

and make some constructive suggestions as to its application and its improvement. With those remarks, I support the Bill in principle.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. M. Thomson.

House adjourned at 5.24 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 18th September, 1968

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

QUESTIONS (31): ON NOTICE ROAD THROUGH KOONGAMIA

Upgrading

1. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

Has any finance been made available to the Midland Town Council to upgrade the road through to Koongamia?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Yes. The Main Roads Department has programmed \$15,000 to assist the Midland Town Council to construct and seal a road giving access to Koongamia. The department is currently waiting on advice from the town council on various matters associated with this proposed work.

MINERAL ROYALTIES

Waiving

2. Mr. HARMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) In view of his answer to part (4) of my question on the 11th September, 1968: "in order to encourage exploration for, and production of, copper, no royalty has been charged"—

Does he intend to waive the royalty on amethyst, bentonite, beryl, chalcedony, diatomaceous earth (calcined), feldspar, ochre, scheelite, wolfram and other minerals of which mining has been at a very low ebb for many years?

- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) As the value of copper mined during the year ended the 30th June, 1968, was nearly \$1,000,000, to what value must production rise per year before a royalty is imposed?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) and (3) Royalties payable on all minerals are being reviewed. The committee reviewing these royalties is undertaking considerable research and investigation respecting royalties to be charged.

CONSUMERS' PROTECTION COUNCIL

Establishment

3. Mr. CASH asked the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that of the first 3,000 complaints to the newspaper ombudsman the majority related to matters in the consumer-financial group?
- (2) With this in mind and having regard to existing Victorian legislation for consumer protection and similar proposed legislation for New South Wales, will the Government, as a matter of policy, give consideration to the establishment of a consumers' protection council?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) I am not personally aware of this, but no doubt the honourable member has inquired into the matter.
- (2) This, and other matters of policy, are constantly under review by the Government.

SWAN DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Extensions

4. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are extensions to the Swan District Hospital, Middle Swan, to be undertaken in the near future?
- (2) If so, what proposed extensions are to be undertaken?
- (3) When are the extensions to be finalised?
- (4) Are any arrangements being made to cater for children under the proposed extensions?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A 40-bed ward block, a new X-ray department, a nursing aide training school, and extensions to nurses' home.
- (3) It is expected that work will commence in March, 1969, and be completed by the end of 1970.
- (4) When the extensions are completed, existing accommodation which was designed to cater for children will be available for this purpose.

5. *This question was postponed.*

BUILDING BLOCKS

Forrestdale

6. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Housing:

Relating to the answer of the 12th September, 1968, by the Minister for Lands, as to availability of building blocks at Forrestdale—

- (1) Has the commission's interest in Crown land in this area been finalised?
- (2) What are the commission's intended activities for the Forrestdale area?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The commission does not contemplate acquisition of land in the Forrestdale area at present.
- (2) No activities are planned for this area by the commission in the near future.

CATTLE COMPENSATION FUND

Discontinuance

7. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the amount of the Cattle Compensation Fund on the 30th June, 1968?
- (2) How much was paid out of the fund for compensation in 1967-68?
- (3) Can this fund be used for diseases other than tuberculosis and actinomycosis?
- (4) If not, and as the incidence of tuberculosis is now at almost negligible level, is it considered that the levy may be discontinued?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Treasury Trust Fund as at the 30th June, 1968: \$571,096.78.
- (2) \$39,518.50.
- (3) Not at present.
- (4) Amendments to the Act are being considered to provide for the control and eradication of brucellosis. If implemented, the current levy level will require to be continued. Also, eradication of tuberculosis, as distinct from control, is being planned and will increase the demands on the funds.

MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Employment of a Horticulturist

8. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Main Roads Department a horticulturist to assist in the beautification of verges and median strips of the road system in relation to wildflower preservation as he advised was intended on the 11th March, 1968?

- (2) If so—

- (a) when;
 - (b) at what salary;
 - (c) with what staff;
 - (d) with what annual budget?
- (3) How does the provision under (2) compare with similar items devoted to the nursery and other activities for beautification of the Narrows interchange?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. He will have executive duties for specific projects for roads controlled by the department and will have advisory duties for other roads. The preservation of wildflowers will be only one facet of these duties.
- (2) (a) The 22nd April, 1968.
(b) \$3,872 per annum.
(c) Staff is provided, as required, by the various divisions of the department.
(d) No specific annual budget has been provided but any project requiring funds is financed from within the framework of the department's programme of works.
- (3) In the past three years expenditure of \$60,000 has been incurred. In view of 2 (d) above a direct comparison is not possible.

9. *This question was postponed.*

SEWERAGE EXTENSIONS

Ascot Electorate

10. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Are any sewerage extensions listed in the works programme of 1968-69 for the districts of—
(a) Belmont;
(b) Bayswater;
(c) Bassendean?
- (2) If "Yes," for any of the above districts, where and to what extent are the extensions?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
(b) Yes.
(c) No.
- (2) (a) (i) From Knutsford Street to Belmont Avenue along Arthur Street.
(ii) An extension in Esther Street between Knutsford Street and Belmont Avenue approximately 400 feet long.
(iii) An extension from Esther Street along Belmont Avenue approximately 500 feet long.

(b) The main sewer capacity in this area is limited but a small amount of reticulation will be carried out after discussion with the local authority either:—

(i) by extension to the Morley shopping area; or

(ii) nearby residential properties.

(c) Minor sewer extensions will receive consideration as applications are made.

11. *This question was postponed.*

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING SCHEME

Termination

12. Mr. H. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Will the artificial breeding scheme in the lower south-west terminate at an earlier date this year than it did in 1967?

(2) What is the termination date for both years?

(3) Will he explain the earlier closure of the scheme in 1968, if this is so?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) 1967—the 9th November.

1968—the 26th October.

(3) Costs of maintaining a service with deep-frozen semen are much higher than with fresh semen, as was used last year, and the financial losses involved in maintaining a longer season in the lower south-west places a burden on the board which must be absorbed in the overall scheme. The board is obliged to endeavour to have its income meet its expenditure and must institute economies where possible.

TREE SOCIETY

Financial Statement

13. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Forests:

Will he table a copy of the latest financial statement of the Tree Society covering a period of 12 months?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

Yes. I present the Tree Society's statement of receipts and payments for the period the 1st July, 1967, to the 19th June, 1968, as submitted by the auditor of the society, Mr. R. J. Oliver, A.A.S.A., a public accountant.

The statement was tabled.

DE VANEY V. QUARTERMAINE

Tabling of Papers

14. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Will he table all papers concerning a prosecution instituted by Special Constable DeVaney against a Mrs. Quartermaine and, upon being heard before Mr. Syme, S.M., was dismissed with costs against DeVaney?

Mr. COURT replied:

No. The file was perused by the honourable member on the 22nd July, 1968, and has been considered by Crown Law officers and the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, who all consider that if the complainant was dissatisfied with the decision in the case, his remedy was, and still is, by way of appeal to a superior court.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Turnover at Bunbury and Collie

15. Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Police:

(1) What was the T.A.B. turnover for the three Bunbury shops for years 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68?

(2) What was the turnover for the Collie shops for the same period?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. Craig) replied:

(1)—

	Agency 90	Bunbury Agency 01	Agency 92
	\$	\$	\$
The 31st July, 1966 ...	341,274	328,193	123,403
The 31st July, 1967 ...	289,842	306,535	155,788
The 31st July, 1968 ...	229,351	307,165	174,095

(2)—

	Agency 97	Collie Agency 108
	\$	\$
The 31st July, 1966 ...	246,052	164,200
The 31st July, 1967 ...	192,674	136,867
The 31st July, 1968 ...	330,152	874

(Agency closed
June, 1967)

BUNBURY POWER STATION

Production Costs

16. Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Electricity:

If the cost of coal supplied to the Bunbury power station was reduced by \$1 per ton, what would the production costs per unit of power be—

(a) if the station was retained at the 1968 level; i.e., coal burn of 236,500 tons;

(b) if the station was retained at the 1965 level; i.e., coal burn of 469,968 tons?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (a) and (b) The fuel cost per unit generated at Bunbury would in each case be reduced by approximately .062 cents.

The effect on other production costs of burning the higher tonnage would be difficult to calculate.

TIMBER

Freight Concessions

17. Mr. H. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is he aware that timber and other building materials are being imported from overseas and interstate?
- (2) To enable Western Australian building firms to compete more successfully with outside concerns, will he grant concessional rates for timber carried by the W.A.G.R., as is being done already with some minerals?
- (3) Could the principle of concessional rates for carrying timber be extended to the State Shipping Service?
- (4) If he is not in agreement with these requests, would he indicate his reasons?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes. Importations from overseas and interstate have been common for many years, but I presume the honourable member is referring particularly to material for recent building contracts in the north-west.
- (2) Since 1953, freight rates on timber have risen only 8.7 per cent. whereas similarly rated commodities have increased 20 per cent. In addition consignments in excess of 12 tons in a bogie wagon and destined for the north-west are granted a further concession on the rail haul to Meekatharra and Geraldton.
- (3) As a concession the State Shipping Service already carries all cargo including timber to the north-west at less than cost and does, as a normal commercial practice, negotiate lower contract freights where large consignments are involved.
- (4) Answered by (2) and (3).

WHOLE MILK LICENSES

Taxation Department Valuation

18. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Premier:

- (1) What are the circumstances in which the Taxation Department values licenses to sell whole milk at \$160 per gallon?

(2) Is he aware that the Milk Board maintains that a license to sell milk has no monetary value?

(3) Does this policy of the board not conflict with that of the Taxation Department?

(4) Is the Taxation Department correct in placing a direct monetary value on the whole milk license of a deceased estate?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) It is understood that the Taxation Department bases its values on the difference between a licensed and unlicensed dairy.
- (2) A dairyman's license is subject to renewal each year and the contract quantity is an integral part of the licensed dairyman's business.
- (3) What the Taxation Department does is outside the jurisdiction of the Milk Board.
- (4) Answered by (1).

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Surplus from Fertiliser Works at Kwinana

19. Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Is the Cuming Smith-B.P. fertilizer works at Kwinana generating its own electricity?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) is it the intention of the commission to purchase surplus power from this source;
 - (b) what are the terms of the agreement?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The company generates most of its requirements.
- (2) (a) No.
- (b) See (a).

NURSING STAFF

Hospitalisation

20. Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are members of the nursing staff at Government hospitals required to pay for periods of hospitalisation incurred by them in the hospital where employed?
- (2) If so, is such payment on a reduced scale?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. The minimum public hospital daily charge of \$10 applies to nursing staff in any public hospital, for which they may be covered by hospital insurance.
- (3) Answered by (2).

MINE WORKERS AT KALGOORLIE*Medical Examination*

21. Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

What arrangements are made for the examination of mineworkers at Kalgoorlie when the mines medical officer normally resident there is not available?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

A mines medical officer is stationed in Kalgoorlie and, apart from periods of accrued leave, is always available to conduct examinations of mineworkers. Special arrangements are made to cover periods of leave.

MITCHELL FREEWAY*Alternative Plan*

22. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Have any alternative alterations been made to the original planning of the Mitchell Freeway resulting from the present location of the Barracks Arch?
- (2) If so, what alterations or departure from the original plans have been made or are intended to be made?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The original planning of the Mitchell Freeway central section was carried out on the basis that the Barracks Arch would be removed. However, when the contract was let it contained an alternative design which provided for the Barracks Arch to be retained.

The alternative design to avoid the arch involved mainly a modification of the Malcolm Street bridge wing wall and of the upper retaining wall which connects with this bridge. In addition, there were some minor changes to street grading, lighting, and reticulation.

- (2) Construction has been carried out on the basis of the alternative design.

DOOR-TO-DOOR SALESMEN*Application of Criminal Code*

23. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Police:

Under what section of the Criminal Code can the Police Department take action against high pressure door-to-door salesmen?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. Craig) replied:

The practice of door-to-door salesmanship does not constitute an offence under the Criminal Code.

DRAINAGE*Bentley*

24. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware of the serious drainage problem which exists at the corner of Hillview Terrace, Boundary Road, and Jarrah Road, Bentley?
- (2) Is he also aware that this same problem has existed each year for the past five years?
- (3) If "Yes," will he kindly advise what remedial action is envisaged?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) Drainage at the locality mentioned is the responsibility of the local authority.

PERTH CITY COUNCIL BY-ELECTION*Voting*

25. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is he satisfied that sufficient protection exists for the taking of postal votes and the prevention of dummy voting by post in the forthcoming East Ward of Perth City Council by-election?
- (2) How is a postal vote application and declaration proved in view of the fact that the local authorities have no specimen signatures to compare with as in the case of the electoral enrolment card?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes. The penalty for the offence of impersonating a person for the purpose of illegally obtaining a ballot paper is two years' imprisonment.
- (2) Application for absentee votes is required to be signed in the presence of an authorised witness who must satisfy himself as to the identity of the applicant.

HEALTH PROBLEMS*Natives and Whites*

26. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the relative position of natives and whites in Western Australia with regard to the following health problems—
 - (a) leprosy;
 - (b) yaws;
 - (c) trachoma;
 - (d) infant mortality?

- (2) Are any special provisions made by the department to cope with native health problems to reduce incidence?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) There is a relatively high incidence of leprosy in aborigines in the Kimberleys. An occasional case occurs in the white population.
 (b) There is evidence that a mild form of yaws was prevalent among aborigines, but major lesions are now seldom seen. No cases have been recorded in the white population.
 (c) Trachoma is prevalent among the aboriginal population and a few white persons become infected.
 (d) Infant mortality is much higher in aborigines than in the white population.

- (2) Yes.

NATIVE RIGHTS

Equality with Whites

27. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Will he state whether in his department's view aborigines have equal rights in Western Australia with the white community with respect to—
 (a) education;
 (b) housing;
 (c) land rights;
 (d) health matters?
 (2) If the aborigines have greater or lesser rights in any of the four interests referred to, would he state the reasons for the differentiation?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (a) to (d) Yes, equal rights, but with additional financial benefits available.
 (2) The additional available benefits are intended to be of a temporary nature and are designed to enable aborigines to overcome their social and economic disabilities.

INDUSTRIAL WASTE, KWINANA

Analysis

28. Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Would he provide an accurate description of chemical analysis, including relevant concentrations, of all materials discharged with waste from the Western Aluminium N. L. refinery, Kwinana?

Mr. COURT replied:

40 per cent. silicon dioxide.
 20 per cent. iron oxide.
 2 per cent. titanium dioxide.
 4 per cent. calcium oxide.
 10 per cent. chemically combined water.
 The remainder (24 per cent.) comprises varying percentages of alkalis and alumina.

HIGH SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

Cockburn Electorate

29. Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Education:

Would he advise—

- (a) The anticipated intake of first year students to South Fremantle High School in 1969?
 (b) The anticipated intake of first year students to the Hamilton Hill High School in 1969?
 (c) The total student enrolment for 1969 of South Fremantle High School?
 (d) The total student enrolment for 1969 of Hamilton Hill High School?
 (e) Whether all students will be adequately accommodated at each of these schools or whether it is anticipated that an annexe or annexes will be required?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (a) 325.
 (b) 335.
 (c) 925.
 (d) 1025.
 (e) It is anticipated that all students will be adequately accommodated and that annexes will not be required.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT

Lighting of Buildings: Inspection

30. Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Do inspectors employed under the Factories and Shops Act supervise the implementation of the Australian Code of Lighting in new commercial and industrial buildings and the maintenance of these standards in existing buildings?
 (2) How frequently are inspections carried out?
 (3) What special qualifications are required of the inspectors who make inspections of lighting facilities?

- (4) Have there been any prosecutions of any firm or individual for failure to provide the requisite lighting standards?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Inspectors require occupiers to maintain standards of natural and artificial lighting as laid down in regulation 17 of the Factories (Health and Safety) Regulations, and regulation 4 of the Shops and Warehouses (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations in premises subject to registration under the Factories and Shops Act, 1963-65.
- (2) Inspections are made at least twice annually.
- (3) Inspectors are required to pass a prescribed examination before they can be appointed.
- (4) No.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Sales Promotion

31. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it to be assumed the Milk Board is not a marketing body and therefore unable to participate in a publicity campaign for increasing the sale of dairy products under the board's administration; namely, milk and cream?
- (2) If "Yes," will the department draw together representatives of all sections of the milk and cream industry (producers, treatment depots, milk vendors, and retailers) towards obtaining maximum sales on local and export markets?
- (3) Is it considered there is a demand on local and export markets for—
 - (a) milk with butterfat content of varied quality;
 - (b) skim milk;
 - (c) butter milk;
 - (d) cream of various qualities?
- (4) If "Yes," what steps have been taken towards marketing dairy products mentioned above?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) A publicity scheme for cream and milk would require legislation to provide a compulsory industry levy. The Milk Act does not provide for such a scheme. The *per capita* consumption of milk and cream in this State compares favourably with the consumption in those States at present expending large sums on sales promotion.

- (3) and (4) Present population would not economically justify production of a range of milk and cream of varying butterfat standards.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Western Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Lewis (Minister for Education), and read a first time.
2. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. O'Connor (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

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

COURT OF MARINE INQUIRY

Rehearing of the Case of George Henry Page: Motion

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [4.51 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the case of George Henry Page should be reheard by a Court of Marine Inquiry as provided by Clause 106 of the Western Australian Marine Act, 1948-1966, which states—

The Governor may, where any such inquiry as aforesaid has been made, order the case to be reheard by a Court of Marine Inquiry, either generally or as to any part thereof, and shall do so if—

- (a) new and important evidence, which could not be produced at the inquiry, has been discovered; or
- (b) for any other reason there has, in the opinion of the Governor, been ground for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.

This motion arises out of a collision between two vessels which took place on the Swan River on Friday evening, the 26th February, 1965. As a consequence of the subsequent Court of Marine Inquiry which took place, one of the masters, Mr. George Page from South Perth, lost his competency certificate for life. This certificate is commonly referred to as a master's certificate, and he lost it in the court as a result of the marine inquiry.

Ever since then Mr. Page and I have been trying to have this case reheard, but to date our efforts have been unsuccessful. We have written a number of letters

to the Minister concerned, who has referred the matter to various departments and has stated that he is not prepared to have the matter reheard by a court of marine inquiry.

There are many very unsatisfactory features about the inquiry into the case. May I say, firstly, that prior to the Court of Marine Inquiry a departmental investigation was carried out. It was conducted by Captain Palfreyman. When the departmental inquiry was mooted, Mr. Page felt it was simply a departmental inquiry. He did not bother to take witnesses or anything like that, but simply went along to the inquiry. Consequently he was very surprised to find that the master of the other vessel had brought along five witnesses. Subsequently, evidence was then taken and Captain Palfreyman submitted a report. I wish to read the last paragraph of the report, because I think it is extremely pertinent. I repeat that this was written after the preliminary inquiry took place. Captain Palfreyman said—

Evidence would seem to indicate that Page in the "Andrew" may be much more to blame, but this could also be because Kitcher produced five witnesses whereas Page produced none.

That was the final statement in the report which Captain Palfreyman submitted to the Manager of the Harbour and Light Department after he had conducted the preliminary investigation. In other words Captain Palfreyman emphasised that Kitcher, the master of the *Katameraire*, produced five witnesses, whereas Page had produced none.

Later on, a court of marine inquiry was held. At the particular time Page, unfortunately, was in the Repatriation Hospital at Hollywood suffering from a nervous breakdown. He had lost his boat; he had lost his house; he had been declared bankrupt; and, as a consequence, he was suffering from a nervous breakdown. He was in a psychiatric ward, incidentally.

Two weeks previously he had had an operation for a double hernia and was still recovering from the effects of the operation. In addition to all this, he was suffering from laryngitis. I have here the doctor's certificate from the medical officer, Mr. V. Book. It is a treatment certificate and simply says—

This is to certify that G. A. Page was admitted to the Repatriation General Hospital on the 3.6.65 for treatment of a war-caused disability, a nervous condition. . . .

The date of discharge on the certificate is the 6th August, 1965. Later it states—

The patient will be unfit to resume work until the 22.8.65.

It also is stated on the medical certificate that Mr. Page was suffering from laryngitis on the 29th and 30th July, 1965, the days on which the inquiry took place.

Here we have the incidence of a man in a psychiatric ward recovering from the effects of double hernia and also suffering from laryngitis; yet he was advised two days before the inquiry when that inquiry was going to take place.

Mr. Dunn: What was the date of the inquiry?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It was held on the 29th and 30th July; and, as I have said, he was advised two days before the inquiry, because the notice of the inquiry had been sent to his home in South Perth whereas he was in the Hollywood Hospital. So, under the conditions which I have outlined, he received the notice only two days before the hearing.

He immediately got leave from the hospital and went to the Legal Aid Bureau in an endeavour to obtain legal assistance. It was pointed out to him there was insufficient time for him to be legally represented by the bureau. Therefore he had to go along the following day without any representation at all and without any opportunity to obtain witnesses. He was not able to obtain witnesses by his own efforts, but went along to the inquiry despite his condition. He was, in fact, under sedation. There is no query in regard to any of these things.

I have asked the Minister quite a lot of questions on this subject. On the 17th October, 1967, I asked the Minister whether he was aware—

at the time of the court of marine inquiry, G. A. Page was a patient at the Hollywood Repatriation Hospital.

The Minister replied "Yes." I further asked him whether he was aware—

that G. A. Page was under sedation for a nervous condition and was recovering from an operation for bilateral hernia performed approximately two weeks earlier.

The Minister replied:

I am aware that he was under treatment for a nervous complaint and I have since been advised that he was under sedation and had previously had a hernia operation. His doctor had advised the department that there was no medical reason why Mr. Page should not attend the court.

Apparently the Harbour and Light Department, or the Crown Law Department, had contacted the hospital and asked whether he could attend the court and the doctor had given permission for him to do so. That was the extent of that permission.

As I have said, it was in those circumstances that Page went before the Court of Marine Inquiry. In respect of this,

there was one major aspect at stake; namely, the question whether the vessel skippered by Page was, in fact, the leading vessel. The evidence I will present later points to the fact that Page must have been in charge of the leading vessel. The section of the judgment that was given by the Court of Marine Inquiry showing how important that aspect is, reads as follows:—

In order to assist in fixing responsibility for this deplorable exhibition of erratic seamanship it devolves upon this court to determine which was the leading vessel. If, as her master, Page, claims, the "Andrew" headed the "Katameraire" throughout then, subject only to such sanctions as might reasonably attach to her in an emergency she would have been entitled (if indeed not bound) to maintain her course and speed.

That was the situation; that if Page was in control of the leading vessel he would be entitled—if indeed not bound—to maintain his course and speed.

When the master of the *Katameraire* appeared before the Court of Marine Inquiry he had legal representation and a number of witnesses. The evidence that was submitted is available and after reading it, it becomes readily apparent that the evidence given by Kitcher and his witnesses is full of loopholes. For instance, in the course of the evidence it was said that Kitcher left the jetty one minute after the *Andrew*. This point was stressed; that is, there was one minute between the departure times of the vessels when they left the jetty. Most of the witnesses called by Kitcher emphasised that this, in fact, was the situation.

Since then statements have been obtained from highly responsible people who witnessed the actual departure of each vessel. In these statements it is claimed that, in fact, Page left 10 minutes before Kitcher, who was in charge of the *Katameraire*. Witnesses have come forward, since the trial, to emphasise this particular point. In the evidence given by Kitcher's witnesses it was stressed that where Kitcher, in the *Katameraire*, rounded the inner dolphin, it was his usual custom, and he was travelling along the course he normally took. We can produce witnesses who say that he had never taken that course before and on the previous evening he had asked another master whether it was possible to cut across the sandbank at that particular point.

The evidence given by Kitcher and his witnesses indicated that when the collision took place the *Katameraire* could not move across to the right, because the water at that point was very shallow and there was a sandbank in the area. I have a chart which indicates the spot where the collision took place and it also shows the

depth of water to be about 20 to 27 feet in that particular stretch, and the *Katameraire* draws only about six feet.

There are numerous other discrepancies in the evidence such as that relating to the speed of the vessels. The evidence was that the *Katameraire* could travel at about 16 miles an hour, and that the maximum speed of the *Andrew* was about 10 to 12 miles an hour. So we have the situation that Page was in the slower vessel and left 10 minutes before the other craft, and yet he was the one who was penalised for overtaking the *Katameraire* and, as a consequence, lost his master's ticket for life.

Had Page been able to obtain legal representation at the Court of Marine Inquiry the flaws in the evidence submitted by Kitcher and his witnesses would have been pointed out, and if those witnesses had been subjected to cross-examination by counsel representing Page it would have been apparent that their evidence was not factual.

Before I deal with the new and important evidence which has come to light, I would like to state that since the accident the master of the *Katameraire* has been involved in a number of similar happenings. I will read a report on one of those happenings which appeared in the *Daily News*, dated the 6th March, 1967. It reads—

NEW INCIDENT IN ROTTNEST FERRIES WAR

There was another clash in the long-running battle of the Rottnest Island ferries at Fremantle yesterday.

Islander II and *Katameraire* came dangerously close to each other when jockeying for berthing rights on the return journey from the island about 5 p.m.

A passenger on one of the ferries claimed today that the *Katameraire* came close to the rocks of South Mole in a "race" for the jetty.

Passengers on the Islander II and the *Katameraire*, which was overtaking, cheered their respective boats in the run up the harbour.

But cheering ceased when the *Katameraire* and the Islander II closed to within three feet.

Katameraire took evasive action, then cut her engines.

She was left to cruise around the harbour for about 10 minutes while the Islanders I and II discharged their passengers.

The three ferries left Rottnest at 10 minute intervals in the order Islander II, *Katameraire* and Islander I.

It was a fairly rough trip. They all reached a point a few hundred yards from the mouth of the harbour about the same time.

The Islander I was nearest the North Mole and would obviously reach the jetty first.

The Katameraire had slightly more speed than the Islander II and started to draw up on her.

Both ferries appeared to increase speed at this stage. It seemed the Katameraire would head the Islander II for the jetty.

Then the Islander II swung towards the South Mole, leaving a wide space between her and Islander I.

For a few minutes it appeared that the Katameraire would have enough speed up to pass her. Islander II came in close enough for anyone to jump from one ferry to the other.

The rocks of South Mole were closing. Just inside them was the first of the harbour dolphins. Katameraire cut her engines.

Mr Norman Hunt, co-owner-operator (with his brother Douglas) of the two Islanders, today admitted that the ferries came dangerously close, but blamed the Katameraire.

He said: "We work to a Fremantle Port Authority ruling that the ferries will berth in the order in which they reach North Mole.

"Islander II reached North Mole ahead of Katameraire and altered course to berth. The Katameraire tried to force a passage.

"The rule of the road says the overtaking boat shall keep clear and Katameraire did not do this," he said.

Mr Hunt said that Islander did not deliberately swing wide towards South Mole but followed her normal rough-weather course of "hugging up" to the jetty in the lee of South Mole.

Those vessels were loaded with passengers and the incident took place in strong tides, which are prevalent in the Fremantle Harbour. It was a highly dangerous act, and yet this was the sort of happening that took place.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Who do you think was guilty in that incident?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am not saying, but Kitcher has been involved in a number of accidents since.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You seem to imply that because of this he is the guilty party.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know. I am merely quoting a newspaper report of what happened in Fremantle Harbour.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What was the result of the inquiry?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know, but perhaps the Minister can tell us later. Quite a number of reports on similar lines appeared. For instance, there was a complaint by Mr. E. G. Ashdown. I think this was a complaint made to the Harbour and Light Department and the letter will probably be on that department's files. It reads—

On Tuesday 1st. February 1966. I was in command of the M.V. "Pantarei" en route to Fremantle.

At approx. 9.47 a.m. this day, as the vessel was almost opposite the State Implement Works, I heard a claxton from astern of me. At the time I was favouring my starboard side of the channel and was travelling at approx. 7-8 knots. I looked astern of my port quarter and saw the "Katameraire" beginning to overtake me. I moved over to my starboard side as far as practicable. The "Katameraire" then proceeded past me on my port side at approx. 10-11 knots. The pull of the wash of the "Katameraire" pulled my vessel sharply to port, and slewed across her stern and missed her by approx. 25-30 feet.

It was through being on the bridge of the "Triton" on a previous occasion in a similar incident concerning the "Islander I," that I was prepared for my vessel to behave in such a manner, as to necessitate my taking strong avoiding action to save my vessel being drawn alongside the "Katameraire" and causing a serious incident and a strong risk of collision.

The avoiding action necessary to hold my vessel clear of the "Katameraire" was to reduce speed sharply and put my wheel hard over to starboard.

The distance between the two vessels at the time of being overtaken was approx. 35-40 feet.

The "Katameraire" had at least 20 passengers on board.

That was a report submitted to the Harbour and Light Department. I have another statement here made by Mr. N. A. Hunt. It reads as follows:—

Report on Attempted Ramming of "Islander II" by "Katamaraire."

"Islander 2 or 6" departed Perth at 9 a.m. on Saturday the eleventh of December and Mr Kitcher left a few seconds later. This was the first time Mr. Kitcher had left at 9 a.m. as his time had always been 9.15 a.m. The "Katamaraire" gradually overtook "Islander II" and as we both passed the outer dolphin to port which we all do every time because of the deeper water inside it, the "Katamaraire" was about 150 feet behind "Islander II". The "Katamaraire"

drew abreast of the "Islander II" at Armstrong Spit beacon and then altered his course to starboard to clear Point Resolution. I held my course, as we draw 8 feet and cannot cut into these shallow waters west of the spit, and the "Katamaraire" continued on a collision course. When he was within 50 feet of our Port bow I sounded my whistle 5 blasts and when he ignored me and was within 15 feet of my Port bow I altered my course to starboard. He then altered his course slightly to port and carried on his way.

I reported the matter to Mr. Syd Dewar by phone that night and discussed the matter with Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Forsyth on the Monday.

The photos enclosed were taken by a resident of Perth and photo No. 4 shows the "Katamaraire" distant 15 feet.

Mr. Keet who took the photos is prepared to be called as a witness.

Mr. Syd Dewar witnessed our progress down river as far as Chidley Point.

Mr. Alan Smith the Engineer Surveyor saw the two boats at Armstrong Spit.

Mr. Bryant George my deckhand, witnessed the whole incident through the portside porthole.

My other deckhand John Maddox was in the wheelhouse and noted the course steered and the attempted collision.

At no time did Mr. Kitcher attempt to avoid the collision.

I have yet another statement made by the master of *Islander I*, and this reads—

Dear Sir,

I wish to report a further breach of regulations by the master of the "Katamaraire". Mr. Alan Kitcher which in my opinion would have resulted in damage to both vessels.

I sounded 3 whistles to signify my going astern at 8.45 a.m. At the time I went astern the "Katamaraire" was stationary at his berth. The "Katamaraire" went astern without any signal or indication as my bow came level with the State Ferriers wharf in ahead gear.

I had to stop one engine to avoid colliding with the "Katamaraire".

Swan River Inspector Harold McGillvary witnessed the "Katamaraire" pulling out in front of me.

This incident occurred on Friday, 11th February, 1966.

There is no point in quoting all the reports that have been made against Mr. Kitcher, because they are fairly numerous and all deal with happenings similar to the

one in which Mr. George Page was involved and as a result of which he lost his master's certificate.

On the occasion when a preliminary departmental inquiry was held in regard to the circumstances of the collision, Page had no witnesses. When he attended Page expected it would be a normal type of inquiry, but he was astounded to find that the master of the other vessel had called five witnesses. At the Court of Marine Inquiry, Page attended in the circumstances I have already described; that is, because of his leaving directly from the psychiatric hospital he had no opportunity to call any witnesses. Since then, of their own accord, a number of people have come forward and given evidence on behalf of Page.

In the wording of the motion I have pointed to the fact that the Western Australian Marine Act specifically provides that if new and important evidence is produced, it is mandatory upon the Governor to have the case reheard by a court of marine inquiry. My motion includes the following:—

The Governor may, where any such inquiry as aforesaid has been made, order the case to be reheard by a Court of Marine Inquiry, either generally or as to any part thereof, and shall do so if—

- (a) new and important evidence, which could not be produced at the inquiry, has been discovered; or
- (b) for any other reason there has, in the opinion of the Governor, been ground for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.

Both these conditions exist. There is ground for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, because the man concerned was in hospital, and he could not obtain the necessary witnesses. Surely that is ground for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.

In addition, there is new and important evidence, and the Act says where new and important evidence is available the case shall be reheard by a court of marine inquiry. Let us briefly consider the type of evidence we have. When the actual collision took place there were a number of people, unknown to Page, at the Perth Flying Squadron who were actually watching the two vessels. These people are prepared to give evidence and say that in fact the leading vessel belonged to Page. One of these people was Mr. R. C. Ward, a retired civil servant, from Subiaco who made the following statement:—

On the day in question I and a number of other members of the Perth Flying Squadron were on the club premises.

I had a good view of the river.

In the group with me there were included amongst others a Mr. John Bridges and a Mr. Tom Sargent.

Both these men are members of the Perth Flying Squadron and experienced yachtsmen.

Mr. John Bridges has been vice-commodore of the Flying Squadron.

Our attention was drawn to the motor vessels *Katamaraire* and *Andrew*, which were proceeding down river en route to Rottneest.

Both vessels appeared to be off the normal course.

This is why our attention had been drawn to the vessels.

Normally the ferries to Rottneest take a course that would bring them further off shore than the course taken by the *Katamaraire* and the *Andrew*.

In fact the vessels were so close in shore that they were only about two hundred yards from the Perth Flying Squadron at one point.

The *Katamaraire* was closest in shore and therefore furthest off the normal course.

Apparently the *Andrew*, which I understand was skippered by Mr. Page had rounded the inner dolphin and was making a bee line for Armstrong Spit.

There is no reason why this should not be done particularly if you are in a hurry although there are certain hazards.

One of the hazards is the bank which goes beyond the spit post and for a large vessel could be too shallow although it is sometimes possible to cut the bank and go across the shallow part.

I and my friends were discussing the situation and it appeared to us that the *Andrew* was in a reasonable position but the *Katamaraire* was closer inland and did not appear to be in such a reasonable position as the *Andrew*.

Because the situation was so unusual we continued to watch out of curiosity.

I saw the two vessels come close together at about three to four hundred yards east of the club premises and about two hundred yards from the north bank.

Because the incident was unusual we were discussing the reasons for it and I suggested that the two vessels must be exchanging baggage.

I thought that probably somebody from the *Andrew* had either left baggage behind and the *Katamaraire* was transferring it to the *Andrew*.

At the time that we were looking my impression is that there was about one-third of the *Andrew* showing ahead of the *Katamaraire* when the boats appeared to converge. I still have this impression.

If this is so then the *Katamaraire* must have been the overtaking vessel, at least at this point. I do not know what went on before this.

The overtaking vessel should always give the vessel it is overtaking plenty of water in which to move.

This in fact did not occur.

It looked as though the *Katamaraire* was pushing the *Andrew* up so that he could get around closer to the spit post.

Here we have highly responsible witnesses—not one, but several—who were watching the incident because it was so unusual, and they are prepared to come forward now to a court of marine inquiry and say that in fact the *Andrew* was the leading vessel at the time of the collision. If that is so then Page would have been entitled to maintain his course—as was indicated by the court—indeed, he was bound to do so. In spite of this he has lost his master's certificate for life.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you say the other witnesses were responsible?

Mr. GRAYDEN: These witnesses were extremely responsible, and I hope the Minister is not querying the fact that they are responsible witnesses.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I asked you whether the other witnesses were responsible.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know the other witnesses, but after having read the evidence, I would not put their evidence in the same category as the evidence of the witnesses I have just quoted.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You would say they are irresponsible?

Mr. GRAYDEN: There are many loopholes in the evidence which I would be very pleased to point out to the Minister. If necessary I would be prepared to go through this evidence with the officers of the department concerned. If the case were reheard it would be possible for Page to be represented by a solicitor, and it would be quickly established for the benefit of the court that there were many loopholes in the evidence of the witnesses to whom the Minister has referred.

Here we have people not actually involved in the incident watching it and coming forward with the evidence I have read. This is new and important evidence. The Minister does not appear to think so, and this is where I think he is wrong. If it is new and important evidence it is mandatory for the Governor to order that the case be reheard. A number of other witnesses are also involved.

Mr. Graham: Did the new witnesses come forward or were they rounded up?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I had no idea at the time that they were watching the incident. Apparently they read the report of the case in the newspaper and felt obliged to come forward with this evidence.

Mr. Bertram: How long after the case was this?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am not sure, but I could obtain that information for the honourable member if he desires. As I have said, other witnesses have since come forward.

In the evidence given by Kitcher and his witnesses it was emphasised that the *Katamaraire*, skippered by Kitcher, left the Mends Street jetty only one minute after the *Andrew*.

I have a statement here from a retired master, who was master of the *Valhalla* which plied between Mends Street and Barrack Street. Mr. Seubert has written to me in the following terms:—

I was the Master of the ferry "Valhalla" leaving Mends St. jetty about 5.40 p.m. on the 26th of February, 1965 en route to Barrack St. jetty. At the first spit post from the Mends St. jetty, I happened to notice the vessel "Andrew" passing under the main arch of the Narrows Bridge.

I looked towards the wharves at Barrack St. and found the "Katamaraire" was still in the vicinity of the No. 3 wharf where the vessel berths and it appeared to be alongside.

I have had 3 trips to Rottnest on the ferry "Andrew" while Mr. Page has been Master, and I took particular notice that this man has been trained the right way to be Master of any vessel.

His letter then continues—

Mr. Grayden—I have had 51 years on the water, and 42 years of this time as Master and I think I am quite capable to know a good Boat Man when I see one.

The evidence he brought forward was that when he looked across he saw the *Katamaraire* virtually at the wharf, and that the *Andrew* was already passing under the main arch of the Narrows Bridge. This was to indicate the lead which the *Andrew* had on the *Katamaraire*. As I have said, this man who was master of the *Valhalla* is a highly responsible witness.

I would now like to read a letter written to me by Mrs. H. E. J. Higgins which states—

Mr. G. Page, late skipper and owner of the M.V. *Andrew*, wishes me to write to you, regarding the departure time of the *Andrew* from Barrack St. Jetty on the 26th February, 1965.

At the time my husband and I owned the kiosk at Barrack St. Jetty and did the bookings of all boats, travelling to Rottnest and Garden Island.

On the above date, "Andrew" was due to leave at 5.45 p.m. but left early.

I was interested as it was the first trip for Mr. Page, so I stood on the jetty and saw the "Andrew" depart. The "Andrew" was more than half way to the Narrows Bridge when the "Katamaraire" left the jetty.

"Andrew" sailed at 5.35 p.m.

The time indicated in that letter is 10 minutes before the *Katamaraire* sailed. So here we have a responsible witness saying that the *Andrew* left 10 minutes before the *Katamaraire*. Yet we find that the master of this boat which left 10 minutes earlier, was subsequently accused of overtaking and colliding with the other. I would now like to read a letter from Mr. Ashdown which states—

On the 26th February 1965 I had just returned from Rottnest and was speaking to George Page who was master of the "Andrew" and suggested that as the time was approx. 5.35 p.m., and as he only had one passenger it would be better for him to leave ahead of his scheduled time of 5.45 p.m., as he may have a better chance of picking up passengers at Fremantle. On my suggestion he left at approx. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. Page has worked for us at various periods, and I consider him a capable master.

That letter was from Mr. E. G. Ashdown of the C. & A. Water Transport. He is a highly responsible witness, and he states that Page left 10 minutes before the *Katamaraire*. I repeat that subsequently, before the court, the M.V. *Andrew*—which is a slower boat—was charged with overtaking and colliding with the *Katamaraire*.

Finally I would like to read a statement from somebody else who wishes to give evidence, because the Court of Marine Inquiry questioned the evidence which Page had given in respect of overheating occurring in his motor. Page's evidence was not believed, even in so far as it concerned his time of departure. Subsequently Page went to the gentleman to whom I refer and obtained the following statement:—

This is to certify that I knew Mr. G. Page while he was operating the M.V. *Andrew* and since while he has been working aboard the M.V. *Pantarei*.

Mr. Page has a good knowledge of the handling of vessels of this class and has carried out his duties to full satisfaction.

On Wednesday, 3rd March, 1965, at Mr. Page's request I inspected the M.V. *Andrew's* starboard engine which had been overheating badly. I found the heat exchanger badly choked with accumulated mud and silt. When this was cleared the engine performed satisfactorily and the vessel was able to travel at her full speed of approximately ten knots.

Here we have another witness who says that one of the statements made by Page—which was disbelieved by the court—was in fact true. Because Page had nobody to represent him, because of his physical condition, and because he had no-one to turn to, the evidence given by Page was clearly disbelieved by the court. If a man goes before a court and does not produce witnesses one can imagine what the court is likely to think.

I understand a couple of witnesses were called for Page, but they did not know much about the situation. In fact there was a woman on board who was an unpaying passenger and who is prepared to give evidence. Page had only one paying passenger; but this unpaying passenger was also on board.

So here we have a galaxy of witnesses—10 or so in all—who are prepared to give evidence for Page. We have here a man who was involved in a relatively minor collision. He had only one paying passenger on board, and though the boats scarcely touched, and though little damage was done, Page has suffered this extreme penalty.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is hardly relevant that the boats just touched; there was danger to people on board.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The point is relevant; the boats scarcely touched, and yet one captain has lost his license for life. This man was in the Navy during the war, and the sea is his existence. He has lost his license with no right of appeal, and it is for the Minister to say whether the case can be reheard by a court of marine inquiry.

I pointed out that there are all the grounds in the world for having the case reheard. We know that the Act says there shall be an inquiry if new and important evidence is brought forward. Surely the evidence that I have mentioned is new and important. There are eye witnesses who are prepared to give evidence which, as I have indicated, has a tremendous bearing on whose vessel was the leading vessel at the time of the collision.

Under these circumstances it is mandatory for the Governor to have a case reheard. It is similarly mandatory for the Governor to have a case reheard if there are grounds for suspecting that there has been a miscarriage of justice. Goodness, gracious me! If a man is in hospital suffering from a nervous breakdown and laryngitis, if he is under sedation, and if he is

recovering from an operation for double hernia—and Page was suffering from all these things—and if he is deprived of the opportunity of obtaining witnesses because he is in hospital; and if in addition he cannot obtain legal representation, then surely those are grounds for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred!

I think there is another ground for having the case reheard inasmuch as the two assessors at the Court of Marine Inquiry—I understand a magistrate and two assessors are appointed—were not present the whole time. After the case had gone on for some time I understand that, notwithstanding his physical condition, Mr. Page, together with the opposing solicitor, was invited to go into the magistrate's room. They were asked if the assessors could leave, and they apparently agreed to permit them to do so. I think there is a possibility that only one of the assessors left, but as far as Mr. Page can recall they both left. They apparently said, "We will read the evidence and come to a conclusion." I think that is a ground for having the case reheard.

If the assessors did decide to go home—that might be an exaggeration because I think they were captains of north-west vessels—then they would not have heard all the evidence and must have made their judgment on the written evidence which was supplied.

Members can see what would have happened in this Court of Marine Inquiry between, on the one hand, a man with all his witnesses, and with his solicitor questioning Page, and, on the other hand, Page with no witnesses, no legal representation, and up to his ears in drugs. This to me is an appalling state of affairs.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The doctor said there was no reason why he should not attend.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I should imagine that if somebody phoned a doctor, and told him there was some sort of inquiry at which a person who had had an operation for hernia two weeks before should attend, the doctor would say, "Let him go." That, surely, is not the point. How can a man defend himself under those circumstances? If the Minister had recently had an operation from which he was recovering—that in itself would be bad enough—and if he was also suffering from a nervous breakdown, then those would be good reasons for his not being at his best before a court of marine inquiry.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Well, I am not suffering from them.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If the Minister was under sedation, and if he was suffering from laryngitis, I would say he would be extremely handicapped; and that was the situation. Surely the Minister will agree

that in those circumstances there are grounds for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice occurred!

If Mr. Page is able to get witnesses and to obtain legal representation, as would be the position if the case is reheard, all sorts of flaws in the evidence of the other master (Mr. Kitcher) will be pointed out, and Page will be able to demonstrate clearly to the court that his evidence is factual. In those circumstances there can be only one result of a rehearing, and that is that Page will have his license restored. This however, is a matter for a court—for a magistrate and assessors—irrespective of the outcome of the previous hearing.

What I am endeavouring to say is that there are grounds for a rehearing, inasmuch as I believe there has been a miscarriage of justice, and that new and important evidence has been produced. In the circumstances, I trust the Minister will not oppose this motion. I hope he will agree to it upon reflection, and that he will not be able to do anything other than support it. If that happens we will have a rehearing and, no doubt, justice will be done.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works).

BILLS (3): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
2. The West Australian Trustee Executor and Agency Company Limited Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Council; and, on motions by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), read a first time.

3. Poisons Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), read a first time.

HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL *Second Reading*

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

There is a growing feeling in the community that more responsibility ought to be placed upon those between the ages of 18 and 21; and, in some quarters, there is very strong opinion that full legal capacity ought to be conferred upon young people below the age of 21, down to 18. Obviously, this Bill does not propose

to bestow full legal capacity; it proposes to approach this objective step by step. It is considered by those on this side of the House that the first step in this direction ought to be to enfranchise young people down to the age of 18, so that, being given the right to enrol and vote, they will then be able to express their opinion with regard to other alterations which may subsequently be thought desirable, and which may be attempted.

Up to now the Government has given no indication that it intends to move on this question. If it had, then no move would have come from the Opposition; but we feel that this question should be tested and that an expression of opinion ought to be sought on it. We would not be the first in moving in this direction, as action has already been taken by the Premier of Tasmania. The Leader of the Opposition in South Australia has introduced a Bill giving full legal capacity, and it is proposed to enact legislation in Great Britain to give those aged 18 a vote. So by no means are we attempting to break new ground.

It was said many years ago there should be no taxation without representation. We do tax young people aged 18, 19, and 20, but they have no direct representation—they have no right to have a say in representation. So there is a basic principle involved here to start with. Furthermore, we must have regard to the fact that the school-leaving age has been raised substantially from what it was when the age of 21 was inserted in the Statute to govern enrolment and voting.

I think it must be accepted that with the increase in the school-leaving age, there has been an improvement in the standard of education. I am not one of those who accept completely the statement that the young people of today are more mature than they were some years ago. Some people hold very strongly to that point of view, but I do not; it depends upon what one means by being "more mature." I notice a lot of young people today wear whiskers, but I have never regarded whiskers as wisdom.

Mr. Williams: Just as well.

Mr. TONKIN: No doubt there is a reason for this vogue which seems to be developing. It seems rather strange to me. However, I watch it day by day and keep wondering. No doubt, one day I will ascertain the real reason behind it, because there is a reason behind everything.

Mr. Court: I do not suppose it is any more strange than were Oxford bags and other things.

Mr. TONKIN: However, I do believe that, because of the greater facility for education, and the advent of radio and television, the opportunities for the

dissemination of information and knowledge have been greatly increased. Therefore it is reasonable to accept that the education of the people has improved.

From my own experience I do know this: I watch two-year olds and three-year olds, who sit in front of a television set, learn so rapidly that I am sometimes amazed at the grip they get on the subjects that are discussed from time to time. So I think it is very reasonable to believe that, generally speaking, people of 18 today are more knowledgeable and have a greater grip of current questions and problems than was the case, say, 20 or 30 years ago.

Furthermore, we are engaged in a war, which is not a war, and we have compulsorily conscripted people under 21 and placed upon them the responsibility of fighting and possibly dying for their country, without giving them any say in the question at all. We direct them to go. The 21-year olds and over determine the Government to be in charge of the country, and the Government decides that those under 21 shall be conscripted for the purpose to which I have just referred.

Surely it is not unreasonable to say that under these circumstances the people who are being so conscripted and directed ought to have the opportunity to have some say in the matter.

Mr. O'Neil: Your Bill will not do this, though.

Mr. TONKIN: No, but it will be a step in this direction, because I believe the time is not far off when the Commonwealth will follow the lead of the States, especially if this action is taken in all States—and I think there is a strong probability that it will be.

The Bill will first of all change the provision for enrolment. The Act now provides that no-one below the age of 21 shall be entitled to claim enrolment. This Bill if it becomes an Act, will alter the Statute to the effect that no-one under the age of 18 will be entitled to enrol. The Bill then provides that, having become entitled to enrolment, no-one under the age of 18 will be entitled to vote.

Several amendments are proposed to the existing Statute, but once the principle is agreed upon, the amendments are consequential to ensure that in the various sections of the Act the necessary alteration from 21 to 18 will be made in order that the purpose may be properly effected.

One either believes in this proposition or one does not. It does not require any great amount of illustration or argument. One has to consider whether people of 18 are of sufficient stability and have sufficient knowledge to be able to cast a sensible vote on the questions which have to be determined from time to time.

Comparatively recently we enfranchised aborigines and we have a situation in which in most cases these aborigines do

not vote themselves—or do not mark the ballot paper themselves, is a better way to put it. We find that generally they are obliged to call upon the services of the presiding officer, or some other person who is brought into the polling booth for the purpose. I cannot imagine that 18, 19, or 20-year-olds will be under such a disability that they will not be able to mark their own ballot papers. Surely, therefore, they would be in a better position to cast a sensible vote than are quite a number of the aborigines who vote; but there was no hesitation in extending the vote to them.

I cannot see that there can be any valid argument against enfranchising people of 18, 19, or 20, so long as we accept that they are capable of forming a sound judgment on political questions. That is all that is involved in this measure. If the Bill were to give full legal capacity and responsibility, then there would be much greater room for argument because a number of other aspects would have to receive consideration. But all that this Bill provides is that when an election or referendum is being held, instead of the voting being restricted to those who are 21 and over, if they possess the requisite qualifications, those below 21, but not below the age of 18, will also be permitted to vote.

In this more enlightened age—an age with greater educational facilities, and opportunity—it is not unreasonable to believe that these people of 18, 19, and 20, have the capacity to cast a sensible vote on political questions. If we accept that that is a reasonable view on this question, then there should be no reason why the Bill should not be passed.

The Bill ought to commend itself to members as a first step in the direction of giving greater legal responsibility and capacity. We frequently hear people talking about encouraging young people and placing more responsibility upon them, and so on; but we do not do much about it. In my experience of many years ago, when I was engaged in school teaching, I invariably found that when responsibility was placed upon children who otherwise adopted an irresponsible attitude, they immediately responded to it and lifted themselves up. I never had a failure in that regard. It seems that if young people are allowed to go on in their own way, and very little notice is taken of them, a lot of them are quite irresponsible; but place responsibility upon them and they change immediately and they give one a very great and pleasant surprise.

I repeat that in all the times I tried that out as a means by which I could gain a better response, I never had a single failure. Sometimes it was only a matter of placing the responsibility on a child to see that all the necessary textbooks were distributed for a lesson at a certain time, or to make sure the blackboards were clean and chalk was put out in readiness for the next lesson. The mere fact that

the child was given some responsibility made him react in a very pleasing way, and the results were always good.

My view is that if we place upon these young people of 18, 19, and 20, the responsibility of having a say in the Government of the country, and let them recognise that we consider they are worthy of this responsibility, then they will improve in stature and I think will act as more responsible citizens. So I suggest this is a good experiment in proving citizenship. It will be a privilege we will confer upon them, as well as a responsibility; and I do not think it will be a step we will ever regret.

The sole purpose of the Opposition in moving this way is to give practical effect to part of party policy. It is Labor Party policy that the vote should be given to people not under the age of 18. That policy was known prior to the last election and therefore it must be accepted that if we had become the Government we would ourselves as a Government have introduced legislation of this kind.

I do not intend to say any more at this juncture. I will leave the question to the careful consideration of members, hoping they will have due regard for what I have said in connection with the proposal, and hoping they will not hesitate to express their own points of view and will give a sound judgment when the time comes to make a decision.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development).

TWO-PART WAGE Restoration: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 11th September, on the following motion by Mr. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition):—

In the opinion of this House legislation should be introduced this session of Parliament to restore the concept of a wage divided into two parts, viz., one part to be subject to cost-of-living adjustments and the other part to reflect the relative skills of the workers.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Labour) [6 p.m.]: I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would be disappointed if I were to say that the Government did not propose to oppose the motion. However, the Government does propose to oppose it, and I believe that any debate on the subject at this stage would be purely academic. There will be ample opportunity, when the Government introduces its legislation at a later stage, for this matter to be fully debated and discussed.

It is, therefore, not my intention to keep the House very long, but simply to reply to some of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition when introducing the

motion. I think the motion needs examining because, to a degree, it does not get home to the real problem, nor is it sufficiently clear in what is intended. The Leader of the Opposition has moved that legislation should be introduced during this session of Parliament to restore the concept of a wage divided into two parts.

I suppose that because at the present time we have a wage divided into three parts, it would be fair to say that the use of the word, "restore" is probably correct. But I do not think that was the intention of the Leader of the Opposition; I think he really meant we ought to continue a wage fixation system which involves a basic, or living wage, plus a skill wage, or margin. I think that was the intention of the Leader of the Opposition.

This, in fact, is what the Government proposes to do, so there is no need to restore the concept we have had in the past. However, the word "restore" is used in the motion.

A further part of the motion which needs clarification is that, according to the Leader of the Opposition, one part of the wage should be subject to cost-of-living adjustments. I would suggest—and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition realises this—that one part—that is, the basic wage part—is subject to other adjustments as well, and not purely cost-of-living adjustments. Many factors come into the consideration of what will be a basic, or living wage, with the other part of the wage reflecting the relative skill of the worker. This, of course, is the secondary wage, or margin. I suppose in that respect the second part of the motion is, in itself, quite accurate.

When I commenced to speak I mentioned that I felt any discussion at this time would be purely academic. I am certain members will take every opportunity of the occasion when the Bill is introduced some time later in the session. However, I do want to have something to say on the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. To be fair to him, he did say that the matter of wage fixation was a subject which had exercised the minds of industrialists, judges, scholars, and economists the world over. I think the Leader of the Opposition implied that we are not too sure really, what method of wage fixation is the one which finally produces what might be called, "wage justice."

I think I am right in saying that the concept of a basic living wage plus a margin for skill is peculiar to Australia. I do not think any other country in the world has this system, and even to assume that this is the best system is being a little presumptuous. Although I suppose, in the circumstances or the situation in which we find ourselves, it probably is the best.

The Leader of the Opposition was also fair enough to say that any movement in the primary wage, in accordance with the

consumer price index, or cost-of-living adjustments, does not necessarily mean that wages so produced reflect total wage justice. I think this is perfectly true. In his motion, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the part of the wage which would move with cost-of-living adjustments, but other matters must be taken into consideration when determining the minimum wage. He also stated that he felt there should be a return to the concept of having a basic wage which will provide a reasonable living standard for a man and his family, and he also indicated that, in the view of the Opposition, this wage should be adjusted quarterly in accordance with quarterly movements in the consumer price index.

I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that although this was the first proposition presented to the Government by the Trades and Labour Council, that council did propose an alternative method which did not involve quarterly adjustments to the basic wage. So, it would appear that the trade union movement, although favouring quarterly adjustments, is not totally tied to that system.

The Leader of the Opposition said it had been computed that if quarterly adjustments had been permitted to continue, the basic wage would have been a certain figure. I interjected and said that it "could" have been, and the Leader of the Opposition insisted that it "would" have been. I want to make this point quite clear, and to do this I think it is necessary to look at section 127 (1) of the Industrial Arbitration Act, prior to its repeal and replacement in 1966. This is the subsection which dealt with quarterly adjustments, and how they should be made. It reads as follows:—

The State Government Statistician shall as soon as practicable after the end of each and every quarter in the year, supply to the Commission a statement indicating by price index numbers and other information the variation (if any) in the cost of living which has occurred during the last preceding quarter and if such statement shows that a change of one shilling or more per week has occurred in the cost of living then, notwithstanding anything in this part of the Act to the contrary, the Commission shall of its own motion consider such statement and may adjust and amend the basic wage declared and for the time being in operation under this Act; and the Commission shall when making any adjustment and amendment of the said basic wage, have regard to the change in the cost of living indicated as aforesaid.

The important words are that the only time the commission had any right to examine the basic wage was when the con-

sumer price index moved by an amount which indicated a 10c—or 1s.—variation in the cost of living and then, even though the commission "shall consider" such a movement, it only "may adjust" the basic wage.

Another matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition relates to information which I think may have been supplied to him by the Trades and Labour Council. An advertisement appeared in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 27th August, which read in part—

You are now losing \$1.62 per week due to price increases recorded by the index figures . . .

When I saw the advertisement I immediately asked my officers to check on the accuracy of the figures in the table. An industrial officer from the Department of Labour carried out the appropriate research on my behalf. He gave me information which indicates the figure is in error. I will quote from his report to me on the 27th August, as follows:—

With reference to the statement by the T.L.C. in this morning's issue of the *West Australian* wherein it was stated that the workers "are now losing \$1.62 per week due to price increases recorded by the index figures", I have been unable to ascertain the basis of calculation. However, I would state quite categorically that the figure is in error.

I have had my calculations checked by the Government Statistician's Office to ensure their accuracy. It is emphasised that the movements in the consumer price index indicate that over the relevant period the basic wage could have increased by \$1.75, the 60 cents special loading awarded by the Commission as from the 1st July, 1967, must be taken into account and this reduces the possible increase to \$1.15.

Mr. Moir: That is still substantial.

Mr. O'NEIL: It is substantial; but I want to make the point that an organisation such as the Trades and Labour Council, when spending a lot of money on an advertisement in order to influence people's thinking along a certain line, should be more accurate in taking out those figures.

Mr. Lapham: What did it say the figure was?

Mr. O'NEIL: The amount of \$1.62 is stated in the advertisement. During the course of the Leader of the Opposition's speech I interjected and indicated that I had made an announcement some time prior to the day upon which he moved his motion in the House relative to the Government's intention. The Leader of the Opposition replied that apparently insufficient interest had been taken in this, because

apparently nothing had been done about it. Something had been done about it, Mr. Speaker.

I did not actually hear the announcements which were made over the air by the A.B.C., because it is not very often that I have time to listen to the radio. However, most Ministers receive news clippings of the items used by the A.B.C., and I myself received these clippings.

The date when the Leader of the Opposition introduced his motion escapes me for the moment, but I think it was last Wednesday, the 11th September, 1968. However, on the 22nd August, 1968—a Thursday—the following news was released by the A.B.C.:—

The Minister for Labour Mr. O'Neil is expecting a report this week from a Government Committee which is examining ways of overcoming a stalemate over State Wage fixation.

Amendments to the Industrial Arbitration legislation will probably be necessary.

The fact that the Government was considering this question was revealed in the Legislative Council last night when Mr. O'Neil was winding up the debate on the Address-in-Reply.

There is an error at this point, because it was the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council who was winding up the debate. The news article goes on to state—

Outside Parliament Mr. O'Neil said the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission decision to abandon the basic wage and replace it with a total wage had virtually frozen the State Basic Wage.

He added that now Western Australia was no longer a claimant State it could no longer be penalised as previously for having a basic wage higher than that of the other States.

Mr. O'Neil said the Committee's report would enable a decision to be made on whether legislation would be necessary.

Following certain statements which appeared in the daily Press, and which indicated that there would be a march on Parliament House, I was queried by an A.B.C. reporter, and on the same day, Tuesday, the 27th August, 1968, the following announcement was made by the A.B.C.:—

The Minister for Labour, Mr. O'Neil says he's puzzled by a decision of the Trades and Labour Council to call a special meeting tomorrow on the State Basic Wage issue.

Mr. O'Neil said today that the Council was well aware that the Government had the matter under study and in fact the Council had submitted its

suggestions to the Government on what should be done. The Council had canvassed all Unions for their views.

The submissions, along with others from the Employers Federation and the Public Service Commissioner had been placed before a special Government Committee set up to examine the situation.

The Committee has reported to the Minister who has placed the findings before Cabinet.

Cabinet did not have time to consider the report at its last weekly meeting yesterday.

Mr. O'Neil said the hope was that a decision could be made by Cabinet in time to allow legislation to be placed before State Parliament during the current Session.

I would like to point out here that I received the report of the special committee at about 4 p.m. on the Friday, and my recommendations relative to the report were before Cabinet on the following Monday. A further announcement was made, on the 29th August, 1968, as follows:—

The Minister for Labour Mr. O'Neil does not believe that Western Australia will return to the system of quarterly adjustments to the basic wage.

This view was expressed by Mr. O'Neil when commenting today on claims made at a meeting in Perth yesterday of 200 Trade Unionists. They carried a recommendation calling on the Government to declare a State Basic Wage and reintroduce quarterly adjustments.

Mr. O'Neil said he had considered a report from a Government Committee established to examine the wage fixation issue and recommendations had been made to Cabinet. They have still to be considered at this level.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. O'NEIL: I do not propose to delay the House much longer. I now want to quote the last of the A.B.C. news releases on this subject, mainly for the reason that, once again, I want to make a correction in regard to the statement made in the news release of the 10th September, 1968. On that date, over the A.B.C. news, the following statement was made:—

The Minister for Labour (Mr. O'Neil) has received Cabinet approval to prepare legislation to amend the State Industrial Arbitration Act.

The legislation will include provision to maintain a State basic wage and return to the State Industrial Commission the power to make regular reviews of the State basic wage.

Except for a special loading of 60c applied in December last year—

It is this part of the statement I want to correct. Continuing—

—the State basic wage had remained frozen at \$33.50 a week since the Federal Government's decision early last year to abolish a basic wage in favour of a total wage.

In the Legislative Assembly today the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tonkin) gave notice of a motion calling for the introduction of a two-part wage system in Western Australia, one part to relate to cost-of-living adjustments, the other to reflect the relative skills of workers.

I wish to correct the statement that the special loading of 60c was applied in December, 1967; in fact, it applied as from the 1st July, 1967.

I conclude by repeating my opening remarks: that is, I feel that any debate on the subject at the moment would be mainly academic. I oppose the motion and leave any further comment to the time when legislation is introduced.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Moir.

BARRACKS ARCH

Resiting: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 11th September, on the following motion by Mr. Fletcher:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should use finance and existing material available, for the purpose of more appropriately resiting the Barracks Arch, entirely or in part, at the foot of Barrack Street after which, it is understood, the street is named.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [7.32 p.m.]: Prior to the previous occasion, when the subject of the Barracks Archway was before us by way of a motion, several debates were conducted on the same subject, and I recall one notable one. In the initial stages of the 1966 session we were dealing with the financial requirements of the State, as is the usual course at the first night's sitting, and during the debate held on the 2nd August I made my position very clear.

It is true that subsequent to that, when the Premier's motion was moved, my name did not appear in the division list because of certain circumstances. I now wish to indicate clearly to the House that that situation in no way altered the views I held on this subject early in 1966. I quote the following taken from page 50 of the 1966 *Parliamentary Debates*, wherein I said—

My great concern is as to where we will stop in regard to the cost to maintain the archway in its present posi-

tion. I represent a metropolitan electorate, and I have only received one letter of protest. This does not mean that I want to encourage the writing of thousands of letters.

Further on, I more clearly indicated the views I held. I stated—

If I were told by a Minister of the Government that the Treasurer was able to provide money either for the archway or for a schoolroom at Beeloo, but not for both, then for me it would have to be the schoolroom at Beeloo.

The matter is as simple as that. Nobody knows, and nobody is prepared to estimate the cost of maintaining, over the years, the archway in its present position.

We have had presented to us a series of astonishing figures relating to the cost of the work which has already been carried out over the past few years in maintaining the arch in its present unkempt state. On the 21st August, 1968, I asked several questions on the Barracks Archway. My first question was—

- (1) What amount has been spent on the Barracks Arch to retain it in its present state by—
- (a) the original foundation underpinning before the removal of the rest of the building;
- (b) the shoring up of structure to prevent further deterioration of the upper section of the arch;
- (c) the final underpinning and foundation strengthening before the completion of the Mitchell Freeway main wall?

Mr. Nalder, on behalf of the Premier, replied as follows:—

- (1) (a) \$2,500.
- (b) and (c) \$5,300.

I do not know why there is a discrepancy in the figures, but I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in 1965 I asked the Minister for Works the following questions:—

- (1) What is the nature of the work at present in progress, in and about the archway of the Public Works buildings (Barracks)?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of these activities?

At that time, Mr. Court, on behalf of the Minister for Works, gave the following replies:—

- (1) Underpinning the foundations of the archway.
- (2) £2,000.

That amount, of course, would represent \$4,000 today, which is a great deal in excess

of the total amount involved for the three items I have quoted. On the 21st August, 1968, I asked this question—

What was the difference in the successful tender for the demolition of the Barracks:

- (a) leaving the arch;
- (b) removing the arch?

In answer to this question the Minister said—

No alternative tender was obtained for total demolition. Therefore the answer cannot be determined accurately. The estimated figure involved is \$350.

This amount has to be added to the figure previously given. My next question was—

What was the difference in the successful tender for the Mitchell Freeway with—

- (a) arch left in position; and
- (b) no arch?

To this question the reply was "\$2,126."

We are becoming more and more involved with estimates for the future, and estimates always seem to fall short of what the actual final cost is. At a cost of \$50,000 or \$60,000 a western face can be put on the archway transforming it into something it has never been, and therefore something which was never wanted by the people advocating the retention of the arch; or, if that is what they do want, those people want a memorial and something different from what the archway was originally. Therefore, if such people want a memorial they should give it space to breathe and not expect it to be maintained in the present position.

If the archway is maintained in its present position I doubt whether we will ever see such a grandiose memorial as is depicted on the pamphlet that has been forwarded to members, together with the remarks made by John Oldham. He is a person who for some time has been advocating the retention of the arch, but unfortunately, because of Mr. Oldham's vintage, he is getting beyond the stage of being able to grasp the things of the future.

Mr. Graham: Are you referring to John Oldham or Mrs. Oldham?

Mr. JAMIESON: The pamphlet has been circularised by Mrs. Oldham, but the printed remarks on the back of the pamphlet in support of the resolution passed by the National Trust of Australia (W.A.) were made by Mr. John Oldham. So it is quite clear he was the one who arranged for this pamphlet to be printed.

Mr. Oldham, along with many others who seem to gain sympathy in the various trusts that are set up, such as the National Trust of Australia, the Royal Historical Society, and others, has become completely emotional about matters such as the Barracks Archway. It is useless trying to talk

to such people on the economics or the practicability of such propositions. Their minds are made up, and they will not be convinced in regard to any other line of thought. They remain in that frame of mind indefinitely.

So one can completely disregard their opinions on such matters. They have completely set ideas and a tendency to grasp and hold things that have passed, because they themselves have reached the stage where they will soon pass.

This is an unfortunate trait; it is an example of dotage. It is most unfortunate, however, that not only are the old people—those who advocate this course of action—in their dotage, but there also appear to be several young people in their dotage. Because they feel the older people have had more experience, the young people are inclined to follow their suggestions blindly, as they feel the older people know what they are talking about.

It would be very apt at this stage to refer to what my Deputy Leader is reported to have said at the opening of a function. According to the newflash he said, "There are many people who have not had a new idea in the last 20 years." That is a shocking state of affairs, particularly when the older people are able to convince the public that the decisions have been made in the public favour.

Mr. Graham: When I said that I particularly had in mind the Minister for Industrial Development on licensing.

Mr. JAMIESON: It is interesting to consider some of the questions asked of the public from time to time on certain issues; particularly those put forward by the Press. We know from experience that if the Press can make a story out of a situation it will do so, even if it ridicules Parliament or any other organisation or individual in the process. It will boot the story along and do all it can so long as it feels the story has public appeal. It does not matter very much what the subject matter of the story is—it might be rape, murder, a Royal Commission, or something as mundane as the Barracks Archway, but this does not mean that its report constitutes the opinion of the public of Western Australia. It is merely the opinion of whoever is writing the article, which is very often slanted towards obtaining the best news story.

The object of the Press is sensationalism; whether it be belting the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition in the process does not seem to matter at all. The Press goes after its story without any regard to whose head lies on the chopping block at the time.

I have no doubt that all members received a telegram early in the week indicating that Parliament had made a decision a few years ago, and that we should not forget the promises made. As

far as I know the Premier made a promise that he would assist in the restoration of the archway. I do not want to appear to be defending the Premier, but he was cajoled into a situation to the extent that he said he would have a look at the position and, if necessary, would conduct some sort of poll or inquiry to find out what the people thought, with a view to carrying out the wishes of the people if possible.

We then found everybody jumping on the bandwagon. We found the local television stations and news media employing people representative of recognised poll organisations to conduct a poll throughout Western Australia. The questions, of course, were framed to secure the answers sought by the organisers of the poll. We also had the newspapers conducting a poll and asking the people to answer simply "Yes" or "No" to certain questions.

We have all been associated with popularity polls long enough to know that the only people who will secure a vote are those who are active in the matter. This is particularly so where there is no compulsory vote. It is a shocking indictment on the people of Australia, but it is nevertheless true.

The result of these polls, however, constitutes the opinion of a few people. In the main we find that organisations which have been set up by Parliament seek to wield the big stick and try to convince people that they are doing so in the best interests of the community. Some of them even go so far as to try to override the Premier.

I am sorry for the position in which the Premier found himself. I know I do not have to be sorry, but I believe that politically he was unwise in what he did. It was purely an administrative matter, but far too many people were given the opportunity to talk about it. It would have been better had the Premier done what he normally does in matters of this kind—he should have obtained a Cabinet decision and proceeded with it. The whole argument would have been over and nothing more would have been said.

Nobody can convince me that those who supported a similar motion were, as a result, detrimentally affected at the poll; because some members who supported it were defeated while others, who did not support it, were defeated. This matter had no effect on the outcome of the poll, and if we convince ourselves to the contrary we are being very foolish.

Unfortunately for the Premier, all the activity for the retention of the archway comes from people who are fairly closely associated with the Liberal Party. Consequently it makes the Premier's position most difficult, because he is unable to judge the situation correctly.

There are, I suppose, people who tell the Premier that Mr. So-and-so has been a good supporter of the party, but he reckons

he will no longer be one if a decision is taken to do away with the archway. In spite of the fact that this was probably said to the Minister for Industrial Development, the people concerned still voted for him, if his figures at the last election are any indication.

Most of the people to whom I refer are the older class of citizen, and it will take a lot to convince me that such people will change their attitude towards politics or religion. When people pass the age of 60 they very rarely change their attitude towards politics or religion; their thinking follows the lines it did previously.

Mr. Bickerton: Have you changed yours?

Mr. JAMIESON: I have not reached that age, as the member for Pilbara would imply. He would know more about that than I would. From the brochure with which we have been supplied we see a grandiose structure hidden in a forest of trees. This in itself is a complete fallacy; it could never take place. If trees were grown in the area suggested by the brochure, the Main Roads Department would soon cut them down, because they would obscure the lights. As it is, we have enough on our hands trying to work out our road safety problems, and this sort of thing would certainly not be countenanced. We see from the brochure that the structure will have three floors of concrete, which would not have been possible at the time it was originally constructed.

One of the objections I heard expressed on TV by a certain personality so much in favour of the retention of the archway, is that the floor had been taken out of C. Y. O'Connor's office. This is too laughable for words. We all admit that C. Y. O'Connor was a great engineer and a great son of the State. We have shown appreciation of the work he did by erecting memorials to him at various places, but with the exception of those who have been associated with the workings of the department, very few people have seen inside his office. I do not think anyone is particularly interested in retaining the suite of offices as a memorial to C. Y. O'Connor. He was certainly a great man who was well thought of, and he will continue to be well thought of long after the people to whom I refer have gone.

Neither the Government nor any structural engineer has given an assurance that when the archway is faced on the western side it will remain secure. With my limited knowledge of this subject—my knowledge is becoming somewhat distant, and probably it is regarded by some as being in the dotage stage; and, no doubt, people with experience of modern building procedure will know more about the matter—I doubt very much whether the structure which was planned originally to be held up by the two wings will be secure by being propped up on a big slab of concrete.

Obviously this slab of concrete will move with the vibrations caused by the traffic. We experience the extent of the earth movement when heavy earth-moving equipment is being used near Parliament House, and I would point out that Parliament House is built on a modern foundation, as compared with the foundation on which the structure to the east is built.

As a consequence of the earth movement which will occur when the traffic flow rumbles beneath the foundations of the arch, there will be a constant need to prop it up, and one side of the building will become stronger than the other. We know what happens to an individual who is placed in similar circumstances; he starts to limp. I say this structure will limp along in the future. If it is worthy of retention and preservation then let the work be done in such a way that the structure will stand; so that the first cost will be the last cost; but let us not be involved in pouring money down the drain year after year for no purpose other than to placate the wishes of a few people who become highly agitated about these matters.

If I might be permitted to digress a little, one of the best historical buildings in Perth, in a structural sense, was the old T. & G. building. I once took objection to Mr. Oldham's attitude to this building, because he could not see anything structurally nice about it. We all remember this charming building across from the Supreme Court Gardens, and we can all see what has replaced it—an egg crate or a box-type structure. Mr. Oldham did not object, the Historical Society did not object, and the National Trust did not object, to the demolition of the old T. & G. building. However, as soon as any move is made to change or alter a Government building there is immediate objection from some people.

To them it does not matter how much the taxpayers are called upon to bear to accede to their whims and desires. They are not interested, and they are not capable of being interested, because they are emotionally unsound when it comes to considering associations with a building like the old T. & G. structure. Some people will, no doubt, take me to task for my attitude on this question, but I am afraid I must be a modernist, and I must move with the times.

The Leader of the Opposition was the Minister for Works at the time the Narrows Bridge was being built, and he was placed in the position of having to make a decision on the fate of another old building—the Old Mill at South Perth. If I remember the circumstances correctly, the Government of the day decided that it did not have the finance to restore the Old Mill to a shipshape form, and that

it would have to be demolished. However, a benefactor came to light and restored the building, in its present charming location, to a state somewhat similar to the original state of the structure. No doubt, people will be able to appreciate the Old Mill for many years to come.

In the case of the Barracks Arch, which was the focal point of the original building, the problem of retention poses many difficulties. All sorts of troubles will arise, not the least of which will be the policing of the site. I am sure it will be used for all kinds of purposes for which it should not be used, including the usage mentioned by the member for Fremantle when he moved the motion. It is a fact that of recent times the arch has been used extensively as a urinal, despite its open location. It was only as a result of a complaint by me to one of the engineers of the department that it has ceased to be so used.

Some members were able to see through the front windows of Parliament House that the building was being used as a urinal. Very much more use of the building in this manner will occur on dark evenings, because there is no room on which to erect a fence around it. People will commit these nuisances around the structure forever and a day. One of the favourite walks of the people of Perth is from King's Park down to the city, and if there is no public convenience on the way, some will use the arch site as a urinal.

Mr. O'Neill: The member for Swan might agree to have it resited on one of the metropolitan railway stations!

Mr. JAMIESON: It would have a functional use there.

Mr. Bickerton: Some people might jump off the top of the structure!

Mr. JAMIESON: The existing structure consists of a great deal of old building materials. The bricks are known as soft-baked bricks; and the mortar between the bricks is not as strong as the cement or lime mortar that is used these days.

Mr. W. A. Manning: It has not done too badly over the years.

Mr. JAMIESON: It has not done too badly, but it has been propped up from time immemorial. Even before the early days of this century there were worries about this structure, and the authorities intended to pull it down. There is a reference in our *Parliamentary Debates* of 1882 to this question. At that time the building had been vacant for several years, and the Colonial Secretary (Lord Gifford) was justifying its retention. He said that if he could find the funds to put the structure in order he would convert it into a police barracks at an early date. Subsequently he did find some money to put the building in order, and from then on, over the years, various Ministers for Works have had to continue putting in money to

keep it in order. Goodness knows how much money has gone down the drain in propping up this structure!

If the archway is not demolished now, it will be eventually, although that might be in 50 years' time. Even if the structure is rebuilt on its existing site, it will eventually have to come down, and something will have to be done to it. It was never built to last. It was built as a temporary structure to accommodate the pensioner military personnel. This building has been referred to as the Pensioner Barracks, and it was used to house people between 35 and 40 years of age who had served their terms in the Army and who chose to remain in the State after their discharge. They were accommodated at these barracks while they were awaiting land allocation.

These premises were so used, because there was a reduction in the military forces which were being sent out from Britain, particularly as a result of the cessation of the transport of convicts to the settlement. There was not then, as there was when the building was built originally, the need for these barracks. Of course, the building has been used for many purposes other than the one for which it was originally intended.

I can see no good reason for retaining the arch where it is at present situated. I realise the matter has already been before this Chamber, but a lot of people make mistakes. We hear them vowing and declaring in the Press that Parliament has made a decision. However, this is not so. It is true the Legislative Assembly made a decision on a motion, but Parliament did not make a decision; and, I should hope, after the passing of the motion in its present or amended form in this House, it will be referred to the Legislative Council for its concurrence.

At a later stage I propose to move an amendment to the motion, but before doing so I would like to make a few more comments. When dealing with emotional matters, from a Government's point of view, or from an Opposition's point of view, it is hard to judge what is the most expedient thing to do. It is in cases like this that one meets many problems. A Government may take the best possible action, but if the Opposition has a chance it is its bounden duty to take the opportunity to try to stand the Government up, especially on issues that emotionally concern the public. There is every reason for the Opposition trying to become the Government, and it should make use of every opportunity that comes its way.

I know that during the 1966 debate many members would have been influenced by the emotional issues and would have formed an attitude of mind which, one might say, was perhaps not a very honest one. However, a lot of doubtful things are

done in the name of political expediency. They come into that category irrespective of whether we are dealing with the Barracks Archway, on opera house, or the FIII; and the Opposition of the day would try to exploit any weaknesses it could see on the part of the Government. I think the weakness displayed by the Government was to let this matter come to the House in the first place. I clearly indicated at the time that I was not prepared to get the Premier off the hook if he put himself in the position of bringing the matter to the House.

I believed it was purely an administrative matter; and if one brings one administrative matter before Parliament one should bring all questions before Parliament. If that is not to be the case, then let the Premier keep them away, and make the Administration responsible for any action that should be taken. Having delivered himself into the hands of the Philistines they did their best to rid themselves of him; and I suggest that was a lesson to us in regard to emotionalism, and the actions taken by various people; because they were all trying to obtain some advantage which could backfire. Mark my words, the whole matter will backfire unless this House is careful not to allow itself to be put in a position where the archway involves a permanent recurring cost for doing something that, in effect, will be quite hideous until it is transformed into something that it never was originally. If that is the retention of an old-style building, then I do not wish to be associated with it.

I am not one for tearing down all old buildings, as some of them have great charm. The prettiest part of the whole building was the tower at the end of the water supply section, as it contained some very quaint brickwork. But Mr. Oldham was not concerned about this; his mind was set on the arch.

If the interested organisations can obtain some sponsors to help them, and if the Premier keeps his promise and offers them some money for the restoration of the arch in nice surrounds, without permanently encumbering the Government in a repetitive cost for maintenance, this might be a good alternative to leaving it where it is where there is no room to breathe. There is insufficient room at the present site to do what is proposed. The information in the pamphlet issued is a lot of eyewash, as there is insufficient room for all of that to take place. The fact that the arch will have to be constantly manned to see it is not mistreated is sufficient for me to say that it should be shifted. I am not in the least worried whether it is re-erected, but the Premier, having previously given a promise that he would supply some money for the re-erection, would be in a spot if some provision was not made under suitable circumstances.

I would like to take this opportunity to move an amendment.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: While you are looking for it, have you wondered what would happen if the Western Australian Historical Society decided not to consult?

Mr. JAMIESON: The Government would be in a difficulty, but that society has been advocating the retention of the arch, and I think it would recommend resiting, with something decent built around it.

In the first place, a model of the Old Barracks should have been made and placed in the Museum. Years ago I indicated that I thought this was desirable. Had that been done anybody who wanted to see how the Barracks used to look would be able to do so. The archway at the present time is a monstrosity in comparison with what it looked like when it was incorporated in the old building.

Amendment to Motion

I move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word "Street" in the second last line of the motion.

The SPEAKER: Before I call on the member for Karrinyup I wish to draw the attention of members to the procedure which will be adopted, because this will be the first time we have had a motion of this sort before us since the new Standing Orders came into being.

Any member who speaks to the amendment can speak to the amendment only. He will not be denied his right to speak to the motion itself after the amendment has been disposed of one way or the other. I propose to treat this debate on the amendment as a debate not otherwise provided for under Standing Order 164. Therefore, members will be limited to 20 minutes each when speaking to the amendment.

MR. LAPHAM (Karrinyup) [8.9 p.m.]: I am completely at variance with the previous speaker. Because he happens to oppose me, I do not intend to indicate that he is immature, or that he is in his dotage, or that he has no national spirit—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Karrinyup must address the Chair and not speak directly to another member.

Mr. LAPHAM: As I see the arch, it would have been far preferable had the wings and dome remained; but the arch itself is at least a part of history.

To me it is an indication of what occurred 100 years ago. I now want to refer to what Professor Reid had to say in a publication called *Westerly*. This volume is No. 1 of 1967. Professor Reid said—

In 1862-3 there was in Perth a pre-occupation with the problem of providing a "fine western termination" to

St. George's Terrace, and it is curious that more than a century later, that same seemingly minor issue bedevils—

The SPEAKER: Order! I gave a direction—the member for Karrinyup will resume his seat when I am on my feet. I gave a direction that the honourable member could speak to the amendment, which is to delete certain words. The member for Karrinyup will have an opportunity later to speak on the merits of the motion. He will confine his remarks to whether the words should or should not be deleted; and also he may forecast his views on a consultation with the Historical Society. That is as far as he can go.

Amendment put and negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR. LAPHAM (Karrinyup) [8.11 p.m.]: I want once again, if I may, to refer to what appeared in a copy of *Westerly*, No. 1 of 1967. I was dealing with an article written by Professor Reid who said—

In 1862-3 there was in Perth a pre-occupation with the problem of providing a "fine western termination" to St. George's Terrace, and it is curious that more than a century later, that same seemingly minor issue bedevils Western Australian politics and its politicians. But in 1862-63 the western termination was not envisaged as a grandiose parliamentary edifice overlooking the city, but a large two-storey Barracks block in local red brick, to house the newly established Enrolled Pensioner Force. The Force was needed for guard duty over the State's growing penal population. Its members were retired British servicemen from 35 years of age upwards who had guarded convicts on their journey from England; and they were housed with their families, first at Fremantle, and then from 1864, in the partially completed Barracks building.

That is a part of our history. It is something which happened 100 years ago. I am one who feels we are prone to neglect the history of Australia and, more especially, the history of Western Australia. Even though only the archway now remains, to me it is a reminder of what occurred in Western Australia many years ago and a reminder of the people who originally made this country. They laid the foundations on which we have been able to build; and I do not think it is right that we who are living in Western Australia today should feel we are the only ones entitled to any views. Although these people lived well before our time, they were the ones who made the State a place in which it is now well worth our living; and it is worth our while to carry on in their footsteps.

The building does not appear to mean very much to some members, but to me it is a rare building. It represents the old

look amongst the new, and to me it is something worth while. Recently I travelled along St. George's Terrace with a couple of children and one of them said, "Look at the castle at the top of the hill." I thought that was a new approach to the subject of the archway, which is, indeed, something completely different. The child's remark indicated that it was thought we had a castle in Western Australia.

Of course the Barracks had its problems even in 1901. In that year a Select Committee was appointed to investigate what should be done with the building because it was intended that Parliament House should be extended. The authorities at the time thought that the Barracks would be in the way. However, even though a Select Committee inquired into the matter the whole of the structure remained. It is only in recent years that, as a consequence of the freeway and, again, because of motor vehicles, an alteration has occurred in the thinking of a number of people, some of whom want to push over the old history of Western Australia.

I think this is entirely wrong. I will admit that Professor Stephenson is on the side of those who want to use a bulldozer and give the arch a push; but he has been wrong before and I say that on this occasion he is wrong again. To me the archway is a building which has a "texture of time" about it which no other building in Western Australia has.

It is true that a number of polls have been held as to whether or not the archway should remain. Radio and TV stations, the Government, and the Press all conducted their own little polls in turn. One of the remarkable things about these polls was that so few people interested themselves in recording a vote for or against the project. This indicated to me that most people could not care less. They were so busily occupied with the normal every-day mundane problems that they were not prepared to spend any time in considering any other activities associated with the State.

Another point which emerged from the polls was that there is a vociferous majority—it could be called a minority if the whole of the population of Western Australia were taken into consideration—which is very keen on retaining the archway. These people have some degree of national spirit and are trying to imbue others with that same spirit.

It must be remembered that on any occasion like this, it starts off with a small beginning. Someone or some organisation spearheads the attack. But once the attack has commenced it is surprising how the impetus grows, and before long the whole of the population has agreed with what the minority started.

Admittedly it cannot be said that a very grave economic problem exists in relation to the archway; but I do not think we should at all times relate everything to economics. We should consider the problem from the angle of the history of the State and what the retention of the arch will ultimately mean to the young people. We should leave the arch there for the younger people to see in order to remind them of what occurred many years ago. If we have a good look at the arch, and at its structure and design, we will agree it is something completely unusual. There is nothing like it in Perth, and if we destroy the building we will destroy that style of building in Western Australia, and we will deprive our youngsters of seeing something which exists today, but which will not exist if a bulldozer is brought in.

Australia, of course, unlike other countries of the world, and being fairly new, has never attempted to brainwash its own people. In the United States of America the Constitution is quoted in the schools daily. Other countries—well-established countries—by virtue of their national anthems, their national dances, and so on, have some degree of national spirit. Unfortunately, we in Australia—and more especially in Western Australia—because we have only a small population of our natural-born Australians, and as a consequence of having to rely so much on migration over the years, have lost what degree of national spirit we had.

It will take many years to retrieve the position we were in at one time, so I feel that when an organization like the Historical Society—formed, and given mandatory power, by this Government—makes a suggestion and a recommendation for the purpose of preserving something which it feels is good for the community, at least the Government should give some credence to its point of view. It should only be in extreme circumstances that the Government should oppose the view of an organisation such as the Historical Society, which the Government created.

It has been said that if it was a question of building a schoolroom, or restoring the arch, it would be far preferable to have that schoolroom. Well, that might be so, and it might not be so. I am one of those individuals who feel that a schoolroom is a place to house children. What we want is knowledge to pass on to the children. If we retain the arch we will have knowledge—and especially local historical knowledge—and that would be far preferable. So I do not think there is any degree of argument in comparing the cost of a schoolroom with the expense involved in retaining the arch.

As far as the cost is concerned, it is purely and simply a cost which is involved in the whole of the freeway expenditure. That has been a terrific cost, and millions

more will be spent on the freeway before it is completed. Under those circumstances, I do not think a few paltry thousand dollars involved in bringing the arch to some degree of renovation should greatly concern this House.

I would like to refer to what the Premier said when this matter was raised previously. The Premier claimed that the Government had spent some thousands of dollars in underpinning the arch to prevent it from falling into the gaping chasm which would later become the switch road, and also to strengthen it against the vibrations of the heavy traffic that streams west out of St. George's Terrace. The Premier gave an assurance that the arch would stand there, until the freeway was completed, and when the area was being finalised and cleared up, the arch would be treated in a suitable manner.

I would like to feel that the Premier still has those views because, once again, I get back to the fundamental which, in my opinion, is the crux of the position: that the arch can be renovated. It can become a rare building amongst modern buildings. It will really stand out, not as a toilet in the Terrace, but as an old building—the old type of structure amongst the new structures.

It has been said that the arch blocks the view from Parliament House when one looks down the Terrace, and it blocks the view of Parliament House when one looks up the Terrace. That, to my mind, is not so. I have no difficulty in looking down the Terrace at any time from any position in Parliament House. Also, I have no problem when looking at Parliament House—if I want to—from St. George's Terrace. I do not think it matters one iota whether anybody looks at Parliament House or not. The fact is that the arch is a part of history and I do not think we are in a position to destroy any part of Western Australian history.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [8.27 p.m.]: I also want to oppose this motion. We have heard the opinions of those who want to see the arch remain, and we have heard others indulge in a form of emotionalism when stating that there is no real argument for the retention of the Barracks Arch. I will disagree at the outset with the latter argument, because the situation is quite to the contrary. There is all the evidence in the world to support the retention of the arch, and virtually none in support of the case for its demolition.

The first point I would like to make is that in the United States of America there is a Society of Landscape Architects. It is an institution which has no less than 2,000 members—2,000 landscape architects. In Western Australia until recently, we had only one—John Oldham. I do not know what the situation is today, but in

the past we had only one landscape architect. The society in the United States of America—with 2,000 members—is the oldest institute of its kind in the world. I understand there are 40 schools of landscape architecture in the universities throughout America, so it is a pretty reputable profession.

Now, extraordinarily enough, about a month ago the president of that powerful organisation was in Western Australia. His name was Theodore Osmundson. I would regard that gentleman as being an authority on this subject. If there is one person in this world who is qualified to express an opinion on the arch, it is a landscape architect. It should not be an architect or a town planner, but a landscape architect.

The president of this society of 2,000 members visited Western Australia and he said something to the effect that he was of the firm opinion that the Barracks Archway should stay on the present site; it was an indication that Perth had a heart. He said we should preserve the archway and that similar action was being taken throughout America.

When members talk of the emotionalism indulged in by those who want to see the arch retained, let them reflect upon those words of a person who, to my mind, is an expert on this type of thing.

Recently some sort of seminar or planning conference was held in Western Australia and the Professor of Geography from the University of Reading in England, Professor Peter Hall, had this to say—

The arch should remain on its present site on the axis of St. George's Terrace, and people in Perth in 30, 40, or 50 years' time will say it is marvelous that we saved the arch.

Here again a very highly qualified man who came to Perth to attend a conference expressed this view.

When the debate took place in this House some years ago Dr. Henn came up with some excellent quotations. I would like to refer briefly to them, because they are expressions by people who are highly qualified in this field, and not expressions of laymen. For instance, Dr. Henn quoted the statement which was made by Sir Denis Winston, who is Professor of Town and Country Planning, Sydney University. This is what the professor said—

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

I repeat that Sir Denis Winston is an expert. Again, a most important man, Lord Esher, who is President of the Planning Institute of Great Britain, made a comment in this regard. One could hardly go past the qualifications of Lord Esher, as President of the Planning Institute of Great Britain, but he has other qualifications as well; for instance, he was a former Vice-President of the Royal Institute of British Architects. He said—

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

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

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

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

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

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

A few days later he said—

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

Finally, before leaving the State he said—

I should like to express the hope that at least the towers and archway . . . will be preserved. They seem

to me to create a most valuable focal point, the removal of which would surely be regretted in years to come.

I could continue to quote.

Dr. Henn: All those people should know what they are talking about.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have no doubt that they do know what they are talking about; they are men with excellent qualifications. I repeat that I am quoting from a speech made by the member for Wembley in 1966. The final quotation I wish to make is that made by Dr. Barnham, who is an eminent English architectural critic and joint editor of the *Architectural Review*, which is a journal of the British Institute of Architects and apparently one of the world's leading architectural journals. He said—

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

Finally he commented—

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

It is to me incredible that statements of that kind can be made from top authorities throughout the world yet we still contemplate demolishing the archway. This is an action which we could take in 10 years, 20 years, or at any time in the future, should we so desire. The archway could be demolished at any time. If it is left now, it does not mean that it will stand there for ever and impede progress, or anything like that. It is something that could be demolished at any time, but once it is demolished, of course, it cannot be constructed again on the original site and retain its present qualities. Perhaps it could be taken down, stored away, and put up again, but it would not be the same archway.

In the face of this top advice, to my mind it would be a shocking, sordid form of civic vandalism to demolish the archway at the present time. As I have said, we must be aware that we could demolish it at any time in the future should we so desire—we may have to do it then—but if we were to do it now that would be the end of it.

What section of the community wants the arch retained? First of all let us look at some of the organisations involved, for example, the Historical Society. We know the views of the society on the situation.

It is an organisation responsible for retaining most of the important buildings in Western Australia and, indeed, it is tremendously highly regarded. The Historical Society has made itself quite clear on this issue at the present time, quite apart from what it said a few years ago when the matter was controversial.

A letter was written to *The West Australian* under the heading, "Assurance on Barracks Arch" and it was signed by Mr. B. C. Cohen, President, Royal Western Australian Historical Society, and Mr. W. Fred Samson, Vice-President, National Trust of Australia (W.A.). Mr. Cohen was speaking on behalf of the Historical Society and made it quite clear that the society wanted to see the arch remain in its present position. That is one organisation.

Next we have the National Trust of Australia (W.A.), which was given statutory form by this Government a few years ago. Of course it was set up for the purpose of retaining things of historical value. What did the National Trust do? The chairman of that organisation felt obliged to send a telegram to every member of Parliament which read—

Please disregard the present appearance of the Barracks arch mutilated by the demolishers stop Please remember the peoples vote in 1966 stop Please do not ignore the advice of world ranking planners who met in Perth recently stop Please vote to keep the arch on its present site. Ernest Lee Steere President National Trust.

Those are two most important organisations in our community. The Australian Council of the National Trust is a nationwide body and I think South Australia is the only State that does not subscribe to it. This body came forward a few years ago when the issue was controversial and made it quite plain that the trust wanted to see the archway retained on its present site.

We know what the Press thinks on this subject, and only recently an editorial was published. *The West Australian* published the following report:—

UNDERMINING THE ARCH

Parliament has an undeniable right to review the future of the Barracks Arch and the government has properly suspended its restoration plans till a vote is taken on the proposal that the arch be re-erected at the foot of Barrack-street.

It is a private member's motion and there will be a free vote on it. But in a matter essentially concerned with history some of the past as recent as 1966 should be kept in mind by members, especially as parliament

has undergone a lot of change since then and the votes of 17 new members might well be decisive.

There were clear indications at that time that parliament was in step with a majority of public opinion when it decided to leave the arch where it is. Since there is no conclusive evidence that public opinion has changed, this fact should weigh more with members than considerations of how the arch in its present sorry state looks from Parliament House or of how it interrupts the view of the parliamentary building from St. George's-Terrace. The case for parliament's having a pre-eminent place as a climax to the Terrace would be much stronger if parliament were housed in a building worthy of it and of the site.

About \$25,000 to restore the arch, provide floodlights and improve its perspective with trees and shrubs at the sides is a small price to pay to see whether a 102-year-old highlight from history can be preserved on its original site in an aesthetically pleasing way.

So the two leading organisations of this kind in Western Australia—namely, the Royal Historical Society of W.A., and the National Trust of Australia (W.A.)—together with *The West Australian* newspaper, are in favour of leaving the archway on its present site.

Now let us turn to the public. What opinion does the public hold on this matter? Most members of this House will recall that when there was a controversy on this subject a few years ago a couple of polls were taken to gauge public opinion. The first poll was sponsored by TVW 7, one of the local television stations. Apparently that television station engaged the Sydney-based McNair organisation to conduct the poll, because a newspaper report, dated the 4th October, 1966, reads as follows:—

SURVEY: RETAIN ARCH

More people want the Barracks archway retained than those favouring its demolition, according to a public opinion survey by the Sydney-based McNair organisation.

Of 282 people interviewed in 29 metropolitan localities, 124 (44 per cent.) favoured retaining the archway and 91 (32 per cent.) opposed it.

The remaining 67 (24 per cent.) did not know, had no opinion or were undecided.

That was a poll carried out on similar lines to a Gallup poll. Those conducting the poll did not ask the opinion of the first 282 people they met. They selected people drawn from all walks of life, and

that was the result—44 per cent. were in favour of the arch being retained, and 32 per cent. opposed its retention.

The Government went further than the step taken by the television station. At that time the Government was not prepared to accept the result of the McNair organisation poll, and so it conducted a Gallup poll. We all have respect for the result of a Gallup poll, because it is generally within 2 per cent. of the final figure on any particular issue. The prediction of public opinion gained by such polls is very sound. I will now quote the newspaper report, dated the 17th October, 1966, on the results of that Gallup poll. It reads as follows:—

FINAL POLL RESULTS ON ARCH ISSUED

The government yesterday issued the final results of the poll taken on the future of the Barracks arch—49.2 per cent. for retention and 34.4 per cent. for demolition.

The House is now composed of many new members and they may not have been in the metropolitan area when this controversy was raging, therefore they may not be aware of what went on and what was the opinion of the public on this question.

I emphasise that this was a Gallup poll conducted at the request of the Government, and the final figures are absolutely decisive; that is, 49.2 per cent. of the people were in favour of the retention of the arch and 34.4 per cent. voted for its demolition. Surely the members of this House should have regard for the people we represent and take cognisance of the results of a Gallup poll which are as decisive as the figures I have quoted. Let us always bear in mind that the end of government is the happiness of the governed; so how can we brush aside a vote which was so decisive?

So, summarising once again, we have the organisations of which I have spoken, we have the Press, and we have members of the public overwhelmingly in favour of the retention of the Barracks Arch, and we can now go further and speak of what happened in Parliament.

A debate on the Barracks Archway was held in this House, and the final vote was 26 to 18. Two years ago 26 members of this Parliament voted for the retention of the Barracks Archway, and only 18 voted for its demolition, and of those 18, nine were members of Cabinet. It was a block vote by Cabinet members. Of the other nine members who voted for the demolition of the archway there are now only three left on the floor of this House. They are the member for Pilbara, the member for Balcatta, and, I think, the member for

Bunbury. You, Mr. Speaker, were on the floor of the House, but you now occupy the Speaker's Chair.

That is how much support there is left for the demolition of the Barracks Archway. Of those who voted for its demolition when the vote was taken in this House previously, there are only three members left on the floor of the House, apart from members of the Cabinet. This is very significant and I feel sure that had the member for Fremantle been aware of these facts he would never have introduced his motion.

Mr. Lewis: You have only to lose four and you have an even vote.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is, if the Cabinet members vote *en bloc*, but I am about to express the hope that they will not do so in the same way as they did in the past.

Mr. Bickerton: Do you realise that of those members who voted for the demolition of the archway, not one was defeated at the last election?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not doubt that the member for Pilbara says, but he represents an outback electorate and perhaps he was not fully aware that there was a controversy in Perth over the Barracks Archway. That deals with the parliamentary vote.

Most members realise what the situation was when the vote was taken. The Premier made it quite clear to all of us. This is why I express the hope that Cabinet will refrain from voting *en bloc* on this motion; because if it does, and this results in the demolition of the arch, unfortunately it will be the Government that will be blamed for its demolition.

The Premier made it quite clear as to how he felt in respect of the Barracks Archway. The following is taken from his speech when he moved the motion:—

I want to make it clear that in this vote, which will be taken as a free vote, we would like to see a decisive decision made by Parliament. It is the intention that the motion should also be debated in the Council, so that both Houses will be given the opportunity to express an opinion. But, in the event of the opinion not being decisive, I wish to advise that the Government will feel that Parliament is not able to make a decision either, and that we should therefore leave the archway where it is.

Mr. Hawke, who was the Leader of the Opposition at that time, interjected—

What would the Premier regard as being a decisive decision in this House?

To which Mr. Brand replied, and continued with his remarks—

We will see the outcome. I am not evading the point, but I feel if the vote is reasonably balanced we should concede the fact.

Mr. Tonkin, the present Leader of the Opposition, then interjected—

Is this another two-way bet?

To this Mr. Brand replied, in the course of his speech—

No. We are not going to press on with the demolition if there is an indication in this House, or in both Houses, that people cannot make up their minds, and if the voting is fairly evenly balanced.

We discovered how evenly balanced it was; 26 members voted for its retention, and 18 for its demolition. The Premier continued—

I also want to make it plain that in the event of Parliament accepting an amendment to this motion, which plans to defer any action on the archway for, say, one or two years, I for one would feel that it would be a decision to leave it where it is. It is quite clear that once the temporary buildings below Parliament House are removed the archway will not fit into the picture at all. It will stand as isolated as it does at present. I believe that we have the scene before us, and it is for us to make a decision one way or the other.

The Premier had the right of reply, and at the end of the debate he said—

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

The point I wish to make is that we have a further assurance from the Government that if the matter was decided by a vote to retain the archway, it would be restored when the freeway was completed. I am sure if the archway were restored it would bring about quite a different outlook on the part of those who criticise it at the moment.

I have known members to bring visitors to Parliament House, and I have seen them looking out of the windows at the Barracks Archway and saying, "What a shocking state of affairs." It is quite natural that they should say this, because of the condition in which the arch has been left.

I think it was either the Chamber of Manufactures or the Chamber of Commerce which said it was prepared to undertake the task of renovating the archway, but this offer was not accepted.

We then find that the Minister for Works recently outlined what the Government intended to do. He said the Government would spend \$20,000 to \$25,000 on the restoration of the archway. This statement was welcomed by those who cherish the archway. The Press statement reads as follows:—

GOVT. OUTLINES AIM FOR ARCH

The government's plan to restore the Barracks archway was aimed at preserving the character of the structure, Works Minister Hutchinson said yesterday.

The concrete floors which would be built between the archway towers, at first and second-floor level, would not be visible from the outside.

The concrete would replace the wooden floors and would help to brace the building.

A brick preservative and waterproof coating would be applied after the western side of the archway had been matched as closely as possible with the eastern side.

The restoration proposals, which are expected to cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000, include the planting of trees and shrubs around the archway and floodlighting.

Mrs. Ray Oldham, of Swanbourne, a member of the council of the National Trust, said she was delighted with the government's announcement.

The proposals would add much to preserving the character of that area of the city.

I am sure Mrs. Oldham was not the only one who was pleased at the Government's announcement. It was welcomed universally. I hope, in the circumstances, that the motion will be defeated and the archway will be retained in its present position.

When one looks out of the windows of Parliament House at the moment one does not look upon a beautiful city; one looks at a hideous array of galvanised iron roofs, at vents of different kinds, at plumbing fittings, and so on. Virtually every roof one looks down upon from Parliament House is in a shocking condition. There is no attempt by the people who own the buildings to do anything about the roofs, because they are not visible from street level. They are, however, visible from Parliament House. When one looks out of the windows of Parliament House, one's eyes are immediately drawn to the archway at the western end of St. George's Terrace.

I would like to draw an analogy by saying that when a woman wishes to draw attention to her throat she generally wears a jewel at that point. If she wishes to draw attention to her hair it is possible she will adorn it with a flower.

This also applies to the extent that instead of looking at a shocking array of roofs, my attention is immediately drawn to the archway; and had it been renovated some time ago this motion would not have been before the House.

I am very pleased that on this occasion no venom has been engendered into the debate as was the case when the matter was previously before the House. That, in itself, is a very good thing.

I hope the Government will take into consideration the advice given by the experts; that it will take into consideration the public opinion, gained by way of the Gallup poll, which was overwhelmingly in favour of the retention of the archway; and that it will finally join with those who wish to see the motion rejected and the archway preserved in its present position.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [8.56 p.m.]: I have listened to a good deal of this debate over the last two Wednesdays, as I listened when the matter was previously discussed in this Chamber in 1966. Frankly I think the whole thing is becoming a farce.

At the moment I see no reason at all for changing the views and ideas I had when I last voted for the retention of the archway. We talk about emotionalism on the part of people who wish to retain the archway. I do not think it is these people who are showing emotionalism; it is being displayed by those who want the archway torn down or removed to some other site.

Looking at the matter impartially, it rather appears that the section of the people to whom I last referred want to assert their rights and win their point of view; they do not want their efforts to be defeated; they want to prove to the people that their will is supreme.

Personally, I could not care less; it does not mean a thing to me. If, however, some people want the archway to remain where it is, there is no reason for it not to stay there. If there happens to be something around the place which I do not want, but which somebody else wants I can see little reason for the position being changed.

Various views are held in this House, and by people outside—and even by my colleague, the member for South Perth—as to why the archway should be retained. I daresay one must consider a few of the reasons advanced for wanting the archway retained.

In 1966 there were 6,811 votes cast for its retention, and 1,354 votes for its disposal. Is that a fair indication? I think it is, because after all people were employed to find out these facts. Recently in the *Daily News* there was a statement that 47 people were in favour of keeping

the arch where it is; that 41 wanted to pull it down; and eight people wanted to remove it to another site.

In considering the attitude of the Perth City Council, I daresay that, as a country member, I generally go along with what my shire council has to say. For example, if the Government wanted to go through the main street in one of the towns in my electorate and bulldoze the town hall, and the shire council, after taking a vote on the issue, said to me, "Look Mr. Gayfer, we have voted 19 votes to 4 to retain that building where it is; we do not want the Government to pull it down." I would go along with that. In such circumstances would any one of us do otherwise as a member of Parliament and as the representative of the district?

The people concerned would put up a good reason for the retention of that town hall, and would go all the way to ask the representatives of the people to support what was really wanted by their district. That was, in fact, what happened in the case of the Barracks Arch. The Perth City Council voted 19 to 4 for its retention. What does it matter if the council wants it to be retained at its existing site? If it is the view of the Historical Society, which is an organised band of people, that it can do something to make the structure look right, what does it matter if we accede to its wish? The Minister for Works, in answer to a question this evening said that the bridge has been realigned; if it has, then what does it matter now. In my view what has been shown in this debate is the desire of some people to have the arch pulled down by hook or by crook, through any pretence.

The member for Belmont said we would only be placating the wishes of a few people by retaining the arch where it is. What does it matter if it is retained there? It would seem to me that if the arch is retained on its existing site after a while nobody will worry about it or will continue to see it as an imposition on the skyline of Perth. It has been said that a policeman working in St. George's Terrace has got used to the sight of the arch. As one who drives by the arch every day I do not seem to notice it, and if some people want it to be retained I say let it be kept there. What does it matter?

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [9.2 p.m.]: I would not like a vote to be taken on this motion without making my position clear. I have no reason to change my mind on the views I held when the matter was before the House on a previous occasion. I am very anxious to have my views recorded, because I have a disproportionate number—not many I know—of people in my electorate who feel fanatical about the archway.

I want to add in the same breath for their benefit that by some strange coincidence they seem to be the same group of people who always lead the same type of movements in my area—not that I deny them the right to do this. I concede it is their right and privilege. The member for Belmont has suggested that these people would vote for me anyhow, but nine out of 10 of those on this list would not vote for me under any circumstances, because they regard me as a heretic in matters of this kind. I want to make it clear that I cannot see any good reason to retain the arch in its present form or in any modified form.

I would support the motion were it not for the fact—I do propose to give some reasons why the motion should be amended, and the mover might agree—that by the motion the arch would be re-sited at the foot of Barrack Street; or else. I can see this location could be far too restrictive, and I would like it to be left for some definition by the Government, in consultation with the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, and the National Trust. I am not suggesting the Government should be bound to any site, but it should be obligated to confer with these groups about the alternative location for the siting for the arch.

I do not want to labour this point, but there are some aspects we should bear in mind. I think the people, outside this Chamber, who so vigorously advocate the retention of the arch, overstate their case when they try to relate it to some of the great buildings abroad. Those who have seen the great buildings abroad find the arch to be something quite farcical. Still, if some people want to liken the arch to the Arc de Triomphe, or some structure like that, and so let their imagination run riot, then good luck to them. I do not deny them the right to express their views in the strongest terms possible, nor should they deny me my right to do the same.

I believe that one day, even if we do not decide to do something about the arch now, some member or some group of members in this House will decide that it is time Parliament House be given some consideration, and that it be put in the perspective as proposed by the original selectors of this site. This aspect seems to be completely lost sight of. Some of those who are so vocal and so offensive in some of the remarks which are directed at some of us seem to feel that in urging for the retention of the arch they are striking a blow at Parliament and parliamentarians. I am not referring to members of Parliament, but to people outside of Parliament. In point of fact, they are the very people who would be the first to call on Parliament to protect their right to protest, and so they should. At the same time, I think they should be more tolerant in their views and should acknowledge that

Parliament has an important place in our community, no matter how little they might think of members of Parliament.

Mr. May: Some people do not think much of members of Parliament.

Mr. COURT: Even if they think so of members of Parliament, I should point out that the institution is an entirely different matter. It was intended by some very far-sighted people that Parliament House should be the focal point at the end of St. George's Terrace. Admittedly that was in the days when ceremonial occasions were more frequent and more the order of the day. It was a magnificent concept that this site should be the focal point at the end of St. George's Terrace, a site with a gentle slope that is characteristic of the Terrace.

I want to refer to some of those people from overseas who have expressed their views in this controversy. Some of those from overseas who have received a great deal of publicity might be experts in their particular fields, but they do not have to live with this thing. We in this State have to do so. I probably meet more people from overseas than most members in this Chamber, because it is part of my job, seven days of the week, to meet a lot of these people and take them to see as much of our city in the time I can afford. It is very rarely that I meet anyone who supports the idea of the retention of the arch on its present site. These are people who have seen all the magnificent and historical structures throughout the world, and in many cases they have a love of things historic.

Very seldom do I hear any of these people express a desire to retain the arch. Some of the things they say are quite rude, though not quite as rude as the inference of the member for Fremantle! They just think this is a temporary structure, waiting for someone to push it over. I say this in all sincerity.

If we are to quote one or two people who happen to be headline hunters, because of their particular professions, their interests, the things they say, or the way in which they say them, then we are equally entitled to bring forward the other people—who I find are much greater in number—who regard the arch as something of a joke. I do not say that in a derogatory way against those who genuinely feel strongly in favour of the retention of the arch.

I want to make one final comment before I move an amendment; that is, in my analysis the majority of people who have come in contact with me about the arch form a certain type. They seem to think it is the right thing and the done thing to join in this sort of chorus. I have a great respect for the genuine proponents of retention. They have expressed their views, and in the main they did so in fairly temperate terms. I give their views the highest respect, because they are entitled

to hold their views just as I am entitled to hold mine. However, some of the other people are like a few of those who attend a classical symphony concert, because they think it is the right thing to do, but they are not quite sure whether it is Beethoven, Bach, or the Beatles. They seem to think it is fashionable to say things that sound right in the cultural sense.

I will move an amendment to enable people to be consulted about alternative sites. Had I been in the Chamber at the time I would have supported the member for Belmont by asking for an extension of his amendment, because I feel that consulting the Historical Society is not of itself sufficient.

I would like to see people beyond the society being consulted in this matter, to give the Government of the day, as regards the location and method by which the arch would be removed from one place and installed in another, an opportunity to ensure that it is installed in a place where it will have some permanence and not be in the way of a road, building, or change of plan—where for all time it could rest in a nice and proper setting.

I think the most appropriate people to consult in a matter of this kind would be the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, on the one hand, because of its knowledge of the changes of road structures and the like, and of any other changes that are likely to take place in the next 30, 40, or 50 years, and the National Trust, on the other, as it would have feeling and understanding of the type of thing that should and could be preserved, and it would see that the arch was located where it could properly be preserved.

I would not like to express a view as to whether it should be shifted to King's Park or any other place that has been mentioned. This is a decision which must be made after careful study, and the site should be a permanent one. It should be a location which is readily accessible. I do not know whether members have bothered to work out how people of the future will be able to get into this present place, if they wish to have a look at it. If members look at the traffic pattern that will develop at the present site, it will not be easy for people to have a close look at the arch. We do not want it to be something to be looked at from the distance—something at the end of St. George's Terrace—but something with which people can get to close quarters, if it has any historical value for them and they would like to enter so as to get something of the feel of it.

Mr. DAVIES: Has any estimated cost of shifting it been worked out?

Mr. COURT: I have heard various figures, but I would not hazard a guess. The arch will have to be moved properly, with great care, and great skill; but we

have people who could do this. I would like the arch, if it is shifted, to be located where it could stay permanently and be readily accessible to the people who might want to see it.

I can see why some people are attracted to King's Park, because it is a place that will never be interfered with by road systems or development. I am not dogmatic about the matter and would be prepared to leave it to the Government to confer with the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority on the one hand, because of its particular role in the matter, and the National Trust on the other, because its interests would be quite different from the basic interests of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. I think the combination of the two would give an excellent balance before a final decision was made.

Amendment to Motion

I move an amendment—

Add to the motion the following words:—

or at some other place decided on by the Government after discussion with the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the National Trust of Australia (W.A.).

MR. TOMS (Ascot) [9.14 p.m.]: I am afraid I have to oppose the amendment and, of course, in doing so I will possibly be opposing the whole of the motion.

When this motion was first placed on the notice paper, I looked at it with suspicion because it is my firm opinion it is almost a subtle move to finally destroy the arch.

Before I became a member of this Chamber I was in the building trade and I have noted the state of the bricks in this structure. Whilst I have been told there are other bricks set aside somewhere else which could be used to replace damaged bricks taken from the existing building if it is removed, I am opposed to the removal of the arch to another site at the present time.

I believe that young people will eventually be aware of the historical nature of this structure and that time alone will lead to its destruction. I am only prepared to allow the rigours of the elements to destroy this arch. I feel the attempt to have this structure moved is nothing more than an attempt to destroy it, because no matter how carefully the existing building is removed to another site, it will lose the historical value it has in its present position.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.17 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment. I have always had very distinct views about the value of the building that remains at the top of St. George's Terrace. I find I am not alone in

my views, because I have made a point of talking to many people from different walks of life in various parts of the State. I would hazard a guess that if a referendum were taken there would be a strong move to have the archway taken down altogether, as many people see no value at all in allowing it to remain. They are not even interested in seeing that it is preserved in any other place.

However, in the circumstances, I would be prepared to support the amendment, because I believe this structure as it is now is of no value whatsoever to our city. If we consider the future of our city and argue on the basis that this building should remain, no doubt we could argue that many other buildings should be left in their present position. Even many of the old buildings that have been demolished over the last few years should have remained. Take the old T. & G. building on the corner of St. George's Terrace and Barrack Street.

Mr. Davies: Isn't there a difference here in regard to privately-owned and Government buildings? People think they can push the Government around. Mind you, I agree with you.

Mr. NALDER: If the building I have just mentioned had any historical value I think the private owners should have been made to retain it. It was well built and had a distinctiveness of its own; and it held pride of place on the corner of one of our main thoroughfares. Many people made claims that the building should remain but, in the interests of development and progress, it had to go.

Mr. Jamieson: People would see in the arch something they could not see in that other building—the likes of Oldham. They didn't think it was worth a bumper.

Mr. NALDER: I am only making the point that if we carried out the views of a few people—and I respect their views—there would be many buildings in the city and other parts of the State we would have to retain.

There has been talk about changing the site of our railway buildings. We have not heard any scream to the effect that these buildings are very important and should be preserved where they are. How many people have moved in and out of the railway station? How many people regard these as an important part of the State's progress? How many people have taken the time to travel up and down between Fremantle and Midland to recall many pleasant memories of important events which have taken place? Why should we not preserve these buildings?

Mr. Bickerton: Don't put any thoughts in their heads!

Mr. NALDER: I am only suggesting that if we take this matter to its logical conclusion, we should be preserving many other buildings.

I believe that we should be looking ahead and moving with the times. We have extended this fair city so much that many comments are made by visitors who return after an absence of 20 to 30 years. I met a couple from South Australia only this week and they were amazed at the progress which had taken place in the five to 10 years since they were here last.

As I have said, if we take this matter to its logical conclusion and preserve all buildings, we will not progress. The city will not grow in stature as have other cities of the Commonwealth and other parts of the world. I remember only recently looking at a picture of the centre of the city. It showed some trees and horses and carts and a few very small buildings with corrugated iron. It is a wonder that some of those have not been kept to remind us of the progress which has taken place over the years!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must draw the attention of the Deputy Premier to the fact that we are debating the amendment which concerns only the sitting. I must perpetuate the ruling the Speaker himself gave earlier. Members must confine their remarks solely to the amendment. I must insist on this.

Mr. NALDER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will abide by your ruling—

Mr. Tonkin: You have no option!

Mr. NALDER: —and confine my remarks to the value of—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Another site.

Mr. NALDER: —shifting the archway to another site. The Minister for Industrial Development has suggested that different organisations which could be accepted as responsible bodies should advise on the best site for this building. I agree it would be far preferable to shift the building than to allow it to remain where it is.

Members may have read the two-page supplement in the *Sunday Times* about a fortnight ago. It contained a record of the happenings in this State. I am mentioning this to indicate that it is a good idea. A record could be made in some convenient place such as the Museum or the Library. Details of the Barracks Archway could be recorded, including the reasons for its being erected, its dimensions, the cost, and the like. If it is decided to remove the arch, this information could be taken to the new site. Whether the building on re-erection should be altered in regard to height and dimensions is a matter which could be left to those who will consider to where it should be shifted.

On that basis I support the amendment and trust the House will agree to it.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [9.25 p.m.]: I intend to vote against the amendment for the reasons I shall indicate. Now that the matter is being discussed free of emotion,

we can talk about it in a normal way and put forward our views without the tremendous concern with which the subject was debated on the last occasion.

We are now discussing an amendment concerning the site, and I cannot agree that we should shift the building to another site. The decision we could well make is whether or not the building should be preserved at all. A poll was held on the last occasion which indicated that 4.9 per cent. wanted the building shifted to another site. I might declare that 50 per cent. of my very close friends would be in favour of pulling the building down, and 50 per cent. would be in favour of retaining it; but, to my mind, to shift this building to another site, which would incur a tremendous cost—I think the estimate on the previous occasion was something like \$60,000—

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must again draw the attention of the honourable member to the fact that the amendment we are discussing is the transfer of the building to another site. This is the only point which can be discussed.

MR. RUSHTON: The amendment suggests we should refer the matter to the National Trust to ascertain where this building should be resited. My opinion is that the National Trust wants the building left where it is, and I would not like the Government to be in the position of having to decide on another occasion where this building should be sited.

MR. GRAHAM: Who would be more appropriate?

MR. RUSHTON: I believe that the House, having become involved in this issue, should make the decision—the decision should be made tonight—as to where the building should be sited. I do not think we should refer the matter to the National Trust. Having made its decision, Parliament—

MR. GRAHAM: We are only expressing an opinion.

MR. RUSHTON: Everything is an opinion.

MR. GRAHAM: This is only an opinion. It is not a direction or a decision.

MR. RUSHTON: We have expressed opinions in the past. Once again, however, I cannot elaborate on that point, because of the way you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have ruled. I can only say that because of the cost factor and because I feel we should make the decision, we should not leave the matter in the air. We should not hold up this House night after night, and it could be month after month. If we adopt the amendment, we could discuss this issue year after year.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [9.29 p.m.]: As I am to be very limited in my remarks, I simply want to say that

naturally if the archway is to be moved, then I am in favour of its being moved to some appropriate site. As has already been asked by way of interjection, what better equipped bodies are there to decide the site than the trust itself and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority? Because I do not altogether favour being bound by a motion to remove the Barracks to the bottom of Barrack Street, I very much support the alternative which has been provided by the amendment of the Minister for Industrial Development. No doubt we will have an opportunity to say something further before the final decision is made.

I certainly favour the opportunity which is provided in this amendment for an option, as it were, in the event of a decision being made that the arch be moved from its present site.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [9.31 p.m.]: The Minister for Industrial Development and the Premier must think the members of this House are very naive, and that they will fall for this amendment. The decision on the alternative site is to be made by the Government. The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is a creature of the Government, and is under its direction, and the National Trust of Australia will be in the minority. We have already had one example of the M.R.P.A. when the Government wanted something done. It contrived a plan to give power for the compulsory resumption of land at Kwinana. So I am not prepared to allow this question to be determined by that authority.

If the Government wants to decide this issue, why does it not come straight out with an amendment so that it will take the responsibility? The members of this House would then know what they were voting on. That would be the honest and frank way to deal with this situation, and members would be obliged to face up to the question. Are members prepared to allow the Government to determine this question away from Parliament; or do members want it determined in Parliament?

The purpose behind the amendment moved by the Minister for Industrial Development is to put the Government in a position to determine this, and to claim that it has been determined by Parliament. Let us know what we are voting for.

MR. COURT: That is not right at all.

MR. TONKIN: Yes it is. I repeat that the M.R.P.A. is a creature of the Government, and will act under the direction of the Government.

MR. COURT: It will not; you are reflecting on a very large body of responsible people.

Mr. TONKIN: I am stating a fact. The authority can be as large as it likes, but we have the established fact already that the M.R.P.A. contrived a plan to enable the Government to get compulsory powers to resume land. What it has done once, it will do again.

Mr. Court: That is not correct.

Mr. TONKIN: It is correct.

Mr. Jamieson: Perhaps it could resume some land on which to put the arch.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think we will stick to the subject of the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: I will have no objection to Parliament deciding, if it is so minded, that the Government should make the decision. However, I do object to this subterfuge of putting up a proposition to confuse members and to encourage them into the situation where they believe the decision will be made by the National Trust, the M.R.P.A., and the Government. Now I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what hope would there be of the National Trust having any notice taken of its views? The member for Dale has already said—and it is true—that the National Trust has decided it wants the arch to stay where it is.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But if Parliament determines otherwise then the Government will decide after discussion with these two bodies. The Leader of the Opposition should read the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: Let us put it straightforward and let us amend the amendment. If that is what the Minister for Works wants, let us amend the wording so that the arch will be shifted to some other position which the Government itself will determine.

Mr. Court: If the Leader of the Opposition read the amendment he would find that it is explicit on this point.

Mr. TONKIN: I have read the amendment, make no mistake about that. My only purpose in rising is to make members fully aware of what the situation now is. This is a roundabout way to get a decision which will put the Government in the position it has been striving for, for some months. I am not prepared to let it go that way. I want the decision as to what is to happen to the arch to be made by Parliament.

It was the Government which brought the matter here in the first place. The Government had an opportunity to decide this in consultation with any number of bodies if it so wished, but it chose to bring the question to Parliament. As the Government chose to bring the question to Parliament, it should be prepared to accept the decision of Parliament on the matter. Therefore, the question is whether this is to be the site; and surely every one of us knows that if the arch is to be moved at all, that will be the end of it.

This is the place to decide whether we are to move the arch or not, and that is what is involved in this motion, not where it is going. I repeat that this is a roundabout way to enable the Government to achieve what it has failed to achieve all along through its own weakness. The Government chose to bring the matter to Parliament, so let it abide by the decision of Parliament.

Mr. Court: You are reflecting on the member for Belmont.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) (9.37 p.m.): I am not unsympathetic to the amendment. I say that with regret, as a consequence of the stand taken by the Leader of the Opposition. If the Premier has courage enough to stick to a decision that he made—or a stand he made—previously, then I have enough intestinal fortitude to take a stand at variance with my leader.

I regret taking that stand, but let me say this to members that the Premier could have left me very lonely in this respect. He could have said that he would accept the decision which was made two years ago, and have left me like a shag on a rock in regard to my motion. He has not done so.

Mr. Jamieson: Like a pigeon on the arch!

Mr. FLETCHER: Let me say quite frankly that I commend the Premier for his stand. Let me also say that I feel it is refreshing to be in harmony with the Minister for Industrial Development.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Graham: I think "refreshing" is the wrong word.

Mr. Jamieson: His bed-fellows are getting him worried.

Mr. Court: I do not like to tell the member for Fremantle, but most of the things like this I support receive the kiss of death.

Mr. FLETCHER: However, I find it refreshing for this reason—if only for this reason—that so often we are at variance. I, too, would be inconsistent if I did not support the amendment; I could not do otherwise. I will read one paragraph of my speech which appears on page 720 of this year's *Hansard*, and I will ask members to listen particularly to the final words. The paragraph reads as follows:—

The Stephenson-Hepburn Plan provided for the removal of the arch, and Parliament accepted that plan. Under pressure the Premier deferred the demolition of the arch, so that the position could be looked at again when that portion of the Mitchell Freeway was completed.

The member for South Perth referred to that tonight. To continue—

Surely we can see for ourselves that the arch could be more appropriately

placed in the area suggested in my motion; or, alternatively if the members do not like my suggestion, they can propose some other place.

Mr. Tonkin: So long as it is not Fremantle.

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, I am glad the Leader of the Opposition has introduced an air of levity; I prefer it that way. I want the House to know I said that; my leader has taken an honest attitude and I am not going to take an opposite attitude to something I said previously. I think the House will agree it is not inconsistent with my original motion and comment.

I would like to say more on the motion but you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would probably call me to order if I were to speak in support of it. Like others, I am limited to the amendment. I very much regret I do not at present have the right of reply to earlier debate. I have listened attentively to what has been said and I have collected every scrap of material which has appeared in the Press. It is 50-50 in the way it is expressed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr. O'Connor: It is 48-52.

Mr. Court: You have the right to reply.

Mr. FLETCHER: If those people who were previously interested in the issue were still interested in both the motion and the amendment to the motion, then the gallery would be packed tonight as it was previously. Before making a decision on this subject, I ask the House to observe the diminution in interest which exists now in comparison with that which existed previously. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

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

Ayes—15

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Graham	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Harman	Mr. Young
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller)

Noes—32

Mr. Bateman	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Bertram	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Gaylor	Mr. Rldge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rushton
Dr. Henn	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jones	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Kitney	Mr. Toms
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. I. W. Manning	Mr. Davies

(Teller)

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.47 p.m.]: Because I took a definite stand on this question when it was first mooted, I desire to speak this evening in order to ~~make~~ it perfectly clear that there is no difference whatsoever in my outlook, but rather am I confirmed in it. I am in no way deterred because of the vote which has just been taken.

There are some who apparently feel that because some two years ago those who were members of Parliament at the time voted in a certain way, there is something sacrosanct about that position and it should not be changed or varied. Mr. Speaker, you know perfectly well that every day of the week we amend and repeal legislation. We would become reactionary in the extreme if we were not able to have another look at any question.

We are certainly able to look at a heap of masonry which is dignified by the style and title of the Barracks Archway. What I see is offensive to me.

Over the last two years I have taken my own polls and carried out my own tests and in no case has there been a lesser proportion than 70 per cent. in favour of the demolition of the arch and, in quite a number of cases, the proportion has reached in excess of 95 per cent.

Mr. Nalder: That is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM: Apart from a certain pressure group, I say, too, that there have not been more than half a dozen people—and I very much doubt whether it is half a dozen—who have approached me seeking support for the retention of the arch.

I think I can say, regardless of what it might be termed by my parliamentary colleagues, that I probably move about the people, generally, at least as much as, if not more than, practically any other member of the Parliament. I do not know from where this pressure or influence comes. There are one or two organisations which pay for postage stamps and the cost of telegrams; but, outside them, I am afraid I am unable to find the people who are in favour of the retention of the arch.

From the inception, I have supported its demolition, because it is not something that was built in the days gone by—it is a remnant of something that was there and of something that was in the way. It is a remnant of a building which was treated with contempt and which was used for advertising purposes—a building which was condemned by the public servants who were called upon to work in it.

It is only in recent years that it has been surrounded with an aura of historical significance which it never possessed. So it is now seriously proposed that some tens of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money should be expended on

that miserable relic which stands on its present site to turn it into something—as the member for Belmont has pointed out—it never was.

The western side of that structure will assume an entirely different form from whatever it was in the past, and therefore it will not remain as something that represents a building of the 19th century, but something which was constructed in the year 1969 or 1970, or whenever the Government of the day feels disposed to waste money on it.

Because of a decision of the majority of members—and after all is said and done majorities do not prove anything, rightly or wrongly; only that there are more people on one side than the other—it appears a building cannot be demolished as was hoped and, indeed, as the overwhelming majority of members favoured two years ago. Because of circumstances other than those relating to the facts of the case, the vote went in a different direction, and as a result that old heap of bricks remains where it stands. I do not know that that decision does any credit to Parliament.

I am appreciative of the fact that it will cost more to demolish and rebuild the archway than to allow it to remain where it is, but if we are faced with that unfortunate circumstance I am prepared to accept that the State will have to make the sacrifice in order to remove the eyesore from its present situation. I am not using extravagant language when I say that. On its present site we have the miserable remains of something which was never bathed in any glory until a couple of years or so ago; something which is teetering on the brink of a precipice; something which is protruding into Malcolm Street; something which clutters up the footpath and which will be an obstruction to the people for all time; something which represents a definite traffic hazard.

We all know that the order of things, trafficwise, is that the corner of a street should be truncated to enable motorists to have a clear vision of the roadway, but the archway, if it remains in its present position, will serve to act in the opposite way. The bulk of the bricks on the eastern side will have to be replaced if we allow the archway to remain, and so it will inevitably become a structure of patches.

We are told the building has some historical significance. What is left of the original building represents a chapter of a bygone age. There are buildings of approximately the same age in the same thoroughfare—that is, St. George's Terrace—but they are situated on sites where they are not offensive; in places where they do not represent an obstruction to motorists or to pedestrians; in places where they do not constitute a danger or

a traffic hazard. I am referring to buildings such as the Cloisters, the Town Hall, the old Treasury building, and Government House. Of course, I can also refer to buildings of a different age and of a different style of architecture, such as those on the technical school site.

This State is very little more than a century old. Members will probably say, "Here it comes again," but it was my good fortune, just over two years ago, to visit other parts where there were relics thousands of years old. If this obsession which has overtaken some people in our community is to persist, by the time Western Australia is 500 years old the City of Perth will be nothing but a clutter of old buildings. Surely we should possess a proper sense of proportion and perspective in regard to this matter and have only an odd sample to show what existed many years, or many generations, ago.

I think I heard somebody whisper, "We will not be here" and a titter accompany the remark. Surely, as members of Parliament, we are expected to make responsible decisions and have some regard for the future of this State! For the life of me I cannot bring myself to support any move designed to make that heap of old bricks situated immediately in front of Parliament House, and at the western end of St. George's Terrace, a permanent fixture. I hope I have said sufficient this evening for members to appreciate that I am not in favour of the retention of the Barracks Arch.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We have got the message!

Mr. GRAHAM: In the course of my moving amongst people drawn from all walks of life, and in all kinds of circumstances, the greatest reaction I have had on the question of the Barracks Arch is one of acute embarrassment, because of the remarks that people have passed about that structure and, more importantly, because of the derogatory remarks they have passed about parliamentarians; namely, that we are responsible for allowing that structure to remain. So wherever I go I make no secret whatsoever of my position in regard to this question.

At this point I make it clear that I was absent from the House last Wednesday. That day happened to be the annual social of the Osborne Park Agricultural Society. There were about 200 people present when I visited the social, and among the guests were representatives of the principal organisations in the Balcatta district. When called upon to address the gathering I pointed out that I was absent from Parliament, but, to me that was not a serious matter, because although the question of the demolition of the Barracks Arch was being debated in the House no vote was being taken that night. I pointed out that

in the circumstances I was only missing remarks expressed by members which I could subsequently read in *Hansard*.

I stated, at that gathering, so as to leave no doubt in anybody's mind, that I was emphatically on the side of the demolition of the arch. It is no exaggeration to say that so far as I could see those 200 people, to a man—there may have been one or two exceptions—stood up, clapped their hands, and stamped their feet in support of my attitude. I make that statement because this has been my constant experience, and for the life of me I cannot understand those who are placed in a state of fear and trembling when a few communications from people representing outside bodies are received on this particular matter.

Mention had been made of Gallup polls that have been conducted on the question. I hope and trust no Government is ever moved by the result of a public opinion poll taken on any matter, and I hope and trust no decision of this House will be based on a privately-conducted public opinion poll. The only poll of which a Government or Parliament should take notice is one authorised by a Bill passed by Parliament, when a properly conducted vote of the people is taken. Therefore I do not take into account what the result of a poll conducted by Smith, or Jones, might have been.

There is nothing outrageous in the suggestion that the building in front of Parliament House should be removed. We know that Captain Cook's cottage reposes in the City of Melbourne, and I suppose the people give it more attention and more patronage on the site where it is now than it would receive had it remained in the United Kingdom. So surely those people who see some beauty in the Barracks Archway—although it brings no joy to me whatsoever—would be more than satisfied for it to be reconstructed in a place where there is some opportunity to beautify it and to clothe it with some aesthetic sense, instead of its remaining on its present site surrounded by traffic, but with a mighty dip on one side of it.

In considering the interests of the State, I have been somewhat appalled at the attitude of the National Trust of Australia and the Royal Historical Society towards this matter.

I think they are rendering themselves and the State a great disservice. Members may recall that since our last debate on this question, the structure known as Butler's Cottage in the area of the Shire of Perth was unceremoniously bulldozed.

I happened to be in attendance as a visitor at the meeting of the Shire of Perth when the decision was made, and I am as certain as I stand here that one of the factors which influenced the members of

the Shire of Perth, and made them determined in the stand they took, was the irresponsibility of the organisations seeking the retention of the Barracks Archway.

I must confess that the sympathy I had for these organisations has undergone a severe strain because of the unreasonableness of their attitude in regard to this matter. The Minister for Industrial Development has suggested, I think quite rightly, that there was a long-term concept, some farsightedness, in believing that the symbol of democracy, Parliament House—the institution of Parliament, even if that denies each one of us—should surmount the most important street in the heart of the City of Perth; in other words, the elevated western end of St. George's Terrace.

After all is said and done, we are surely the trustees for the time being. It is enough that we allowed more than three acres of this Class "A" reserve which houses Parliament House—it does not house you or me, Mr. Speaker, because we are here today and gone tomorrow; it houses Parliament House—to be shorn and taken away for all time without the additional blight of that heap of masonry which some members feel should remain there indefinitely.

I respect any person's point of view with regard to any matter, but I want something more than foggy, hazy, nostalgic statements in respect of a building which, I repeat, commanded no respect. I say that because I was a public servant some years ago and I mixed and associated with people who worked in that building. I saw on the building signs which read, "Invest in Victory Bonds," and others which read, "Go Slow, Speed Kills," and so on. There was no respect for the building at all; but suddenly, from out of the blue, it appears to have been graced with all the attributes of a monument of the age. It is not a matter of preserving some historic relic, it is a question of protecting a new edifice.

If it were the wish of the majority that there should be some edifice to remind them of a bygone period—and there are other buildings to so remind us—let it be placed somewhere else where it will not be offensive; where it will not appear like a sty in the eye and remain on the doorstep of Parliament House. If there was doubt earlier with regard to my viewpoint, perhaps I have managed to let all members of the Chamber know definitely and emphatically where I stand. I hope we will sum this matter up without any caprice, and without any party political byplay; I hope we will have some regard for what the decision we are about to make really means.

In my view, we are making a decision for all time; because if this thing is allowed to remain in its present position, I suppose every Government hereafter will be committed to retaining it in that

position. The only thing that might save the situation is what the member for Belmont suggested—that the matter could be solved by the rumble of traffic getting ever heavier in tonnage per vehicle and ever greater in horsepower; that with this traffic rumbling backwards and forwards at 50 miles per hour the desired effect may be achieved, and that instead of our having to make a decision, good fortune will be on our side and the building will, after all, be demolished without the thrust and parry of a debate such as we are experiencing tonight.

It is my hope and trust that this archway will disappear, and that the original concept of Parliament House will be brought to fruition; that Parliament House will dominate the scene; though not in the sense of dominating the people.

When the bugles are blown, and while it is fashionable to sling off at members of Parliament, at mothers-in-law, and so on. I am sure there is not a man in Australia who would not be prepared to give his life to defend democracy and what the democratic institution of Parliament stands for. It is a symbol which is dear to everybody, and I therefore suggest there is a responsibility upon all of us to see that the House of Parliament has a position worthy of its name and of its importance in the mind of every right-thinking citizen of the State.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [10.7 p.m.]: From a vote taken a few moments ago I get the impression that the majority of the members of this Chamber did not like the amendment moved by the Minister for Industrial Development, and I do not know whether I am being optimistic in assuming that they prefer the motion moved by the member for Fremantle—the one we are discussing at this point of time.

I have never been a great advocate of retaining the Barracks Archway where it is. Indeed, I do not know that I am particularly keen on its being erected anywhere else, mainly because of the cost that would be involved in such a venture. However, I would prefer to see the motion of the member for Fremantle carried, so that the Barracks Archway can be placed on a more appropriate site, rather than that it be where it is.

I consider it is completely out of character where it stands at the moment, and I think this will obtain even though it be renovated to the extent that those who wish it to remain would desire.

I agree with the member for Balcatta who said that on its present site it would be extremely difficult for any person interested in this type of building to take a great deal of interest in it, apart from viewing it from a motor car speeding past at 30 or 40 miles per hour.

If the desire of the people who wish the building to remain where it is were strong enough, surely the answer would be to site it where it could be of more use to those who wish to study this type of architecture. That would be preferable to leaving it where it is at the moment.

I do not deny the right of those who advocate its retention; that is their business, and I assume they are sincere. I have no sympathy, however, with those who are just expressing an opinion for the sake of running with the mob, as it were, or because they feel they would like to have a shot at Parliament. But I do not wish to argue the point in respect of those who sincerely and genuinely believe the arch should remain where it is.

If a plebiscite were taken throughout the State I believe there would be more people in favour of its removal than there would be for its retention. I do not want to appear too ignorant, but to me the Barracks Archway consists of two pillars which support an iron gate; I do not look upon it as an archway at all.

I can say that of the people with whom I have discussed this matter in order to obtain their views not one in 50 desired the arch to remain on its present site. I would have seen merit in the argument of those people who have put up such a great fight for the retention of the structure, had they been as enthusiastic when the entire building was standing. If they had put up the same fight for the retention of the Barracks, there would be a purpose in their argument now, although I cannot go along with them. The Barracks were a building with which something could be done; it could have been turned into some type of museum to exhibit the old ankle bands or handcuffs associated with that era, and perhaps a few hangman's ropes.

Mr. Jamieson: Perhaps to reconstruct the gallows there.

Mr. BICKERTON: It was a building which could have been used for this purpose: as some type of colonial museum. Once the entire wings were demolished, what remained was completely out of character with the original structure. I fancy the designer of the building would be horrified to think that some day his great achievement was to be demolished, and all that would be left for posterity to view was that part of the structure which enabled the horses, and I suppose the people as well, to get in and out.

I wonder where were the people, who are now interested in the area of land immediately in front of Parliament House, when a motion was debated in the House to construct a tunnel instead of an open cut. If a tunnel had been decided upon it would have resulted in beautiful parklands being established, and I imagine the National Trust and the Historical Society are interested in such development. But not

one voice was raised in any manner or form. Every one of those people was happy that a great chasm should be constructed in front of Parliament House for all to gaze at.

This motion must very soon come to a vote. If we are to be stuck with this structure for the rest of our lives then I appeal to members of the House, even at this late stage, to support the motion of the member for Fremantle, because it has some merit. It does not seek to destroy the structure, but merely to resite it, if that is possible.

Mr. Lewis: In Barrack Street.

Mr. BICKERTON: Yes, fortunately in Barrack Street. I agree with the previous speakers who have reservations about the difficulty of moving this structure whilst endeavouring to have it re-erected somewhat in its original form. I do not believe this is an impossible task, and greater things than that have been, and will be, done. I feel sure that the arch can be rebuilt on another site and still retain its originality; but I am quite convinced that it is completely out of character on its present site.

One always runs the risk, when speaking on the so-called Barracks Archway and mentioning demolition or removal, of being accused of being a person who tries to destroy old buildings and things old. That is not the case with me. I like old buildings, and in my electorate I have gone out of my way to exert whatever pressure I could for the retention and the restoration of old buildings in centres like Roebourne and Cossack. I think it is a matter of priority, and one must be sensible when one is dealing with matters of this nature. One must look at the overall benefits which may accrue.

It is true that Parliament House was sited on its present location as the culmination of St. George's Terrace. Had the Barracks been demolished completely, the view along St. George's Terrace would present what the early planners of this Parliament House site decided. As some speakers have pointed out, I wonder whether some of those who have protested about the removal of the arch did so for the sake of having a shot at Parliament. One wonders whether their views would be the same if the Supreme Court or some other institution was the culmination of St. George's Terrace. I would appeal to members to vote for the motion. I feel sure that if the Barracks Arch is to be removed the task could be carried out and the building could be re-erected elsewhere in its original form.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [10.17 p.m.]: Naturally I cannot allow this debate to close without again pressing the point of view which I have always taken in regard to the archway. The member

for Balcatta, forcibly or otherwise, has expressed his point of view, and the member for Pilbara has done likewise. I agree with everything they said. I believe the original decision to push for the removal of the archway, and indeed, of the Barracks building itself, arose from the fact that it was in the way of the original concept of Sir John Forrest and those who were associated with him in deciding that this area of land should be set aside for the erection of Parliament House and associated buildings.

Because of the changes in modern development and planning, and because of the motorcar, it was decided that a free-way should be built in the area between the Barracks and Parliament House; in fact, through the Barracks site. Might I say, criticised as I have been on this matter, the archway now stands where it is because of the action which I took. Cabinet had decided that the arch should be removed, but because of the representations that I had received I ultimately decided there might be something in the suggestion that had been put to me: that the archway itself could fit into the scene and could be the symbol claimed by some people, without interfering with the original and fine concept of looking up St. George's Terrace towards this Parliament House, whether or not in the future it will house a president or this democratic Parliament.

In fact, it was my intention that the Government should make the decision in respect of this matter. We backed the suggestion by spending thousands of dollars to underpin the archway so that it would not fall down and would be seen in its existing form. I am afraid that I was swayed, during the campaign to retain the arch, to say that the public would be given the opportunity to express its opinion, and this, of course, proved most difficult—the finding of a method by which this opinion could be obtained. However, this was finally worked out, and I had to forgo any right by the Government to make the decision. I have no fault to find with that part of the process. Ultimately through one means or another we were forced to a decision that the question should be brought before this Assembly.

I have been criticised for this; but I do not have to tell members how much we would have been criticised had we made the decision out of hand. At least there would have been just as much argument over the fact that we should have come to Parliament. I realise we have not yet made a parliamentary decision, because the Legislative Council did not take a vote. I might say, whilst I am on this point, that in concluding my speech, having seen how the vote was going to fall, I said we would, as a Government,

renovate, upgrade, and do whatever was necessary to make the archway look the way certain people said it would.

We will never be able to change its appearance other than to re-form the back. It will never be anything else but just a front door of an old building which we once had and which Parliaments of the past decided should not stay there. This was clearly stated when the plan was accepted for Parliament House Reserve to be set aside.

I am not breaking any promises—neither is the Government—because only a few weeks ago we said we were prepared to spend \$22,000, which was the estimated cost of improving, renovating, and repairing that old building. Therefore I want to assure members there was no manoeuvring as far as the member for Fremantle was concerned when he moved this motion, although I have heard that said. His motion was a complete surprise to me; but I believe that he, as a private member, was entitled to move his motion. It has been said I should have given a lead, but the decision has been made. I want to be as consistent with my approach as have been certain of the members here; and I hope they do not deny me that right. However, another decision is to be taken, and there is no doubt as to what will be the result—

Mr. Graham: More's the shame.

Mr. BRAND:—but I believe the stand we have taken will some day prove to be right.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: The campaign about the building was not because we are anti-ancient buildings and anti-preservation of all these good things of the past. We are equally in favour of preserving the Cloisters, Government House, and all other worth-while buildings, but this remnant is still in the way of a remarkable conception and one which I believe, when seen by tourists from overseas, will be admired. I agree with the member for Balcatta, as the majority of visitors to this State to whom I have spoken have queried the wisdom of leaving the arch there and have asked what it was and what it is.

Therefore I believe the best way to achieve our purpose of removing it is to offer to re-erect it at a site about which we are advised by competent people. The Leader of the Opposition hopped in waving his flag about our manoeuvring as a Government, because the Minister for Industrial Development moved a very obvious amendment. The Leader of the Opposition said this was a way of running around the issue. I would have accepted an amendment that the Government make the decision; but the fact remains we were prepared to be advised and, if necessary, influenced to do the right thing as to the siting of the archway.

As I look up at the gallery I well recall, when I made my last utterance as an appeal, there was a lady up there—and the gallery was crowded—and she was knitting. That is just how I felt—there was a guillotine above my neck. The same woman, of course, is still around.

Mr. Graham: The majority of those in the gallery at the moment are visitors from an A.L.P. branch.

Mr. Court: If it were the French Revolution, that woman would have been at the guillotine.

Mr. BRAND: I felt the great pressure of that moment, but have had no reason over the months to change my mind, because I believe a great opportunity has been lost.

Mr. Jamieson: You have still got your head.

Mr. BRAND: And I still have my seat. Perhaps it is well we can laugh and joke about these things. I want to assure the House and the public that our attitude has not changed. If we are presented with a *fait accompli*, we will do our utmost—let me repeat—to make the best of a bad job.

Mr. Brady: That is the spirit.

Mr. BRAND: If the rumblings, or some other influence, do not force people to recognise this is not such a permanent building, that it is not so strong, and that it does not resemble what they claim, I am sure some person down the period of time will move in this House to complete the vision of Sir John Forrest. The people who are pressing for the archway to be retained almost bow at the mention of Sir John Forrest's name, but his great conception for this city, they push aside.

Mr. Graham: They know best.

Mr. BRAND: Firstly, there was my error of judgment; and, secondly, there was the emotion that was stirred up which almost became an issue between the people and myself; and, once again, I want to emphasise that my colleagues were influenced by my decision to give the people a little time to think the matter over—and that is why the archway is there today.

If we shift this building it will cost, say, \$70,000. Maybe we could build a few houses, put a few more beds in a hospital, or do something useful with that money. Nevertheless, I stand firmly behind my belief that even if it costs \$70,000, we should remove this building and have for all time a wonderful view of the great conception of a far-sighted statesman of the past.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [10.29 p.m.]: Might I remind the House of the motion at present before us, which reads as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should use finance and existing material available, for

the purpose of more appropriately re-siting the Barracks Arch, entirely or in part, at the foot of Barrack Street after which, it is understood, the street is named.

I could be pessimistic and say that in view of the vote on the amendment there is no prospect of the motion being carried. Members opposite and those on this side of the House will recognise that I do not give in easily and that I intend to enjoy the right and privilege of replying to the debate.

The Premier has outlined and confirmed what I said earlier. He was consistent in his attitude and I commend him for it. He could have left me, through political expediency, more lonely than I am tonight.

Mr. Bickerton: More lonely than the Barracks Archway!

Mr. FLETCHER: However, I thank supporters from both sides of the House. I consider my motion to be in the best interests not only of the people of the City of Perth, but also of those throughout the rest of Western Australia.

In the light of the Premier's comment that he had no idea I intended to move this motion, I would like to remind members of its origin. I referred my motion to the State Parliamentary Labor Party because I was absent when the previous vote was taken. As I have already reminded the House, I was in Canada when the decision was made. My party had no objection to my raising the matter. I assure the House I had no ulterior motive. It is consistent with my comments in 1966 when I said that either Parliament House is the culmination of St. George's Terrace or that building opposite is—or what is left of it. I also said that had I been present at the time, I would have supported the Premier's motion.

Two years and 17 new members later, I feel the same way, and as a consequence I am enjoying the right of reply. I am not being vindictive in deliberately keeping members here longer than is necessary to hear me fight for a lost cause; but I would like to comment briefly, firstly, on the speech of the member for Wellington who suggested we spend money on the present site.

He said I was wanting to destroy history and that the building could be beautified with flowers, shrubs, and gardens, etc. To me this is a ridiculous suggestion, particularly when we consider the pocket-handkerchief area left. Anyone could see that this would be impossible, despite the attempt by an erstwhile city planner to prove otherwise. He appeared on TV and showed a salubrious area amongst flowers, shrubs, and so on. We all received a communication today with the compliments of Mrs. Oldham, a lady for whom I have a high regard for her dedication of purpose.

However, the drawing she submitted could easily be associated with what we saw on TV. It showed people wandering among flowers and gardens. It would be practically suicidal to attempt to cross the asphalt to get to this imaginary—

Mr. Jamieson: They would be among the flowers, all right!

Mr. Williams: The daisies!

Mr. FLETCHER: They would have difficulty in finding six feet of earth in which to plant them!

The member for Narrogin quoted figures concerning a Gallup poll which was alleged to have been held. Like the member for Balcatta I always consider Gallup polls are suspect. If the figures which have been quoted by those on both sides of the House were a true indication of the feelings of people, then the gallery would have been packed tonight by those who voted at the Gallup poll. However, the gallery has been denuded and this is indicative of the attitude of the community on this issue. Had the same enthusiasm been displayed by negative voters, there would have been an overwhelming decision in favour of the demolition of this building.

One of the television stations requested phone calls from people on the matter. Very naturally the supporters of the retention of the arch rang up to indicate their view. How many times each individual rang up and repeated his call, I do not know. However let us take the wife of any member here: Even though she might advocate that the arch should be demolished, does anyone believe for a moment that she would go to the trouble of ringing up to say so? Naturally the dedicated few indulged in this campaign and rang, and rang, and rang again, and created a disturbing noise in favour of the retention of the arch.

Mr. W. A. Manning: They would not do anything like that!

Mr. FLETCHER: Let us see what the member for Mt. Hawthorn said. He made reference to the creation of the trust, but my motion is not at variance with his remarks. He asked that we give it a trial on its present site. To me it would be ridiculous to spend money on the existing site because we would be sending good money after bad. He also made reference to a monument to posterity. This sounded very nice, and it is still not inconsistent with my motion. The arch could be a monument at another site in a more harmonious locality.

Some people have said that the arch is a building with age and dignity, but I would point out to members that it is not usual to keep an object with age and dignity amongst an ultra-modern jungle of concrete and asphalt. Those who consider the arch is something beautiful, would find it to be still beautiful on an

alternative site. I have seen a flower growing in a muck heap, but I would rather see that flower growing in beautiful surroundings in a garden consistent with its beauty. If people can see beauty in the arch, let us transplant it in to beautiful surroundings.

I feel strongly about this, and I know others think strongly to the contrary; but I suggest they are well and truly in a minority or these galleries would be packed as they were previously. They are not packed, and I suggest there are a lot of political "fraidy cats" here. I am not crying sour grapes. I respect the view of members.

One member made reference to the traffic which causes vibration which could result in a deterioration in the mortar and in the structure itself. This is quite so. Furthermore—and some people might think I am drawing the long bow here—it could collapse as a consequence of earth tremors. I went to the trouble of doing a lot of research on this and rang up a volcanologist. In case some members do not know what a volcanologist is, it is a person interested in earth tremors and so on. He said that brick structures in excess of one floor—that is, of this type of brick—should be reinforced. He further said that this building was vulnerable from the point of view of possible earth vibrations associated with shock.

Therefore, even though this House might not remove the arch, there is still a prospect that it will be demolished by an act of God, even though it might not be the will of this House. Country members are aware of earth tremors which have occurred in the vicinity of York. A relative of mine at one time in the cafeteria of the S.G.I.O. building had been, like others, nauseated as a result of an earth tremor in the City of Perth. Despite the underpinning which has been done on the arch, it is still vulnerable. However, that is just a comment in passing.

Mr. Nalder: I hope it does not fall on the freeway and injure people.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is possible; as long as it does not fall when traffic is passing.

Mr. Graham: I can think of a few blokes I would not mind seeing under it.

Mr. FLETCHER: Without wishing to weary the House, I would like members to hear opinions other than my own. I will not read them all, I promise members, but I could do so in a fit of pique if I were made that way.

Mr. Bickerton: Just read out the ones voting against it.

Mr. FLETCHER: I have kept every letter to the Press and have marked them with a tick or a cross according to whether they are in favour or against the proposal. I can assure members that the opinions have been about 50-50.

If the Press was in favour of the retention of the present unsightly building, then it would favour that angle. However, the Press has been impartial. I have kept the various editorials and subleaders which have appeared on the subject. One editorial stated that since there is no conclusive evidence that public opinion has changed, this fact should weigh more with members than considerations of how the arch, in its present sorry state, looks from Parliament House.

On that one issue alone I am at variance, because there is a change of mind; otherwise the galleries would be full tonight. Kirwan Ward, who usually has a great influence on public opinion, has had a few bob each way. In one contribution he said that the arch should stay, and on another occasion he alluded to Parliament House as being an annexe to the arch. He is quite cynical, and in one contribution he referred to the Marble Arch in London which has been retained.

Some members, like myself, may have been fortunate enough to see the Marble Arch in London; and to draw a comparison between that arch and our arch is ridiculous. Two cars can drive, side by side, through the Marble Arch, but two pushbikes could not ride side by side through our arch, because they would finish up on the freeway. Even though I have a high regard for the humour of Kirwan Ward, he should not compare the two arches.

Mr. Bickerton: He was just being funny again.

Mr. Lewis: Did you put a cross on that one?

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, I put a cross on that one. I could count up those in favour and those against, but I do not intend to take the time to do so. I also have here the opinion of H. A. Fletcher. I might point out that this opinion is accompanied by a photo which looks like the member for Fremantle when he played in the under 18 football team. That 1959 photograph, in relation to my appearance now, will indicate to new members what parliamentary life can do to one, and shows the ravages of time.

Mr. Lewis: Did you put a cross on that one?

Mr. FLETCHER: However, the next opinion on my file states that a bomb should be put under the arch—not under the member for Fremantle. In spite of those opinions, I hope members will have another look at this motion.

I also have a telegram which I think is worth reading to the House. People might get the impression that I am telling only one side of the story, and I want this recorded. It reads as follows:—

Please disregard the present appearance of the Barracks Arch mutilated by the demolishers Stop Please remember the people's vote in 1966

Stop Please do not ignore the advice of world ranking planners who met in Perth recently Stop Please vote to keep the arch on its present site

Ernest Lee Steere President National Trust

I have a high regard for the opinion of that gentleman and for his contribution to the State. I also have a high regard for the contribution made by his predecessors, and for His Worship, the Mayor of Fremantle, who is at variance with my opinion. I suggest to the House that the opinions expressed represent a minority opinion, but I am not frightened of possible political consequences.

Only three or four people have taken exception to my view. I have been to football matches where I have been commended, and I was recently congratulated at the opening of the Stella Maris Seafarers' Club for seamen. The local parish priest, despite the fact that I am not one of his flock, patted me on the back and commended me for my stand.

Mr. Jamieson: You will never burn, that is for sure.

Mr. FLETCHER: Those actions show the diversity of opinion which exists, but the preponderance of comment has been not in criticism of my motion but in commendation of it. One discordant note which I received I would like to read. It is addressed to "Archway Fletcher."

Mr. Hall: The arch villain.

Mr. FLETCHER: The letter does not contain an address or a date, but starts as follows:—

You are a big shot now Fletcher—

Mr. Court: It sounds like one chap that writes to me.

Mr. FLETCHER: I would ask members to contain their hilarity until I have finished reading the letter. I will not read all of it but only excerpts. To continue—

—you forget telling me and several others you would do everything in your power for the public if they put you into Parliament. It is in those terms I canvassed hard for you. All you have done you have had trips at the public expense . . .

If the Arch is causing concern to Parliament House why the hell don't you get out and go back to your greasy job fitting. While in Parliament I cannot recall you saying or doing anything for the starving bloody pensioner paying \$6 a week for a room. You tell the Daily News how he or she live, don't forget to put your photo in the paper.

That is the celebrated photo to which I made reference. To continue the letter—

Give this to your Daily News to publish. They won't publish it for me . . .

Before taking this to the Daily News, will you please give it to your cobbler Dave Brand and ask him if he remembers a man by the name of—

So-and-so, and he gives his background.

Mr. Brand: I will get you to send me over a copy of the letter.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not mind reading disparaging remarks about myself but I will not read the comments about the Premier, nor will I comment on the remarks about the salaries increase. That is the sort of correspondence, and it is the only correspondence, I have received with the exception of the compliment from Mrs. Oldham wherein, in part, she says—

It is no wonder that some Parliamentarians, who for two years, have looked at the scarred and mutilated back-side of the Arch, have become almost pathological about it.

These are Mrs. Oldham's remarks. She said it; I did not. To continue—

Landscape architects are trained to see their work in imagination, long before it reaches completion. The designer of Versailles; the designers of the lovely historical Japanese gardens; the designers of Central Park in New York, never saw these masterpieces of landscape architecture when they had reached their mature beauty. But they saw them in their mind's eye, and knew how delightful they would eventually become.

Those comments sound very nice, but I cannot see any prospect of making—

Mr. Jamieson: A central park.

Mr. FLETCHER: —a comparison with this building in the way Mrs. Oldham envisages. There may have been some prospect of making it look something like that in more salubrious and harmonious surroundings.

It has been implied that the Government would carry the odium for the demolition of the arch. Had it been demolished I would have been pleased to share any alleged odium associated with the demolition.

Mr. Jamieson: You could go down there with a pickaxe.

Mr. FLETCHER: I initiated the motion and I make no apologies for doing so. I thank those who have already supported me.

Mr. Graham: The vote has not been taken yet.

Mr. FLETCHER: I should have said I thank those who will support me. The member for South Perth quoted from *Hansard* the Premier's statement to the effect that the arch would stay in its present position. That is quite all right. That is what the Premier did say; namely, that the arch would remain until people had

a chance to look at it in its present surroundings. The Premier honoured his obligation in that respect. Unfortunately, the arch is still there.

Mr. Graham: That is the greatest mistake he made.

Mr. FLETCHER: The member for Avon stated he could not care less. In fact, I do not know why he bothered to rise to his feet. He quoted figures for the retention of the arch, but holes have been blown through these by both the member for Balcatta and myself. The member for Avon also quoted the hypothetical case of country councillors wanting to bulldoze a town hall in his electorate.

Mr. Gayfer: You could not care less about that.

Mr. FLETCHER: That would be their business. The area with which I am concerned, and the area with which the motion is concerned is the metropolitan area. I hope other members are similarly concerned.

The freeway has already encroached onto the Parliament House reserve, and I regret that very much. We are already on an island with traffic passing by on either side of Parliament House. Perhaps it is inevitable, because commercial interests thrust cars onto the road and create problems for the community.

Mr. Grayden: Where would the \$70,000 come from?

Mr. Jamieson: It will cost a lot more to keep it there.

Mr. FLETCHER: The reply of the member for Belmont is my reply to the interjection made by the member for South Perth in regard to the prospect of finding \$70,000 to effect the removal. I have no doubt it could be found, and found easily. The Government has undertaken to make \$20,000 to \$30,000 available. In Press clippings from which I could read, Mrs. Oldham is also on record as saying that the National Trust could come to the party.

Mr. Grayden: Not for the removal of it.

Mr. FLETCHER: I have no doubt some other additional finance could be found. I draw members' attention to the Old Mill which has been beautified and is in beautiful surroundings.

Mr. Jamieson: There is more room.

Mr. FLETCHER: The mill has been beautified with other contemporary material which is consistent with its appearance. I will not mention the name of the firm which was responsible for providing the expenditure associated with restoring the mill. Perhaps I should mention its name and give a commercial in the House! The mill is indeed a very attractive tourist spot.

What is an expenditure of, perhaps, \$70,000, in relation to the resting of the arch in the harmonious surroundings I have suggested, where it would inevitably

become a focal point as a tourist attraction rather than a focus for detrimental comment from tourists and visitors, as it is at the moment?

I have been here, there, and everywhere since moving the motion. There has been plenty of time for opposition to snowball. I have not had any correspondence over and above that which I have already mentioned. I have no doubt other members are in the same position. The issue is as dead as a dodo. Certain people have tried to create a conflagration from the embers that existed from the past unpleasantness in association with it, but they have been unable to do so. They just do not have the following they had in the past.

Nevertheless, it appears a majority of members will again take cognisance of a minority opinion. Let me say this in conclusion: If those present see any political advantage in the way they vote, I would remind the House—I am not warning members, but reminding them—that two members who previously voted for the retention of the arch are now no longer with us. I ask members to think about that if they feel there is any political advantage in the stand they take.

On this side of the House I often take a party stand on political issues; but, to my mind, this is a problem on which a majority of members of all political parties should make a decision in the best interests of Perth and of Western Australia by having the arch removed from the present unsatisfactory site to a more satisfactory site; that is, to the locality which I have suggested.

Unfortunately, I am confined to that area at the foot of Barrack Street. I commend the motion to the House and ask for the support of the majority of members to join with me in voting for the removal of the arch to the site suggested.

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

Ayes—14

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Graham	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Young
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Noes—32

Mr. Bateman	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Bertram	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Motr
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rushton
Dr. Henn	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jones	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Kitney	Mr. Toms
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. I. W. Manning	Mr. Davies

(Teller)

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier)
[11.1 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn
until 2.30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.2 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 19th September, 1968

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

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Head-on Collisions

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

- (1) How many motor vehicle accidents
have been attributed to head-on
collisions in each of the last three
years?
- (2) Where did they occur?
- (3) What time of the day did they
happen?
- (4) Were white guide lines in use in
the centre of the road at the
actual place of the accident when
the accidents occurred?

The Hon. A. F. **GRIFFITH** replied:

- (1) to (4) This information is not
available as the accident statistical
form does not call for such detail
classification.

RAILWAYS

Losses on Passenger Services

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

What was the profit or loss for
the year 1967-68 on the following
railway passenger services:—

- (a) Fremantle—Bellevue;
- (b) East Perth—Armadale;
- (c) Perth—Kalgoorlie;
- (d) Westland Express;
- (e) Perth—Albany; and
- (f) Perth—Bunbury?

The Hon. A. F. **GRIFFITH** replied:

- (a) and (b) These figures for the
year ended the 30th June,
1968, are not yet available,
but the information will be
forwarded as soon as possible.

- (c) to (f) These particulars are
not normally extracted, and
cannot be provided without
lengthy and costly research.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Boundary with Northern Territory

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

- (1) When was the boundary between
the Northern Territory and West-
ern Australia surveyed southwards
from the north coast of Aus-
tralia?
- (2) By whom was this work carried
out?
- (3) How far southwards did the sur-
vey end, and how many pillars
were erected in the line?
- (4) Is it practicable to have the
boundary line clearly marked to
facilitate construction of fencing
on the actual boundary between
the Northern Territory and West-
ern Australia in the case of such
properties as Rosewood, Mistake
Creek, Gordon Downs, and Balgo
Hills Mission?
- (5) Have sufficient geodetic points
been fixed on either side of the
boundary between Western Aus-
tralia and the Northern Territory
to enable the line to be deter-
mined, and if so, would this fac-
ilitate the survey of the line on
the boundary of Balgo Hills Mis-
sion?
- (6) Does the Minister agree that it is
of great importance to have the
fencing lines on the exact bound-
ary if possible?
- (7) If the requisite surveys are prac-
ticable, when may they be carried
out?
- (8) Is the work the responsibility of
both the State and the Common-
wealth?

The Hon. A. F. **GRIFFITH** replied:

- (1) During the years 1935, 1936, and
1937.
- (2) Surveyors H. C. Barclay, S. J.
Stokes, H. Spigl, staff surveyors of
the Western Australian Depart-
ment of Lands and Surveys.
- (3) The survey extended 293 miles
and 70 chains south from Joseph
Bonaparte Gulf ending in the
vicinity of the Gardiner Range
(approximately 19 degrees 20
minutes). Marks were placed every
mile and at the terminal points
of the line. In all, 296 perman-
ent marks were left.
- (4) The practicability of the project
is at present being examined by
the Surveyor-General of Western
Australia in conjunction with the
Surveyor-General of the Northern
Territory.