

an income of slightly over \$2,000 a year, and he faces an outlay of \$1,000 in land tax and shire rates.

The situation is absolutely crying out for attention, and it should have been attended to long ago. In spite of the gesture which the Government has made, and which it knew full well would not cost it anything, because with the rate of revaluations taking place in the various districts it was inevitable that the new valuations would completely wipe out the exemptions, we believe that action ought to be taken immediately.

Before I conclude I want to say that I am very disappointed with the relief which has been granted to the rural industries. I understand that the farmers who want loans from the Rural and Industries Bank have to give a first mortgage on their properties. The people who are least able to give a first mortgage are those in direst need; they are already mortgaged; and the people whose properties are already mortgaged would not be in the same situation as those whose properties are not mortgaged. However, the people whose properties are already mortgaged cannot obtain loans from the Rural and Industries Bank.

It is time that this situation was corrected, because some of the farmers, especially those in parts of the great southern, are right up against it. I received a telegram today pointing out the distress caused by the lack of immediate finance, which cannot be obtained because these people are not in a position to give a first mortgage on their properties.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir David Brand (Premier).

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 13th August, 1970

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

QUESTIONS (11): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. TOWN PLANNING

Perth Shire District Scheme

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) When was the Perth Shire District Scheme submitted to the Town Planning Department for approval?

(2) Has preliminary approval been granted for the scheme?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) The 21st March, 1969.

(2) No. Examination of a complex scheme such as this which covers a large area must necessarily be fairly protracted. There have been discussions with the shire council officers and these are continuing with a view to resolving a number of questions raised by the Town Planning Board.

3.

LIQUOR ACT

Juveniles on Licensed Premises

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND, to the Minister for Justice:

In view of the fact that section 129 of the Liquor Act, 1970, gives the right to persons under the age of 18 years to enter licensed premises for the purpose of obtaining a meal, but appears to be operating contrary to the apparent intention of the section, will the Minister advise the House—

(a) is it intended that a juvenile, accompanied by a person in authority, be entitled to sit at the bar of an hotel, or at an adjacent table for the purpose of partaking of a meal and consuming liquor;

(b) if not, what is the intention of the section; and

(c) will the Government introduce an amendment to clarify the situation to allow children to be seated in the lounge of licensed premises but not at a bar?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) to (c) This seeks an expression on a question of law and is therefore an inadmissible question. However, I will have the matter examined.

4. *This question was withdrawn.*

5.

TOWN PLANNING

Shenton Park Zoning

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) What is the present zoning of Lots 1, 2 and 3, location 292, Nicholson Road, Shenton Park?

(2) When were these zonings advertised?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

It is not possible to answer this question until the land is more accurately defined. There are two parcels of land described as Lots 1, 2 and 3, location 292, in Nicholson Road, Shenton Park. It will be necessary to point out which one it is.

6.

YOUTH COUNCIL*Allocation of Funds*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Minister for Mines:

For each of the financial years ended the 30th June, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970—

- (a) what was the total amount of money allocated to the Youth Council of W.A.; and
- (b) what was the total amount of money distributed by the Council to—
 - (i) all youth groups, clubs and organisations;
 - (ii) Y.M.C.A. clubs; and
 - (iii) Police and Citizens' youth clubs?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

		\$
(a)	1966	41,000
	1967	91,200
	1968	122,035
	1969	118,000
	1970	195,000
(b)	(i) To all groups—	
	1966	9,700
	1967	67,800
	1968	72,860
	1969	123,000
	1970	220,450
	(ii) To Y.M.C.A.—	
	1966	900
	1967	3,968
	1968	5,850
	1969	11,915
	1970	17,120
	(iii) To Police & Citizens—	
	1966	—
	1967	—
	1968	700
	1969	8,020
	1970	12,350

7.

DAIRYING*Defined Districts*

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many dairy districts are there as defined in the Milk Act, 1946?
- (2) Where are the various districts located?
- (3) In what year were the respective districts gazetted as such?
- (4) What are the total number of dairies licensed to supply "quota milk" in each of the districts referred to in (2) above?
- (5) (a) Have any of the abovementioned dairy districts been subject to—
 - (i) increased quota; or
 - (ii) reduction in quota; and
- (b) if so, by what percentage?

- (6) (a) What were the districts affected by such increase or reduction; and
- (b) in what year were they affected?
- (7) (a) What dairy districts have been, and are, supplying whole milk to the Perth metropolitan area; and
- (b) what other district or districts are proposed for that area in the near future?
- (8) (a) Have the whole milk producers from the Albany regional district sought to obtain access to the Perth metropolitan area with milk from their district over the last three years; and
- (b) if so, on what grounds does the Milk Board justify its non-compliance with their request?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) to (3) Under the Milk Act—

"dairy area" means a defined portion of the State as constituted and declared to be a dairy area under this Act.

"district" means a defined portion of a dairy area as constituted and declared to be a district under this Act.

A dairyman's license is issued for the applicant to carry on the business of a dairyman from premises situated in a specified dairy area.

A milkman's license is issued for the sale of milk in a specified district.

The dairy areas constituted and declared under the Milk Act, 1946, and published in the *Government Gazette* on the 24th April, 1947, are:—

Metropolitan Dairy Area.

South West Coastal Dairy Area.

South Coastal Dairy Area.

Inner Wheat Belt Dairy Area.

Central Dairy Area.

Eastern Goldfields Dairy Area.

All dairy areas are divided into districts which were published in the *Government Gazette* on the 24th April, 1947. Subsequent amendments to and subdivision of districts have been made, and there are now 258 districts.

- (4) The total number of dairies licensed to supply "quota" milk under contract to treatment plants is:—

Metropolitan Dairy Area	125
South West Coastal Dairy Area	494
South Coastal Dairy Area	67

Inner Wheat Belt Dairy Area	nil
Central Dairy Area	nil
Eastern Goldfields Dairy Area	nil

The major contract supply area consists of the Metropolitan Dairy Area, the South West Coastal Dairy Area and the Shires of Capel and Town of Bunbury in the South Coastal Dairy Area. The board approves contracts for dairymen in this area to supply treatment plants with milk, for sale to consumers in the metropolitan area and country areas other than Albany and the surrounding region.

22 dairies in the Shires of Albany, Denmark and Plantagenet supply milk under contract to a treatment plant for sale to consumers in those shires, the Town of Albany, also the Shire of Gnowangerup.

- (5) and (6) The following increases and reductions in contracts have applied from the 1st March, 1965:

Major contract supply area:
Increase Decrease

	%	%
March 1, 1965	—	4.0
Nov. 1, 1966	4.0	—
May 1, 1967	4.2	—
Sept. 1, 1967	1.2	—
Oct. 15, 1967	2.0	—
Dec. 1, 1967	5.3	—
June 1, 1968	1.8	—
April 1, 1969	1.7	—
March 1, 1970	3.4	—
June 1, 1970	1.6	—
Albany area:		
April 1, 1965	14.2	—
May 1, 1966	—	10.0
March 1, 1967	10.0	—
May 1, 1967	6.4	—
Dec. 1, 1967	7.0	—
April 1, 1969	—	10.0
Nov. 1, 1969	10.0	—
May 1, 1970	—	5.0

- (7) (a) Answer covered by (4).
 (b) The board decided on the 21st April, 1970, to include the Shire of Busselton in the major contract supply area and to consider applications for dairymen's licenses by producers in that shire for licensing from the 1st February, 1972.
 (8) (a) Yes.
 (b) Albany milk producers are geographically situated to satisfy the market in that area in accordance with the normal economic requirements of the liquid milk industry.

Any proposal for the forwarding of milk from the Albany area to supplement that from the major contract supply area is considered unwarranted and economically unsound. Licensed dairymen in the major contract supply area, supply annually to their treatment plants, in addition to their contract milk, an excess amount of milk used for manufacturing, equivalent to nearly fifty per cent. of their contract supply.

This excess milk was approximately 10,000,000 gallons for the year ended the 30th June, 1970.

8. RAILWAYS

Electricity Supplies to Fettlers' Houses

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS (for the Hon. J. J. Garrigan), to the Minister for Mines:

Will consideration be given to the provision of electric power to railway fettlers' houses where they are erected in close proximity to State Electricity Commission supply?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
 Yes. It is the policy of the department to provide electricity at all departmental houses wherever economically possible.

9. POLICE

Premises at Yalgoo

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has any provision been made for the replacement of the old police station at Yalgoo with a new air-conditioned complex embracing offices, courthouse, and living quarters for a married officer?
- (2) Will the department transfer a second policeman to the area as soon as possible?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The provision of a new two-man police station at Yalgoo with court facilities and quarters has been scheduled for construction in the 1972-73 financial year, subject to finance being available.
- (2) Yes.

10. PERTH CULTURAL CENTRE

Resumption of Properties

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Mines:

Further to my question of the 2nd September, 1969, regarding properties to be resumed for the

Perth Cultural Centre, which of the listed properties have been resumed, and what price was paid for each?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No resumption action has been taken on the properties in question; however, negotiations for purchase are in course with a small number of owners.

11. *This question was postponed.*

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th August.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [2.47 p.m.]: The Bill we have before us is the Supply Bill, 1970, in which the Government is asking for funds to the total of \$180,000,000. Of that total \$145,000,000 is to come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$30,000,000 from the General Loan Fund, and \$5,000,000 from the Public Account. Perhaps it would be more appropriate, Sir, for me to give some consideration to the state of the economy and the effect that this fund-raising would have upon it. However, I propose to take this opportunity to raise some matters concerning my electorate, which will be affected by the expenditure of those funds.

First of all, I wish to raise some matters in connection with several schools. The first of these is the school at North Perth. It is an old school which dates back 50 years or more, I would think, and because of its age it suffers by comparison with the facilities provided in more modern schools. I do not intend to take the Government to task, because this school was designed and built to cater for a different style of education from that which applies today. However, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to this school in the hope that some action will be taken to place it more in keeping with present-day needs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Perhaps the National Trust should keep it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The school is situated on an area of something under four acres. It includes a junior school with some 280 students, and a senior school with around 420 students, making a total of about 700 children in this rather limited area.

Some time back requests were made that the space available to the school be increased. There are something like 23 classrooms, a toilet block, and a temporary building occupied by the arts and crafts branch all of which are located within this small site.

The Government has agreed to purchase a number of houses on the west side of the school. These will be demolished in order that the playing area may be extended.

On the 20th March I asked a question on this matter and the Minister replied that one house had already been purchased and negotiations were in train to acquire further houses.

To date, however, the school remains as it was; the amount of space available is still very limited. The staff are most concerned about the conditions under which the children have to be taught and under which they are able to participate in outdoor activities.

A matter that can be resolved within a reasonably short space of time and without a great deal of cost is the location of the arts and crafts building. These are temporary premises and some years back a good deal of money was spent on renovating them. They are the sort of premises, however, that can be moved to some other site.

I would suggest—and I am sure the people concerned in the school would agree—that this building should be removed and located at some other site where it could be more suitably established. It was pointed out to me that even after the houses across the road were acquired and the boarding school section was closed off vehicles would still need to enter the grounds in order to bring supplies to the buildings in question. This would continue to limit the playing area available.

This is one matter that could be attended to within a reasonable time and if the difficulty were removed it would immediately make more land available to the school. The school itself has no grassed area at all; it is completely covered with bitumen. There is no large area really suitable for kicking a football which, of course, the older boys like to do.

I taught at the school a few years ago and I have a fair idea of the conditions that exist. The boys in grade 7 use a site on the east side of the school on which to play football, but the ball keeps going over the fence and it has to be retrieved from the road on the other side. The road in question is quite a busy one and there is always the danger of children being injured.

This may appear to be a small matter but I would point out that it is necessary for the teachers to supervise these children and it is quite unjust to expect people to spend their time on these rather small details when, with a little thought, the difficulties could be eliminated altogether.

If a little more consideration were given to the space available around the school and a bigger playing area provided it would be a very good thing indeed. I would ask the Government to give some thought to the possibility of removing the building that is used for the arts and crafts advisory service and suggest that all haste be made to acquire the properties across the road so that the grounds of the school may be extended.

All the buildings in the school are located on about 3½ to four acres of land and this does not leave a great deal of space for the necessary outdoor activities in which the children participate.

Inside the buildings there is a rather small amount of office and storeroom space available. The buildings were designed for a previous era in education and they are quite inadequate for the needs of the school at the moment.

The space available to the headmaster is a tiny little cupboard, about four feet by four feet which is totally inadequate for storage purposes. If members have any idea of the amount of material used in a reasonably up-to-date system they will appreciate the inadequacy of the storage space that is provided at the school. I would also point out that no provision is made for what is known as a utility room.

These utility rooms are used for a variety of purposes, one of the most important of which is the examination of the children when the medical officer visits the school. At the moment there is no room in which this examination can be conducted. I would ask the Government to consider the possibility of providing such space at the North Perth School.

The Westminster Primary School at Balga, which is of a rather more recent vintage, was designed for a smaller population. The numbers of the children in the area have, however, grown far beyond what was expected. In this instance, also, a junior school with some 450 students and a senior primary school with about 700 students are on the same site. This makes 1100 to 1200 children in the one area. These grounds may have been quite adequate initially but they are now being taken up by the erection of temporary classrooms and the school faces a problem in providing recreation and playing areas for the children.

This also imposes a burden on the teachers, because it is necessary for them to supervise and manage the activities of the children in rather difficult conditions. All sorts of problems arise which distract the teacher from his main task of teaching.

On the western side of the school is a bus route and it is on this side that the teachers park their cars, because there is no other space available. I had a look at the situation in the area but I could not offer a satisfactory solution to the problem.

Across the road is a shop at which the children obtain their lunches. While on their way to the shop it is necessary for them to pass between the parked cars. A number of difficulties arise in ensuring that the children cross the street safely. This applies not only at lunch time but also when the children are going to and from the school.

Various attempts have been made to have a guard-controlled crossing provided for the children, but so far without success. The school grounds, too, are somewhat of a problem, but if the departmental landscape gardener could go to the school I am sure he would be able to tell the people concerned how to improve the situation. He could provide a plan for rearrangement of the grounds to overcome the problem of the parking of teachers' cars in front of the school. That, in turn, would obviate the problems associated with children crossing the road while coming to and going from the school. It would enable them to cross the road in safety.

As I said previously, several requests have been made for a guard-controlled crossing, but when one looks at the situation one can understand possibly why it does not measure up to the criteria that the committee lays down in regard to the provision of school crossings.

The school grounds are not reticulated. The normal procedure is for the first move to be made by the P. & C. association for the Government or the department to subsidise the installation of reticulation. However, the association has been involved in raising funds for other purposes. There is a fairly new library at the school and when I spoke to him the headmaster was extremely proud of it. He told me that it was intended to extend the library. Therefore, I think it is a bit much to expect the P. & C. association to raise money for the provision of reticulation for the school grounds. At the moment the grounds are not attractive; they are infested with Gullford grass and they look a bit chatty. In fact they present a somewhat depressing outlook to the school.

In this regard I think the Government could assist by taking the initiative in the provision of a reticulation system. This would help in improving the appearance of the school and also assist in providing better recreational areas for the children.

When I went to visit the school the clerical assistant was sitting in a passageway inside the entrance and people and children were passing her continually. However, this is the only place available for her to do her work—it is most unsatisfactory. There are no separate toilet facilities for the teachers. I understand these matters are being looked at, and I hope the department will expedite any action it proposes to take.

While on the question of schools, I wish to refer to the Churchlands High School. This is a most pleasant school to visit. The grounds are beautifully looked after, and the whole school is excellently planned. It has a good reputation in the area. Last year the school conducted a fund-raising drive for the provision of a swimming pool. Those concerned had been told that the school could expect to have eight acres excised from the Poultry Research Station and attached to the school grounds.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where is this?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Churchlands High School. Since that time it appears the plans have all been changed and that the school is unlikely to have this extra land provided. The shire, too, was informed that it could expect to have 17 acres provided for a recreational area and sports grounds. This area was subsequently reduced to 11 acres and now, I understand, it has been reduced still further to 7½ acres. So it can be seen that the open space which was to be provided for that district has been considerably reduced; the school will not, apparently, get the eight acres it was told would be provided, and the area of 17 acres of open space has been reduced to 7½ acres. This is a matter of concern to the school and to the people who reside in the district.

No doubt the Government is aware of the agitation which has arisen in Wembley Downs with regard to the question of open space, and now the same sort of situation seems to be developing at Churchlands. If what I say is accurate, I ask the Government, and particularly the Minister for Town Planning, to have another look at it to see whether the school grounds at Churchlands can be enlarged; otherwise there will be difficulties in siting the swimming pool which the school proposes to build. I understand there are approximately 1,400 children at the school and only a limited area of land available for recreational purposes. In my view the school is badly in need of an additional playing area.

Previously I have raised the question of the installation of sewerage in this district, but I understand the sewerage scheme is to be extended as far as the Scarborough Beach area. This is an important matter to the people in the district. Originally I believe the sewerage scheme was not extended along Pearson Street, which skirts Herdsman Lake, because if it were installed pumping equipment would have to be provided. With the extension of the main to Scarborough Beach from somewhere around Dunrossil Street, in Scarborough, it has been necessary to install two pumping stations. Therefore, the argument that was used previously is no longer a valid one.

I do not want to go into all the details of this matter, but it is my impression that this extension of the sewerage scheme is being rushed through to allow for the development of high density accommodation in the Scarborough Beach area. In my view this is not wise thinking because a much better area for the provision of high density accommodation is that bordering Herdsman Lake, where there is a large area of open land the development of which would not inconvenience existing home owners.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Instead of indulging in conjecture, why don't you ask the department the reason?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have asked it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have you had an explanation?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would rather ask the question in the House so that I know exactly how the position stands. My point in raising this matter is that while the sewerage line through Scarborough may serve the present residential homes to advantage, high density development will take place among existing single unit dwellings.

If it is intended to promote the development of high density accommodation then I hope the Government will look at the possibility of providing deep sewerage to the Herdsman Lake area so that flat development can take place there rather than at Scarborough Beach.

I have previously asked questions and spoken on the subject of the proposed cultural centre which is to be developed north of the Perth Railway Station. On one occasion I charged the Government with putting this proposition forward only as an election gimmick. Of course, that charge was denied by the Minister. In reply to a question I asked today I was told that no resumption action had been taken regarding private property which is to be included within the scheme. My question was as follows:—

Further to my question of the 2nd September, 1969, regarding properties to be resumed for the Perth Cultural Centre, which of the listed properties have been resumed, and what price was paid for each?

The Minister replied:—

No resumption action has been taken on the properties in question; however, negotiations for purchase are in course with a small number of owners.

I do not know whether we are to infer that no purchases have been made. I do not see how any other inference could be arrived at.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would you rather the Government resumed the land?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am simply saying that the Government has stated the area will be developed and the land will be acquired. If the land is being acquired then I feel the Government has nothing to hide and it should let the public know.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The plan has been published. The land will only be bought when the Government is ready to use it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If a plan has been published I would like to have a look at it. I have been to the chief architect and I asked to be allowed to see such a plan but he did not have one he could

show me. If the chief architect did have a plan then for some reason it was not made available to me. Various sketches which had been drawn up by architects were available, but I gathered the architects were not attached to the Public Works Department. The impression I gathered was that there were no plans at all in existence. I inquired about four weeks ago and at that time no planning had been started. I may be quite wrong.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is every chance.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am anxious to see a start made on the cultural centre, but from the information I have been able to gather I cannot see the centre as anything more than that which I originally stated it was. Apparently no land has been acquired. I noticed in last year's Budget that a sum of \$200,000 had been allocated—and, I assume, spent—for the development of the centre. A further \$200,000 was contemplated for the same purpose.

The scheme was put forward as a 16-year development plan, and that provides a date which is conveniently distant when some excuse can be given for no action having been taken. It is possible, of course, that the planning could be held up because of the uncertainty of the sinking of the railway.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is no uncertainty about that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: On the 2nd October, 1969, I asked the following question:—

- (1) What aspects of the Perth Cultural Centre are at present the subject of planning?
- (2) Will overall planning for the centre be affected by whatever decision is made on the sinking of the railway?

The Minister for Mines replied—

- (1) Privately-owned properties within the centre are being acquired by the Public Works Department with Treasury-allocated funds, according to the comprehensive 16 years' development programme for the centre approved by the Government. The Principal Architect is continuing extensive layout studies for the centre in line with known user requirements.
- (2) The cultural centre is being planned on the basis of agreed design criteria which include a pedestrian and visual link between the centre and Forrest Place, across railway land. It is expected that these criteria will be ultimately adhered to whether the railway is lowered or not at this time.

The sinking of the railway was not a consideration in the planning for the centre. The Museum is being proceeded with and that pleases me very much. No doubt the Museum authorities are also extremely pleased.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Is that not part of the development?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is it part of the development? We have a Museum building and a sketch of the proposed Art Gallery building, but what relation do they bear to the proposed cultural centre concept? There does not appear to be any development at all as a total concept. We must have a new Museum so let us put it up and call it the beginning of the cultural centre!

I would like to be assured that I am quite wrong, and that the Government's intentions are as it has stated. If I am wrong then it would not be to the detriment of the Government if it took Parliament and the public into its confidence regarding what has been done or what is being done, and presented a firmer planning concept than is the case at the moment. I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON: (North-East Metropolitan) [3.18 p.m.]: I have chosen education as my subject for discussion this afternoon. Inquiries I have made regarding the conditions of employment in schools have surprised me. I have come to the conclusion that our society is more dependent on teachers than on any other section of the community. As the years go by society becomes more dependent on the education system as a basis of good reasoning in a rapidly changing world.

I hold this viewpoint because I have looked back over my own life—which has been a long one—and I have compared the way we were taught at school with the present method of teaching. In my childhood it was a simple matter to go forward in school. We thought we received a good education but each year since then we have learnt more and more.

In England no fees are charged for books or equipment used at the schools. I was pleasantly surprised when I found that out while visiting that country. Over 10,000,000 children and young people attend universities, colleges, and schools on a full-time basis in England. Bearing in mind the English standard of education we should look to our laurels and do the best we can in Western Australia.

It is my own idea to speak on behalf of the teachers. Generally, pay increases granted to teachers are particularly poor throughout Australia. At any rate, they are poor in Western Australia.

Classroom teachers who have had two or three years of training and constitute the bulk of the primary school teachers were granted increases ranging from 1.4 per cent. to 4.4 per cent. Classroom

teachers who have had four or five years of training, most of whom are in the secondary schools, received increases ranging from 0.6 per cent. to 9.9 per cent., which represents 1 per cent. to 3 per cent. per annum for that period. Inflation alone is taking approximately 7 per cent. of employees' salaries at the present time; therefore, teachers could have reasonably expected increases in the vicinity of 20 per cent. to 25 per cent.

The new structure of the salary award has now altered the system whereby teachers in promotional positions received a basic salary according to their years of service plus an allowance for the responsibility of the positions they occupied. That system has now been eliminated and total salaries are paid for promotional positions. In effect, in some promotional positions there has been a reduction of the responsibility allowances and many teachers are at a disadvantage because of their placement in the new structure. This point was drawn to my attention by a teacher in my own area.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would I be correct in saying that you are quoting from a document put out by the Teachers' Union?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: No. It is an answer to a letter I wrote. Some of the answers to the questions I asked are here.

At a time when there is an acknowledged shortage of teachers the union justifiably considered that the department would recognise the urgent need to recruit more teachers and to retain those at present in the service. It must be remembered that in this "State-on-the-move" the Education Department is competing with private industry for school leavers of sufficient calibre to benefit from tertiary education and to enter the teaching profession. Although many entrants into teachers' colleges turn to teaching because of a particular desire to teach, the majority, like those entering many other occupations, look at the financial benefits of such a career. Only last week a mother in my own street was upset that her child could not enter the teaching profession because the salary advertised was not good enough.

Over the past few years the standard of entry into teachers' colleges has been falling. The minimum requirements for entry into primary colleges are leaving subjects, including English. Whereas 10 years ago very few entrants into teachers' colleges had only the minimum requirements, the percentage of such people has increased rapidly in the last few years.

Teachers have one of the most responsible jobs in the community. I do not think anyone would deny that. At present they are labouring under the greatest difficulties. Modern educational practice calls for attention to the individual needs of children. Teachers are of the opinion that some children in their classes are

being educationally neglected because the size of the classes prohibits the individual attention needed for some children to progress satisfactorily and equip themselves for future careers.

I think that would be true of almost every school. The population is increasing all the time; teachers are overworked and more thought should be given to the responsibility they undertake. Progress brings with it a host of additional clerical duties, all of which are time-consuming, both in and out of the classroom, and add to the burden of teachers. Teachers therefore justifiably regard the recent salary determination as a slur on their ability, training, and responsibility, and as indicating—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Have they not got a right of appeal from that determination?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: —a complete lack of understanding on the part of the Government to acknowledge the critical teacher shortage and the very real value of teachers in the community. In a young and growing country such as this, good educational facilities are absolutely necessary, and one expects that those good educational facilities have to be paid for.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I want to ask you a question. Who signed that letter?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I think that is my business.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You were quoting from it.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: That does not matter. I am quoting what I wrote.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Tell me who signed it.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I will not do any such thing. It is impertinent of the Minister to ask such a thing. I do not want to be at cross-purposes with the Minister; we fight when we are.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You are always begging, you know.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am not well enough to handle it properly. I am concerned about this because I know of two children who wished to take up teaching. They were training to be teachers but as they got on they were offered better jobs, with more money, in a bank; so they took those jobs. This is the sort of thing that is happening.

I consider that the highest possible salary should be paid to teachers. We cannot do without them. They hold positions of great responsibility in the community, and it is right and just that parents should expect the Government to be behind them to ensure that teachers are well paid, so that they can satisfactorily carry out their duties.

Members might be surprised to hear that I know of some teachers who, last year, of necessity did baby-sitting and other work at night to supplement their salaries. I say again that society cannot do without doctors and teachers. They are of first importance. As one learns and acquires high qualifications, one expects, and has a right to have, better things. That is my main point today. I close on that point and I hope the Minister and the Government will take full cognisance of what I have said. I ask that something be done. There is a great deal of unrest among teachers at the present time, as the Minister knows. I ask the Government not to treat this matter lightly but to treat it earnestly and see what can be done. The world is now entering an atomic age and of all the things that are needed surely at the very doorstep is education in schools. Therefore I expect my request to be given consideration. I do not care who goes short, but we cannot have teachers going short.

I will now touch on another subject. To assist in the publication of a book on epilepsy we received a grant of \$500 from the Minister for Health. However, we are still very short of funds and I want members of this House to know, and I point out to the Government, that every school should be provided with this book dealing with epilepsy so that every teacher may be given the opportunity to read it and study it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We would have liked to give you a lot more but we had to give over \$4,000,000 to the school teachers.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am glad to speak on these two subjects, because this is my contribution for the day. I will not bore the House for much longer. I merely wish to say again that the Government should ensure that the Education Department provides one of these books for every school.

A sad case of a child who was suffering from a mild form of epilepsy came to my notice the other day as a result of the action of an uninformed teacher. This small child who was slightly afflicted was being punished because he was not giving the correct answers to the sums that were given to him. For example, if he were asked to add two and two, due to a momentary lapse that may last for only a second or two he would miss hearing one of the two's and so would give the wrong answer to the question. As a result he was being punished week after week for not being proficient at his sums.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you know that Mr. Logan supplied copies of the book which you have mentioned to every local authority in Western Australia?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Yes, I know that, but I am sorry to say that the society to which I belong which is interested in epilepsy has not enough money to print a greater number of books. The society is most anxious that all schools have a copy of this book. I am concerned with the children and I can assure the House that the circumstances of the case I have outlined are quite true. This child was being punished because he missed hearing one figure and as a result was unable to give the right answer.

I am asking the Minister in this House to ensure that every school in this State is supplied with one of these books on epilepsy, and that it be the duty of teachers to read it. In that way children suffering from epilepsy would be saved a great deal of worry and misery. Teachers should be obliged to read this book, because it contains all they should know about epilepsy. I could say a great deal more, but I will not. I have tried to make my point by raising these two subjects relating to education, and in speaking to them I pay a tribute to the Government for the help we obtained at the seminar which was held at university level. It is the only one in the world that has succeeded in doing that, and so it is a worth-while achievement.

I conclude by asking the Minister to please pay attention to the school teachers and their troubles and also to ensure that school teachers read the book on epilepsy in order that they may become acquainted with its contents. It is a terrible thing that a small child should be punished when he is afflicted with epilepsy. When I spoke to the headmaster of the school in question he told me that the child was just lazy, but the fact was that the child was not conscious for a split second and therefore was unable to hear one of the figures that was necessary for him to get his sum correct. I thank members for their patient hearing.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [3.36 p.m.]: It is not my intention to take up much of the time of the House, but I wish to take the opportunity today to say a few words about a question I asked the Minister for Mines yesterday and the answer I received. I asked the Minister the following question:—

- (1) Has any action been taken on my suggestion in August last year that the Government investigate the result of the system of traffic control adopted in Queensland by the Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, in January, 1969, whereby he instituted a "show the uniform" campaign and advertising of the location of radar-operated speed checking points?
- (2) If so, what are the results of the investigation?

(3) If the reply to (1) is "no"—

(a) is the Government going to make these enquiries; and

(b) if not, for what reason?

I thought that was a fairly straightforward question with absolutely no suggestion of antagonism in it, but the answer I received from the Minister, among other things, was this—

(1) No, it was not considered necessary.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) The practice of hiding behind hoardings, around street corners, under trees and so on, in order to catch traffic offenders, referred to by the Hon. Clive Griffiths and recorded in *Hansard*, is not adopted by the Police Department in this State.

He then went on to say a couple of other things. As soon as I heard that it indicated to me that perhaps the Minister was suggesting that I said this would occur. I think it would be a reasonable thing for anybody who read that statement to come to the conclusion or to form the impression that Clive Griffiths had indeed said that. In fact, in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* there was an article headed, "Griffith Denies Police Traps" and it goes on to say—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Ah!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Minister for Mines has brought to my notice that perhaps I am contravening Standing Orders.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am merely holding up a little book.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I take the point. However, it would be reasonable for one to assume that I had said this. In fact, it is obvious, because *The West Australian* printed an article regarding it, and apparently the newspaper printed the article on the say-so of somebody who said it did occur. I still do not know why the Minister went to the trouble to refer to that in his reply, because it had nothing to do with the question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I got the credit for answering the question, whereas I answered on behalf of the Minister for Police.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The point I am making is that I do not believe I am anything to do with my question. It seems to me that a great deal of trouble was taken on this occasion, because the answer contained a huge number of words, although normally that is not the case when I ask questions. I feel that perhaps there was some intention to provoke me into doing what I am now doing.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: My experience is that you do not need very much in the way of provocation.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am taking the opportunity on this occasion to repeat that I made no suggestion that the police in Western Australia were hiding behind hoardings, around street corners, under trees, and so on, in order to catch traffic offenders. For the information of the Minister what I said was—

There was a belief in Queensland that traffic patrolmen were hiding behind hoardings, around street corners, under trees, and so on, in order to catch traffic offenders.

That is an entirely different story. However, in his answer the Minister did not suggest that. I wonder why he left it out?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you want to know that just ask me a question.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I want the House to know. Every member who heard the question yesterday would have gained the same impression as *The West Australian* gained: that somebody had suggested the instances occurred in Western Australia. My name was mentioned, but I did not suggest that. What I suggested was that I had been to Queensland, and that the Premier of that State was implementing a new system of traffic control because he was concerned with the road behaviour of motorists, and with road fatalities in Queensland. What I did say is recorded on page 469 of *Hansard* of last year.

I suggested that as the road behaviour of drivers in Western Australia had come in for some criticism from time to time—indeed, we are all concerned with the number of fatalities on our roads—the Queensland scheme could well be a good one for this State to adopt. I also said that I was not aware up to that point of time of the success or otherwise of the Queensland system. I said it could well be a good one, and I suggested that the Government of Western Australia make some inquiries to determine whether or not the Queensland scheme has worked. In answer to that the Minister said that the Government did not consider it necessary.

The road fatalities in Western Australia continue to increase. From time to time I read statements made by the Minister for Police pointing out that he has tried everything to reduce the fatalities. Surely the Government should not consider it unnecessary to inquire from a sister State in Australia as to whether or not the scheme it implemented has made any difference.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Have you ever had experience of seeing policemen appearing from nowhere?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I can speak on this aspect, because I did have some personal experience. However, that is not the point I am raising. I have no grudge against our police officers. They are employed to apprehend the law breakers, and that is their job. I think we ought to have twice as many of them, and that they should be paid twice as much.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Hear, hear!

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Then the teachers would not get any increase.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I would point out that the Premier of Queensland, who is an intelligent person, felt there was some merit in this scheme. I made the suggestion that our Government should at least ask the Premier of Queensland whether the scheme has worked, but the Minister said—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: He did not consider it necessary.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you try to jump on the bandwagon!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —he did not consider it necessary. I simply want to make these remarks, because my name has been associated with an answer which suggested that I had complained that our police officers did certain things. I certainly did not say that, and I want to disassociate myself from the suggestion. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.
Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.03 p.m.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.03 p.m.]: It is not my intention this afternoon to endeavour to reply in detail to the three speeches made in support of the Supply Bill. Most of the matters which were raised do not come within the ambit of my own portfolios, but I will refer them to the Ministers concerned.

I would like to say, however, that I believe Mrs. Hutchison is getting back to her old form and I am very pleased indeed to see that her health has improved considerably. No doubt over the next few weeks, and maybe months, in this House I can expect to be castigated on more than one occasion by the honourable member. However, as I have said, I am pleased her health has improved.

I can understand the feelings of Mr. Clive Griffiths in connection with the newspaper article which appeared in this morning's paper. I can appreciate the fact that he did not want it attributed to him that he was implying that the police hid behind hoardings. I rather gather this was the matter about which he was complaining. I would simply like to say that, in answering the question, I submitted information which was given to me by my colleague in another place. The implication was not intended and I think it is

quite a good thing that the honourable member has cleared the matter up for himself.

I think the last time the Government increased teachers' salaries, the cost to the Treasury was something in the order of \$4,000,000. This is the figure which comes quickly to my mind. That was certainly less than a year ago, and I am not going to say anything about the present negotiations concerning salaries. It is my understanding that these matters are negotiated between the Teachers' Union and the Minister. The Minister sets the salary and then the Teachers' Union, if not satisfied with the determination, has an appeal authority to which it can go. Is that right, Mr. Dolan?

The Hon. J. Dolan: That is correct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not intend to make any further comment on that matter. The subject raised by Mr. Cloughton I will refer to the Minister for Education. I was interested to learn that Mr. Cloughton has been having a look around the North Perth School which is in an area that I have known for some time.

I thank members for their support of the Bill which I commend to the House.

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.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 12th August, on the following motion by The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

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

THE HON. F. R. WHITE (West) [4.09 p.m.]: Over the last decade a tremendous amount of building and development of land has taken place within the metropolitan region, especially in the fringe shires. One of the fringe shires to which

I intend to confine my remarks this afternoon is the Shire of Kalamunda where the development has been very pronounced.

Due to subdivision, the zoning has led to a degree of speculation, and, as a result, an increase in the value of the land in the area has occurred. It has caused quite a large influx of population and, as a result, the local authorities concerned are having to supply many amenities which previously they did not find necessary. They have had to provide sporting and other facilities such as ovals, community halls, kindergartens, swimming pools, libraries, and additional footpaths, and also the administration, particularly in the field of town planning, has increased drastically.

In order to provide these services, it has been essential for the shires to increase the rates within their areas. In the 1965-66 financial year the rate in Kalamunda was 1.25c in the dollar, and this rate was based on the 1964 revaluation which took place in the area. Last Monday evening—six years later—the shire, still using the same unimproved capital values, struck a new rate of 2.5c in the dollar. This has meant a 100 per cent. increase in the rates, but it has become necessary in order to supply the additional facilities.

In 1967-68 local authorities belonging to the metropolitan ward of the Country Shire Councils' Association became aware that the rates were becoming rather excessive and were having an unfair impact upon the ratepayers and, in particular, upon the primary producers. A number of meetings were held during 1967 and in February, 1968, it was resolved at one of these meetings to recommend to the Government that special power be given to the councils to declare urban farmlands and to strike a special rate for rural properties being used for primary production. This was desired to give some relief from the rates being imposed.

Through various bodies, this proposal was referred to the Government and I am very pleased to say that in 1969, under the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 4), Parliament agreed to grant this power to local authorities to strike a special urban farm rate if they so desired. Parliament recognised the effect of increased valuations upon people within the fringe areas. Some local authorities have adopted this policy this year, and some have not. In 1968 a further revaluation was carried out in the Shire of Kalamunda. As I have already said, the new valuation by the Taxation Department has not been adopted by that local authority.

In striking the rate this year, the shire realised that the new valuations would cause a tremendous amount of hardship to certain property owners in the area.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It could have reduced the rate to adjust that.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Local authorities always reduce the rate but, in doing so, they do not always—

The Hon. R. Thompson: Receive less money.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: —overcome some of the iniquities that occur. For example, one property was valued at \$15,500 in 1964-65. The rates on that property for the 1965-66 financial year were \$193.75. The new valuation for that same property is \$177,000. If that new valuation had been used for striking the rate it would have meant that the new rate on that property would have been \$1,150.50 instead of \$193.75. The council, in its wisdom, decided to maintain the old valuation and, by doing so, the property will be rated this year at only \$387.50.

The Hon. E. C. House: Did Kalamunda Shire take advantage of the new legislation to alter the rate?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: No, it has not, because it has been able to overcome some of the iniquities by not adopting the new valuations; that is, by staying on the old valuations.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would these more correctly be called iniquities or anomalies?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Both, as I hope to show a little later.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Iniquitous anomalies!

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The word "iniquitous," as we are all aware, means "wicked and unjust." I hope in a short while to be able to show that some of the anomalies are iniquitous.

In 1968 this Chamber dealt with legislation to amend the Land Tax Assessment Act. When the Minister for Mines moved the second reading, he said—

These proposals have as their objective a reduction in the incidence of land tax on improved land and an increase in the rate applicable to unimproved land.

That was the intention of the 1968 legislation. In fact, in many cases, it had this effect on improved land and, in all cases, on unimproved land.

The following year, last year, a further amending Bill was introduced into this House and on that occasion the Minister said—

It is designed to remove or reduce the incidence of land tax and metropolitan region improvement tax on the great majority of home owners, while providing a further increase on the rate of tax on unimproved land.

Therefore, the intention definitely was to relieve the burden of taxes upon owners of improved land and to increase the burden of taxes upon owners of unimproved land.

The revaluation made by the Shire of Kalamunda was carried out in 1968. It has not been adopted, even to this day, by the local authority, but it was adopted by the Taxation Department for the purpose of assessing land tax on the 1st July, 1969. Increases in values from 250 per cent. to in excess of 1,000 per cent. were the result of the revaluation. I shall quote a few examples of the effect which this has had. The owner of a rural-zoned property in excess of five acres which is improved by virtue of the fact that a house is situated on the land—even though it may be a homestead—must pay four taxes to the State Taxation Department; namely, land tax, vermin tax, noxious weeds tax, and metropolitan region improvement tax. I shall quote a few examples of properties in excess of five acres which are, in fact, the genuine homesteads of the owners of the land.

I shall group the figures into percentages to show the percentage of land tax in relation to the local authority rates which must be paid. I shall do this for the simple reason that I had always believed and understood that the main type of taxation on land in Australia was that imposed by local authorities in the form of rates. It had always been my belief that land tax assessments would be less than local authority rates. The examples I shall give of zoned rural land which has been improved and has a house on the site—even though it is used purely and solely as a home—will show that my belief was not justified. An encyclopaedia which I often use supports the view which I once held. However, I shall quote a few examples to illustrate my point. These have been made known to me over the last month or so by some of my electors who are dissatisfied with the burden they must bear. I shall give a little table to illustrate my point—

Size of Property Acres	Shire Rates 1969-70 \$	Land Tax Assessment \$	Percentage of Land Tax Assessment to Shire Rates
7½	86.40	65.66	76
10	54.00	55.00	102
5½	51.75	62.08	120
11	100.80	142.80	142
10	90.00	174.00	193
10	105.75	265.20	252
10	90.00	208.08	232
9½	116.20	288.42	250
5½	81.88	178.00	214
10	85.50	265.20	310
10	74.25	265.20	357
18	121.05	502.49	415

That situation existed in the year 1969-70. Therefore, my past belief that local authority rates were the highest land tax paid by any property owner must have been wrong. The quotations all referred to rural-zoned properties which could not be subdivided and were used for residential purposes by virtue of the fact that a house was built on the land. All the taxes were on improved values.

I have other instances of improved property valuations in urban-zoned land, but I shall not weary the House by quoting

individual figures. However, I have figures here to show that the land tax on a one-acre property is 95.5 per cent. of the local authority rates. Also, I have other figures to show the percentage of land tax to shire rates as being 108 per cent., 166 per cent., 169 per cent., 195 per cent., 268 per cent., and 329 per cent. respectively. This type of tax on genuine landowners who have bought property on which to reside hurts a great deal. It is a recognised fact, and generally agreed, that taxes should be levied in accordance with the ability to pay, provided effort and enterprise are not markedly discouraged.

I can assure you, Sir, that many of the property owners in this area—particularly those I have quoted—have been discouraged. I maintain that some of the cases I have quoted are absolutely iniquitous; and that land tax on improved properties should not under any circumstances exceed local authority rates. Local authority rates are for the purpose of providing services, and the local authorities do supply services from those rates. They supply the amenities I mentioned previously. However, what direct benefit do property owners receive from land tax, vermin tax, noxious weeds tax, or the metropolitan region improvement tax? They receive no direct benefit at all.

I have one instance where a rural property is situated right in the centre of a developed urban area. The property is encircled by a fence five feet high, constructed of timber posts, horizontal wires, and wire-netting, which is very much like a rabbit-proof fence as defined under the Vermin Act. However, the property owner, even though the fence would keep out any vermin—even the two-legged variety—is not eligible even for the 50 per cent. rebate in vermin tax which is allowed when a proper vermin-proof fence, which must be at least 78 inches high, is constructed. Yet that particular gentleman, as I will show members later, has to pay an enormous amount for vermin and noxious weeds tax. How has this unjust set of circumstances developed whereby people have to pay more in land tax than in shire rates?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Did you say the land was zoned rural in an urban area?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I beg the honourable member's pardon. I meant to say that the property is in an urban area, but is being used 100 per cent. for primary production. How have these injustices been brought into being? They are due to the action of speculators. Many people hum and ha over the use of the term "speculators" and tend to think that the word "developers" should be used. I disagree. Speculators are those who gamble on land and acquire an option or a contract of sale over a large parcel of land in the hope that it will be rezoned.

In the meantime they endeavour to find possible buyers who will relieve them of the land at a greatly inflated price.

We are all aware of the action of syndicates within the metropolitan area. I know of one particular case where a well-known organisation which is now in the hands of the liquidator approached a property owner and asked if it could erect signs on his property and endeavour to sell his land. The owner was told that if the organisation was successful in that action it would then be prepared to buy the land from him.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Wouldn't you think developers are builders, as distinct from the others?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: That is right; I agree with the Leader of the Opposition there. The organisation then publicised in the newspaper a wonderful subdivision. It erected a sign on the land outlining the extent of the subdivision and showing the glorious blocks and the roads which would be the result of the future development of the land. The land was advertised as being zoned urban whereas, in fact, two-thirds of it was zoned deferred urban and the balance was rural land.

I think it is most fortunate that that particular organisation was unable to find buyers who were prepared to enter into the ballot for the proposed blocks, because had it accepted even one buyer I am quite convinced in my own mind that it could have been up on a charge of fraud. However, we find there are many others who have found buyers; many others who have achieved their objective and disposed of land at a high price to the gullible public on deposits. They have used the money which has come in from those gullible people to purchase land which they had already negotiated for sale to others.

In my opinion those people are not what we could call prudent buyers. They are gamblers; people who want to be millionaires overnight. We do know of some such people who have become millionaires—even multi-millionaires—but there are also others who have failed miserably and become bankrupt. However, it is the action of these gamblers which forces up the price of land and establishes the value of land when the taxation valuers assess the area.

Therefore, in the revaluation, the value placed on a block of land is, in many cases, unrealistic and unjustly high. We find that when officers of the Taxation Department revalue an area they determine the unimproved capital valuation for the parcels of land within the area. At this point I would like to clarify what, in fact, is the meaning of the term "unimproved value" of a property. In order to interpret the meaning of the word "unimproved" I think it is necessary to go to the legislation and to refer back to the earlier debate

on that legislation. At present we have in section 2 of the Land Tax Assessment Act a definition of "unimproved value" which states—

"Unimproved value" means—

(a) In respect of land granted in fee simple, the capital sum for which the fee simple in such land would sell under reasonable conditions of sale as a *bona fide* seller—

I stress the word "seller"—

—would require assuming the actual improvements (if any) had not been made;

Now, this Act dates from 1907. In 1906 a Land Tax Assessment Act was introduced into another place and then into this Chamber. It had a most turbulent passage—so much so that in 1907 the legislation failed to pass this Chamber, and, as a result, the Premier of the day handed his resignation to the Governor. The Governor refused to accept the resignation and prorogued the Parliament for a period of about five or six weeks.

After Parliament reconvened, the same legislation was introduced in the form of the Land and Income Tax Assessment Bill, and it is that legislation, with amendments, which now forms our Land Tax Assessment Act. During the early debate on that Act the then Colonial Secretary, on the 12th September, 1907, clearly defined in this Chamber what was meant by the unimproved value of a property. In answer to a question by The Hon. J. W. Hackett, concerning a 1,000-acre rural property, the Colonial Secretary said, at page 1434 of the 1907 *Hansard*—

We take the farm as it stands with fences and buildings, not including machinery or anything of that kind; and we find it is worth £4,000, or £4 an acre.

Remember that the area is 1,000 acres. The Colonial Secretary said, a little later—

The unimproved value is not £4 an acre. The gross value, improvements included, is £4,000. We first value the property as a whole, and then deduct the improvements, thus arriving at the unimproved value, the amount on which the tax is payable.

A little further on he referred to a half-acre block of suburban land with a villa on it, and said—

The capital value of the property is £1,800, and the improvements are valued at £1,500, bringing the unimproved value to £300.

The Colonial Secretary presented a whole series of tables to Parliament, and further on, when making reference to Table No. 20, he said—

Table No. 20 deals with city business premises of the capital value of £7,500. The improvements on the block are

not very heavy; being estimated at £2,500, and consequently there is a tax payable on £5,000.

It would be difficult for anybody to imagine that the unimproved value of a property is other than the market value of the property as a whole, less the improvements upon it.

When I was approached recently by people who objected to the land tax, I endeavoured to find out by various means how the valuers of the Taxation Department assessed the unimproved value. One particular property was this 8½-acre property to which I have just referred. It is zoned urban but is used wholly and solely as an orchard. This property has on it a very substantial house of some 17 squares. At a reasonable estimate I think one could say this would be worth \$15,000.

The property would also have some 700 or more prime fruit trees which would be valued by an orchardist in the vicinity of \$30 each. There is also a shed on the property which would be valued at \$2,500. Apart from all this the owner has his own water supply which is reticulated through the orchard, the 8½ acres of land.

Yet when I questioned certain persons as to how the unimproved value of this property would be determined I was told very bluntly that no value whatsoever was placed upon the improvements, and because virgin properties nearby were selling in the vicinity of \$8,000 an acre, the land in this particular property would be worth \$64,000 and that was the unimproved capital value placed upon the property.

If we use the correct interpretation of unimproved capital value that man would need to get in excess of \$100,000 for his property. He could not get this from any primary producer, nor could he get it from any developer, because the developer would only be prepared to pay about \$64,000 for the land. This figure, less the value of the improvements, which could be \$40,000, would give an unimproved capital value of \$24,000.

That man, however, is not being taxed on the low value of \$24,000 but on the value of \$64,000. Upon voicing my objection to this method of valuation I was referred to a court case which took place in 1905 between Spencer and the Commonwealth of Australia.

The locality of the land in question in that case was North Fremantle and its area was about six acres. This land was required by the Commonwealth. The owner wanted £10,000 for the land, but the Commonwealth was only prepared to pay £2,250 to £3,000. The matter was argued in court and the court resolved that £2,250 be paid.

Subsequently the owner appealed to the High Court of Australia which increased the amount to £3,000. This set a precedent which in this case is as follows:—

This is accepted as one of the first acquisition cases which was the subject of appeal to the High Court and although other valuation principles were expounded the case is considered as a leading valuation one mainly because of the manner in which the Court enunciated the principle of the willing buyer, willing seller theory, as follows:—

The owner is to be compensated by the amount of money equivalent to the loss sustained by deprivation of his land and that loss (apart from special damages) cannot exceed what a prudent purchaser would be prepared to give him at that date, not by means of a forced sale, but by voluntary bargaining between the owner and a purchaser willing to trade but neither of them so anxious to do so that he would overlook any ordinary business consideration. We must further suppose both to be perfectly acquainted with the land and cognisant of all circumstances which might affect its value either advantageously or prejudicially, including its situation, character, quality, proximity to conveniences or inconveniences, its surrounding features and the then present demand for land.

In that stated precedent there are phrases and words which we must understand very clearly. We have the willing buyer-willing seller theory. A seller, when he sells land, wishes to be compensated for the property he is about to relinquish. If we have a situation such as the one which concerned the gentleman with the orchard, he would want to be compensated for his improvements plus what he considered to be a reasonable value for his land.

A prudent buyer would vacillate; he would carefully and mentally consider the pros and cons of a situation; he would make sure it was a sound business proposition, and that it had a minimum element of risk. Such a man would not be a gambler. He would bargain with the seller and arrive at a final price for the property.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is not a willing seller but an unwilling seller.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I am talking about a willing seller.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think that is the big difference in the whole issue.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The point is that in the definition we use we have the term *bona fide* seller, and in the precedent I have quoted we have the willing buyer-willing seller theory.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: But in effect he was not a willing seller but an unwilling seller.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Who was?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: The person you quoted. He did not want to sell at that price.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: That is so.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: So he would be an unwilling seller.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I am quoting the precedent established by the case I have mentioned—the willing buyer-willing seller theory—which stipulates that there must be a prudent purchaser and a willing seller who is going to be adequately compensated not only for the land but also for the improvements.

I think this establishes and justifies the original interpretation of unimproved value quoted by the Colonial Secretary in 1907, that when there is an honest deal taking place between a prudent buyer and a willing seller the final price agreed to will be the market value or the capital value of the property.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: In a free market.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The value of the improvements are then removed and we are left with the unimproved capital value which will be used to assess local authority rates and land tax. I believe, however, that this method is not being used.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Was the land resumed in the case of the man you mentioned? I refer to the 1905 dispute.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I have not gone into the details of that, and I could not care less.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If it were he could not be regarded as a willing seller.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I am referring to the precedent which the Minister's valuers are using within this State, or are supposed to be using, to establish the unimproved capital values of properties. Instead of reading into it the words "prudent buyer" they are reading into it the word "purchaser," even if he is a speculator.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Presumably he would have been a willing seller at \$10,000.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The Minister is trying to draw a red herring across the trail.

The Hon. R. Thompson: This was a Commonwealth case and the Commonwealth cannot resume; it must acquire.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: All I wish to do is to make sure of the figure that should be used for the unimproved capital value. I am only using this as an example.

Obviously this sort of thing must be happening elsewhere and I would say the taxation valuers are not using the correct principles when valuing land.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What would you suggest as an alternative?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The alternative is to value the land based on the principle enunciated by the Colonial Secretary in 1907, because I know that is the correct interpretation. If I had a property which was similarly involved I would most certainly challenge the principle. I would definitely challenge it if I had the property of the gentleman to whom I have referred.

It is the actions of speculators and the method of valuation which are making it very difficult for property owners—particularly for owners of broad acres—within the metropolitan region. They are forcing some genuine home owners off their properties. The legislation never intended that this should occur to *bona fide* home owners.

To substantiate this fact I would like to quote a statement made by the Premier when he introduced the Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill in another place on the 24th October, 1968. His words can be found on pages 2159 and 2160 of *Hansard* for that year, and they are as follows:—

One other important concession is provided in this Bill. Under existing land valuation and taxation procedures, persons who own and reside in a home in an area which is subsequently rezoned for multi-residential, professional, commercial, or industrial use are faced with heavy land tax assessments as a result of the steep rise in land values in the area.

This rise in land values consequent upon rezoning is a natural product of city growth and serves to hasten the transition of the area to a more economic form of land use.

Very many people so affected are happy to accept the gain to be made by selling out and building elsewhere, often in newer, more pleasant surroundings. But there are many who are not in a position to move so readily. They may often be of advanced years and not able to face the upheaval of moving to a new environment far from friends and familiar places. Frequently, too, families are at a stage where they feel tied to schools and neighbourhood activities and would prefer to delay a few years before moving.

In such cases the very heavy land tax burden on their homes may represent real hardship—as I am sure it does in many cases—and certainly seems most inequitable compared with others living in similar homes in other areas which have not been rezoned.

Therefore the Bill provides that in such cases land tax will not be levied on that part of the unimproved value of the land which is attributable to the rezoning. Put another way, in calculating the assessment the valuation of the land on which the home stands will be notionally reduced to a figure which would be appropriate if the zoning were for ordinary residential use.

As legislators we were aware that there could be a certain impact from the rezoning. Now, with the recent revaluations, I think we would all be aware of the impact that those revaluations have had; and in my view we need legislation to make it possible for a deferment of rates or for an exemption from increased rates to be allowed where revaluations occur on properties being used as homes, irrespective of the acreage and irrespective of the zoning.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Irrespective of acreage and irrespective of zoning?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I can see some anomalies in that.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: There are so many anomalies now that I think if that were done the anomalies would be reduced, and there would certainly be better public relations with my constituents.

New South Wales has legislation called the Land Tax Management Act, and various amendments have been made to that land tax legislation because, as late as 1967, it was considered tremendous problems were resulting from rezoning, development, revaluations, and so forth. That New South Wales legislation has many good provisions written into it. Some of them are not to my liking, but I think it would be worth while if Treasury and Taxation Department officers could go through that legislation to choose what would be suitable for our situation here and submit amendments accordingly.

So far I have dealt with improved land which is used by the owners purely for home purposes. Now I wish to deal with land which is used for primary production. At the present time primary producers pay the smallest tax under the Land Tax Assessment Act. If such a person has a property in excess of five acres he pays only the combined vermin and noxious weeds tax, which is equal to .21c in the dollar of the unimproved capital value.

If we go back to the original valuations which were in effect in 1965 we find that in a typical rural area, such as Bickley Valley, the valuation for a 2½-acre property was \$2,100. Because of the recent revaluation the value increased to \$5,400. In the same area a 38-acre property had a valuation in 1964-65 of \$7,200 but with the latest revaluation this increased to

\$11,400. That is quite an acceptable figure for a primary producing property and the owner would not object to that valuation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As a matter of interest, what would the market value of those two properties be?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: That I do not know because they have not been sold. They are still owned by the original owners, but a fair assessment of the market value of those properties would be \$3,000 an acre, because that is the ruling and accepted rate for a fully developed orchard.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But if it were likely to be rezoned urban—

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: There is no hope whatever of that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: —it would have another value.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: There is no hope of that so we need not pursue that discussion. There is no hope of its being rezoned urban because there is no water, and it would not be possible to have a reticulation system. Under the metropolitan region scheme Act water must be available before any rezoning can occur.

I have referred to two people whom I consider to be *bona fide* primary producers whose properties are in a primary producing area. Now we will consider some properties which have been adversely affected by the recent revaluations. These are primary producing properties upon which only the vermin and noxious weeds tax at .21c in the dollar is paid. On one property of 16 acres the shire rates were \$202.50. The year before last the vermin and noxious weeds tax was \$25.50 and last year, due to the revaluation, under which the value was increased from \$9,000 to \$25,500, that tax increased to \$53.55.

On another property of 11 acres, the tax, before the revaluation, was \$14.50 and after the revaluation it was \$73.50. The shire rates were \$130.50. On a similar 11-acre property, the year before last the noxious weeds and vermin tax was \$14.33 and last year \$84. On another property of 30 acres—and, by the way, these properties are in an area which is all zoned rural—before the revaluation the U.C.V. was \$10,500 and after the revaluation \$76,250. The old land tax was \$26.25 and the new tax \$160.12.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Are you referring to land tax or vermin tax?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The vermin tax.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Because the vermin tax was reduced last year.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to that. The vermin and noxious weeds tax was \$160.12.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Where is that property?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: This property is in the foothills in what is commonly called Forrestfield. It has no reticulated water and is zoned rural. It is all under orchard production. On the last property members will notice that the rate paid per acre would be \$6.65 for vermin and noxious weeds tax.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Is there much vermin on it?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: The property is totally cleared and planted with fruit trees, and I would say there is no vermin whatever on it.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Would there be much of a resale value on that property as it stands?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: As it stands, no, because in this area there has recently been what is known as a reappraisal. Prior to this reappraisal, which was the Kalamunda scheme No. 5, I think, there were certain proposals to upgrade the land from rural to urban; and so the speculators moved in. They assumed that more land was to be rezoned than eventually was the case, and, as a result, the values escalated causing artificial prices. Some of the objections to the reappraisal still have to be considered, although the period for objections has closed.

Most of the land the value of which was forced up has not come into urban zoning and so there are certain properties, such as those to which I have referred, where there is no hope of their being rezoned and there is no chance of having any speculators interested in them. The position is that the prices of these properties were forced up but now the values have gone down. One might ask: what could a man expect to sell his property for? He would have to sell it at whatever price he could get from a primary producer because nobody else would be interested in it—certainly not a speculator or a developer.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Is the area held mainly by speculators?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Some properties are and they are trying to get rid of them. As a matter of fact, some of those people are in very dire financial circumstances.

The Hon. E. C. House: Was that caused by the rate increases?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: No, it was caused by their buying land for more than it was worth in the hope that they would be able to make a fortune if the land was rezoned.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You haven't any sympathy for them, have you?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: None whatever, but I have sympathy for the genuine owners who have lived in the area for many years.

I have two other cases of *bona fide* primary producers who pay only vermin and noxious weeds tax, but whose land is zoned urban. It has been zoned urban since these people originally owned the properties and developed them. On one eight-acre property the owner, the year before last, paid vermin and noxious weeds tax of \$8.75, and last year he paid \$56.70.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can I point out something to you?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: That is \$7.9 per acre for vermin and noxious weeds tax combined.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I was going to point out to you, although you may not be aware of it, that you are talking from the seat of the The Hon. J. M. Thomson.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I thank the Minister very much. I suppose in my agitation—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I do not think the Leader of the House is entirely right. He is at a very bad angle.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That may be so.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Last, but not least, is the case of a *bona fide* primary producer who has an 8½-acre property. Last year his vermin and noxious weeds tax was \$20.50 and this year it was \$134.40, an average of \$15.80 per acre.

Now I should like again to refer very briefly to the minutes of the meeting of the authorities which made recommendations to the Government on urban farming land. The Government took notice of the recommendations and Parliament amended the legislation in accordance with the authority's desires. The meeting, which I chaired, was attended by representatives of the Shires of Armadale-Kelmscott, Kalamunda, Swan-Guildford—as it was then known—Rockingham-Safety Bay, and Mundaring, and also the Secretary for Local Government (Mr. A. E. White).

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Of the Local Government Association.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: Yes; of the Local Government Association. The report reads—

It was resolved that the present basis of taxing for vermin and noxious weeds was unjust and inequitable. It is based on unimproved values, which means that farmers on highly valued land in the Metropolitan Region are paying at a very high rate compared with those in the wheat-belt and other country areas, where values are not only low, but are inequitable even among themselves, because some districts have recently been revalued, whilst other districts are operating on old valuations, thereby paying a much lower share than they should if all values were brought up to date

It was resolved that the fairest basis would be that of acreage, which would overcome the inequities inherent in the use of unimproved values, but that the acreage basis should be subject to minima on a sliding scale, and that there should also be a maximum.

It was resolved therefore, to recommend that the Government be asked to amend the Vermin Act and Noxious Weeds Act, to allow for the imposition of a Vermin and Noxious Weeds Tax on the following basis.

The areas and rates are then set out in tabulated form, in the report, and they are as follows:—Properties up to 10 acres, \$4—a flat rate—properties between 11 acres and 20 acres, \$5.50; properties between 21 acres and 50 acres, \$6.50; properties between 51 acres and 99 acres, \$8; properties between 100 acres and 149 acres, \$8.40, and so they carry on until they reach properties which are between 400 acres and 499 acres. The owners would pay a flat rate of \$10. Thereafter, the rate would be \$10 per property, plus 1c per acre to a maximum of \$100.

This proposal would have meant that the Agriculture Protection Board would receive the same return as it receives under the existing system. However, that would be a more equitable method of taxing. Unfortunately, this system has not yet been adopted. I trust that this acreage basis, rather than the unimproved capital valuation basis, will be adopted in the very near future to relieve the burden which many primary producers are carrying, particularly in the near metropolitan area.

The Hon. E. C. House: It should be changed.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: It has not been changed yet, and I am quoting from minutes which prove that the matter has been brought to the notice of the authorities concerned.

It is obvious that certain injustices are occurring. These have not been the result of the intention of the Government; they are the result of a problem which has developed from our very rapid expansion and the increase in land prices. However, they must be rectified, and rectified quickly, particularly in relation to properties within the metropolitan region close to the city.

I feel that in certain instances the new valuations should be stopped, and the vermin and noxious weeds taxes, and the metropolitan region improvement tax, should be based on the old valuations as is the case with shire rates in the Shire of Kalamunda. That has been the basis not only this year but also last year. In this way we would have better public relations with the owners of improved properties. It will have been noticed that during my speech I have avoided making reference to unimproved properties. The burden is too

great on improved properties, and genuine landholders—mostly very little people—are being forced off their land. That is not the intention of the legislation.

We must have a much more realistic approach and we must base all our taxes on the ability to pay, and not discourage enterprise and personal effort by individuals. We must introduce different legislation and endeavour to base the legislation on the use to which the land is put. Most important, we must give owners an opportunity to budget for the bills which are presented to them.

In the 1969-70 financial year, when a new valuation came into effect in the Shire of Kalamunda, the taxpayers had no warning of the impending accounts. They had no opportunity to budget and in the majority of cases the assessments were not received until the end of the financial year. One man received an account for \$500-odd in the month of June, which had to be paid, I think, within 42 days from the date on which the assessment was issued.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: What did he pay previously?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: He previously paid \$67. It went up to \$514.20. However, he did not know what his bill would be until he received it at the end of the financial year. He will be presented with a second bill before next Christmas, so within six months that man will have to pay \$1,028.40, even though his shire rates are only \$185.50.

I consider that no land tax assessment form should be sent out to the owner of improved land where the assessment is higher than 50 per cent. of the shire rate. This is a proviso that could be written into the legislation—"Providing no land tax assessment exceeds 50 per cent. of the local authority rates." I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Heitman.

House adjourned at 5.23 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 13th August, 1970

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

QUESTIONS (53): ON NOTICE

1. HOSPITAL Collie

Mr. JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Referring to his answer to my questions of the 13th May, 1970, wherein he advised that the matter of toilet facilities in the male