engineers of today would consider putting a level crossing on Albany Highway? I will repeat—

Of the 12 boom-gate crossings, one (Albany Highway) will become a road bridge, and eight will have grade separation when traffic densities warrant.

Of the seven flashing light crossings, one will become a boom-gate crossing pending completion of plans for an eventual road bridge, another will be converted to boom-gates, and a third will be replaced by grade separation when traffic warrants.

Mr. Harvey went on with quite a lot more with which I will not weary the House because I am sure every member would have read the article. Towards the end of the article, he says—

The minimum cost of grade separation where there are no problems and levels are all technically ideal is about \$100,000. Expenditure could easily reach \$1,000,000 if bridges were ordered immediately.

On a project where we are spending \$42,000,000 to \$43,000,000—which could probably finish up \$45,000,000—for this railway to run between Kalgoorlie and Kwinana, surely it would be economical for those concerned to find the finance to carry out the work I have mentioned when costs are what they are today. According to an answer received by me yesterday, the Government does not think that price fixing will stop the spiralling costs. I suggest that in 15 years' time this work which could perhaps cost \$1,000,000 today, will probably cost nearer to \$1,500,000 or \$1,750,000 because of price rises.

I think Mr. Harvey has made out a very good case, but he has spoilt it by his final statement, which is—

Crystal-gazing is easier on the taxpayer's pocket.

I know Mr. Harvey and I know that he does not mean to imply what I am suggesting could be read into this statement. But it could be suggested that it does not matter how many people get killed in the meantime; that it is only crystal-gazing by the four or five departments involved that will allow only a certain amount of money to be spent on grade separation now.

Some of the accidents which have occurred in the past at the Helena Vale crossing involved costs of up to £25,000 or £30,000, and some insurance companies have paid out amounts ranging from £10,000 to £20,000 because of those accidents. I think Mr. Harvey would have helped us more had he added a few words to this effect, "Crystal-gazers should not think of the taxpayer's pocket." At this time, when road accident prevention is the main topic and the main concern of all Governments throughout Australia, I think he could have helped us a lot.

Having said that I shall turn nearer to home. The people in the Kwinana shire district have been concerned for some time about what is to happen regarding railway crossings. They are rather fortunate in that only three crossings are to be built—that is, as far as we know at the moment. Firstly, the department is building an underway on the Rockingham Road opposite the B.P. Refinery; secondly, no definite decision has been made, but a crossing is to be built where the old Rockingham Road meets Thomas Road; and the third crossing is to be built at the 11-mile peg on the Hope Valley Road. This is within a chain of the 16.6 mile peg on the standard gauge railway line.

At this point there is a secondary road or one which, according to Mr. Harvey, the department is working on and for which there will probably never be a grade separation. However, God has been kind in this particular situation because 130 yards north-east of the Hope Valley Road there is a bank which the Railways Department has had to provide to enable a cutting to be put through. According to the pegs I saw yesterday the cutting is 17 ft. 3 in. deep. To get over this situation a deviation of from 450 to 500 yards of the Hope Valley Road would provide an overway for this cutting. The Kwinana Shire Council believes that this provides an opportunity for grade separation at a very low cost, because the cutting is already there and it is only a matter for the Main Roads Department to come into the picture and tidy it up.

I should now like to quote from the *Daily News* of the 30th June, as follows:—

Scheme To End Level-crossings

Kwinana Shire Council may ask the Minister for Railways for grade separation between the standard gauge railway and roads in the shire.

This move, following a motion carried at the latest council meeting, means that the council may ask the

Minister to do away with level-crossings within the shire, and substitute bridges or underpasses.

When I spoke a few moments ago I was referring to the trans-line, but, of course, there are other railway lines running through the district. I have with me a map which shows the area which has already been resumed for the controlled access road which is to go from the south to the north, and this controlled access road is to pass within 190 ft. of the cutting to which I referred. Therefore, when this controlled access road is built, in 12 to 14 years time, it would assist matters if the cutting were bridged because at the moment it means only a small deviation and the further resumption of 1½ acres. I understand the person who owns the land would be very happy to have it resumed for this purpose. I have drawn attention to this question because now is the time to do something about it. However, if the members of the committee concerned consider that the time is not appropriate then I have done my best. Crossing lights are to be installed and at the moment there is not a great deal of traffic east of this point in Hope Road, but it is an area that has been heavily developed and the Department of Industrial Development has taken up a large area of land in this locality.

I now want to mention some of the benefits to be derived from adopting the scheme I have suggested in regard to grade separation. I believe it would save lives and alleviate suffering; it would also save time and wages and strain on the nerves of both motorists and enginedrivers; it would save money and time as well as insurance claims, investigations, post-mortems, and the like. Therefore I suggest to the Government that it does everything possible to co-operate with all interested parties and provide grade separation because of the many benefits which would accrue from it.

Another point I wish to bring forward is one I mentioned during the debate on the Supply Bill—I refer to police patrols in the metropolitan area. Facetiously the Minister for Mines suggested that because I had raised this matter criminals would know that it was easy for them to operate in Perth if they wished to do so. However, I was pleased to see that the Commissioner of Police, not in reply to me but in reply to a Mr. Rosenthal, a businessman in Perth, said that the city block was not patrolled every night of the week by policemen on the beat. That substantiates what I said, that from 8 to 11 p.m. there are no policemen on the beat in the city block.

Mr. Napier went on to refer to patrol cars, and so on, and he said that policemen did patrol the streets when necessary, but this was not every night. I cannot understand that. Mr. Napier also said that we now have more mobile radio-controlled units to cover the growing shopping and industrial areas. But these are on the perimeter of the city. In the



paper today there was an article in which the views of some of the traders of Perth were published. They supported what I had to say in this House some time last week—that the business proprietors of Perth are dissatisfied with the present police protection against thieves in the city.

I shall not discuss that matter further at the moment but I wanted to mention it again to show that it was not just Lavery blowing off about nothing; this is something that is happening in the city today. Surely at a time like this, when so many people are coming to this State from other States, and from overseas, our tradespeople, and those who occupy private homes should be entitled to more protection.

Also, I could not help but agree with Mr. Robinson when he said last night that the fines imposed on some of the people who are caught stealing cars are not nearly sufficient. I drew attention to what I said on the Supply Bill merely to indicate that what I said then has been substantiated by the Commissioner of Police and business people in Perth.

There are two other matters I wish to mention and they are concerned with the compensation for resumptions and road-works. They are two items which are in dispute at the moment and I wish to offer a suggestion that I hope will help to alleviate some of the suffering.

In the proposal to extend Stock Road through the Fremantle city area, and through the Shire of Melville, we are now told that a road resumption of six chains is necessary. Those of us who know Stock Road where it passes through Attadale will know that there are some very fine homes in that area. Before the homes were built on the blocks there the latter were valued at £3,000. The distance between the two alignments is only 1½ chains, so members will appreciate what it will mean if a resumption six chains wide is made. The councillors of the Shire of Melville approached me in the matter and asked why it was necessary to have a resumption of six chains at that particular point. Why is it necessary for the new road which it is proposed to build to have a width of six chains?

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: What about the new library?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would like to read an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 14th July, 1966. It is headed, "Road Plan a Threat to Many Homes", and reads as follows:—

Hundreds of private homes, many of them modern, will have to be demolished if a new controlled-access freeway is built on what is now Stock Road, starting in Attadale and passing through Melville and O'Connor.

The Fremantle City Council has been told by the Main Roads Department that the highway will need a six-chain wide reserve, at least in the 1½ miles of

the proposed highway's route through the council's area.

The Melville Town Council said it had not yet been told how wide the road reserve would be, in its area.

This reverts to some of the things mentioned by Mr. Ron Thompson when he spoke last night. I would now like to get back to the question of the proposed new bridge at North Fremantle across the Swan to East Street. Here again a six chain resumption is proposed. This will go through an area where there are two schools, and it will continue past the John Curtin High School. It will then continue slightly east to Monument Hill, where the War Memorial is; after which it will travel south past the oil tanks and finally reach the area previously known as Beaconsfield. In the area which it will traverse, namely, Wood Street, and others, there are about 120 homes which are to be resumed. Almost all the people in these homes are either retired people, or working people about to retire, and they are at an age when they have no desire to shift anywhere else in order to build new homes.

After speaking to a number of these people I make the suggestion that the State Housing Commission and the Main Roads Department should give some thought to the fact that when the homes of these people who are pensioners, and those who are about to become pensioners, are resumed, some provision should be made for a block of flats to be available to them in order that they might move in when the time arrives.

It is too late in life for the people concerned to buy new homes, and they do not wish to do that. Most of them feel the compensation they would receive would be about £2,000 or £2,500, because that is about the value of their homes. For the most part they are old-fashioned homes which have been there for years. Mr. Clive Griffiths knows the area well. Rather than fight each individual case with the departments concerned, I make this suggestion in the hope that the State Housing Commission and the Main Roads Department will give the matter serious consideration and provide the alternative accommodation which is so necessary. I understand the people would be prepared not to fight very hard for a high figure by way of compensation if they knew houses were to be made available to them when they were asked to move out of their present homes. The Government is getting early warning about this matter, and I hope it will endeavour quite sincerely to do something about it.

I wish to close with the remark that while speaking on the Supply Bill Mr. Willesee brought up the question of two sessions of Parliament. At the same time the *Daily News* came out with a very sound editorial which I propose to read to the House. But before I do so, however, I want to say why I believe the State has

reached the stage where two sessions of Parliament should be held each year.

In the earlier days, the average member of Parliament was a farmer and had to leave Parliament and assist in putting in his crops. Accordingly, Parliament did not meet until all the crops were in, and that was why it did not meet till the end of June or July. I have discussed this matter with the older members of Parliament, and they assure me that that is the real reason why this time was selected.

It is not necessary now, however, for the modern farmer, who is a member of Parliament, to go out and harness up his horse team, because today the farmers work with tractors, and modern machinery. Accordingly, two sessions of Parliament would prove no real hardship to these people.

I would like to point to the number of files that are at present on the Table of the House. I took particular notice of this fact and I found that within seven days of Parliament opening there were 136 files placed on the Table of the House. These files contain what the departments have actually been doing in the seven months since Parliament last met. If you care to look at those files, Mr. President, as they affect your district, you will find that they deal with shire council matters, medical matters, health matters, and so on. They contain regulations and by-laws which have been promulgated since Parliament last met.

We, the back-benchers of Parliament have no opportunity of knowing what is going on between sessions of Parliament unless we care to approach an individual Minister in the matter. I must say that every time I have approached a Minister I have been received most graciously. But why should we come here within seven days of Parliament opening and find 136 files on the Table of the House; 136 files containing the work done between the end of the session last year and the beginning of the session this year?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There would be only one annual report.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The editorial from the *Daily News* to which I referred earlier, dated the 4th August, 1966, reads as follows:—

So Western Australia is to be firmly saddled with a one-session Parliament.

Last year the Government agreed to examine the possibility of introducing two sessions of Parliament a year.

This week Premier Brand announced that the Government had decided not to change the present system. He gave no reasons for this decision.

It means that our Parliament will remain the only one in the Commonwealth—Federal or State—which meets for only one session a year.

It also means that for seven or eight consecutive months of the year the Opposition will be virtually forced into retirement.

I do not quite agree with that, particularly when I know the amount of work I have had to do, but it is correct so far as Parliament is concerned.

The editorial goes on to state—

This is unfair to private members—and to the public which has a right to expect that its well-paid parliamentary representatives at least have the opportunity to do their jobs properly.

#### Members Restricted

And private members cannot do their jobs properly when, for more than half the year, they are unable to question or debate day-to-day issues and the executive decisions of the Government.

Long-standing Government opposition to an extension of parliamentary sittings has rested on the weak argument that this would place an intolerable work load on Ministers.

Yet in Canberra and every other State this is no problem.

If there is some other reason which would justify the Government in limiting the democratic working of Parliament, the public should be told. I did make out a list of the papers which were tabled by the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Health, and the Minister for Mines; but the departments which they control would not be able to tell a private member of Parliament about everything that had gone on during the year. They cannot be expected to do so.

The time has arrived—with the appointment of a third Minister in this House, with the great increase in the population and the production of the State, and with the promulgation of hundreds of new by-laws on town planning, local government, etc.—when no member of Parliament can be expected to keep up with the position. Before the Government goes to the hustings on the next occasion it should give the people the reasons why it intends to continue the existing practice. I thank members for listening to my remarks; I support the motion.

*Sitting suspended from 3.44 to 4.1 p.m.*

**THE HON. A. R. JONES** (West) [4.1 p.m.]: I wish to make a very small contribution to the debate on the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. Might I say at the beginning that although I personally congratulated both Mr. Willesee and Mr. Dolan, I do so again and suggest that we have had sufficient experience of Mr. Willesee over the last week or so to realise that he is going to make his mark and will justify the confidence placed in him.

To the man who left that job may I offer my thanks, not only for the job he has done over so many years in this House,

and in other places, but particularly for his efforts last year when, with reduced numbers in the House, he rallied his forces and, with the support of his colleagues, helped us to enjoy an interesting session. The debates were of a very high standard and, so far as I am concerned, he has my grateful thanks for the job he did. I wish him the very best and trust that those blood vessels will not stand out too often and that he will live for a long time yet to put us right when things go wrong, and to enjoy himself without overtaxing himself.

Members have mentioned the trip north. Unfortunately I cannot, because I was not well enough at the time to go. However, I would like to thank the Minister because I think it was at my instigation, or as a result of the questions I asked last year about an organised trip for members, that an approach was made to the Premier and the trip organised. I think it was on the last night of the session, during the debate on the Appropriation Bill, that I again mentioned the matter and asked the Minister to approach the Premier and ascertain whether an organised trip could be arranged.

The Minister did this and the trip was arranged. I am sure that those who were able to enjoy it have found it of great benefit. My only regret is, of course, that I was unable to go, but possibly one of the Ministers going north one of these times might have a pocket in the plane into which I could fit and thus enable me to make the trip with him.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We will have to take you and Ruby next time.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Some dipped out, but not many; and I certainly would like the opportunity to make the trip. My health has improved sufficiently to enable me to hope that in a month's time I could undertake such a trip.

One of the two or three matters to which I wish to refer concerns repairs done through Government departments. I know that the Public Works Department is responsible for building repairs, renovations, and maintenance required on Government property throughout the State. Local organisations have the right to expend a certain amount of money on small repairs, but in the main the Public Works Department is responsible for it.

It is rather strange, I feel, that things have reached such a sorry pass. I am sorry the Minister for Health is not here because I now wish to speak about one of the hospitals he controls. This was sold to the Government some two or three years ago.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister had to take a phone call. He will only be a moment.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Three old houses were bought and converted into a hospital and run by private enterprise, and then the Government bought it out to keep it going. These old places, of

course, are not equipped for hospital work. In the first place the electrical system throughout the three buildings was in a rather shocking state and when the present matron took over some 15 to 16 months ago she asked immediately that something be done about the electrical equipment. If the housemaid is required to vacuum the floor she has to climb on a chair and put the plug into the light socket after removing the globe. That procedure is followed throughout the building.

The matron made the request and I believe an inspector visited the hospital and made a report, but nothing was done. A little later she made a further request and another inspector made a report.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am sorry I was out when you commenced speaking. What is the name of the hospital?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Avro. Nothing has been done unless it has been in the last fortnight. With a builder I took the trouble to inspect the building to ascertain what was necessary and it seemed to me that a few power points were required on the walls. The Public Works Department has such wonderful and grandiose ideas. It has suggested that the only way to carry out the work is to rip the plaster off the walls and put the wires in so they are concealed and then cover everything up, thus doing a first-class job at a considerable cost. It is this cost which has, I believe, prevented the work being done.

This hospital must be very necessary or surely the Government would not have taken it over. It will not operate as a hospital for more than a few years, I would think, so would it not be sensible to put the wiring down the walls? Many types of wire which are not unsightly can be obtained today, or it could even be painted. In that way the power points could be installed and thus prevent the possibility of an accident occurring. I feel that if something is not done at this hospital there will be an accident. As a matter of fact it is a wonder someone has not been electrocuted before now. It is disgraceful that a person should have to climb on a chair to take a globe out and then put a plug in the socket before a power unit can be used.

It would be interesting to know how many times an inspector—or someone else—has looked at this hospital and submitted a report; and it would also be interesting to know just how many more inspections and reports will be made before something is done. I suggest the Minister should investigate the situation because someone could be electrocuted.

A member: It is illegal, too.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: If it is illegal, it should not be condoned in any Government institution. This also ties in with what another member said the other day. We must save money wherever we can. I quite agree that all Government departments must look to their laurels and really

cut their costs to a minimum. This is not being done with regard to this hospital, because men, one after the other, are diving in, inspecting, and then diving out to make a report. This procedure adds to the cost, especially when nothing is done. Let us hope that the situation will be rectified soon.

It seems that many people are being inconvenienced by the progress being made in the State, and, as has been mentioned by, I think, most speakers to date, land resumptions are causing headaches and heartaches to many people. I have spoken on this subject for the last eight years, and have always contended that people who have land or property taken from them for the benefit of the public should be well and truly compensated for it, and if it is at all possible, they should be given a better proposition than the one they leave. That is my honest opinion. As some members know, I can speak on this subject with some authority because I have waited for three years to obtain finality on a land resumption.

The Hon. R. Thompson brought sufficient evidence forward last night, I think, to keep several investigators busy for the next couple of months. I wish to mention only one case at the moment, but I have two or three more which could be brought to the light of day if necessary. The one I am about to disclose to members is a glaring example of what is happening and of how unfaithful and how untrue the department is in handling its resumptions.

I am referring to Lots 153 and 154, Great Eastern Highway, Redcliffe. It concerns an area of 1.2 acres of rather low-lying land. If it were filled in at one end, it could be a very good commercial site. Its owner, through an agent, had reached finality with Western Livestock Ltd., which was going to take over the property. The price had been arranged and it was not until the agent went to the then road board to ascertain the rates and taxes position of this area—this was on the 11th June, 1963—that he was told Lot 154 could not be sold because it was needed by the Main Roads Department to form part of the Beechboro-Gosnells Highway.

Naturally the agent had to advise the owner, and the person about to purchase the land, what the road board had told him. As a consequence, of course, the purchaser was not then interested because he required the two lots as one was not sufficient. Therefore the whole arrangement fell through. The owner tried to sell one block on its own and had reached a stage where he had a buyer nibbling, but that was all.

In August, the owner received a notice from the department to say that all the land was required. It is strange that the department could not make up its mind before whether it required two blocks or one. Anyway, the land could not be sold

and he had to wait for a resumption notice. He did not receive this notice and so he thought that perhaps the department had changed its mind and did not require the land after all. However, on making inquiries he found that the land was still to be resumed and could not be sold, and subsequently an offer was made by the department on the 19th September of the same year. The amount offered, \$3,700, was not acceptable to the owner because he had previously been offered \$7,500 and he had indicated to the department that he wanted \$7,000. So the battle went on with the chief land resumption officer. He also, I think, on a few occasions saw the chief of the Public Works Department to ascertain whether some arrangements could not be made, but the negotiations went on and on and on.

The Taxation Department eventually made a valuation of \$7,000. He was dissatisfied with the earlier offer and had a private valuation of the property made by the firm of P. C. Kerr. This company valued the property—as a commercial site—at \$10,500, with reservations. The reservations were to the effect that the property had to be a commercial site which it was not at that time. However, it can never be a commercial site because now the land is going to be resumed, but at that time it was feasible to make the reservation with respect to a commercial site because there was a garage right next to the property, and this suggested to P. C. Kerr that the property should have been made a commercial site.

As a result of this, negotiations went on until the department made him a flat-out offer of \$3,800—that is to say, the department increased its offer by \$100 over a 12-months period. Naturally, the man turned this down, too, because it represented nowhere near the value of the land. Between the 15th October, 1965, when the department offered \$3,800 and the 1st January, 1966, the department jumped its offer to \$7,000. This suggests to me that the department is playing all along the line in the hope of paying the least for the land that is possible and also sparring for time. This situation is occurring everywhere.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is going on from Redcliffe to Kwinana.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: What I am saying is not political. It is something in which every member of this House should interest himself in order to see that the Government department concerned does the right thing by the individual.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I will give an instance of this next week.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The more cases of this nature that we can bring forward, the better. I have here the complete file of the man I have just mentioned. I have to return this file because it is his only evidence of negotiations and it contains all the correspondence dealing

with this matter since the day he was approached.

He was offered \$7,000 which he agreed to accept. Because of the inconvenience to which he had been put, several ideas occurred to him and he spoke to me about them. His idea was to approach the department with a view to its refunding rates, taxes, and incidentals since the day the department had told him that it was going to resume this land. He asked me if he was entitled to do this and I said, "Yes." I suggested that he apply for a rebate to be effective from the day the department approached him. Accordingly this man wrote to the Under-Secretary of the Department of Public Works, only last month, asking him to authorise a refund of all rates and taxes paid, with compound interest, since the 11th June, 1963. For the benefit of the House, I will read the letter written by Mr. Holland to the Under-Secretary of the Public Works Department—

In reply to your letter dated 1st July, 1966 I feel that in addition to the amount of \$7,000.00 I would be entitled to a refund of all rates and taxes paid and compound interest at the rate of 7% p.a. on the sum \$7,000.00 since 11th June, 1963, being the date I was advised that blocks would be resumed for the Beechborough Gosnells Highway.

Interest to be compounded to the date of settlement.

The interest rates I have paid on my overdraft have varied between 6½% and 7½% p.a.

I think this is a reasonable request as since 11th June, 1963 I have been unable to deal with this land in any manner and so my Capital has laid idle. Also during this period the buying value of the Australian currency has fallen badly.

At this juncture, I might add that the same man deals in shares and he bought £25,000 worth of Kathleen Investments at around 17s. and today they are worth 27s.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Some people have been buying Kathleen Mavourneens.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: It is not unreasonable to assume that this man could have made a lot more money if he had had access to this other money some years ago.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He might have lost it, like me.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The Department of Public Works replied on the 8th August, 1966, and I quote—

Your submission concerning refund of rates and payment of interest from 11th June, 1963 in respect to purchase from you of land at Belmont has been referred to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority which has now replied that it is not prepared to agree to any such additional payments.

If that is not Hitler coming amongst us, I do not know what is!

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is different from what they did at North Fremantle.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I do not wish to bring anything further forward. I think this is another clear-cut case of how people are being treated, and I hope that every one of us will rise up in arms in order to see that this department, and the Government, does the right thing by these people whose land is being taken from them.

I would like to mention another type of person who, I know, has suffered in the public's interest. To my way of thinking, and in the thinking of some other members of Parliament who have seen his land and know the circumstances, this person, while not in the same category as the one previously referred to, needs some consideration. This latter person had some justification, I feel, when he lodged a claim for damage which had been caused through the Public Works Department not carrying out its work properly in connection with the training of a river; the Main Roads Department, too, was involved because it had erected a bridge directly below his property and, as a result, some of the land has been flooded and, consequently, damaged to some extent.

I am not prepared to say to what extent his property has been damaged but I do believe that this man has suffered some damage. He made an approach to the department through Mr. Lewis, and myself, and together we managed to obtain for him the sum of £500 from the department. However, the department made him sign a letter to the effect that he would not hold liable. Although I have seen the letter, I could not report the contents of it. However, on the bottom of the letter the man had the sense to put "Unless the position deteriorates." He protected himself in this way. This took place some five or six years ago and, to my mind, the position has deteriorated.

The Department of Agriculture was going to try to help this man to re-establish the land by giving him advice. Unfortunately, he let it be known somewhere along the line that he was going to take legal action. Through advice from the Crown Law Department all other departments froze—they would not give him anything, they would not tell him anything, and they left him out on a limb. I suppose the Crown Law Department could not very well have one department telling this fellow something which might be used in evidence later on.

However, the point I want to make is that this man—partly through his own fault but partly through the fact that he has suffered this damage—has gone broke. He has no money at all with which to fight a case.

I approached the ex-Minister, who is now in London, to see if he would consider

setting up a committee of men with an independent chairman to deal with these cases. I suggested that the committee might be composed of representatives from the Department of Agriculture, the Public Works Department, and, perhaps, the Main Roads Department but with an independent chairman. It was my idea that the committee should have a look at this property in order to see whether or not this man had suffered some damage. If the committee considered that damage had been done, it was then reasonable to suggest that the department should assist and justice be done to this man. However, the ex-Minister knew he was going to England at the time and, although he said, "Yes, I will do it," he never, in fact, did anything at all—he never, to my knowledge, made a note of my request. I saw the present Minister who said, "Until summoned, I do not intend to do anything."

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It costs £100 to go to a lawyer.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The man to whom I have referred has had his health undermined. He is so sick now that, in physique, he is an old man. His sons are battling to try to take the property over and build it up again. Whether or not they stand a chance of doing this, I do not know.

However, I feel very strongly that something should be done to look after people who come into this category. I believe there is a branch set up now to which a person without money can go in order to request legal assistance. I am going to try—even tomorrow—to see if I can do something about this.

In the meantime, he put his case in the hands of the ombudsman for the *Daily News* and I believe he is going to take it up. To my mind, this will not show the Government in a very good light.

I can recall writing to Premier Hawke when his Government was in office suggesting that this position was so grave that the Government should do something about it; because I could see the time coming when the Government could be liable for damages in this connection. That was an opinion I formed before the damage was really done; I could see it happening. By training the river at Moora it built up and flooded the lower countryside. The Main Roads Department built a bridge to carry traffic west. This, of course, is a hazard and stops the flow of water. Another bridge constructed 13 miles up river has a considerably greater capacity to clear water than the bridge previously mentioned. One would have expected the opposite because nine small tributaries join the river in this 13 miles. Nothing adds up at all.

This man has a just case for some good and proper treatment—yet no-one is prepared to give him any at all.

In fairness to the general public, if a river is to be trained to relieve a township or an area, or if a bridge is to be built

to allow access and egress to an area, compensation should be payable to anyone who is inconvenienced. I think this should apply generally to land resumption.

The honourable Dr. Hislop mentioned certain factors which would, perhaps, increase safety if implemented. I, also, would like to add a few points to what he said.

Whilst it is true that we have more police now than we had many years ago, it is equally true that large numbers of them are tied up with so many office duties that they have little time for anything else. Every time I have occasion to go to a police station—whether it be Nedlands, Subiaco or Claremont—I see young constables sitting behind a desk busily engaged in writing out and filling in reports.

My daughter runs a little kindergarten only 100 yards from a police station. If she has any trouble—and there is occasional trouble because the kindergarten is broken into now and again, or windows are broken by vandals—she makes a complaint to the police. However, so busy are these policemen with their clerical duties, that my daughter has had difficulty in getting anyone to walk the distance with her in order to inspect the trouble.

What I am suggesting is that this same number of policemen could do a lot more towards handling traffic problems if they were relieved of their clerical duties. Instead of tying up the policemen in this way I suggest that the Police Department should employ clerks to do this work and this would allow the trained men to get out and do the work for which they have been trained. I am sure a lot of them do not appreciate being desk-bound.

Just recently, a chap hit the back bumper of my motorcar. No damage at all was done but he made quite a fuss about it and said it was necessary to report it. Therefore, I reported it and this took up a considerable amount of my time. I had to make two trips to the police station and I wasted a good half hour in reporting something which did not matter at all.

To my way of thinking this is wrong. We should not be spending the amount of money which is necessary to recruit and train these men for more constructive work and then delegate them to menial tasks.

I would like to mention conditions on the road. A glaring example came to my notice only the other day on the corner of King Street and Wellington Street, where there is a bus stop. I was travelling along King Street from the south and one of the big transport trucks from the Eastern States—I suppose it was a 20-ton truck—was pulled up right on the corner and as far into the bus stop bay as it was possible to go. There was no room to see around this truck, over it, under it, or any other way. I was the unfortunate man who was first in the line of traffic waiting to turn right at King Street into Wellington Street. However, I refused to

move out of the line of traffic because I could not see what was coming. Very quickly the whole of the street was blocked and everyone was tooting me to try to get me to move on. There was no alternative but for me to move my car forward and, as I did so, from very close into this vehicle came a fellow on one of those very little scooters. Because I had good brakes, I was able to stop and he was able to go in front of me. However, if I had gone another yard further, he would have been underneath my car.

Bus stops should be most jealously guarded and reserved specifically for buses. Anyone who parks on a bus stop commits one of the worst offences possible because if a bus comes along and there is no room for it to draw into the bay, it has to park one vehicle wide in the street. Then all traffic following must stop, because it is impossible to see around the bus, and should any driver attempt to drive around it he would be committing a traffic breach. So I appeal to the appropriate Minister to request the Metropolitan Transport Trust to direct its drivers to report the number of any vehicle that is parked on a bus stop. Further, when a driver is convicted for this offence he should be penalised with a heavy fine.

I now wish to speak about traffic lights. I have referred to them before. I know I have been criticised for saying that there are too many "Stop" signs and too many sets of traffic lights in and around the metropolitan area, but I am still of the same opinion. At the intersection of Hampden Road and Stirling Highway, there are so many lights that one becomes confused as to which light one must obey, and recently at that intersection there have been three accidents within three weeks. Therefore, in my opinion, that supports my argument that traffic lights do not achieve everything that is expected of them.

My suggestion is that instead of having these traffic lights operating every day of the week, and every hour of the day, they should be used only during those times when there is peak traffic; that is, from, say, Monday morning until Saturday midday. At present it is ridiculous that these lights should be in operation every hour of the day on Sunday in the same way as they are operating on other days of the week. My reason for saying that is that if one is driving a vehicle down St. George's Terrace on a Sunday one is often unnecessarily held up at traffic lights before they change to green and one can proceed on one's way.

In Sydney and in other capitals in the Eastern States the traffic lights do not operate on Sundays or on holidays when traffic is light. Therefore, the Government should further review this problem to ascertain if something can be done to put the traffic lights out of operation at the weekend. If the traffic is light and there are no vehicles in sight at any inter-

section, there is no reason why a driver should be prevented from going on his way. The traffic lights should not be against him. There is no reason why he should not have free access along the road.

When a driver is delayed unnecessarily at traffic lights he becomes irritable and he is more inclined to make a mistake and become involved in an accident when he is in such a state of mind. I make an appeal to the Minister for Police to have another look at the regulations governing "Stop" signs, with a view to replacing them with "Give Way" signs.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you take notice of the "No Standing" signs, because one must stand where it says "No Standing"?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes, that is quite true. I suggest to the Minister who is in control of traffic lights that he should make inquiries to ascertain if something can be done to prevent this pin-pricking caused by unnecessary traffic regulations to which the motorist should not be subjected. I realise that all members are waiting for me to resume my seat, so I will now conclude my remarks.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise.

House adjourned at 4.34 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 11th August, 1966

### CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| <b>ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY—</b>  |      |
| Speakers on Motion—  |      |
| Mr. Dunn .....   | 316  |
| Mr. Elliott .....  | 296  |
| Mr. Molr .....   | 298  |
| Mr. Rushton .....  | 306  |
| Mr. Sewell .....   | 313  |
| <b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>  |      |
| Electricity Supplies: Connections at Weekends .....                          | 290  |
| Gas Coal: Supplies at Collie .....   | 294  |
| <b>Health—</b>   |      |
| Cardiac Implantable Pacemakers—  |      |
| Comparison between Local and Imported Units .....                            | 291  |
| Market Survey into Usage .....   | 290  |
| Qualification for Financial Assistance .....                                 | 291  |
| Fluoridation of Water Supplies: Introduction of Legislation .....            | 294  |
| Land at Lesmurdie—Resumption from W. J. Lucas: Settlement .....              | 294  |
| Ombudsman—Appointment: Government Attitude .....                             | 293  |
| Ports in the North-West—   |      |
| King Bay: Non-proclamation as a Port .....                                   | 293  |
| Master Mariners: Complaint .....   | 292  |
| P.W.D. Goods Yards and Offices—Carnarvon: Future Use .....                   | 290  |
| Railway Wagons—Reflector Lights: Attachment at Esperance .....               | 295  |
| <b>Roads—</b>  |      |
| Leifroy Road, Fremantle: Completion to Coastline .....                       | 294  |
| Stock Road Freeway—Properties Affected: Sewerage Connections and Rates ..... | 293  |
| Tourist Coaches: Restriction on Use of North-West Hotel Accommodation .....  | 290  |
| <b>Town Planning—</b>  |      |
| Albany: Recreation Reserves, and Value .....                                 | 292  |
| Non-conforming Use of Land: Meaning and Effect .....                         | 292  |