

I agree with Mr. Heitman that the increase in borrowing powers could easily be taken up by increased costs and that the capital expenditure will be very slight.

If Mr. Baxter intends to move an amendment I will not go into Committee tonight. I ask him to put the amendment on the notice paper so that I may obtain a considered reply to it. The House will then be able to consider the position.

My understanding of the terms of the Loan Council may not be strictly right but my understanding is that the Loan Council controls the situation.

I again thank members for their attention to the Bill and the remarks they have made. I commend the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 14th September.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [9.28 p.m.]: Considerable concern has been expressed by members in this House because I re-introduced this Bill in the same form as it was introduced last year. Those claims are correct; I have done just that.

The reason for the re-introduction of the Bill is the terrific demand from the various parents and citizens' associations and similar organisations. Because of representations made to me I decided to resubmit the Bill for the consideration of this House.

It will be remembered that last year I accepted an amendment in good faith, and the Bill then went to another place where it was withdrawn. I cannot predict what will happen should the Bill pass this House again.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why was the Bill withdrawn?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Because it was unacceptable to the Government, I suppose.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is the Minister not a member of the Government?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes, I hope I am a member of the Government! The point is that the Bill previously introduced went to another place where it was withdrawn. For some reason or other it was not acceptable.

As I say, I accepted the amendment made in this House in good faith and I was not to know that after the Bill left this place the Government would change its mind on the matter.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you know what happens to a Minister who gets out of kilter with his Government?

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Hang him!

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He ought to resign.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: They are doing away with capital punishment.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Anyway, that is the position. I cannot add anything more. There is nothing to add. I have explained that I have brought the Bill in on account of pressure from various organisations.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We passed the Bill and we wanted those organisations to have the benefit of your actions, but your own Government stepped on it.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I am quite aware of what happened in this House, and I am aware of the fact that I agreed in all good faith.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What are you going to do with the amendments I have placed on the notice paper?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I will ask the House not to accept them. If the House accepts them, they will go to another place, and I do not know what will happen there. I hope the House does not accept the amendments but I have an idea it might.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Might what?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Accept the amendments.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: This has already been indicated.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: That is all I can say at this moment.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 11th October, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (38): ON NOTICE

1. ARMADALE HIGH SCHOOL

Prevocational Centre

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the provision of a prevocational centre for Armadale Senior High School been approved?
- (2) If so, when will this centre be built?
- (3) Will the department give every consideration to retaining the present structure contributed to by the students?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes.

2. TOWN PLANNING

Kalamunda Golf Club: Rezoning

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will he table the file dealing with the application by the Kalamunda Golf Club to have rezoned approximately 80 acres of land adjacent to the Kalamunda townsite?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Objections to the scheme are currently being considered.

3. WATER SUPPLIES

Walliston School: Grounds Reticulation

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has consideration been given to my request that water be supplied from Metropolitan Water Board mains to reticulate the Walliston school oval in a similar way that water is to be provided for the Kalamunda shire to maintain the Lesmurdie oval?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), what is the decision?
- (3) If "No" to (1), when will consideration be given and a decision made?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. JAMIESON) replied:

- (1) and (2) Discussions are at present in course between the Metropolitan Water Board and the Public Works Department for the provision of water to the Walliston school oval on similar lines to that for the Lesmurdie oval, and an early decision is anticipated.
- (3) Not applicable.

4. FORREST-NICHOLSON ROADS INTERSECTION

Redevelopment

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the redevelopment, including necessary safety measures, of the Forrest Road/Nicholson Road Forrestdale intersection been programmed for construction this year?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1)—
 - (a) when will this work commence;
 - (b) what is the present plan;
 - (c) how much is it estimated this development will cost?
- (3) If "No" to (1)—
 - (a) will this necessary safety measure be given a high priority;
 - (b) when is it expected this work will commence?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. JAMIESON) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) (a) Priority for construction of the channelisation at this intersection will depend on satisfactory financial arrangements being agreed to with the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire Council.
- (b) Until the negotiations referred to in (3) (a) are resolved no firm date can be given for commencement of the work.

5. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Loans and Interest Charges

Mr. REID, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Further to my unanswered question of 20th September would he when supplying the answers to the amount of money the Government has borrowed using local authority borrowing power in the years 1967-1972 also include the purposes for which these loans were raised?

Mr. MAY replied:

Information requested is as follows:—

	1967	1968	Year ending 30th June		1971	1972
	\$	\$	1969	1970	\$	\$
			\$	\$		
Water supply schemes	290,000	500,000	..
Sewerage schemes	36,250	268,000	197,000	939,000
Housing for Government Employees Housing Authority	20,000	379,100	530,100	390,000	292,000
Housing for Agriculture Protection Board	20,000	77,000	148,977	30,000
Airport facilities	257,000	78,000	40,000
Public buildings	150,000
Totals	87,500	749,350	1,315,077	1,307,000	1,231,000

6.

TRANSPORT*Fish from Albany*

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

- (1) Has an interdepartmental committee examined the problems of transport of fish from Albany?
 - (2) If so, who were the members of this committee?
 - (3) Has this committee reported to the Government?
 - (4) Has the Government adopted a firm policy in relation to the transport of fish from Albany to Perth?
 - (5) If so, would he give details of this policy, particularly as it relates to—
 - (a) the transport of—
 - (i) processed wet fish;
 - (ii) canning varieties;
 - (iii) canned fish;
 - (iv) lobster bait;
- and
- (b) fishermen transporting their own fish to Perth?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No, but a conference took place on 18th April, 1972, between representatives of the Transport Commission, the Department of Development and Decentralisation and the Department of Fisheries and Fauna. A further meeting, including a representative of the Railways Commission, took place on 26th April, 1972.
- (2) The meetings were attended by—

Mr. D. J. Dyson, on behalf of the Transport Commission.

Messrs. H. R. Brennand and C. J. Jordon on behalf of the Department of Development and Decentralisation.

Messrs. B. K. Bowen and H. B. Shugg on behalf of the Department of Fisheries and Fauna.

Mr. D. Bennewith, on behalf of the Railways Commission.
- (3) A report and recommendation was submitted to the Government on 26th July, 1972.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) (a) The policy provides that road transport of canning varieties of fish (other than a fisherman's own catch being transported in his own vehicle) from the Albany region should

not be allowed. This applies irrespective of the method of processing, if any or the purpose for which the fish is to be used.

(b) Answered by (a).

7.

EDUCATION*School Bus Services*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many school children in the age group of—
 - (a) five years plus;
 - (b) six years plus,
 were eligible to use the school bus transport system in—
 - (i) the metropolitan,
 - (ii) the non-metropolitan area,
 at any given time during the current school year?
- (2) How many school children in fact did use school bus transport in the same categories and at the same time as given in (1)?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) It is not possible to supply the information requested without a special survey of all schools and of the 703 school bus services to determine eligibility.

Departmental information is that a total of 22,792 children are using school bus services of whom 22,029 are on country bus services and 763 on special buses for handicapped children in the metropolitan area.

- (2) See (1) above.

8. **WOODSIDE-BURMAH OIL GROUP***Meeting with Members of Parliament*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Mines:

Are there any developments regarding his reported plan to arrange a meeting between the Woodside-Burmah Oil group and members of Parliament?

Mr. MAY replied:

Woodside-Burmah has requested deferment of the meeting pending current feasibility studies.

9.

BOATS*Launching Ramp, East Fremantle*

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) For how long has he been aware that there was a possibility that the boat launching ramp on the

Swan River at Putney Road, East Fremantle, was likely to be closed because of the limitations of the site?

- (2) Is he aware that such closure will, whilst improving the traffic flow on the road behind the ramp, create much inconvenience to boat owners who have in recent times had boat licenses substantially increased by the Government?
- (3) Is he further aware that members of the public who in the past have used the Putney Road ramp will be forced to use other boat launching ramps which are already overcrowded during the summer months, thus creating further inconvenience and prejudicing public safety on cluttered access roads?
- (4) Is he further aware that the East Fremantle Council has long been concerned that the launching ramp at the foot of Putney Road is not well sited as far as convenience and public safety is concerned?
- (5) Is he also aware that as a result of the reclamation work carried out further upstream at Preston Point sufficient area was set aside for constructing a new boat launching ramp with land backing to facilitate public safety and convenience in order that the Putney Road ramp could be closed without the consequential problems?
- (6) Why has the Government been so dilatory in proceeding with the long proposed plans to overcome these problems?
- (7) Will he, for all the reasons involved, take urgent action to finance and forthwith construct a modern boat launching ramp at Preston Point?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. JAMIESON) replied:

- (1) In a letter dated 20th September, 1972, the Town Clerk of the Town of East Fremantle advised that the council considered that the ramp should be closed.
- (2) and (3) If the ramp is closed I must agree a certain amount of inconvenience will be caused to boat owners who generally use this facility.
- (4) No.
- (5) Yes. The Government has provided the new site at Preston Point and has undertaken the necessary reclamation work.

(6) and (7) At the present time the Government does not acknowledge it has a responsibility for financing the construction of launching ramps.

This has been the accepted policy since 1969 when a new basis for distribution of Commonwealth petrol tax collections was adopted.

10. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Route: Surveys and Plans

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Have all surveys been completed on the routes for the 330kV Kwinana/Balga power line?
- (2) If both routes have not been surveyed when will this work be complete?
- (3) Will he table plans so far completed which indicate the exact location of the lines?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The survey work is programmed for completion 31st December, 1972.
- (3) Plans of section so far completed may be inspected and explained at the commission's office.

11. WATER SUPPLIES

Greenough Electorate

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Following the visit by the Director of Engineering to towns on the Midland line and the coastal areas around Leeman and Greenhead, could he outline proposals for the supply of water to centres in these regions?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. JAMIESON) replied:

Exploratory drilling to prove an underground supply source is planned to commence in December 1972. A commencement on a reticulated scheme will be dependent on the proving of an economical source, the availability of finance and other work priorities.

12. MINERAL SANDS

Eneabba: Allied Minerals Leases

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has Allied Minerals, holding leases in the region of Eneabba, put any

proposals to the Government for the development of the mineral sands in the area?

- (2) If so, what are the detailed plans and over what period?
- (3) Has the alignment of the coastal road been resolved as it has been affected by mineral sand leases?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No. The company has held preliminary discussions with the State and is proceeding with pilot plant work.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) The Main Roads Department has considered an alternative alignment and a decision should be reached shortly.

Although the member for Greenough is not present at the moment, I would point out that I ascertained what was meant by "shortly" and I am informed it should be within two weeks.

13. RAILWAYS

Mineral Sands: Cartage

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

- (1) Has a decision been made to revert to the haulage of all ilmenite and other mineral sands by rail from Capel area to Bunbury port for shipment?
- (2) What proposals are envisaged during this financial year to provide—
 - (a) loading facilities at the mine end;
 - (b) terminal facilities in the port area,
 for which the Government has provided \$196,000 in the Estimates, General Loan Fund?
- (3) Are the port terminal facilities to be provided in the new harbour area or at the present land backed berths?

- (4) What tonnages of—
 - (a) ilmenite;
 - (b) other mineral sands,
 have been hauled to Bunbury by—
 - (i) Government owned road vehicles;
 - (ii) privately owned road vehicles,
 during the years 1967-68 to 1971-72 inclusive?

- (5) What railway rolling stock is to be used for this freight; who will supply it, and at what cost?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) to (3) No decision has yet been taken in this matter.
- (4) To publicise the details requested would divulge the volume of the client's business and this is against Government policy.
- (5) Answered by (1).

14. *This question was postponed.*

15. RAILWAYS

Timber: Cartage

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

What tonnages of timber were railed from the following shire council areas—

- (a) Nannup;
- (b) Busselton;
- (c) Colle;
- (d) Manjimup;
- (e) Boyup Brook,

during the years 1969-70 to 1971-72 inclusive, and to what main destination were consignments made?

Mr. MAY replied:

The reply to the Member's question is very lengthy and I request permission to table it.

The answer was tabled (see paper No. 402).

16. STAMP DUTY ON RECEIPTS

Refunds

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What portion of the claims for refund of receipt tax of \$5.2 million are—
 - (a) claims from individuals;
 - (b) claims from companies, partnerships, etc.;
 - (c) claims of \$100,000 and above?
- (2) How many companies or individuals, etc., have nominated to give their receipt tax refund to the charities trust fund and what is the total of these gifts?

- (3) What portion of the gifts to the charities fund are to be found from the State's revenue this year and placed in the trust account?
- (4) Who are to administer the trust fund?
- (5) What are the criteria for making application and distribution of this charities fund?
- (6) Does the repayment of \$5 million in equal instalments over the next ten years mean the Government has committed unequivocally future Governments to find \$500,000 from revenue for this purpose for the next ten years?
- (7) Is interest on the outstanding debts to claimants over the ten year period to be paid and, if so, at what rate?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) This information is not available, as claims are not recorded in this way.
- (2) To date, nine approved repayments totalling \$290,078 are to be paid into the Charities Trust Fund when this is established.
- (3) \$29,000.
- (4) and (5) These matters are under consideration.
- (6) No. However, I should hope that future Governments would accept this obligation which, in my opinion, is a legal, as well as being a moral one.
- (7) No.

17. *This question was postponed.*

				(a)		
				\$		
Prime movers	UQD	799	17,260	
				901	17,260	
				924	16,922	
				962	18,372	
				972	18,372	
Trailers	UQW	253	5,400
					252	5,560
					257	5,740
					278	5,740
					279	5,740
Zircon						
Prime movers			12,120	
Semi-trailer			5,616	

18.

RAILWAYS

Mineral Sands; Cartage

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

- (1) Because of the Government's proposal to haul by rail mineral sands from Capel area to Bunbury, what number of—
 - (a) drivers;
 - (b) mechanics, fitters and assistants;
 - (c) others,
 will be displaced at the Bunbury W.A.G.R. road services depot?
- (2) What extra staff will be employed in the W.A.G.R. rail services division at Bunbury and what number in each classification?
- (3) What was—

- (a) the initial cost of each road services vehicle in the present mineral sands fleet;
- (b) the miles travelled by each vehicle;
- (c) the date upon which it entered this service;
- (d) the estimated remaining economical life?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) and (2) Examination of this proposal is not sufficiently advanced to enable provision of this information.
- (3) Ilmenite:

	(b)	(c)	(d)
	507,551	7/8/62	Nil
	494,316	6/2/64	
	488,140	10/6/64	
	503,604	22/3/65	
	532,515	2/4/65	
Not recorded		11/5/64	Approx. 1 year
		30/4/64	
		10/6/64	
		24/3/65	
		2/4/65	
	250,785	19/8/64	Approx. 5 years
	250,785	19/8/64	Approx. 5 years

19. ABATTOIRS

*Thomas Borthwick and Sons:
Expansion*

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) During the negotiations between Thomas Borthwick and Sons of Albany and the Government regarding their expansion programme—
 - (a) did the Government suggest or was the question raised of the company relocating its abattoirs;
 - (b) would the Government have made available additional incentives to assist them with a relocation;
 - (c) what were the reasons advanced as to why they could not use this opportunity to relocate?
- (2) Did the company have any previous opportunities or have any discussions with this or the previous Government as to relocation?
- (3) If so, when?
- (4) What were the reasons advanced at that time for not proceeding with relocation?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) (a) Yes, the company's attention was drawn to the Government's new inducements being applied to its deferred new works proposal.
 - (b) It is likely that a higher level of inducements would have been applicable to a new works.
 - (c) The company considered the cost of the new works to be too great; in addition to which, the previous Government's decision to expand the Midland abattoirs finally decided the issue.
- (2) The company put forward a relocation plan in July, 1969. Advice of its decision not to proceed was received in March, 1971.
- (3) Answered by (2) above.
- (4) A variety of factors, including the sharply escalated costs involved, and the world economic and market outlooks influenced the company to defer its plans until an assessment of the effects of the Midland decision was made and which resulted in the determination to confine activities to the present site on an upgraded and expanded basis.

20.

HEALTH

Infectious Hepatitis: Karratha

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many cases of infective hepatitis have been reported at Karratha over the past six months?
- (2) What measures have been taken to prevent further cases occurring?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

- (1) 21.
- (2) Comprehensive inspections have been carried out by the regional health surveyor in an effort to ensure the maintenance of good sanitation and hygiene in the area; and action has been taken to remedy deficiencies where these have been found. In addition, the attending doctors have used and are using gamma globulin as a prophylactic for close contacts.

21.

DESERT FARMS PROJECT

Wiluna: Abandonment

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he read in *The West Australian* of 5th October a report relating to the imminent closure of the desert farms melon and citrus fruit project at Wiluna?
- (2) Would he agree that the abandonment of this venture would be a grievous loss to the Wiluna district particularly in relation to the employment opportunities that it provides for the 120-odd natives who reside in the area and, especially, in the interests of decentralisation of which it is a perfect example?
- (3) As this operation is regarded as a pilot scheme, would it not be an exceptional opportunity research-wise at least to provide the necessary finance to enable the first crop of citrus fruit from the 7,000 trees already established to be harvested and marketed, to see if these oranges are publicly accepted, particularly as citrus fruit from this area matures earlier and would supplant to some extent imported varieties which at present hold the greater proportion of the market in this State?
- (4) Does he realise that the desert farm venture employs an average of 55 natives between November and the end of January and lesser numbers during the rest of the year with the aggregate wages amounting to \$41,256 up to the present time?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, but the Government has not officially been advised of this abandonment. The venture is currently being investigated by the Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs.
- (3) The project is not considered to be a pilot scheme. Further, no request has been made to my department on the lines suggested by the Member.
- (4) I am aware of its value in the employment of natives.

22. RESEARCH STATION

Wiluna

Mr. COYNE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it intended to phase out the agricultural research station in Wiluna?
- (2) If so, what are the reasons for this action and would the Department of Agriculture's offices and living quarters in the old Lakeway Hotel be also abandoned?
- (3) Is it a fact that the department has inquired about the purchase of building blocks in Meekatharra, and, if so, is it envisaged that it will re-establish in that town?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes. Basic information on irrigation in the Wiluna area has been acquired and further expenditure is not warranted in view of the poor chances of commercial expansion.
- (2) It is possible that the Department of Community Welfare will take over all facilities.
- (3) It is intended to re-establish an office at Meekatharra.

23. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Route: Armadale-Kelmscott

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Why is the Government and the Commission insisting on routing its 330kV power line between Ranford Road and Westfield Road, Armadale, and the South West Railway Kelmscott over developed properties, including the necessity of purchasing a \$19,800 house, which most probably will have to be demolished, when the route could be moved a few chains north along the Allen Road alignment with far less cumulative disadvantages to homes and properties and certainly a large saving in payouts to property owners in compensation?

- (2) Has the Parliamentary Commissioner sought alternatives to the present proposed route?
- (3) Does this mean the route is open to change if the Parliamentary Commissioner can prove residents are being unnecessarily disadvantaged?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) All aspects were fully explained at the meeting in my office on 26th May at which the Member for Dale was present, when the Shires of Armadale-Kelmscott and Gosnells presented their views.
- (2) The Parliamentary Commissioner has asked the Commission for the reasons for selection of the route, and for any reasonable alternatives.
- (3) The question is hypothetical and is therefore not admissible.

24. MACEDONIA STREET RESERVE, KWINANA

Vesting

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Has the Macedonia Street Reserve Kwinana been vested in the Kwinana Shire Council?
- (2) What is the acreage of this reserve?
- (3) If "No" to (1), is it still the intention to transfer the administration of this reserve to the council?
- (4) If "No" to (1) what is holding up the vesting of this reserve in the Kwinana Shire Council?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) About 4.25 ha (10.5 acres).
- (3) Yes.
- (4) The land to be reserved is, at this point in time, the subject of negotiation between the Department of Development and Decentralisation and the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. It is affected by the Integrated Steel Works Agreement Act of 1960.

25. WATER SUPPLIES

Country Areas

Mr. BROWN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Following the Commonwealth Government's determination to reject financial assistance for the extension of water supplies to the York-Greenhills and Corrigin-Bullaring areas will he advise the House the present and future situation for country water supplies?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. JAMIESON) replied:

The current works programme envisages completion of the 1963 comprehensive water supply scheme by December 1973.

The case for inclusion of additional areas within the scheme is under review.

26. POLICE FORCE

A.L.P. Moves for Inquiry: Interjections in Debate

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Speaker:

- (1) Has he studied the *Hansard* report of the debate on the motion moved by the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. O'Neil) on the subject of the police force and in particular the speech of the member for Floreat?
- (2) If so, does he consider some of the interjections about the member for Floreat from certain Government members offensive and unparliamentary?
- (3) Does he propose to allow this type of comment to be made unless it is specifically objected to at the time and withdrawal demanded?
- (4) Will he please instruct members that when a person has been naturalised and accepted Australian citizenship, his country is Australia and it is improper to infer that his country is now that of his former nationality particularly as some naturalised persons take strong exception to this and desire to be regarded as Australians?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) Yes, since my attention was drawn to a *Hansard* "pull".
- (2) Yes, they could be so classed and are not in keeping with the dignity of the House.
- (3) There was a continual run of interjections and it was necessary for order to be called on a number of occasions. Quite often reporters pick up remarks between the two front benches that are not heard by me. Action by me to uphold the dignity of the House will be taken whenever the occasion warrants it.
- (4) It is not for me to so advise Members; this should be within the knowledge of all.

27. NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Reduction in State Allocation

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Treasurer:

Will he please advise the composition of the item 24, "Assistance to Private Schools" in the education

estimates (page 57) and why the amount is estimated to be \$10,506 less than the \$264,506 spent last year?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Item 24 is made up as follows:—

	\$
Grants for equipment ..	92,000
Interest subsidies on loans for residential accommodation	150,000
Subsidies for swimming pools	6,000
Library books and materials for 4th and 5th year secondary students	6,000
	<hr/>
	\$254,000

Reduced expenditure is expected on interest subsidies for residential accommodation because amounts outstanding on existing loans will be reduced in 1972-73.

28. NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Per Capita Grants

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he advise the House the nature and extent of his Government's discussions with the Commonwealth Government about the Prime Minister's announcement on 11th May that per capita grants towards independent schools' running costs would be increased to the equivalent of 40% of the cost of educating a child in a Government school and of which the Commonwealth would pay half and the State the other half?
- (2) Will he also state how his Government plans to meet its share of this scheme and in particular—
 - (a) the use of existing payments to independent schools by the State Government as part of this scheme including identification of the items involved;
 - (b) the amounts included in the Budget currently before State Parliament which specifically refer to or are part of the scheme;
 - (c) the additional amount that will be needed to meet the estimated 1973-74 financial year's commitments for the scheme;
 - (d) the per capita amount involved and how this is calculated?
- (3) When does the scheme start?
- (4) What discussions have been held with independent schools and with what results?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Since the Commonwealth statement was made, discussions have continued between the Commonwealth and the States to clarify various aspects of the Commonwealth plan and to see how it could be co-ordinated with the various principles and practices which the States have followed in this field.

- (2) (a) and (b) The following existing payments are to be taken into account in determining the State contribution under the scheme:—

	\$
Per capita grants	1,445,000
Interest on loans for residential accommodation	150,000
Subsidies on swimming pools	6,000
School stocks	210,000
Grants for equipment	92,000
Library issues for matriculation studies	6,000
Subsidies, projectors, etc.	8,000
Free primary textbooks	99,000
Text book grants to secondary students	130,000
Boarding allowances	305,000
Bursaries	10,000
Transport of pupils and fare concessions	936,000
Total	\$1,952,000

(c) Not known.

(d) This information is not yet to hand.

- (3) 1st January, 1973.

- (4) Discussions relating to methods of allocation of assistance have been held with representatives of independent schools. These discussions have been of a general nature, and no conclusion has been reached.

29.

HOUSING

Building Blocks: Availability

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Of the 33,600 blocks announced by him as "fully serviced or almost fully serviced" will he advise how this figure is arrived at and whether it includes land already owned by private citizens who plan to build their own homes on such land they hold?

- (2) How many of the 33,600 blocks are actually on the market for prospective homebuilders and how many are held by private citizens for their own future needs?

- (3) Is it correct a canvass was made by various means to obtain information about block availability from local authorities, real estate agents and the like?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

- (1) My statement referred to the availability of residential lots for building purposes within the metropolitan region. This figure was arrived at through the use of zoning plans, subdivision plans, aerial photographs and departmental statistics. It includes land owned by private citizens who plan to build their own houses. I am sending the Leader of the Opposition a copy of my Press statement so that he may appreciate that the stockpile of residential lots is only one of five important factors in this situation.

- (2) It would be impossible to determine the answer to the first part of this question with any degree of accuracy, nor to the second part without ascertaining what is in the minds of individual lot owners.

- (3) Not for the purpose of establishing the number of residential lots. Surveys were made to ascertain the price range of lots and the state of development of local authority town planning schemes and of major projects by developers.

Mr. O'Connor: The actual figure could be closer to 20,000.

30.

KATANNING HOSPITAL

Extensions

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have the plans for the extensions to the Katanning hospital been completed?

- (2) Is it anticipated that the work will be done in stages?

- (3) When is it intended that tenders will be called?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

- (1) Preliminary plans completed and approved. Brief of requirements currently in course of preparation.

- (2) Yes.

- (3) A date cannot be given. When the brief is completed, architects will be commissioned and tenders will be called as soon as contract documents are completed.

31. SEWERAGE

Katanning

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has any decision been made as to the extension of deep sewerage at Katanning?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) what is the extent of the programme;
 - (b) when is it anticipated the work will begin;
 - (c) what is the anticipated cost;
 - (d) will the work be done by contract?

Mr. T. D. Evans (for Mr. JAMIESON) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Work during the current year will be confined to a minor sewerage extension to serve a State Housing Commission subdivision in the Adams Street area.
- (b) Work is planned to commence early 1973.
- (c) \$25,000.
- (d) No.

32. PUBLIC SERVICE

*Directors and Commissioners:
Advertisement of Positions*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) How long a period was given to applicants from the first advertisement for the positions of—
 - (a) Director-General of Transport;
 - (b) Director of Environmental Protection;
 - (c) Director of Consumer Protection;
 - (d) Parliamentary Commissioner?
- (2) Which of these positions were advertised overseas?
- (3) How widely spread and for what period of time are advertisements proposed to be placed for the head of the Fuel and Energy Commission?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) to (d)—Three weeks.
- (2) None.
- (3) The position of Commissioner for Fuel and Power has been advertised throughout Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America. The period of time from the first date of advertisement to the closing date for applications will be six weeks.

33. PUBLIC SERVICE

*Director-General of Education:
Advertisement of Position*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it his policy to receive applications for Director-General of Education from the widest possible circle of people in order to be able to select from a large number of the most experienced and qualified applicants the most important appointment of his department?
- (2) If so, was it considered that a total of—
 - (a) one advertisement in the *Commonwealth Gazette* giving only one week to apply;
 - (b) two advertisements in only one national newspaper with comparatively small circulation, giving less than two and one weeks respectively to apply;
 - (c) and two advertisements in *The West Australian* giving two and one weeks respectively to apply,
 serves adequately this purpose?

- (3) Will he dispel the doubt of many people interested in education that the lack of overseas advertisement, the narrow range of interstate advertisement and the short time for both interstate and local advertisements indicate that the Government is not keen to receive applications from sources other than the Western Australian public service?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) Applications for the position of Director-General of Education have been called by the Public Service Board in accordance with the Public Service Act.
- Under the normal procedure this position would have been advertised only within the State Public Service. Special action was taken to advertise it under section 24 of the Act making it available to persons outside the public service. If the Government had not been keen to receive applications from sources other than the W.A. public service such action need not have been taken. The time for the closing of applications is the standard applicable to positions under the Public Service Act. Having in mind that the impending vacancy is well known among top educationalists throughout Australia the time and the range of advertisement are considered adequate.

Applications have been invited throughout Australia. It was not considered appropriate to advertise overseas but any overseas application will receive consideration.

I am advised that on the last occasion this position was vacant, in 1966, it was not advertised outside of the *Government Gazette* and the *Education Circular* of Western Australia.

34. WEMBLEY SCHOOL

Sports Grounds

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Referring to the reply by the Minister for Works to my question 15 on 5th October, 1972—

- (1) Will he consider to have discussions with the Perth City Council, and give financial aid if necessary, in order to ensure that Rutter Park could be made usable for organised sports and playgrounds for the Wembley school during the period when the Selby Street reserve will be unavailable because of proposed widening of Selby Street?
- (2) Alternatively, will he ensure that a suitable ground be made available for the Wembley school for these purposes?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The Education Department has requested advice from the Perth City Council regarding the development of alternative playing areas at Rutter Park.
- (2) The Education Department is endeavouring to acquire additional land for the school site.

35. RAILWAY RESERVE

Lake Grace

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

- (1) For what purpose is the railway reserve on the Lake Grace-Newdegate line east of Beenong siding being cleared?
- (2) As all the timber is being removed what steps are being taken to prevent future wind and water erosion?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) The work is normal side-width maintenance to provide fire protection in addition to graded fire breaks, and also to provide greater sight distances for locomotive enginemen.

As far as possible only scrub is being removed. Trees which are of no danger to railway operations are not being removed.

- (2) Natural grass and weed growth will provide sufficient protection against soil erosion.

36.

STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Building Blocks and Land Acquisition

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) In which areas in the metropolitan region were the 525 serviced sites and 250 partially serviced sites purchased in the past 18 months?
- (2) Does the Commission intend to continue with this policy?
- (3) Will he indicate his Government's or the Commission's intention related to purchase and site use of the remainder of the M.R.P.A. (Kelmescott) Scheme No. 4?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) The 525 serviced sites and 250 partially serviced sites are located in the south-east quadrant of the metropolitan area.
- (2) Yes, in the interests of diversification and where the price is satisfactory to the commission.
- (3) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority Scheme No. 4 at Kelmescott was gazetted in May 1969. To date M.R.P.A. has developed 354 fully serviced home sites. Since 1971 owners of these developed sites have sold 287 of the 354 sites to the commission. At no time has the commission approached the owners of the sites.

37.

TOWN PLANNING

Kelmescott Scheme No. 4

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will he indicate his Government's and the department's future intention relating to the development and site use of the remainder of the M.R.P.A. (Kelmescott) Scheme No. 4 area?
- (2) Will he now table the M.R.P.A. report upon the Naval Base rezoning of 1300 acres of industrial land to urban?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

- (1) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is maintaining close contact with land owners and the market situation in this area and will develop further areas as required.
- (2) Not at this stage. I understand that the Premier will be issuing a statement shortly.

38. **TOWN PLANNING***Metropolitan Region*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

What is the Government's determination for the future development of the metropolitan region and, in particular—

- (a) the corridor plan;
- (b) the directional network;
- (c) any other planning alternative;
- (d) future workforce of the Perth central business district?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. DAVIES) replied:

The Government has made no determination on these matters and is still awaiting the report of the Honorary Royal Commission.

QUESTIONS (4): WITHOUT NOTICE**1. BOOKMAKERS' TURNOVER TAX***Effect on Racing and Trotting Clubs*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Was there any pre-budget discussion with the W.A.T.A. and the W.A.T.C. about the impact of the Government's proposal to increase the tax on on-course bookmakers and take the whole tax into Consolidated Revenue instead of sharing it with clubs?
- (2) If "Yes," what was the reaction of the W.A.T.A. and the W.A.T.C.?
- (3) If there were no discussions, what advice was given to the Government and from what sources about the likely impact of the change on—
 - (a) metropolitan clubs;
 - (b) country clubs?
- (4) What will be the total estimated loss in a full year to—
 - (a) metropolitan clubs;
 - (b) country clubs?
- (5) What will be the loss per meeting to individual clubs such as—
 - (a) Pinjarra;
 - (b) Bunbury;
 - (c) Northam?
- (6) What representations has he received since the announcement of the Government's Budget proposal?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) to (6) Although I have had some notice of this question it would be obvious to anyone listening that it would be unreasonable to expect an answer to be given on

such short notice. Therefore, I regret to have to ask that the question be put on the notice paper.

EDUCATION*Pre-school Education Report*

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Minister received the report of Magistrate Nott on pre-school education in this State?
- (2) Will he make the report public?
- (3) If the reply to (2) is "Yes," when will the report be made public?
- (4) When will the recommendations contained in the report be acted upon?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Printing of the report has not yet been completed although an advance copy was received by me yesterday.
- (2) and (3) Early consideration will be given to the release of this report after it has been examined.
- (4) This will depend upon decisions made after a thorough examination of the report.

3.**WOOL***Effect of Increased Prices*

Mr. REID, to the Premier:

- (1) In the light of the dramatically improved wool prices and the need to assist woolgrowers in consolidating their financial position, would the Government support the introduction of prosperity wool bonds, similar to the present drought bonds, the bonds to be included in the taxable income in the year of redemption?
- (2) Is the Premier aware that despite the five-year income averaging concession available to primary producers, many woolgrowers will be forced into a development programme to ease their taxation rate when it would be in the best interests of the industry if their financial reserves could be replenished and consolidated?
- (3) As many wool producers will receive possibly three times the returns of last season's clip, would he not agree it would be in the best interests of the State's economy to support action towards stabilising the highs and lows of marketing in such an important industry?

- (4) If the Government is in support of the principle, would it be prepared to introduce the matter at the next Agricultural Council meeting?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) to (4) Although I had some notice of this question it was by no means adequate. I think the honourable member will realise that it has not been possible to obtain the necessary information and I ask him to put the question on the notice paper.

4. SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hours: Balance of Session

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

Has the Premier yet made a firm decision on sitting times for the balance of the session and, in particular, when does he propose to sit on Thursday nights? I ask the question so that members may make arrangements. If it is not convenient for the Premier to answer today, tomorrow will suffice.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I intend to raise this matter at the Cabinet meeting next week. There was no Cabinet meeting this week. I do not think it will inconvenience any member if he does not know the sitting times until Tuesday of next week when I will make the information available.

BOATS

Launching Ramp, East Fremantle: Grievance

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [2.48 p.m.]: I want to raise a matter about which I and many other people are concerned: it relates to the lack of conveniences such as boat-launching ramps on the banks of the Swan River.

On Thursday of last week I asked a brief question of the Minister for Works, without notice, on this matter. On today's notice paper a question also appears concerning the same matter. My question was to endeavour to secure some greater detail about the closure of the launching ramp at Putney Road, East Fremantle. The reply given to my question was entirely unsatisfactory, and has led me to take the opportunity to air my grievance on this occasion.

The Swan River is not only beautiful, and is not only of aesthetic value to the people of the City of Perth, the people of the country, and visitors to our State, but it also provides a wide range of interests for the people who use it. Many

people use the river for their own pleasure, and in providing pleasure for their families. It is extremely important that those people should have facilities such as launching ramps provided in order that they may easily, and with safety, and with a minimum of inconvenience, launch their boats so that they can use the river.

The Putney Road launching ramp at East Fremantle is roughly equidistant from H.M.A.S. *Leeuwin* and the bridges at East Fremantle. The ramp has long served a purpose. However, its good purpose has been spoilt because there was no land backing the ramps and the people who launched their boats there posed great problems as far as traffic was concerned. Many people who would have liked to use this facility had to go to other boat-launching ramps many miles away.

It has been known for a number of years that the East Fremantle Council was not at all pleased about the road safety and traffic problems posed by the presence of the Putney Road boat-launching ramp, and in this period the council has been in discussion with the Government through the Public Works Department. Therefore, the department and the Minister should have known that the closure of the ramp was imminent.

Partly in order to overcome this situation, I, as the Minister for Works, brought before this Chamber at least one proposal for the reclamation of portion of the Swan River near Preston Point. The House agreed to the proposal and a small area of the river was reclaimed which gave some living room to the Swan Yacht Club and also provided room for a modern boat-launching ramp with adequate land-backed parking space which is essential for the convenience of the public.

Since the reclamation was carried out, nothing has been done by the Government to help the East Fremantle Council to facilitate the convenience of the public by building a new public ramp. I think it is not good enough for the Government to fob the matter off, as it did in the answer I was given to my question today, and take no responsibility by saying a policy was begun in 1969, which means the Government is not prepared to contribute any finance.

I do not believe we should be tied to a policy that was begun in 1969. That was three years ago and the times have changed considerably since then. In the two years the Brand Government has been out of office, this Government's revenue has increased by about \$50,000,000 annually. Revenue as described in the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure has increased by \$100,000,000 in the two years since the Brand Government was defeated.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Revenue from where?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: From all sources.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What about expenditure?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I stated that the difference between revenue and expenditure has increased to at least \$100,000,000. I would like the Minister to tell me whether I am right or wrong in making that statement about the amount of revenue over expenditure.

Mr. T. D. Evans: My comment is: You would have to be joking.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: This position is revealed by the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure—the total revenue as against the total expenditure. This year the total revenue is about \$50,000,000 more than it was last year, when it was about \$57,000,000 more than in the previous year.

Surely there comes a time for the Government to look more closely at the matter of public convenience and safety. With the closure of the Putney Road boat-launching ramp more people will be forced to go to nearby ramps, where the problems will be accentuated by the crowds wishing to avail themselves of the ramps in order to get onto the river for their own pleasure and enjoyment. For this reason, I believe there should be an immediate change in policy. There should be no delay. The Government should have worked on this matter to ensure there was a smooth changeover. As the Government has not moved in the matter so far—and this is the burden of my grievance—it should get on with the job forthwith, without any further delay.

The answers to my questions have revealed that the Government is careless in the matter of public convenience and safety as regards the provision of boat facilities on the Swan River and, for that matter, the provision of other venues which boat owners will have to use as a result of power boat racing being restricted.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I believe the case should be judged on its merits. The position is made worse by the fact that in some cases boat license fees have been increased by up to 250 per cent. since the Brand Government was ousted from office. This places an added responsibility on the Government for the provision of facilities.

I appreciate that departmental inspections possibly necessitated an increase in boat license fees, but increases of up to 250 per cent. surely mean that facilities should be readily available for the members of the public who use the Swan River. I hope the Minister for Education will therefore inform his colleague the Minister for Works of the burden of my grievance, that the Minister for Works will not

stand on ceremony or rely on any previous policy, and that he will ensure something is done to facilitate public convenience and safety.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [2.57 p.m.]: I do not intend to stand on ceremony or on any launching ramp at the moment, but I will give the member for Cottesloe the assurance he seeks; that is, his comments will be drawn to the attention of the Minister for Works.

"MOTIVACTION" COURSE

Operation: Grievance

MR. A. R. TONKIN (Mirrabooka) [2.58 p.m.]: I wish to draw attention to a brutal and shocking practice which occurs in Perth at the present time. It is difficult to believe this practice is actually occurring in Western Australia in 1972.

The situation exists where at least four employers in Perth—and two of them are big employers—have required their employees to take a course given by a firm which is known as "Motivaction," under the threat that if they do not take the course they will be dismissed. I know that at least one person has lost his job as a result of walking out of the course after one day because of its terrible nature. In one case an employer who had previously done the course acted as an instructor—or perhaps more accurately as a bully, having been privy to intimate details of the personal life of members of the staff. These were details of which no employer should be in possession to enable him to hold them over his staff.

There are often 25 people taking a six-day course, and each pays \$250, which computes to \$6,250 a week. If employers insist on employees taking this course, it seems to me we cannot rule out the possibility that some employers receive a rake-off from the proceeds.

I pose this question: If employers are to force their employees to take part in these courses, do employers own their employees, body and soul? Have we a new form of slavery in this State today?

I would like to quote three cases. In case A the employee, having been forced to take the course, was struck twice across the face with a riding whip. While he was being struck in this manner, another instructor—whom I call a bully—rushed in and attacked him with his fists. This man fell and injured his neck and skull, and a short time later he suffered a heart attack. He had no previous history of cardiac trouble. The use of whips in this context reminds me of the notorious Jew-baiter, Julius Streicher, who strutted about Nazi Germany with a plaited rhinoceros-hide whip.

Mr. Hutchinson: Is he going to take action?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: He is considering civil action.

Case B concerns a woman who took part in this course. She was the only female amongst the 25 participants. She was required to reveal intimate details of her sex life. She was kept standing for hours until she admitted the details.

Mr. Williams: This sounds a little like scientology.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: In many cases this participant gave incorrect details so that she could sit down. She has since been admitted to hospital with a very serious nervous breakdown.

I will just mention case C. This man was hit, not only by the instructors but also by the other participants. He was also required to reveal details of his sex life, and his wife was telephoned to confirm the details.

Mr. O'Connor: How do you get on one of these courses?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: The gentleman concerned stated that he could not stop shaking for days afterwards.

Mr. Coyne: They must have been very weak "characters."

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: Perhaps they may have been weak. Some of the questions were as follows: Are you a homosexual? Do you have lesbian tendencies? Have you enjoyed sex outside marriage? Were you a virgin before marriage? Do you indulge in oral sex? Do you have orgasms? I would like to emphasise that these questions were asked of a mixed group—both males and females were present. Most of the people took part in this course because they were afraid of losing their jobs, particularly having regard for the present rate of unemployment.

In at least one case an employer took part in the course himself, and the spouses of people on the course were questioned in order to check on the details of sexual relationships.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the possibility of the opportunity for blackmail resulting, as there are at least 25 people on each course.

I mentioned the lady who suffered psychological damage, and I have checked with psychiatrists on this point. There is no doubt that psychological damage has resulted in more than one case. Physical damage has also resulted, and I instance the man who suffered a heart attack.

I earnestly request the Government to examine the situation to enable action to be taken to stop these despicable practices.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara—Minister for Housing) [3.03 p.m.]: The Minister for Health would normally deal with this grievance, but unfortunately he is away at the present time. However, I assure the honourable member that his remarks will be referred to the Minister and no doubt he will be contacted later by the Minister.

ABORIGINES

Tjurunga Stone on Parliament House Reserve: Grievance

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [3.04 p.m.]: I have a grievance with respect to the ceremony carried out last August by some uninitiated Aborigines in the grounds of Parliament House. Members will recall that at that time these uninitiated Aborigines buried a tjurunga stone.

There are two types of tjurungas in Western Australia. One is made of wood and one is made of stone. I know the names of the two stones, but under Aboriginal tribal law it is improper to mention them in a situation like this. In those circumstances I will not name them, but I do emphasise that there are two types.

The tjurunga is highly sacred to Aborigines, and yet we have this spectacle of uninitiated Aborigines burying a stone in the grounds of Parliament House. In the process of this ceremony, they made a mockery of Aboriginal law in this State. If Aboriginal law is to mean anything at all, it is imperative that some action be taken very quickly about the tjurunga stone in the grounds of Parliament House.

I would like members to understand just how seriously this state of affairs is regarded by the Aborigines. Recently a building was constructed of cement in the Northern Territory. It contained steel safes and it was constructed for the one reason that the administration in the Northern Territory and the missions concerned felt that with the increasing number of prospectors and tourists in the Northern Territory, someone may unwittingly stumble upon a tjurunga. The Federal Government and the missions felt it was necessary to construct a stone building containing steel safes in which to lock the sacred tjurungas, because it meant death to a girl or uninitiated native who unwittingly viewed a tjurunga.

The tribe concerned has a key to the safe housing its tjurunga. It is taken out on ceremonial occasions and later returned to the safe. Members will see, therefore, how seriously this matter is regarded by the Federal Government and the Aborigines themselves.

In normal circumstances, tjurungas are hidden in highly secret places and the Aborigines are warned to keep away.

With the advent of prospectors and tourists to the Northern Territory it is now thought advisable to use a safer method.

The Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority in Western Australia regards the matter very seriously. I have here a press cutting headed, "New Curb on Tribal Research." This was published in August and was brought about by the fact that about 12 months ago a book was published in Australia depicting a tjurunga and other sacred objects. Because the book fell into the hands of Aborigines in Laverton, some of them were subsequently under threat of death because they had seen the photographs. Therefore, the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, during the lifetime of this Government, introduced curbs to prevent this type of thing happening again. Research workers on Aboriginal affairs in Western Australia are now required to seek the permission of the authority and elders of the tribe concerned before discussing details of tribal law with Aborigines. This is to avoid another situation arising of a tjurunga being unwittingly shown to a girl or an uninitiated native.

The authorities in the Northern Territory have taken action to prevent the sacred objects being seen by uninitiated Aborigines, and the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority has restricted research because of the sacred nature of the tjurunga. Yet in the very grounds of our Parliament House a tjurunga has been buried. This is certainly not a secret place and its location has been broadcast throughout Western Australia. Anyone could dig it up at night and show it to a girl or an uninitiated native, and the penalty for this is death. The crime in Aboriginal eyes is further compounded because the tjurunga was buried by uninitiated Aborigines, or people who claim to be Aborigines. In the tribal areas of Western Australia, the penalty for this also is death.

I have had the opportunity to visit many places in this State, such as the Warburton Mission in the Warburton Range, the Rawlinsons, Lake Disappointment, the Kimberley, and elsewhere, and almost everywhere I went I was accompanied by an Aboriginal who was not initiated. I was accompanied by him as an interpreter, because to converse with the people in these places an interpreter is necessary. However, no matter how civilised were the people who accompanied me, no matter how big they were, and regardless of whether they carried firearms, they always stood close by my side. If there were nomadic natives in the group, on the occasions I was present if I took one step sideways the uninitiated native would take one step sideways, and if I took one step forward he took one step forward. That uninitiated native kept as close as he could to me otherwise he would have been

whisked away and initiated or would have paid the penalty to which I have referred. That is the situation that pertains in those parts of the State.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes left.

Mr GRAYDEN: I am sorry about that, Mr. Speaker, because I still have a great deal more to say. I will have to seize the opportunity to speak on the Budget debate to explain something about the nature of the ritual ceremony according to Aboriginal law. Concluding my remarks, the main point I wish to make is that if Aboriginal law means anything at present, and if it is to mean anything in the future, nobody should make a mockery of it in the way the uninitiated natives have made a mockery of it in the grounds of Parliament House. If that is not so, why did the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority take the action it did? If that is not so, why did the Commonwealth Government and the missions concerned take the action to which I have referred in the Northern Territory?

I think we have had enough of this hypocrisy. Anyone who has any regard for Aborigines accepts that their tribal law means a great deal to them. It is an integral part of the Aboriginal way of life and to have a situation such as that which I have mentioned occur in the grounds of Parliament House is only making a mockery of that way of life. I am certain that the Aborigines of Western Australia have become irate about this, and I have received messages from many of them from all over the State that something will be done about it in the future.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Works) [3.13 p.m.]: Native tjurunga stones are one of the last things about which I wish to get involved in an argument; I do not know much about them and, with all due respect to the member for South Perth, I doubt whether any other member in the House knows much about them. I can only say that they seem to be part of the religion of Aborigines and are associated with certain features of their folklore and tribal customs and, consequently, the subject is rather confusing to those who have been brought up under Christian religions and ideals and who do not appreciate the Aboriginal folklore.

During the whole time white people have been occupants of the Australian continent, it is only in recent times that we have heard much about tjurunga stones. Indeed, until the Weebo stone incident was brought to light probably most of the general public were completely oblivious to the fact that there was such a thing in the native law of this country. Perhaps this was due to our ignorance, and probably we should have given the subject closer study. However, we abide by our religions, our

culture, and our ideals, and endeavour to join them with those that exist among the people who were resident in Australia before the Caucasians settled here.

The burying of the tjurunga stone in Parliament House grounds has, of course, been causing a great deal of concern to the board that has vested in it the responsibility of looking after the Parliament House Reserve. That board has had under consideration what should be done about the incident that occurred. However, due regard must be paid to the fact that anthropologists who have studied this Aboriginal feature—possibly more than the member for South Perth—are of the opinion that the ceremony conducted at Parliament House on that occasion, whether by initiated natives or those referred to later, was one of innovation.

Mr. Coyne: Uninitiated.

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes, I am sorry; uninitiated natives. Whether or not those people are indoctrinated fully in the beliefs of Aborigines is not for us to judge. It should not be for us to determine that they did not have this right, any more than we have the right to differentiate between one Christian religion and another; that is, if the natives do differ in their dogmas and their teachings.

According to the anthropologists it is in the minds of the people concerned that they are entitled to indulge in that innovation, but I do not know whether this is correct. As I have said, we must rely on the experts and on the opinions of those who have studied these matters, and none of us here would be as expert as the anthropologists who have made a close study of this feature of native law and native religion, which is part of their various dogmas, ideals, and rites. They say that the mode of innovation taken on this occasion is quite in order.

I do not know whether the arguments that can be adduced against such a move can be justified, or whether they are completely out of order. However, we have given the matter great consideration, and indeed we are giving it further consideration, and I am sure the final decision of the board in control of the Parliament House Reserve will be made only after due weight has been given to what the member for South Perth has said; because, undoubtedly, he has made a study of Aboriginal laws. He has for some time been associated in some way with native activities, but, in the final analysis we must go to those who are classified by the community as being the experts in such matters. If those experts advise us that there is a degree of innovation, and right of activity that can justly be indulged in by perhaps the uninitiated native or the blood relatives of the initiated who fostered this activity, then we must give such advice every consideration.

Whether the stone that is now in the grounds of Parliament House has been unlawfully removed from an area where it was originally placed, I do not know. I am not in a position to say much about that.

However I am certain that the whole matter will be thoroughly investigated by the board in control of the Parliament House Reserve before its final decision is made.

ABORIGINES: WELFARE NEEDS

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 6th September, on the following motion by Mr. W. A. Manning:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on conditions and make recommendations regarding the Aboriginal people in Western Australia with particular reference to—

- (a) health and physical needs;
- (b) finance and housing;
- (c) education of children;
- (d) vocational training,

and that the inquiry and reports be dealt with in two sections—

- (1) the South West Land Division;
- (2) the remainder of the State.

MR. RIDGE (Kimberley) [3.20 p.m.]: I intend to support the motion because, like the member for Narrogin, I believe we have a great responsibility towards the Aboriginal people of Western Australia. While we might claim this feeling of responsibility is not something which was recently acquired, I think we could do well to make a list of our achievements and successes in the field of Aboriginal advancement. I feel sure the list would not be particularly impressive. At the same time I appreciate that many sincere and dedicated people have devoted a great deal of their time and energy towards trying to solve some of the problems associated with the plight of our Aborigines; and their efforts are very commendable.

However, this does not necessarily mean they have been successful. Sincerity and devotion are essential in any sphere, but so is sound logic and good common sense; and I consider that had we been using these two attributes we would have recognised many problems and failures long before this. I consider it is time we stopped fooling ourselves. Instead of getting out amongst the Aborigines and others who have had close, practical association with them, we have blindly formed and followed biased and hypocritical opinions to the extent that many of our attitudes and

policies have been fragmented and no semblance of co-ordination has existed between the people involved in dealing with Aborigines throughout the State.

By conducting an inquiry of some sort we will have the opportunity to learn a few home truths, and a subsequent report could well provide the Government with a foundation for a better policy. I appreciate that policies can never provide the ultimate solutions to all our problems. They can achieve no more than is desired by the people they are intended to serve. However, if through our system we can strengthen this desire amongst the Aborigines, then we may provide the framework within which they can seek their own goals.

The member for Narrogin saw fit, perhaps desirably, to confine his remarks to generalities, and, while he very ably expressed himself, it is my intention to be a little more specific on some of the points he considers should be the subject of an inquiry.

My association with Aborigines has been confined to the Kimberley area and for this reason most of my comments will be related to that region. On the other hand I hope members will appreciate that there is a vast difference between the Aborigines in the far north of the State and those in the south of the State. For this reason I was pleased that the member for Narrogin included in his motion a request that a report of any committee should be dealt with in two parts—one for the South-West Land Division, and the other for the balance of the State.

Every day of the week we can pick up a newspaper and find a reference to one of the four items referred to in the motion, and it is my belief that the fundamental source of these problems stems not from the Aboriginal people failing our educational system, but from our educational system failing the Aborigines.

In the fields of health and medicine great changes have taken place over the course of the last 10 years and even in the Kimberley region almost every town has a comparatively new hospital; the number of doctors has increased rather dramatically; and public health and infant health services have improved radically.

Despite the best efforts of the Government with its limited financial resources, we still have a disastrously high infant mortality rate amongst Aborigines. Hookworm and trachoma continue to reach frightening proportions, and a large number of the Aboriginal people are still under surveillance for leprosy.

To this list we can add half a dozen other prevalent health disorders, include some alcoholism and prostitution, throw in some frustration and neglect, and we

have a rough picture of some of the problems which contribute to mental and physical disabilities confronting the people we expect to step into our civilisation as if it were simply a matter of pushing a curtain aside.

It is not this easy at all. We have in Western Australia at present a crazy sort of social merry-go-round which is going so fast at times that it is throwing people off and hurting them, while at other times it is going so slowly it is bogged down with cobwebs. We must do something about it.

Not for a moment do I blame the medical profession for the health problems because it is ridiculous to expect people who live under hopelessly deprived conditions to enjoy sound mental and physical health.

I consider that hand in hand with an improvement in living conditions we must have a massively expanded home and health education force which is able to tackle the problem at a community level as well as deal with individuals. It would need to be a devoted, highly trained, and flexible team to probe deeply into the social factors which have a bearing on the attitude of the Aborigines towards their health and well-being.

Let us not kid ourselves. It would still be a slow, hard haul, and the people involved in this education force would become sick and tired of asking, pleading, cajoling, and finally bullying to achieve what they require. However, the day would come when a breakthrough would occur and we would see a very marked degree of success. This has already been proved by a handful of public health sisters who pioneered this field.

I appreciate that public health sisters cannot be plucked off a tree; but, on the other hand, this is a field which could appeal to many young people who have completed their nursing training. I believe that if the work were given some publicity, and a suitable training course were established, many people would be anxious to participate and blend their nursing training with social welfare work.

It is not my intention to dwell on this subject because I believe the Government and certainly the medical profession are well aware of the deficiencies in our system. However, I do believe that if an inquiry were conducted it would very desirably highlight the need for a vastly improved health education programme and perhaps it would aid the State to gain additional Commonwealth funds to effect the necessary measures.

One other point which comes to mind—and this could well be categorised under the heading of health education—is family planning. Why is it that in a situation where poverty is a characteristic of life we neglect to teach people the fundamentals of family planning? Do we honestly

believe these unfortunate people want to raise large families in the squalor they have experienced, or are we naive enough to think they understand the modern concept of family planning? On the other hand are we fearful of being accused of aborting the natural growth of the Aboriginal race? To answer the question, I would not need a blindfold and a pin.

I respect the right of any family to have a large number of children, and I have no desire to offend people's religious beliefs; but I do think it is logical in a situation such as this to have a family planning programme and education scheme included in the overall health programme. Such a service should be available to all who desire advice and guidance.

Housing was a further point raised by the member for Narrogin. I do not think we have wilfully underestimated the importance of adequate housing, but we have underestimated the importance of providing it, and therefore due regard has not been paid to the effect housing has on other phases of a person's development.

A woman by the name of Sister Pat McPherson may be known to some members. She was awarded an M.B.E. a couple of years ago for her service in the nursing profession amongst Aborigines in the north. She once commented that the full range of the socio-economic needs of Aborigines is interdependent. She said—

Fundamental to good health is a house. A house requires rent and rent means having an income. Income means having a job for which one has training and skill. Training requires education and skill requires motivation. Motivation requires a satisfactory pattern of child rearing, which in turn requires a home. A home means having a house.

I believe Sister McPherson has raised some points which we would all do well to remember.

Some of the Aboriginal people in my electorate are well housed and have successfully integrated themselves into the white community. Others are well housed amid the white community but show no prospects of successfully integrating themselves. Further, they show no prospects of even wanting to accept our standards and ways of life. Many unfortunate Aboriginal people live in tin sheds which are bitterly cold in the winter and brutally hot in the summer. Others live in tents and wurlies. On the other hand, it is fair to say that many have elected to do so, perhaps because it is more akin to their traditional way of life or maybe because they do not want to be forced into an acceptance of our standards.

Several points emerge from this and I wish to make a brief reference to each of them.

The first is that all forms of education must be oriented towards teaching people to value their own cultural and life styles but, at the same time, to have regard for the advantages of health and cleanliness, and a respect for material things.

Many of us are guilty of criticising black families for vandalism and displaying poor social behaviour when they move into our environment. I do not say those criticisms are not well founded in many instances. However, quite often we close our eyes not only to the traditions and background of those people, but also to our inadequate training which is responsible for poor behavioural habits.

The next point to emerge is the need to build homes in areas which are totally acceptable to the prospective occupants and closely associated with this is the necessity to plan units which suit the particular requirements of certain individuals and groups.

If a settlement of Aborigines is happily ensconced on a mission or pastoral property, the Aborigines have just as much right to good and adequate housing as have white people. Our past attitudes have denied them this right, because we have claimed housing to be the responsibility of pastoral lessees and mission authorities. In other words, we have said to Aborigines, "If you want good and adequate housing, leave your job, leave the mission, leave the place where you were born, leave your friends, and move into the towns." This is nothing more than blackmail and forced integration in my opinion. It is doing irreparable damage. What is the reason? Probably it is that somebody has a bogey of being accused of racism or segregation. We are a bunch of hypocrites if this is the case, because in at least one instance our so-called integrated housing is at least a mile or more away from the established white settlements. Nevertheless, we push down the throats of Aborigines the fact that they must be integrated.

Why do we not wake up? If these people cannot accept our culture; want to maintain their traditions; and cannot see fit to expose their children to alcoholism and prostitution, as well as some of the other habits we have taught them, surely this is their right and we should be glad that they are proud of having an identity of their own.

Let them choose where they want to live, but let us provide them with a decent environment so that their children or grandchildren may see fit to accept our values.

If we can go along with the principle of building homes in areas of settlement and employment, the next step is to ensure that the design and construction suit the requirements of the group concerned.

Older and semi-tribalised groups may require nothing more than a shelter from the elements, but the younger people who

are on the threshold of accepting our civilisation would need something considerably more sophisticated.

Members may recall that some months ago I made reference to the pensioners' camp at Fork Creek, which is out of Wyndham. At the time I suggested that these people would probably be happy if the Government were to provide them with spinifex sheds. If I remember correctly some members did not think this was a good idea, but to the credit of the Native Welfare Department, officers went out, saw the pensioners, and asked them what they would like to live in and where. The pensioners said that they would like to live where they were and wanted tents. The tents are close to the road and are not attractive but, on the other hand, the old pensioners are happy and probably the tents are better than anything else they have ever lived in.

At Balgo Hills, the mission has provided Aboriginal people with small huts. Some of the older and semi-tribalised people have constructed wurlies inside the huts, purely and simply because they have never been accustomed to living in anything in which they can stand up. When a member of the family dies they revert to their natural habitat in the open. These people are primitive nomads.

The point I am making is that before the planners decide on what is best for the Aborigines, they should talk to the natives themselves, to the mission authorities, to the pastoralists, and to other people who have had close and practical association with these people. What is more, each settlement would have to be treated on its own merit. The reason is that each settlement of Aborigines can have entirely different beliefs to a group, say, 50 miles away.

I am not suggesting we should not have respect for privacy or climatic conditions. However, the sooner we get away from the one-room and two-room tin sheds, the better. If we cannot find anything better than corrugated iron and zinc anneal sheeting, it does not say much for modern technology.

I have inspected the settlement at Fitzroy Crossing on the newly created native reserve. The department has erected 12 transitional houses. Although these houses are new, quite frankly I believe they are a disgrace to the planners. They are corrugated iron sheds. They have small windows with metal louvres. There is no interior cladding on the walls and no trees within 100 yards to keep them cool. There are no hand basins in the houses, but a tap outside to which they may connect a hose. Further, there are no toilets. This is 1972, but we expect people to live under these conditions.

While I was at Fitzroy Crossing—and this refers to a comment I made previously about Fork Creek—I saw a group of Aborigines erecting spinifex sheds. The sisalation and the wire netting had been provided by a group known as Abscol. There was enough for two sheds, and this suited them admirably. At the time 200 people were on the reserve, but within a few weeks, when the cattle season draws to a close, the population will swell to 700 or 800 people. A situation such as this could be overcome if the Department of Community Welfare could see fit to send a couple of project officers to the area with a truck load of sisalation and wire netting. The people will be quite happy to build spinifex sheds. This would gainfully employ many people who are often on unemployment benefits when they are in the town, anyway. I am sure it would gainfully employ them for a short time. If necessary, the spinifex sheds could be built in a pattern which would be in accord with the village type of complex proposed by the State Housing Commission. If and when funds are available to build better houses, the spinifex sheds could be used as store sheds, for lying down in the cool, or for recreation purposes. It is as simple as that. This is the way to overcome the problem almost immediately and it could be done before the wet season sets in.

A while ago I referred to the fact that there are people who do not appear to have any respect for Aborigines who move into a home, and wreck it. On many occasions I have seen evidence of Aborigines shifting into a house and within a matter of weeks they have chopped down the doors and used them for firewood, and so on.

I think it is here that it is so necessary for us to commence an education scheme and put it into being; to ensure that such people are well aware of their responsibilities, before they are permitted to occupy homes costing \$20,000 — homes which are provided from our tax funds.

The education of children and vocational training were the next points raised by the member for Narrogin. For the purposes of discussion these could be grouped together.

As I have said previously, the root cause of many of our problems can be attributed basically to inadequate training, and the sooner we provide courses which are suitable and appropriate to the particular needs of the Aboriginal the sooner will we be able to help him develop his abilities and independence, and the sooner will we be able to assist him to adjust to living in a culture which is dominated by white people.

I believe that the training programme for children needs to commence when they are about four years of age and, if this is to succeed, it is necessary for some dramatic changes in the school curricula and teaching aids to be made.

We must step up and broaden adult education in all its phases to include schemes for the training and retraining of people in economically depressed areas.

By instituting pre-school education for Aboriginal children we would provide a change in the child's environment while he is at a most impressionable age; it would also give him the opportunity to acquire the first concepts on which our language is based; and it is on these concepts that learning skills must later be developed.

In my opinion it is little short of crazy to take a six-year-old child from a reserve and plonk him into a mixed class where the teacher, and even most of his classmates, speak in what to him is a foreign language. It is possible that his clothes are ragged and his personal hygiene of a low standard. He may also be suffering from a diet deficiency and, because of the financial position of his parents, he is probably ill-equipped with books and other essential equipment.

Is it not natural to assume that under such circumstances his progress will retard that of many other children? Is it not equally obvious that this is where he acquires his first feelings of insecurity and inferiority? He will probably not be aware of this at that particular stage, but such feelings will more than likely plague him for the rest of his life; they will have an adverse effect on every stage of his development through to manhood.

Surely it does not need much imagination to see that pre-school education will nip such possibilities in the bud! What a great opportunity it would be for us to help prepare such a child for eventual assimilation into the school classroom. The advantages would, of course, be twofold if mothers were also encouraged to attend such classes. It would give the mothers an opportunity to acquire some grasp of the English language apart from which they would be able to supervise the hygiene and the general habits and behaviour of the children in a home environment.

As I understand the situation the education authorities are opposed to having the mothers attend pre-school classes. I may be wrong, but that is what I understand the position to be. If this is so I would like to know why. It certainly would be something different if the mothers did attend, and it could possibly work.

For some reason or another we do not want to accept change. The general opinion seems to be that if something has not been tried before, it could not work. What is wrong with our trying something new? Quite obviously there will be occasions when our ideas fail, but there will also be occasions when we will enjoy success. The important thing is that whether or not we succeed, we would be able to take pride in saying that we were prepared to try something different.

I would like to turn some of our civil servants upside down and rattle them up a bit in an endeavour to get some sense out of them, and to persuade them to try something new.

Several members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. D. Evans: I cannot recall your having spoken in this vein between 1959 and 1971.

Mr. Williams: You could not have been here.

Mr. RIDGE: I suggest the Minister has a look at some of the earlier volumes of *Hansard* from which he will see that I have made several speeches on this matter.

Mr. T. D. Evans: On this particular point?

Mr. RIDGE: It might not have been on this particular point, but I have spoken generally on the need to educate our Aborigines. I am not criticising any particular Government. Quite frankly there seems little doubt to me that the field of Aboriginal welfare and progress is rather barren of blooms but I would point out that I am not handing out any brickbats.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.06 p.m.

Mr. RIDGE: Before the suspension I was referring to the education of Aborigines, and I spoke of the necessity to introduce Aboriginal children to pre-school education. A further point which emerges is the need for specially trained teaching staff, particularly in the far north of the State. Without casting any reflection on present and past school teachers in northern areas, it must be conceded that if we have any real desire to exploit the undoubted talents of the Aborigines, we will need to have people who are adept at, and trained in, bringing out the best from their pupils.

Bear in mind that many of the teachers who are sent to the north are fresh out of training college, and the only specific instruction they have in the handling of Aborigines is acquired at a one-week in-training course at the commencement of the school year. That is a course of only one week, yet the Aborigines are a race of people whose historic and environmental background is totally unrelated to ours. In their indigenous state, probably their sole aim in life was the pursuit of survival, and it cannot be denied that their values were developed in a world which was alien to our way of life.

Generally speaking, the young teachers who are sent to the far north are most devoted and are anxious and willing to work. They are prepared to accept the challenge. However, after trying to teach whites and Aborigines in a mixed class, quite often within only a couple of months they become dejected and as mystified as many of their pupils are.

It is only a comparatively few years since the Aboriginal people discarded their nomadic habits; yet, ever since they discarded those habits, we have been trying to force them into acceptance of our ways. We have been intolerant of the habits and cultures they have acquired during the course of a civilisation, and quite unprepared to adapt our instruction to their capacity and desire.

I am not suggesting that we entirely divorce Aborigines from our present system; I am saying that in certain instances it will be necessary to provide specialised instruction to inculcate in Aborigines a reasonable degree of security by discovering their strengths and emphasising the things they can do well. If that means having some schools with all black pupils, then I am completely in accord with that because I honestly believe it would be best for the blacks and best for the whites.

The Northern Territory administration saw the need for specially trained teachers something like 10 or 12 years ago. So we do not have to go very far—in fact, no further than our back door—to see whether there is value in the proposal.

I would now like to comment on teaching aids. I believe it is time we commenced to use television in schools, particularly in the north where we have a large Aboriginal population. I believe this is a natural method of revolutionising Aboriginal education; and the fact that the advantage would not be confined to the children is an added attraction.

Anybody who has been associated with the Aborigines of the far north of our State will be aware that their level of interest in a spoken lecture is comparatively low; but if the same people are seated before a movie screen we find that it has their undivided attention for as long as the film keeps rolling.

It is not a technical or financial impossibility to provide television—even in very remote centres. It can be achieved for an outlay of something like \$50,000 in each centre. This might sound a lot of money, but the Government has recently announced that it intends to air-condition all new schools north of the 26th parallel. It has also indicated that it intends gradually to air-condition existing schools. I applaud the Government for that action, because for as long as I have been in this House it is something I have claimed should be done.

Mr. Graham: You didn't get very far with the previous Government.

Mr. RIDGE: Yes I did. We got the Wyndham School air-conditioned, and work on it is under way at the Kununurra School. The present Government took the credit for it, and perhaps rightly so. However, that is beside the point. The cost of air-conditioning a school can amount to

\$50,000 in some instances. I am not suggesting that someone has his priorities in the wrong order, but if we can afford to air-condition schools at a possible cost of \$50,000, then I believe we can also afford to provide television in remote areas, primarily for the purpose of education, but also to provide every resident of the towns concerned with a form of relaxation which presently they do not have, and it seems they will not have for a long time.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you support an approach to the Commonwealth Government along those lines?

Mr. RIDGE: Most certainly. Incidentally, I think local authorities and businessmen in some towns in the north would be anxious to participate in the provision of television. The trouble lies in the capital cost of getting the project off the ground. If we could provide assistance with the capital cost I am sure we would get local participation in such a venture. Recently some businessmen from the north came to see me, and we contacted the television people in Perth. They were most anxious to get television under way if at all possible. We found it could not be done because of the fact that the videotapes would have to come from the A.B.C. Therefore, the businessmen would not be permitted to advertise and they would have no means of obtaining a return from the venture.

Still on the matter of teaching aids, I would like to mention that I was impressed by a scheme which is operated by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. It involves having a mobile unit carry a wide variety of instructional material to various Indian schools. The material includes tapes, films, books, records, etc. The mobile unit also circulates periodicals and reference material for the use of teachers.

The scheme has been found to have considerable merit in the United States. I would like to think it is a scheme that could be put to use successfully in, say, the Kimberley region, where between Broome and Wyndham there are something like 19 or 20 schools both private and Government. I am not suggesting that we equip a van with a couple of fully trained teachers merely to travel about exchanging library books. However, I do suggest that the Department of Community Welfare, the Public Health Department, and the Education Department should get together and work out some scheme whereby a couple of teachers could visit schools, missions, pastoral properties with large Aboriginal populations, and native reserves in order to instruct Aborigines in skills which they can use in their every-day lives. They could show health education films and put their training to work in many other useful ways. Perhaps that thought is a little far-fetched, but once again it is something

different and it need not be confined to schools. It could be used in all manner of ways.

Returning to a point I made earlier, I repeat that it appears our educational process is failing the Aboriginal people rather than *vice versa*. The product of our system is a poorly-adjusted youth who still does not comprehend half of what he has been taught, and who cannot understand what relationship the other half has to his future. He is frightened and confused, and in many instances he has an inferiority complex. But we turn him loose with the firm belief that the world is his oyster. Then within a year or two he will very likely know the inside of the local police lockup fairly well. It is quite likely that this person has turned to alcohol; he might be the father of a child or two, and in most instances he has an enormous chip on his shoulder.

Our reaction to this is to nod our heads, say "tut-tut" a couple of times, and remark "Make way for another leech in the welfare stream." What is wrong with our system when we tolerate this sort of thing? As inadequate as the training might have been, this is the most important time in the lives of the Aboriginal children. If we expect them to grow up with a healthy and a responsible attitude towards their involvement in the future, it is a natural progression to follow them out of the schoolroom and to lead them by the hand. We certainly have to lead them into job opportunities.

However, we should not desert them there; we should follow their progress through; we should liaise with their employers, their families, etc. We should ensure that they are provided with extra tuition where necessary, and we should involve them in service projects and youth activities. In other words, we should provide a counselling and employment service with a strong emphasis on showing these lads that somebody does, in fact, care.

We have to evolve a scheme for getting employers, employees, and service organisations to become positively involved in taking these people under their wings. When we do this we will be able to turn out better citizens.

I would like to ask how many Government departments in the north which have workshops in the area, such as the Main Roads Department, the Department of Agriculture and others, are employing a couple of these young lads each year? I do not mean that these lads should be employed as swamper on road gangs, but they should be employed as tradesmen's assistants or apprentices. In each of those departments there are experienced tradesmen who are prepared to accept the responsibility for teaching these young lads the fundamentals of their trade or vocation.

Those employees of the departments would be able to give these lads good training in the ways of life in general. This is one opening to assist the Aboriginal people where the Government departments seem to be missing out.

It is time we stopped relying on priests and parsons to act as employment officers. They have done a good job, but this is a field for which the Government should be responsible. However, I know of several instances where priests seem to spend half their time going around the countryside trying to find job opportunities for the young Aboriginal people.

There is one other point I would like to mention, and this reflects fairly poorly on our system. A couple of years ago a senior officer at the Kununurra Research Station approached me and indicated that he had vacancies for two young men at the research station. One of them was to be employed as a tractor driver, and the other as a mechanic's offsider.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. RIDGE: This officer, being a public spirited person, approached the Department of Native Welfare and indicated that he was prepared to provide training and employment for two young Aboriginal lads. They were to be provided with accommodation and their meals would be cooked for them. These lads would be able to learn a job and they would receive good pay.

The Department of Native Welfare provided the officer at the research station with two young lads, but they came from the southern part of the State — I think from Tardun or Katanning. I do not deny the Aboriginal people in the southern part of the State the right to employment in the Kimberley; but what was wrong with the department finding two local lads to fill those positions? The result was that the two lads from the southern part of the State remained at the research station for a couple of months only, after which they returned to their own districts.

This reflects poorly on the Department of Native Welfare. The result is that quite possibly the senior officer at the Kununurra Research Station might not make available to the department the same opportunity for employment of Aboriginal lads.

One could almost write a book on the inadequacies of adult education for Aborigines, but at this stage it is sufficient for me to say once again that we are failing rather miserably. Unless we are prepared to adopt a whole new outlook we will have to be content in the knowledge that many of today's adult Aborigines will remain social misfits for the rest of their lives.

Our conscience should dictate a sensible course of action. But will it be a sensible course, or will we remain smug in the conviction that "She'll be right mate"? This is a good, old Australian attitude, but I say "She'll not be right, mate." We will not get anywhere with this problem unless we are prepared to do something practical and give these people a lead. We should take them by the hand to guide them, and we should try out new ideas. By doing this we will get somewhere, and we will turn out citizens who are able to take their place alongside the rest of the community. There is no reason why the Aboriginal people should not be proud of us, and we of them.

In conclusion I would like to point out that in the Kimberley electorate, in many instances the Aboriginal people and the white people are desperately resentful of one another. When a situation like this is reached it is natural to predict that violence will become commonplace. Members should not take my word for this; they should be agreeable to the appointment of a Select Committee or a Royal Commission to inquire into this matter. They should let an independent body go to the north as well as the other parts of the State to make inquiries, so that it can record the bitterness, the anxiety, and the frustration that is evident, particularly in the far north.

We should let this body talk to people who will not whitewash the picture. I am sure such a body will find from its inquiry that the white people are indignant and angry at seeing the smashed homes, drunkenness, beatings, laziness, and wasted opportunities in the process of integration.

This body should talk to the Aboriginal people also. No doubt it will find that they are disillusioned; depressed; and tired of sickness, red tape, broken promises, procrastination, and many other setbacks.

I believe this inquiry is quite urgent; whether it be a Select Committee or a Royal Commission does not matter at this stage, so long as the person who is responsible for the inquiry is impartial and is prepared to talk to people who have had a lifetime of experience with the Aborigines. This body should visit the mission properties, including those which have proved successful and those which have not. If this job is done properly then I believe out of the mess will come a little bit of good.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [4.23 p.m.]: At the outset I wish to say that I support the motion. In some ways it does not go far enough, and some modifications should be made to it. Be that as it may, might I also say that I am particularly concerned with the last aspect mentioned by the member for Kimberley. It deals with the question of violence.

The motion before us reads as follows:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on conditions and make recommendations regarding the Aboriginal people in Western Australia with particular reference to—

- (a) health and physical needs;
- (b) finance and housing;
- (c) education of children;
- (d) vocational training,

and that the inquiry and reports be dealt with in two sections—

- (1) the South West Land Division;
- (2) the remainder of the State.

I agree that the terms of the motion are very general, and certainly we are able to deal with any matter appertaining to the Aborigines under it. Personally I would like to see the motion go a little further, and deal with certain items to which particular attention should be paid. I think the motion is an extremely timely one. In the last few months we have seen great changes taking place in respect of the attitude of Aborigines in Western Australia. To anyone who is concerned about these matters—and I am one who is concerned—these changes are not necessarily beneficial to the Aborigines.

In many areas of the State, as a result of the policies which have been pursued over generations, the Aborigines have been reduced to a mendicant people depending on handouts. That certainly is the situation in the Warburton, Leonora, Laverton, and Wiluna areas, as well as many others. There the Aborigines are almost completely dependent on handouts.

In the past it was felt that with a little more enlightenment and public awareness of the situation, something really positive would be done to assist the Aboriginal people. I think that in Western Australia we are arriving at that objective. There is a general awareness throughout Australia—and this took place particularly in the last few years—of the need to do something positive to assist the Aboriginal people.

Overnight a new body has come into the picture. This is a group of Aborigines, mostly of the unemployable type, who have adopted the attitude of not being grateful for any assistance given, and of not working in co-operation with the authorities to improve their conditions. They are simply saying, "It is your duty to supply us with these things. If you do not give these things to us we will resort to violence."

That is the situation, and if the attitude is to continue to be adopted then very shortly we will find large groups of these people in Western Australia living as parasites off the rest of the community. They will say, "We are not prepared to

work. We are not grateful for any assistance. We just demand these things; and if we do not get them we will resort to violence." This is similar to the Cargo Cult which existed in New Guinea. In the past the people of that country believed that certain things came their way as of right; that these things dropped out of the sky; and that if they held out their hands they would get these things.

I am sure that no responsible Aboriginal in Western Australia would expect these things as his right; but there are many thousands of Aborigines who think this way. The responsible Aborigines are proud people; they are proud of their heritage and their race. They hold their heads up high and they take their place in the community.

However, that is not the attitude of the small group to which I have made reference. In the last few months we had the episode of a tent being erected in the grounds of Parliament House; and a threat of violence was made against those who might pull it down. Previous to that episode the so-called "Aboriginal Embassy" was erected on the Parliament House grounds at Canberra; and violence did erupt when it was pulled down.

When the tent was to be erected in the grounds of Parliament House in Perth, some Aborigines came forward and declared it was an act which denigrated the Aborigines of this State, and they were unhappy with the move. However, their pleas were ignored. The group went ahead and erected the tent. Recently there was talk in terms of erecting the tent again, and violence was threatened if the headstone was not restored to its place.

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable member is getting away from the motion.

Mr. **GRAYDEN**: The motion is a very general one. What I am leading up to is this: I believe the terms of the motion should be **widened** along the lines I am suggesting.

As a consequence of what has transpired over the past few months there has been a hardening of attitude throughout the Kimberley, the Murchison, and other centres of the State towards the Aborigines. I think this is most unfortunate.

We have the situation where irresponsible individuals have talked of violence, and they have triggered off a spark which could have a general reaction. Unfortunately this adversely affects the Aborigines themselves. No minority group of people in any country, particularly when they are dependent on the country for assistance, can hope to obtain any benefit from violence. Yet at this point of time there are individuals in our community who are advocating violence as a means of solving their problems.

Unfortunately we have columnists and others in this State who support such violence. Only the other day a columnist in the *Sunday Independent* made the announcement that one of the events of the week was that a respected Aboriginal leader took a swing at an honourable member of Parliament. This was said to be a respectable Aboriginal, but I would like to tell the House how respectable he is. It is as a consequence of support of this kind that temptation is provided to these people to resort to violence.

In Western Australia we have at the present time many Aboriginal organisations, and one of them is the Aboriginal Advancement Council. A top member of this organisation has a serious criminal record. Let me put it this way: At least one top individual of that organisation has a serious criminal record. A person who now holds a responsible position in that organisation has been released on a bond for the offence of assault occasioning serious bodily harm.

The same individual, some time ago, served—or was sentenced to—three years for assault at Port Hedland. His record, of course, goes beyond that. He appears as the man who is hailed as one of the respected leaders of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. I do not know how many people belong to the organisation. Apparently about 28 attend meetings, and about 15 are financial. They have, as one of their leaders, a man who has a criminal record, about which I have been speaking. However, that individual and the president of the organisation have been appointed by the Government to the Aboriginal Advisory Council of Western Australia under the legislation recently passed. Quite apart from occupying positions on the Aboriginal Advancement Council, these two men have actually been appointed to the Aboriginal Advisory Council.

That is an extraordinary action because the Aboriginal Advisory Council comprises 14 representatives from seven zones in this State. The whole idea of the legislation was that two Aborigines from each zone were to be elected to the council. I understand this is how most representatives were selected. However, I believe that Mr. Winder and Mr. Davis were appointed by the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority. Now, one of those individuals has a criminal record, which I have already mentioned. Also, Aborigines in the jobs have police records to which I will not refer. However, the case I have mentioned is a serious one. I find it extraordinary that such people should be appointed to the positions they hold.

When the representatives from the seven zones came to Perth they elected Mr. Davis as their president because he was most articulate. I do not know whether Mr. Winder was elected as secretary, but

those two men are on the council. It is the articulate ones who are elected, and they are the ones who are guiding the affairs of Aborigines in Western Australia.

Let me just relate my own experience of a week ago with the two individuals to whom I am referring. In the company of the member for Murchison-Eyre I was invited to address a meeting on brick-making and one other subject. On our arrival we were met and taken to a group of people, who were sitting down. They stood up and we were introduced individually. The member for Murchison-Eyre and I were then shown to our respective seats and we sat down. I started to talk to the person on my left. Mr. Davis, the president of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, walked across—I did not see him do it—and with all his weight struck me in the face. I only had time to look up to see who it was when he made the announcement that he had hit me—as though it was a great accomplishment—and he said he would have to inform the Press. He immediately spent 20 minutes ringing up the Press.

The **SPEAKER**: I hope the honourable member will relate this to the motion.

Mr. **GRAYDEN**: I will relate the incident to the motion, Mr. Speaker, because there is a great need to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into Aboriginal affairs in Western Australia. The motion is all-embracing and I am suggesting that this is one aspect which the proposed Select Committee should inquire into.

Here we have a situation where this event occurred. As far as I am concerned it was cowardly in the extreme: To hit someone not only while he was sitting down, but while he was looking the other way. We have plenty of witnesses. As it happened a member from another place was present with his wife. There were many other witnesses as well as the member for Murchison-Eyre.

That was an extraordinary occurrence and I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Davis was extremely lucky. Quite apart from the fact that I could well have retaliated, had it been in a different situation—certainly not in the dining room of the Country Women's Association building—there are certain provisions in the Criminal Code and the Interpretation Act to protect members of Parliament.

Under the provisions of those two Acts there is a penalty of seven years for assaulting a member, and a penalty of two years for intimidating a member. So the individual concerned is extremely lucky, from that point of view, that I do not intend to go ahead with a case. He is also extremely lucky in that he appeared on television, and talked about members in terms of racism when, in fact, we loathe the word "racism."

This is the sort of person we are contending with at the moment. The persons to whom I have referred are the actual leaders—not the leaders, but the self-styled leaders—of Aborigines in Western Australia. I have already mentioned that Mr. Davis is the President of the Aboriginal Advancement Council and that Mr. Winder is the secretary. Both of those men have now been appointed by the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority to the Aboriginal Advisory Council, and that is a very serious situation indeed.

I have mentioned this matter to indicate that all Aborigines in Western Australia do not share the views of Mr. Winder and Mr. Davis. The Aboriginal Rights League is a very different organisation indeed from the Aboriginal Advancement Council. The Aboriginal Rights League recently wrote to me, and to the Leader of the Opposition, and the tenor of its letter was that the organisation was nonpolitical and nonsectarian. It did not share the views of the Aboriginal Advancement Council.

I thought it was extremely nice of that organisation to write to me along those lines. However, an organisation such as the Aboriginal Advancement Council is, at the moment, receiving \$22,000 a year from the Government. I have contacted the Federal Audit Department, the State Audit Department, our own Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority, and other departments which might have anything to do with the auditing of the books of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, and not one department has any connection with the council.

I understand that over the last two or three years many members of the organisation have questioned the spending of the \$22,000. Not only have those people not had an opportunity to speak within the organisation, but they have been castigated as a consequence of their inquiries. I ask: What is happening to the \$22,000?

I understand one of the members of the organisation, Mr. Winder—about whom I have been speaking—is off to China. Where will the money for that trip come from? I propose to find out more about what is happening to the \$22,000 which is provided by the Commonwealth Government to the Aboriginal Advancement Council.

No doubt the Commonwealth Government believes that the organisation represents the Aborigines in Western Australia which, of course, it does not. What appals me is that the Aborigines of any consequence in this State—men like Ken Colbung, an ex-serviceman with a terrific record, and Don Farmer—are pushed out of the Aboriginal Advancement Council by the Davis's and Winders, and they are not recognised anywhere along the line by the Government or any other authority. However, they are responsible men and they would guide their people along a

path which would be acceptable to all—along a path which would ultimately benefit their people. Why are they not recognised?

The situation absolutely astonishes me. Without any question we will hear a lot more in the future about men like Ken Colbung and Don Farmer being pushed aside and faith being placed in individuals of the type, and with the records, to which I have referred. They influence the ways of the Aborigines and as far as I am concerned that is not good enough.

For those reasons I believe the Select Committee should be appointed. I hope it will inquire, particularly, into the extent of the relatively new move to incite Aborigines in Western Australia to resort to violence. That is a matter which should be inquired into. I would like the Select Committee to establish what organisation is behind the moves, and the origin of the funds which are used.

We recently heard the statement that Mr. Brockman was paid \$1,500. That money was paid into his account and I ask: Where is that money coming from? This is one of the things into which we should inquire. When we have so-called responsible individuals cast in the role of leaders of the Aborigines in this State, and holding responsible positions, we should ascertain the extent of their criminal and police records. We should find out their suitability for the respective positions which they occupy.

I think this is a very important matter. Violence is contrary to the makeup of the Australian Aboriginal. In their tribal life, the Aborigines always go out of their way to be as fair as possible and avoid resorting to violence. At the Warburton Range, Mt. Margaret, Jigalong, and Balgo missions in the Gibson Desert area, the greatest difficulty is experienced in inducing any of the Aboriginal children to win races and other events on annual sports days. Some of them have more athletic prowess than others but they do not want to beat or take advantage of each other, so the fastest runner hangs back and the whole group crosses the finishing line together.

The Aborigines have survived in an inhospitable environment because for generations they have been prepared to help each other in all circumstances and the competitive instinct has been completely bred out of them. Similarly, in the areas I have mentioned, if an Aboriginal commits a serious offence he is speared in the thigh. Then he spears the man who speared him in the thigh. This custom makes it quite clear that one must not go around lightly spearing other people. If one man spears another, even in punishment, he must undergo the same treatment himself. This is an indication of the character of these people, and this is why they have been so much respected over the years and have fitted into our society.

In certain areas where there has been no employment for them, their natural way of life has been interfered with. In these circumstances they have no alternative but to exist as mendicants. However, they are not a violent people, and I think it is extraordinary that at a time when we are on the threshold of accomplishing so much because of the general awareness of the need to do something for the Aborigines, we allow in this State people who have criminal records and who, with funds obtained from outside sources, try to incite violence. If they are successful, the cause of Aboriginal welfare in Western Australia will be set back for 100 years.

Fortunately, many Aboriginal leaders in Western Australia are aware of the situation, but those who would normally support them are frightened of the Wonders and others because of their criminal and police records. Therefore, the Aboriginal leaders do not receive the support they should receive. Somewhere along the line a lead is needed—not constant support, as has been the case, for the few who are inciting violence in Western Australia.

One of the things I deplore about some of the people who have been inciting violence is that they will virtually say anything at all, whether or not it is true. I cite the accusation of racism. I, for one, have had all my life an absolute horror of the word "racism." On one occasion my mother went the other way around the world when returning to Australia rather than go to a country where apartheid was practised because she did not want to be held responsible for what she might do when confronted with a situation which offended natural justice. I share her views. Yet on television the other night Davis, of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, repeatedly said I was a racist, and to support his accusations he quoted some statements made by the member for Kimberley and attributed them to me!

What Davis said was, of course, straight-out slander. He is therefore very fortunate that I have not taken action for slander against him. I think it is a shocking thing to be accused of racism. I mention this incident to indicate that such people take a certain line of action and go out of their way to denigrate anyone who is opposed to their views or who does anything for the Aborigines. They will do anything in the process.

Again, in the lounge of the Country Women's Association building, Davis said we had come down uninvited. That statement appeared in *The West Australian* the following morning, but on television he contradicted himself by saying we were invited to come down to discuss certain things. It is a serious matter having to deal with people of this kind, and I warn members that if they hold views contrary

to those people they should take a witness with them when giving an address by invitation.

All these incidents add up to the fact that in our society at the present time a group of people are muscling in on the Aboriginal question and inciting the Aborigines in Western Australia to violence. In the process they are doing a great disservice to the Aborigines. There are in Western Australia at the present time some outstanding Aborigines who could take their place in any society or walk of life and be regarded as men. They are ex-servicemen and others who have proven over the years to be in the category to which I am referring. Why are we not doing more with people of that kind? They are the natural leaders of the Aborigines and they will do something for their people in Western Australia.

I applaud the fact that, no doubt, a Select Committee or a Royal Commission will be set up to inquire into the needs of Aborigines in Western Australia. I would like to say much more in support of the motion because the question raised by it is a huge one. It has many facets and it is rather difficult to know which aspects to deal with.

In 1956 I moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate conditions in the Warburton Range area, and I became the chairman of the committee. I did not think very much eventuated as a result of that Select Committee at that particular time. In company with the member for Murchison-Eyre, I recently had the opportunity to go to Ayers Rock via the Warburton Mission and the Docker River Mission. I was astonished at the changes that had taken place since the time of the Select Committee in 1956. At that time the Aborigines in the area were relatively small and wiry people. On my recent visit I noticed they were at least six inches taller and of much heavier physique, which must have come about as a result of the food they are now obtaining. The situation that existed in the Warburton Range in 1956 does not exist at the present time.

A tremendous amount remains to be done. Most of the Aborigines in the area receive a training allowance and they have reached the stage where they no longer go out and hunt or get their firewood. They simply sit down and receive assistance. At the Docker River Mission, 1,300 Aborigines receive \$60 a fortnight, ostensibly as a training allowance; yet no training is given. No longer does anyone go out hunting unless the mission supplies a truck. The track from the Laverton Mission to the Warburton Mission is littered for 365 miles with discarded vehicles. At Warburton Mission there are about 60 abandoned vehicles. Even though there was virtually no employment of any kind

in the area, the people had sufficient money to buy those vehicles. In that respect, the changes are not necessarily for the better, but at least the population in that area is being fed and receiving medical attention. Infanticide and many other things that were evident in 1956 no longer occur.

Although at the Docker River Mission in the Northern Territory, just across the border, the Commonwealth is paying the Aborigines \$60 a fortnight as a training allowance, I was surprised to learn that no training is given to the 1,300 people at that mission or settlement. Obviously, much remains to be done in respect of the Aborigines in Western Australia because the situation applying at the Docker River Mission also applies in varying degrees to the Aborigines in this State.

My experience of Aborigines is that, with the exception of a handful of unemployable people, they are anxious to work. They want to be gainfully employed; they do not want to be the recipients of hand-outs.

I do not think I will pursue the subject. It is one that has many facets. A tremendous amount can and should be said on it. We will have many opportunities to do so when speaking to the Budget and in other debates at a later stage, and I conclude by saying I support the motion.

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [4.59 p.m.]: It will take me two or three minutes to say what I have to say on this motion. I have been a member of this House for 4½ years, during which time I have listened to some good speeches and some bad speeches; but I think the speech that has just been delivered by the member for South Perth must rank as one of the worst speeches that have been made in this House.

Sir Charles Court: What makes you say that?

Mr. HARMAN: Last week, the member for South Perth apparently received a blow in the face from a person named Davis who happens to be an Aboriginal. The honourable member left that scene without making any retaliation. He said it was a cowardly attack, and he did not retaliate. I ask the House to judge whether or not the honourable member has now retaliated, because he has seen fit to use the debate on this motion in order to parade before this Parliament the fact that certain gentlemen have criminal records, and he obviously hopes the Press will parade it before the public of Western Australia.

Mr. Grayden: This is a man appointed to the Aboriginal Advancement Council.

Mr. HARMAN: I do not think that a member of Parliament has the right to take this kind of action. It is for this

reason that I regard the speech made by the member for South Perth as the worst speech I have heard in this Chamber.

The member for South Perth has allowed this man to be tagged with a criminal record, even though the events may have happened some years ago. It is a fallacious argument to say that because a man has a criminal record he should not now be a member of a particular council or a representative of a group of people. To use such an argument would mean that no person with a criminal record should ever be elected to any position and should remain condemned for life.

Mr. Grayden: He was appointed to the Aboriginal Advancement Council.

Mr. HARMAN: The member for South Perth used this Chamber to retaliate to a blow. I do not know how the honourable member obtained the information of this man's criminal record, but he used this Chamber to parade it to the public of Western Australia.

MR. McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [5.02 p.m.]: I intend to be very brief in my remarks. The point I wish to make is that I feel this matter has been very well covered by the earlier speakers in the debate who agreed that this motion is very desirable. All speakers have indicated their support.

I was prompted to make a few comments by the remarks of the member for South Perth about violence. We are all concerned when we hear of certain actions involving natives and we endeavour to find out the cause of the violence. I believe that one of the principal causes of aggression with the natives is their access to alcohol.

Last Friday a publican spoke to me about the natives' access to alcohol in his hotel. There had been a fight in the hotel and one of the natives was very seriously injured; he is now committed to a lifetime in a home. He cannot speak and cannot understand when he is spoken to. He will be a burden on the State for the rest of his life.

The aggressor appeared in court on two occasions and in each instance the publican was asked to give evidence. In his summing up the judge stated that he would give the native a chance to atone. The publican was quite concerned at the leniency of the sentence given. The native was not sentenced to imprisonment but was placed on three years' probation. Members will bear in mind that the offender so seriously injured another native that he is now condemned to life in a home with no chance at all of participating in his former activities.

This example clearly shows the need for the investigation which is suggested in the motion. It is time that the natives

were educated so that they have a broad understanding of the effects of alcohol. They must also be educated as to the conduct which they must observe in hotels.

The publican is very concerned as to his future conduct of the hotel, as natives in the area have seen that this offender was placed on probation after a serious offence. The publican attempts to conduct his hotel in a manner acceptable both to the Caucasian and the Aboriginal population.

Investigation should be made into the various aspects of education. There are many facets of life which the natives do not seem to understand, and they should be given the opportunity to obtain a broader understanding in these areas. They must be able to understand the effects of the alcohol to which they have access, and the laws which we all must obey. I hope that the motion will prompt such an education amongst the Aborigines, not only in the south but also throughout the rest of the State. I also endorse very strongly the motion before the House at the present time.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [5.07 p.m.]: I do not intend to speak at any great length or in any great detail on the motion before us. However, as the Leader of the Opposition, I would be remiss if I did not take the member for Maylands to task in view of the comments he made.

If he looks back into the history of this House, he will find that the comments of the member for South Perth were quite mild under the circumstances. It is for a good reason that Parliament has certain privileges and members of Parliament have certain privileges. Here we have the case of a member of Parliament being assaulted; there is no argument about that. This member was not assaulted for his actions, but for what he stood for. The member for South Perth did the right thing in not seeking revenge on the spot.

Mr. May: Would it not apply to other people as well?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the member had retaliated on the spot, his position would be less strong than it is now. The fact that he refused to retaliate on the spot is to his credit.

The member for Maylands is using this occurrence to vilify the member for South Perth, who was using his just rights in the House. Members must realise that this matter goes far beyond the facts stated by the member for South Perth. However, the honourable member confined himself to the particular incident which I believe was quite pertinent.

The people to whom the member for South Perth referred have accused the member for South Perth, the member for Kimberley, and me, of being racists. This

is quite untrue and quite unfair. Another organisation of Aborigines has written to us and dissociated itself completely from those comments. I appreciated the fact that this organisation took the time and trouble to ensure that we clearly understood that a big body of Aboriginal opinion in Western Australia dissociated itself from this opinion expressed about the member for South Perth, the member for Kimberley, and me.

I want to record in this House the objection of the Opposition to the attitude taken by the member for Maylands. I believe the member for South Perth was quite within his rights to bring this matter to the notice of the House in the way that he did. Most of the facts of this case would be known to the member for Maylands, and he should appreciate that the member for South Perth was being quite moderate in the comments he made. In my experience, over a period of many years, no-one in this House has shown such an interest in the welfare of Aborigines as has the member for South Perth. There was a time when the Aborigines had very few friends, either in this House or in this State. Some of us were amazed at the extent to which the member for South Perth spoke up for these people. In fact, not only did he speak up, he acted. Aborigines visited his home as friends, and he visited other places with them. Not many people were prepared to do this, and therefore, it ill-becomes the member for Maylands to speak as he did. The member for South Perth was simply exercising his right, and under the circumstances his comments were quite mild and moderate.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [5.10 p.m.]: I had no intention of speaking to the motion this evening until I heard the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. He took the member for Maylands to task about his comments that the member for South Perth was using this particular place to attack the members of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. I believe the member for South Perth has a right to take civil action, if he so desires, in regard to what he believes was an unjust action by Mr. Davies on the occasion referred to.

In my opinion the member for South Perth has done no more for the Aborigines than many other people in the community. However, because he has been a member of Parliament for many years, he received a great deal of publicity he would not otherwise have received. It seems tonight the member for South Perth is again pursuing his role of seeking publicity in this matter at the expense of the Aborigines.

The worst thing that can happen in this State is a division amongst the Aboriginal people. The member for South Perth is endeavouring to do this by highlighting

the incident at the Country Women's Association building last week. If it were not for the publicity, probably the whole affair would die down.

Mr. R. L. Young: Until the next chap gets hit on the face.

Mr. BRADY: The native people are entitled to proper consideration, and this is well overdue. They have been exploited in this country for the last 100 years.

The member for South Perth did what he believes to be the right thing for the native people. But, as I said, many other people have done as much and more. As a matter of fact, the mission community of Western Australia has done far more than the member for South Perth and these people have never received any publicity. Irrespective of denomination, the missionaries work from a sense of charity and Christianity. They do not seek publicity and they do not attempt to divide the natives. They are aware of the weaknesses of the Aborigines, but they are also aware that weaknesses exist in every community.

I deplore the fact that the member for South Perth has taken this opportunity to highlight an incident. I would like to see the Aborigines obtain more than they are getting from the Australian community. Of course, in many cases they have to prove they deserve more, and in some cases they do not deserve a great deal of assistance because they do not help themselves. In other cases they deserve more because they are trying to help themselves. For instance, at Port Hedland and other places I saw natives building their own houses. A young native is in touch with me now and he is prospecting for nickel and other ores in the outback of Western Australia. He is a credit to his race. However, I have seen others who will take all the handouts they can get and do nothing in return. These people will always depend upon charity to rear their families and obtain handouts they are not entitled to.

It is hoped that an investigation into the problem will cover the whole State. I believe, as the member for South Perth said, tremendous advances have been made in the interests of natives right throughout Western Australia and, indeed, Australia, in the last 10 or 15 years. I wish to see this effort continuing. About 18 months ago I was in Roebourne and saw great improvements for natives. It was little more than a bush-hut town for natives previously.

There are some very fine institutions that look after Aborigines. One can go right through the north-west and see many activities being undertaken by the Native Welfare Department, by the missions, and even by the natives themselves. All these organisations are endeavouring

to lift these people out of the difficult position in which they were placed for many years and when they were exploited by all sections of the community, except small groups who follow the Christian faith and who are prepared to make sacrifices both through the medium of their churches and their various organisations to assist the Aborigines.

I believe the member for Maylands has taken the right stand in regard to this matter, and, in taking the member for South Perth to task for having the temerity to make reference to this particular case, I think he was quite right in the action he took. He does not want to see men like Mr. Davis or Mr. Winder, who has already paid his penalty, having any of their weaknesses highlighted by discussing this case.

Mr. Grayden: Who appointed them to the advisory committee?

Mr. BRADY: I do not know, but that does not justify the action taken by the member for South Perth. If he wants to raise any questions in regard to their appointment he may as well go through all the appointments of white people to various organisations to ascertain whether they have unblemished records in business matters, taxation matters, or in criminal dealings. Anyone would think that the man he mentioned was the only one who had ever been on a criminal charge. The fact remains that the member for South Perth in speaking to the motion did not enhance his position in this House by highlighting the difficulties that have been faced by Mr. Winder.

I would have no objection to the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate Aboriginal matters, because it would throw light on many aspects that need to be reviewed. However, tremendous progress has been made towards assisting the native community under the administration of both Liberal and Labor Party Governments and I want to see that trend continue. I do not wish to see originating in this Parliament moves that will create a split in the various organisations that already exist for the benefit of native people, and also a split among the native people themselves.

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [5.18 p.m.]: I do not think the member for Maylands or the member for Swan have done anything whatsoever for their cause.

Mr. Brady: Let me see you do some good for your cause by talking sense.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: If the honourable member will allow me a couple of minutes I will tell him all about my cause. The member for Swan indicated that merely because other people had done as much or more than the member for South Perth for the native community, the member for South Perth had no right to make known

his views on the subject. All I have to say is that nobody in our community, including the Aborigines, would deny that the member for South Perth has been an able representative for the native community not only during the period he has been a member of this Parliament, but also before he entered it, and therefore any comment he makes on the Aborigines of this State is well justified—certainly what he had to say this afternoon was well justified.

Mr. Brady: That is only in the opinion of the Liberals.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We are all agreed that the principle behind the motion should be supported, and I do not think there is any division between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in regard to this. However, the people who want to create divisions between the natives themselves are the Winders and the Davis's who mix among the natives to stir them up and inculcate in them the idea of adopting some of the most incredible left-wing attitudes anyone could see this side of the Castro regime. When a member of Parliament, who has acted on behalf of the Aborigines all his life, attends one of their meetings at their invitation to speak to them on their terms, and one of them hits him in the face, who will say that he has not the right to make some sort of protest? What was he expected to do? Retaliate by hitting the native in the face?

If Parliament is worth anything it is worth this: That when a person wants something said in the community to warn people that certain individuals are creating divisions among the Aboriginal population—or creating divisions among any other population for that matter—he should be able to get up in this House under parliamentary privilege to acquaint Parliament of what he knows. The member for Maylands, in saying that the member for South Perth does not have that right is, in my opinion, not showing much respect for Parliament itself.

Does not the member for Swan believe that the member for South Perth has the right to bring these matters before Parliament? Certain action is being taken by some members of the Aboriginal community with diabolical consequences. We all know, as does the member for Swan, that that is so, but he says we are not allowed to talk about it.

Everyone believes in this motion. Everyone believes there should be an inquiry into Aborigines, and the member for South Perth rose to his feet in this House because he knows what is going on among members of the Aboriginal community. He has given his support to the motion, as has the member for Swan. I do not know the import of what was said by the member for Maylands. All he did was to run down the member for South Perth.

The **SPEAKER**: I think you had better get back to the motion.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I would like to point out that three speakers in a row have spoken on this particular subject.

Mr. Brady: You are reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: No, I am not. I am merely pointing out to the Speaker that some of the comments made by previous speakers to the motion need answering.

For many years the member for South Perth has done an excellent job for the Aborigines of this State, and I am sure he will continue to do so. In supporting the motion moved by the member for Narrogin I would point out that if we are to have any success with the attitude we adopt towards Aborigines, we should at least be permitted to rise to our feet in this House and warn the people of Western Australia that the divisions referred to by the member for Swan are being created by the very people mentioned by the member for South Perth.

The tragedy is that everyone knows it, including the member for Swan and the member for Maylands.

Mr. Brady: Don't talk a lot of rot!

MR. LEWIS (Moore) [5.23 p.m.]: Like two or three of the more recent speakers who have contributed to this debate, I did not intend to speak to the motion.

I regret the turn the debate has taken, because I think the move by the member for Narrogin was very commendable, and members will recall that he emphasised he did not want to make this question a political football, and with that, of course, we would all agree. He also quoted some Commonwealth and State figures relating to expenditure on Aborigines in this State in recent years, and he posed the question that he thought it was time we had a good look at this expenditure to assess whether both the community at large and the Aborigines themselves were getting the best value for the money spent. In my opinion the motion has been framed for that particular purpose.

I greatly appreciate the Minister's comments that he agrees an inquiry should be held, and I understand that he prefers a Royal Commission to a Select Committee. I endorse that view wholeheartedly and I repeat that I would not have participated in this debate had I known that, because if we all agree that a Royal Commission should be held, let the Royal Commission go to it, and so give us an opportunity to study any recommendation it makes.

I regret that on the eve of the appointment of a Royal Commission there has been some sort of an investigation by a body that calls itself "Public Interest Research Group." I believe all members have

received a copy of what that group calls, *Aboriginal Survey*. I notice that on the front page the following appears:—

Acknowledgments are due to Dr. Henry Schapper for his help in formulating the questions used in the survey and for his participation in the seminar, to Mr. Ken Winder, who also participated in the seminar, and Mr. Ray Francis, who briefed the students on interviewing methods before the survey.

I am not participating in this debate to espouse the merits of this or that man, or to espouse the merits of any Aboriginal body.

This survey was conducted in many country towns, and I have been rather struck by the comments made by the interviewers, because they comprise most of their own statements. They interviewed many Aboriginal bodies and Aboriginal spokesmen, and posed to them 29 questions. They also posed another 24 questions on "Other Aboriginal Subjects," making a total of 53 questions put to Aboriginal authorities. Further, six questions were put to publicans; 10 to doctors, and six to priests. I do not know how many doctors or priests were interviewed. They also posed seven questions to shire councils, which in all probability were put to the shire clerks; five to the police; six to teachers, and 10 to officers of the Community Welfare Department. With the total of 53 put to Aboriginal authorities, that made a grand total of 103 questions.

Under nine headings the interviewer was able to make his own observations. Running through the questions I noticed that they were slanted. I am satisfied about that, and I am sure that most people would agree with me. However, that is not surprising in view of the fact that Dr. Schapper assisted in formulating the questions.

However, the interviewers have made the comment that when anyone was frank and not over-sympathetic, he had a negative approach to the question and brushed it off; but when anyone expressed himself as being sympathetic and anxious to help, the interviewers said that that person was helpful.

Nothing surprising has arisen from this review, and therefore this sort of study is of no value to a Government or to members of Parliament in trying to assess whether or not we are doing the right thing by the Aborigines. I speak as one who had close association with Aborigines in a ministerial capacity for over nine years and I welcome the appointment of a Royal Commission, because one can be so close to the situation that one cannot see the wood for the tree. It is possible, as was suggested by the member for Kimberley, that one's mind can become really clouded and could perhaps continue to follow a

policy that has not achieved all that it could despite the best intentions in the world.

In my experience I have found that the greatest difficulty was to ascertain what these people themselves really wanted. I am speaking now of past years when there was no advisory council. I again emphasise that the Aboriginal population covers many sophisticated people who have become school teachers, nursing sisters, and others who hold responsible positions in the community, such as a position in the Public Service of this State. The Aboriginal people then range down to the rather primitive natives east of the Warburton Range, and even further east than that, and so we have to try to evaluate a policy to do something for Aborigines within that great range from the sophisticated native to the primitive native.

It is only in recent years that we have had greater liaison between the Aboriginal community and the white people in the form of the establishment of the advisory council. The natives themselves elect three representatives to that council, but even though we split the State into seven divisions, and there are two representatives from each division on the council, there must be many Aborigines within those divisions who cannot make contact with their representatives. The two representatives, say, from the Kimberley division, or even from any other part of the State, must have the utmost difficulty in assessing what an Aboriginal 200 or 300 miles away really needs to meet his social standards.

However, they are doing their best and some good has arisen from this advisory council. The point I want to emphasise is that this is a long-term job. A solution to the problem cannot be found overnight. I do not care what resources a Government has, financial or otherwise, but resources are a vital factor in regard to Aboriginal welfare in this State.

Even if all the financial resources were made available overnight it would not be possible to make the road to assimilation smooth and easy. It will be hard, difficult, and painful for many of the Aborigines themselves. However, I support the motion and I hope much good will result from the inquiry.

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

METROPOLITAN REGION PLANNING

Criticism of Government Action: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 6th September, on the following motion by Mr. O'Connor:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government has failed to co-ordinate its metropolitan regional planning efficiently and has proceeded

with its planning in an unco-ordinated manner which will affect adversely the future metropolitan regional traffic plan and operations, environmental aspects and result in a large financial cost and waste to the taxpayers of Western Australia.

This House is also of the opinion that the Government should act immediately to co-ordinate its planning using the services of competent authorities such as the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the Environmental Protection Authority.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Town Planning) [5.32 p.m.]: I thank the House for postponing the debate on this motion earlier this afternoon when I was unable to be present. I am sure that any one of my colleagues would have been able to deal with the matter effectively because, being as generous as I can be, I cannot find the words of the motion actually proved in the content of the matter submitted by the member for Mt. Lawley when speaking to the motion.

The motion states that the Government has failed to co-ordinate metropolitan regional planning efficiently; that it has proceeded in an unco-ordinated manner; and that this will adversely affect the future metropolitan regional traffic plan and operations, thus costing the taxpayers of Western Australia a large sum of money. The Opposition then calls on us to act immediately to co-ordinate planning, using the services of competent authorities such as the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the Environmental Protection Authority.

I submit that this is exactly what the Government is doing and consequently the House has no need to direct the Government to act in this way. The Government is using the M.R.P.A. and the E.P.A. in exactly the way those authorities were meant to be used and as the legislation directs that they be used.

I listened very carefully to the honourable member's speech, and have also read it. I suppose that if we deleted all the interjections the number of pages of his speech would be reduced by half because he certainly drew many crabs, as we call them. However I do not think the interjections altered the context of his speech to any large degree.

The motion implies that new regional planning developments and decisions are continually taking place, almost on a month-to-month basis, and that the regional picture is changing rapidly. That, I believe, is the inference to be drawn from the speech of the honourable member.

The charge that the Government has failed to co-ordinate its metropolitan regional planning and has proceeded in an

unco-ordinated manner suggests that the Government has instituted major changes in the regional planning sphere since it took office. Of course, this is not so. Any-one who has studied the position in any depth will realise no real change has been made.

The member for Mt. Lawley referred to the Stephenson Plan of 1956 and he then traced the history of town planning and M.R.P.A. matters from that point to the present time. Having done this so thoroughly he should have been able to appreciate that what was required was being done. It is therefore my responsibility to advise simply and clearly on the planning situation.

What I have to say to a very large degree relates to what the member for Mt. Lawley said and I am sure a very similar conclusion will be reached. It will then be abundantly clear that the motion is not necessary.

Metropolitan regional planning is at present covered by the metropolitan region town planning scheme approved by Parliament in 1963 and amended from time to time. We all know the nature of and reason for those amendments. The first scheme of 1963 was a framework for future urban expansion. The filling in of the detail on that framework has been a continuous process ever since and I am sure it will be a continuous process for a long time to come.

The local authorities submit their schemes to the M.R.P.A. In other words, the scheme represented an outline of a picture and the painting in of the final detail was, to a large degree—in fact almost entirely—left to the local authorities under the guidance of the M.R.P.A.

We have now almost reached the final stage of that first section of the scheme. All but four of the 26 local authorities have submitted their town planning schemes, and I believe that those four will make theirs available to the M.R.P.A. for approval within a reasonably short time. I am sure that good reasons exist for the fact that the four local authorities have not submitted their plans as yet, but they are being encouraged to get on with the job very quickly. Although the power exists under the Act to allow the department to institute a town planning scheme it would be very reluctant to do this while the goodwill of the local authorities is still evident.

The fact that we have advanced so far in our planning in almost a 10-year period is a credit to us. I pay recognition to the work done in this direction by the previous Government also. I suppose we have been left with the tail-enders; that is, those who have been a little slow to complete their schemes. The M.R.P.A. has, for a considerable time, been preparing for the next phase. The parent Act charges it

with the responsibility of administering and reviewing the scheme. As a result of the powers given to it under the Act the authority undertook a major review almost five years ago and submitted the corridor plan which involves a form of growth which should be adopted over the region during the next two decades.

Because planning must always be ahead of the actual development, the M.R.P.A. presented its corridor plan almost 18 months ago and I believe that is a reasonable period. At almost exactly the same time the Perth Regional Transport Study report was presented. This also involved a long-range view—not of anything to occur next month or even next year. I must say that it took me some considerable time, when dealing with town planning matters, to appreciate that we are planning for the future—years and years ahead—and not for something which will occur next week and be completed next month.

As I have said, the PERTS report involved a long-range view of the future and it recommended certain action. As members are aware, both reports are at present with the Government and it is very important that I emphasise that the corridor plan—this, as I said, is the next stage of the metropolitan region town planning scheme—does not require any immediate or drastic changes to the policy implemented over the past several years.

Mr. Rushton: Do you not think that the fact that it has not been adopted is a contributing factor to the uncertainty?

Mr. DAVIES: I expected that interjection long before this.

Mr. Rushton: What is the answer regarding the uncertainty?

Mr. DAVIES: I will give it, although the honourable member has already been supplied with it in the answer to a question asked today. This is the point which seems to be worrying the member for Dale no end.

The motion strangely contradicts itself. On the one hand it talks of a failure to co-ordinate metropolitan regional planning. As I have indicated, this is the scheme administered by the M.R.P.A. Is it a fact that the M.R.P.A. has failed to co-ordinate properly? If it is a fact, why does the motion recognise in the same breath, as it were, that the M.R.P.A. is one of the competent authorities the services of which should be utilised? In fact it is a contradiction. The M.R.P.A. is doing the job with which it was charged.

It is not possible to come to any decision on the corridor plan while the Honorary Royal Commission is still sitting. In fact, were a decision reached, it would be an affront to Parliament. This surely is a basic principle and it would

be accepted even by the most unreasonable member of Parliament. Until such time as the report of the Honorary Royal Commission is presented to me I have no intention whatever of announcing the Government's intention concerning the corridor plan. Surely that is not unreasonable. The Chairman of the Honorary Royal Commission is a member of the Opposition in another place. If members opposite could get him to hurry the report along, then I would be able to consider the matter much quicker.

Mr. Rushton: Two years have gone by already.

Mr. DAVIES: Has the honourable member referred to this in his own party room?

Mr. Rushton: I am saying that the Government has a responsibility.

Mr. DAVIES: Has the member for Dale asked the members concerned in another place to get on with the job?

Mr. Rushton: You should be getting on with the job.

Mr. DAVIES: The Government will get on with the job but it will not affront Parliament. If I were to make a decision before the report of the Honorary Royal Commission has been handed down, I would be accused of affronting Parliament.

Mr. Rushton: Think again of your laundry.

Mr. DAVIES: The honourable member can debate that at some other time. I am waiting for the occasion.

I have read a great deal and I know my feelings on the matter, but I will not make them public in this House—or known to anybody—until all the evidence is placed before me. If any members of the Opposition are able to hasten the report of the Honorary Royal Commission, I will be ever grateful to them.

Regional planning, as I have already said, is the business of the M.R.P.A. and it would be difficult indeed to find a more competent planning body than the 12 men who comprise it. I think this bears repeating, because a question was asked in another place regarding the composition of the M.R.P.A. For the information of members I think I should state who the members are. The Chairman of the M.R.P.A. is the mayor of the largest local authority and is widely experienced in municipal government. There are five representatives of Government departments; namely, the Town Planning Department, the Main Roads Department, the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board, the Transport Department, and the Department of Development and Decentralisation. Next, the Lord Mayor of the City of Perth and the four representatives of other district planning

committees in the region cover the whole field of local government participation in planning. Finally, there is a representative of the industrial community.

I think members will agree with me that the constitution of the M.R.P.A. provides us with a very competent body to deal with planning matters. If members care to look at the answers to questions asked today—questions to which I have already referred—they will find that the attendance of the members of the M.R.P.A. at meetings has been extremely good in the last several years, and particularly during the time the present Government has been in office.

I have already said we are approaching the end of one phase and the beginning of another. Members will be aware that both in the corridor plan for Perth and in the PERTS report there are a number of recommendations for changing, updating, and amending policies and administration procedure. This is being done all the time. It is obvious, from reading both of these reports, that the experience of carrying out the region scheme over the last nine years has necessarily shown the need for improvements and revisions if the business of regional planning is to work smoothly. I believe the M.R.P.A. and its associated bodies are doing just that. They are reviewing the scheme, making amendments where necessary, and applying themselves very competently indeed to the problems of planning. It is equally clear from both reports that the need for effective co-ordination between land use requirements and transportation needs has been given close attention.

The member for Mt. Lawley implied the necessity for this in his motion. I agree. We must look at land use requirements and transportation needs. However, this is being done and it is precisely these recommendations—among many others—that will be scrutinised by the Government before it reaches any decision on the next phase of the regional planning policy.

I do not think it should be assumed from this that a measure of the closest possible co-ordination does not already exist. The steering committee of the PERTS study group, for instance, includes four members of the M.R.P.A.; namely, the Town Planning Commissioner, the Director-General of Transport; the Commissioner of Main Roads, and the Lord Mayor of Perth.

Had any of these members felt at any time that it was necessary to refer any matter to the M.R.P.A. for attention, of course this would have been done. In fact, throughout all its deliberations, the steering committee—through the Director-General of Transport—has kept the M.R.P.A. fully informed of what is going on.

In fact, the PERTS committee has continuing and close co-operation with the M.R.P.A. This is highly desirable, and indeed essential, but I emphasise that it already exists.

When the proposals of the corridor plan and of the PERTS report so closely match each other, and particularly when the proposals of both reports refer to future recommended action and do not call for immediate action—I emphasise this latter statement—it is absolute nonsense to say that the Government has proceeded with its planning in a way that will adversely affect the future traffic plan. This implies, as I have already said, that something will happen overnight. The information is being brought together, is being co-ordinated, and is being looked at by the proper authorities to determine what will be the best move.

The future traffic plan has not been finalised and, as I have already said—but emphasise again—the Government has not decided on the future of the corridor plan for Perth. Further, even if the Government announced its decisions on both reports today, it would be some considerable time before any action “on the ground” took place. I have already mentioned what must happen before we reach that stage.

I did not notice a single statement from the Opposition to the effect that any decision now being carried out “on the ground” conflicts with M.R.P.A. policy. These are broad principles which are being examined and will continue to be examined for future consideration.

Perhaps I might say something about one or two of the items which appear to be causing some worry. One is the creation of the new suburb at Coogee. Had it been possible for me to attend Monday’s Cabinet meeting last week, and had there been a Cabinet meeting this week, I am sure the Government’s intentions in this regard would have been made public by now. As soon as they are, I will be quite happy to table any report I have in my possession, but until such time as the Government makes its decision, I believe we have every right to retain the reports. As I have said, a decision will be made on the information available and, at that stage, if any further information is required from my departments, I will be only too happy to table any papers.

I have noticed that there was some considerable debate—although I could not pick up the point of that debate—on the charge that the Government is proceeding with an underground railway. All the Government is doing is to seek legislative action. What is the good of even considering the matter and of trying to relate it to any planning scheme if there is no legislative authority to do this? That is all the Government is doing at the present time.

From what I have seen and the brief notes I have taken on traffic matters overseas and in Australia, I believe an underground railway scheme has a great deal of merit. The fact that a scheme which could possibly suit has been discussed and tabled does not mean that this is to be the ultimate scheme. Before the Government—irrespective of what Government it might be—proceeds with this, there is a tremendous amount of work to be done. The Government would be culpable if it did not try to give a broad outline of what the final result is likely to be. This is exactly what has happened in this case.

To say, as the motion does, that the Government is not using the facilities available to it and is acting in an unco-ordinated way, is completely incorrect. The Government has used all the legislative processes available to it. The Government has been using the M.R.P.A., which is the appropriate authority. In addition, as I have said, there has been the closest co-operation between the M.R.P.A., subcommittees, and other planning committees on all matters, and this will continue to be the case. Surely we do not want to have expert opinion, vested with statutory authority, and not use it. Although I have often said in this House the fewer committees we see the better, this is one body for which I have tremendous regard, because it puts a great deal of time into the work it has to do. It is a body which accepts a great responsibility and is doing a splendid job in co-operation, as I have said before, with other similar planning committees.

I believe the Government is doing everything required of it. The Government is acting within the law and is using these authorities. I do not believe that the charges contained in this motion were substantiated in the slightest way.

There are several vague references within the motion to other matters, but I am afraid I cannot answer these, because they are too vague to be real to me. If the matters are developed I will try to see what answers can be given to them.

For my part, I say the Government is using the proper facilities available to it and the motion is a complete waste of time. I could remind the House that it was brought forward at a time when this matter was fairly topical and newsworthy. It probably had a fair amount of public interest and could have brought some publicity to the Opposition.

I believe the motion has cast a slur on the M.R.P.A. As I have said, I have the highest regard for the people concerned and I do not believe this is the type of motion which should have been brought before the House. No case has been presented by the Opposition. The M.R.P.A. is doing a very good job and the Government is using that body and will continue to do so, as is proposed in accordance with

the legislation. I believe that the Opposition is shying at shadows and ignoring the real substance of planning in this State. I oppose the motion.

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [5.57 p.m.]: I have listened with some interest to what the Minister had to say. I think there is a great deal of merit in his remarks but, in fact, the impression I gained is that they tended to support the motion instead of negating it.

Mr. Jamieson: Snarler and sniveller.

Mr. MENSAROS: The Minister said that the member for Mt. Lawley did not prove in his speech what the motion seeks to achieve. To my way of thinking, the implication of this is that the Opposition did not come up with an overall plan, which it had instigated, in connection with what the Government should do. In this respect I do not think the Minister needs to be reminded that it is not the job of members of the Opposition, who do not have advisers at their disposal, to devise an overall plan. This is the task of the Government whereas the Opposition has to highlight the faults or lack of policies.

Indeed, I think the Opposition has achieved something by this motion together with questions which have been asked in Parliament on this particular field and associated fields. This has caused the Minister to make a recent statement about land values, which subject is connected with this motion.

My only regret is that the Minister did not make use of this Chamber to make his statement. The motion provided the Minister with an appropriate opportunity to give this information to Parliament first instead of going directly to the Press.

The Minister has explained that an Act known as the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act is in existence and, of course, we are all aware of this. He also explained that local authorities went ahead and, with the exception of four, submitted local plans. The Minister said that everything is going ahead sweetly. It is only 18 months since the corridor plan and the PERTS plan have been considered.

He also said that there is no need for any drastic move. This, of course, is not the aim of the motion. The member for Mt. Lawley did not suggest that something drastic should be done either one day or the next. The motion simply indicates that the Government has failed to co-ordinate its planning and has proceeded in an unco-ordinated manner. The motion refers to the total concept of planning and implies that whatever is done in between—whether it be a plan for an underground railway line or the establishment of a bus terminal, which may or may not fit in with the overall concept—should be co-ordinated according to the desirability and it should be related to the total concept.

At the outset I will admit that planning is almost a nasty word for every true Liberal, unless it refers to an overall intelligent concept which is based on incentives and not on compulsion and on the necessary actions by the Government.

I think that experience overseas, and to a certain extent in the Eastern States, has convinced us all that there is a necessity for some planning if only to meet the increasing demands and problems associated with traffic; problems which do not only increase with the increasing population but to a faster degree with the higher standard of living.

It is not easy to meet the overall concept which the motion seeks because, as the Minister has said, this is based on a number of unknown future components. But because it is not easy it should not be evaded and we certainly accuse the Government of evading the issue of overall planning.

We all realise that we are very lucky in this State not to have reached the stage which has been reached in the larger capitals and cities of the world. The more we delay with this overall concept of planning the more costly and the more difficult will it become, and eventually it will be almost impossible to implement any plan which is reasonable or feasible, as has been the case in other countries.

It is not possible for an overall concept of planning to be achieved in a piecemeal fashion—by introducing piecemeal legislation. We must first have an overall concept on which to work. The Minister said he did all he could in the matter and that he used all the facilities available to him.

The Minister did not seem to understand the fact that it is not possible to plan for a bus terminal or an underground railway without first knowing what the general concept will be.

We do not even know—to give one example—how the existing railway line will be utilised, because legislation has not yet been passed. I understand the reason for this is that it has been submitted without the necessary and adequate study first being carried out; studies on which such legislation should be based. If this plan for an underground line is not practical it is a waste of time and money to continue with the proposition in a piecemeal fashion.

I could also detect some contradiction in the attitude adopted by both the Minister and the other members of the Government while these methods were being discussed. The Minister tells us that the undergrounding of the railway is only a plan; that it would not necessarily be implemented.

This is precisely what we said when the matter was first brought to Parliament; we said that it had not been researched sufficiently.

Or, talking about the bus terminal, it is no explanation to say that this project will cost only \$300,000 or \$500,000 and that is nothing compared with \$50,000,000 for the underground line. We should not waste even \$300,000 or \$500,000 if the project on which it is to be spent does not fit in with the overall concept. It cannot fit in and, in fact, it will not fit in.

Some experts have pointed out that the establishment of a bus terminal may hinder the present traffic flow through the city along Wellington Street. From the statements we have heard it would appear that the Government does not seem to know the exact fate or future of the bus terminal, because if I recall correctly the Minister for Works said by way of interjection, "Of course this one will not be there forever, and will be pulled up after 20 or 30 years."

On the other hand, the Premier said on the same subject that this terminal would eventually be integrated in the overall concept. We want to know where is the overall concept in which the terminal is to be integrated.

As I emphasised before, even the future components are almost unknown. It would seem that we must arrive at the components in a speculative sort of way, after studying all the foreseeable circumstances. So it would appear that the components have not even been set.

The Nielsen plan was based on the assumption that the central business district will have 90,000 employees in it by 1985. We have nearly 80,000 employees and businessmen in the central business district at the moment. With an upswing in the economy—which will be inevitable after the Government changes—the number of employees could, I suggest, reach 90,000 much before 1985, and this figure will be greatly exceeded by 1985. Whether this is desirable or not is, of course, another matter.

Experience in overseas countries and in the Eastern States has shown that it is difficult to prevent the development and growth of a city. I heard an explanation given in London, when an endeavour was made to establish satellite cities, that one of the most difficult single aspects was the problem of finding employees, particularly young female business workers, to work in those satellite cities because, for the most part, they wanted to go into the city proper where they felt they would have more social advantages.

What was announced in connection with Melbourne three or four weeks ago has already been tried in Sydney years ago. One must say this has been tried without much success, the only result being a loss in rates for the city council.

I would dare to forecast that even the residential population, at least in the surrounding areas of the city, if not in the city proper, may very well also increase

because of the circumstances that will prevail. For instance, in New York a number of people choose to stay in the city during the week and leave it during the weekend. They have to travel many miles and keep only their families away from the city because they get tired of commuting every day, particularly if the service is not good enough.

Mr. Jamieson: They go down to Yundurup.

Mr. MENSAROS: The present plan for the underground railway could be accepted only if the central business district's population is enormously increased.

If the population of the central business district does not increase as quickly it would be hard to imagine how such a plan for an underground railway can be financed. It is hard enough to find the finance in places where the population is 10 or 20 times as great as that of Perth.

For example, one mile of underground railway line so far as this State is concerned must be financed by X people; whereas in a densely populated area it would be financed by 10 X or 20 X people; therefore the expenditure *per capita* would be 10 X or 20 X times less.

If the underground loop is to have any hope of success it should be integrated in a future rapid transport system which, for the time being, could be connected at the extreme ends of the suburbs with a bus service and, later, an underground railway.

It is hard to imagine how this can be done in a looplike form, because very few people will be using it, by parking their cars, in order to travel a distance of one or two stations by underground. We would have to do what is done in Japan where a rapid-way transport is used with three, four, or more terminals at the end of each corridor through the city. In Japan the first train goes from point 1 to point 2, the second to point 3, the third to point 4, and so people do not even have to change trains.

These are details which we should not go into even though they highlight the problem which is experienced not only by us but by other cities also; a problem which will become bigger and more urgent day by day; despite the fact that the Minister rightly said it cannot be solved in one day or the next.

One knows of cases of cities where the problem has been solved, but one also knows of places where it has not been solved at all. In this connection I would refer to two such examples, the first of which is Seattle, where the problem of traffic has been solved by way of rapid transport in addition to numerous free-ways. I experienced no traffic congestion at all during the short time I was there two or three years ago.

In New York and Rome, however, the traffic problem seems to be insurmountable. It is obvious that we do not want to get into this situation. It is because of this that the motion urges the Government to do something about the matter.

I cannot see anything contradictory in the motion—as was suggested by the Minister. The motion asks the Government to co-ordinate metropolitan regional planning and it suggests that something should be done by some authority. I cannot see any contradiction in the motion whatever. On the contrary, I think it expresses very well the lack of overall planning that exists today, and it highlights the necessity for it.

For those reasons I support the motion.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [6.11 p.m.]: I have only a few moments at my disposal before the tea suspension. I think it is timely to mention, however, that one of the highlights of the motion before us stresses our surprise that the Government should proceed with an underground railway plan without such a plan being first considered by the M.R.P.A. We are amazed that the Government should proceed with this matter without knowing its land use for the metropolitan region. The whole thing seems totally incredible.

The Minister of the day had all sorts of opinions which appeared to differ from those held by the M.R.P.A. This has been made evident in a number of ways, and it has caused tremendous conflict and concern in the community. It has caused so much concern that we are now reaping the aftermath, and the consequent result is that people have been unemployed because of the uncertainty the Government has created.

The public are not prepared to build or subdivide to the same extent and, accordingly, we are accumulating the evils resulting from the present Government's inaction.

I appreciate that there has been a change of Minister and I must admit that the present Minister has tried to grasp the nettle and get some certainty into his planning. We must be fair to him and see how he performs, and it is reasonable that he be given the time to carry out the necessary work.

The Minister's Government, however, has been in office for 20 months. It has not availed itself of the advantages that were created immediately prior to its appointment; advantages that were created by the tremendous efforts of the previous Government to restore stability and to ensure that the public had confidence and knew where we were going. All this was done by tremendous application, and as a result of great effort and endeavour by the previous Government.

From answers I have received to my questions it is evident that even at this late hour the Government does not wish

to indicate to the House what the future of the central business district is to be as it relates to employment. The Government is, however, prepared to sink a railway at a cost in excess of \$500,000,000. It is prepared to do this even though we do not know what the central district employment situation is likely to be.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. RUSHTON: Before the tea suspension I was indicating to the House why it was necessary to move the motion before us, and I said I would go on to prove the need for it.

It is obvious that the Government has failed in its responsibility to show leadership in town planning and environmental protection policies. The Government has tended to be diverted by side issues and it has not been at all positive in regard to either of those two subjects. These are issues which adversely affect everyone in the community.

I think it is readily accepted that the Minister in this Government who was in charge of town planning from the outset—and we understand he asked for the portfolio—was determined to do things his way. It was interesting to watch him going about his intentions. Unfortunately for the State, he failed. This is evidenced by the fact that he relinquished the portfolio and also the fact that we had so much disquiet in the community as a result of what transpired in the department under his leadership.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What fairy story have you been reading?

Mr. RUSHTON: This is factual; it is public knowledge. We heard talk about a fifth corridor, and we had a lack of certainty about where we were going. Obviously that caused developers, small subdividers, and all others wishing to do anything in the State, to be uncertain about the future. No-one knew just when the fifth corridor would be extended. People throughout the metropolitan region were influenced by that. We still do not know what is happening in that regard, because the Government has not indicated its intention to the public. Yet the Premier interjected that I was not on sound ground when I made my allegation.

Of course, it is commonly understood that people button up their pockets and defer developments they have in mind when they have no confidence in the future. They do not wish to be caught by a Government which is threatening and is not definite in its policies.

A good example of this is the rezoning which occurred in the area in which the Premier lives. This matter was disclosed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and it was debated in the media of the area for quite a considerable time. The rezoning left much to be desired. If much more of that type of action is perpetrated,

who knows how far the destruction of public confidence will go? We do not know how far it has gone, but that will unfold as time goes by and more is known of the various actions of the Government.

I mention also the delay in the determination of the corridor plan. It is now approximately two years since the Town Planning Department put forward recommendations to the Government to adopt a forward policy. Part of that policy was introduced by the previous Government in the Armadale corridor, but the Tonkin Government has been procrastinating for two years.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Tonkin Government has not been in office two years yet.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am saying the report has been available for two years.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You said the Tonkin Government had been procrastinating for two years.

Mr. RUSHTON: Well I will give the Government four months' grace and say it has been procrastinating for 20 months. If one briefly refers to the past one realises that the previous Government made great efforts of leadership, it provided direction, and it took action to bring confidence to the community regarding the availability of land. It restored a state of sanity with regard to the price of land.

However, that sanity has been lost in the last 20 months, partly as a result of the uncertainty created by the Government. Nobody is willing to move because the Government has provided no leadership. There is no confidence in the community, and there is no trust in the Government because we have had threats of what it would do if such and such did not occur. That is not the way to encourage positive action and to encourage people to progress with their projects with confidence.

Let us consider the action of the previous Minister for Town Planning, who engaged Mr. Ritter to make a report. I think Mr. Ritter has been made a scapegoat by the Government. I regret that, and I deplore the fact that the Government has not the decency—

Mr. Jamieson: It is surprising to have you and Ritter on the one side. I have heard everything now.

Mr. RUSHTON: —even to make a decision upon the report prepared by Mr. Ritter. It employed that eminent town planner—

Mr. Jamieson: Wherever Ritter is, he will be sweating now.

Mr. RUSHTON: —to undertake this exercise, and it has left him carrying the baby. The Government has not reported to the House regarding the result of the work carried out by Mr. Ritter. I seem passing strange that the Government could not appoint a qualified, independent person

to make a report in connection with such an important issue as Cockburn Sound, yet it appointed an independent person in the case of the corridor plan in order to get itself off the hook and to give it more time in the hope that its uncertainties could be solved with the passage of time.

Today the Minister spoke about awaiting the report of an Honorary Royal Commission. The reason the Royal Commission was appointed was that the Government was procrastinating and its decisions were unacceptable. The Government has not provided any leadership during the last 20 months. We all realise that the area of town planning is a most tender and sensitive one, and one in which the previous Government took certain actions to restore confidence.

Also it is no good saying to the M.R.P.A. that it should show leadership; it is up to the Government to show leadership. The M.R.P.A. should act upon the policy decisions and follow the leadership of the Government.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It also acts within the jurisdiction of its own Act.

Mr. RUSHTON: But surely the Minister for Education would accept that the Government should give it leadership. I remember that when I was serving as a shire representative on the M.R.P.A. group C committee, I felt the M.R.P.A. was all powerful, but it has been instructed to provide recommendations to the Government, and it is up to the Government to make decisions and to create confidence so that people may act in a positive way.

It is certainly to be regretted that although Mr. Ritter was asked to prepare a report on a most important issue, and although the report has been tabled for about 10 months, the Government has made no decision. That is totally unfair to the person engaged to make the report. I think the House wants to know what is the decision of the Government.

What is to be the future? We have heard about the corridor plan and what is to be undertaken in that concept; we have also heard about a directional network concept, and it may well be that other concepts will be produced. What is the decision of the Government? Certainly it is not known to the public. I think the Government is hiding behind the Honorary Royal Commission. According to the Minister it is waiting for the report of the commission so that it may take some action. Surely that is not the action of a positive Government! Nor have we been able to obtain any indication of the thinking of the Government in regard to the work force to be employed in the central business district, although recently we heard of another concept in this regard. I think it is necessary to refer to these issues because the confidence of

the public has certainly been lost as a result of colourful and unsubstantiated announcements.

One such announcement concerned the Macedonia Street Reserve at Kwinana. I received an answer in regard to this matter today. The Minister for Town Planning made a colourful announcement that the Government would reverse all the iniquitous things done by the previous Government. He virtually said, "Here is a gift." Approximately 10 acres of reserve was mentioned, but what happened? Nothing. The Minister was forced to apologise, and his apology appeared in the local Press some time ago. This was simply another announcement.

Then we had the announcement of the Pilbara concept. We also had the announcement of the railway plan which took place, I think, at—it was not at Coogee, but near there; the Minister for Works would know because he was present, the Premier was in Japan—

Sir Charles Court: The Robb Jetty terminal.

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes, that is it. That was a further similar announcement. We are getting them almost every day. I feel sure that a diary is kept in the office of the Minister for Town Planning and that every three months a card comes up to let the Minister know to make another colourful announcement. The announcement is made regardless of the fact that the subject has not been investigated, that it has no background, that no feasibility study has been made, or that it is unsubstantiated. I am sure we will have a further three or four such announcements before the election.

That is what happened in regard to the Perth railway plan. The final implementation of the railway plan will be nothing like that which was presented to this House. One can be sure of that because the plan presented to the House is not workable. One need only refer to the terminals at each end of the city. Surely that concept would not be acceptable to anybody? Surely we must have an integrated, high-capacity transport system which is soundly based and flexible enough to enable it to be improved in the light of modern technology. The plan with which we were presented was not backed up with any basic facts; it was merely another concept.

This tends to destroy the confidence of the public in the actions of the Government. We hope it will shortly turn up with something, but even if it does the people will not believe the Government. That is not good enough for the elected Government of Western Australia. Whatever be the political colour of the Government of the day, the people should have some degree of confidence in it, so that each member of the community can play his part with some confidence.

The fact that the Perth regional railway plan was not considered or approved by the M.R.P.A. is incredible. This is another reason for the moving of the motion. We got the impression from the Minister that the M.R.P.A. had given the plan its blessing. However, this motion is the reaction to the fact that this \$500,000,000 project in the long term has not been vetted by this specialised authority. If anything causes disquiet, it was what we heard at our interview with the town planners in the television room of this building. That was the occasion when we heard an explanation of the corridor plan and the directional network plan. We were told that the M.R.P.A. had not considered the sinking of the railway line. I believe this is another fundamental reason for bringing the motion before the House, to let the people know what is taking place. Surely the public cannot be expected to have confidence in the Government's town planning when such things are revealed.

Today in answer to the motion the Minister did not tell us why the M.R.P.A. had not fully investigated and reported upon the Perth regional railway plan. That, in itself, would be sufficient reason for the Opposition to bring the motion forward.

No-one will believe that the Government in bringing forward a proposal like the Perth regional railway plan, which is based on the transport needs of the public, has not formulated its future policy on land use. This plan is found to be wanting. Members accepted the plan in good faith, but that confidence has since been destroyed.

I suggest that the lack of leadership by the Government has resulted in additional unemployment, because developers are not prepared to expend their money on additional projects. Developers have been reluctant to undertake the servicing of additional land, and this has resulted from the lack of leadership by the Government. It is fair to say that the Government has not given purposeful or sound leadership in town planning development in its 18 months of office. The Minister for Town Planning is now awaiting the report and recommendations of the Honorary Royal Commission so that he can proceed with a policy.

The motion deals with the lack of co-ordination and policy making of the Government in respect of environmental protection. I need refer only to three issues which I have raised with the Environmental Protection Authority. The first is the 330kV power line; a small part of the route of this line traverses my electorate. What the Government has done provides me with evidence that public money is being wasted, as is indicated in answers to questions which I have asked in this House.

Although the State Electricity Commission is purely an agency of the Government, it has purchased for \$19,800 a house which lies on the route of this power line. I understand the house will be demolished. Other people on small undeveloped blocks, on some of which homes have been erected, will be disadvantaged.

The Parliamentary Commissioner has also been involved, although the Premier has disputed his involvement. In answer to the following question which I asked of the Minister for Electricity today:—

Does this mean the route is open to change if the Parliamentary Commissioner can prove residents are being unnecessarily disadvantaged?

The Minister said the question was hypothetical and was not admissible. Fancy the Minister not accepting that question!

If the Parliamentary Commissioner can obtain evidence that in relation to environmental protection a member of the public is being disadvantaged unnecessarily, surely remedies should be available. The Parliamentary Commissioner has been appointed to highlight such cases, so that action by the Government should not disadvantage people unnecessarily. If the actions of the Government do disadvantage the people then it is reasonable for the route of the power line to be altered. As I pointed out, a house has been purchased, and this is to be demolished. By shifting the route of the power line that would not be necessary.

The previous route passed through the middle of many properties. It was altered slightly, and the present proposed route is an improvement, but even this takes an unnecessary alignment. It is very necessary to have a Parliamentary Commissioner to investigate such matters; and we certainly need one with this Government in office, because it does not seem to be inclined to agree to practical remedies.

The story of the Kwinana-Balga power line is a long one. The member for Darling Range has said such a great deal on this subject that it is well known what the Government has done in respect of the route. I believe it is the right of a member of Parliament to bring forward this matter to the Environmental Protection Authority for its report.

In answer to a letter which I wrote to the Environmental Protection Authority I was told that the report by the authority on the S.E.C. transmission route had been tabled in Parliament. That merely indicated that Cabinet had made a decision which was contrary to the recommendation of the Environmental Protection Authority. Of course that authority could not proceed further on this matter. So much for the Environmental Protection Authority, its reports and findings, and the acceptance of its recommendations.

The next issue which I raised was the creation of the Naval Base housing suburb, and this is a strange story. I remember when the Minister for Development and Decentralisation told us no report on this project would be made by the Environmental Protection Authority. Could anyone think of a project with a higher priority to be vetted by this authority than this particular project?

It would appear that since I wrote to the Environmental Protection Authority in July or thereabouts asking for a report, it has now prepared a report. This was not done I believe at the Government's request. We have not been successful in having it tabled. We are waiting for the Premier to make an announcement in this respect.

We are told that the M.R.P.A. has made a recommendation on what is taking place in this housing project, but we cannot get the report tabled. We have asked the Chief Town Planner about this and we have heard from Dr. Carr for whom I have a great deal of respect the reasons for wanting the land in this area to be rezoned as urban. This gentleman appeared very embarrassed in saying what he did, but he certainly did not give substantial evidence as to why this land should be rezoned urban.

We now have a report from the Environmental Protection Authority, quite likely as a result of my request, but the Minister will not table it. He is waiting on the Premier to make an announcement, but that is not good enough. His action is causing uncertainty among the public.

It was claimed by the Government that the development of the Naval Base housing project would be the answer to the unemployment situation. This was supposed to be one of the major projects to be undertaken by the Government to provide employment. What has happened? I suggest, nothing. We cannot even get the report tabled. We all remember round about June the announcement by the Government that this was supposed to be a huge project which would reduce unemployment, but all that it has done is to create concern in the suburbs south of that locality. It has caused a reduction in building activities in the Rockingham-Kwinana area.

Sir Charles Court: It has scared the daylight out of the developers.

Mr. RUSHTON: They are not prepared to move, because they do not know what the Government will do next. The Premier has threatened to do certain things, and that is enough to cause the developers to sit on what they already have. The southern suburbs in the Kwinana-Rockingham area which were thriving under the Brand Government are now licking their wounds.

An announcement was made some time ago that one of the steps the Government had taken was to further develop the light industrial land at Dixon Road. However, nothing has been done in respect of that

land, but it was said in answer to questions that the Government was taking positive action.

Two persons were prepared to establish factories in that area, but they could not get any assistance from the Government. Those factories would employ something like 100 people. I examined one of these two cases, and I am convinced that the employer could have provided employment for 40 persons. That is the sort of reducing confidence that has been engendered by this Government.

The third issue which I raised was in regard to the long-term development of Cockburn Sound and its effect on environmental protection. I expected the Environmental Protection Authority to be asked by the Government to examine the possibility of environmental disturbances that would be caused by the Government's plan. Quite contrary to the pronouncements of the Premier when he was in Opposition, wharves are to be erected at Point Peron. It was my concern that this project should be vetted by the authority. Firstly, I was told by the Minister for Works that it would be, but later on I was told it would not be. Then in the letter of the 20th September from the Environmental Protection Authority I was told this—

With regard to long term development of Cockburn Sound, the EPA has not seen the need to date to formulate a specific report. However, it has been kept advised of moves by the Government and the Fremantle Port Authority related to such development and it is anticipated that close liaison will continue in the future.

We all remember what mileage was gained at the expense of the Commonwealth Government in respect of the development of Garden Island and the disturbance it would cause to the environment.

We also know that the Department of the Navy has installed certain protective devices to ensure that the ecology is kept under close study. However, our Government does not take similar steps. The Government gives contradictory answers to me concerning what is happening. We now learn that the Environmental Protection Authority has not been asked to investigate the proposed plan related to the wharves which are to be built in Cockburn Sound. Surely, if ever there was an issue which was sensitive to a change in the ecology it would be the construction of wharves.

The future of the port facilities in the Cockburn Sound area depends upon the continuance of the present healthy ecology in the area. If certain things take place the ecology will be destroyed and, for that reason, it is necessary to monitor certain actions which might be to the detriment of the future of the area. If the grasses

on the seabed are destroyed the sand will shift and that could necessitate dredging of the sound.

I have mentioned some of the simple and sensible actions which should be taken by the Government. This Government, which professes to do great things in relation to environmental protection, has let the team down. The State has been let down because the Government is not providing the proper leadership. I think the member for Mt. Lawley has quite rightly moved the motion we are now discussing. As a result of his examination of the public viewpoint, and the concern of the public for the future policies regarding town planning and environmental protection, the member for Mt. Lawley has seen fit to move his motion.

This House should agree to the motion. It implies that this Government, in a period of 18 months, has not provided leadership. The Government is resting on the results of the Honorary Royal Commission. The Royal Commission was set up to cover what the Government is not doing. Surely the Government should get down to business and provide leadership to give the public confidence.

The two vital issues readily understood by the people are unemployment and the high price of building blocks. Those two situations have resulted from the inactivity of the present Government, particularly in relation to town planning. It is no good the Government blaming the M.R.P.A.; it is the responsibility of the Government to provide leadership.

We will have an opportunity to debate a motion relating to land, and we will be able to show clearly what the Government has not done, and what has been lost to the State. I wholeheartedly support the motion moved by the member for Mt. Lawley.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [8.05 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion. It was my pleasure to entertain in this place today two visitors who came from Britain. I was extremely delighted at the comments they made about our city, and the Perth metropolitan area. My visitors had travelled through many countries of the world and they said Perth was one of the prettiest places they had visited.

I consider that we owe it to future generations to ensure that we retain the beauty we now have and, if at all possible, to make Perth even more attractive. We have the benefit of experience gained in other older cities of the world and, indeed, the experience gained in older cities within Australia. We have a unique opportunity to gain from that experience. I believe that a great responsibility rests upon the Government of Western Australia to ensure that it enunciates policies which take us towards that end.

The Stephenson plan was implemented several years ago, but it did receive some opposition. There are people who consider that the Stephenson plan was not practicable, and that it would not work. The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority undertook a study of the development because it considered that was the best way to develop the Perth metropolitan region.

With the change of Government in 1971 the new Minister for Town Planning had his own ideas on the development of the Perth metropolitan region. He further clouded the issue by implementing yet another study. However, I think it can clearly be seen that it would not matter how many plans were put forward there would be some opposition to them. We ought to have faith in the authority which we set up to co-ordinate the planning of the metropolitan area. I believe the M.R.P.A. has done a splendid job, and if given the right lead by the Government it will continue to do a good job.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. THOMPSON: I do not think the Government is giving the right lead. A little earlier my colleague, the member for Dale, referred to the 330kV power line but I do not wish to deal at length on that issue tonight. I want to point out that one of the weaknesses in the M.R.P.A. plan is that no provision was made for such a vital part of the development of the metropolitan area: for transmission lines of the magnitude of those under construction at this time. I repeat: No matter what plan is put forward some weaknesses will be found in it. However, if there is a plan, and it is adhered to, we will be travelling in the right direction. The planners will then have an opportunity to overcome some of the anomalies which occur from time to time. If we switch from plan to plan we will be in trouble forevermore.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. THOMPSON: We recently debated a Bill relating to the Perth regional railway. Whilst I recognise that there ought to be some planning with regard to the future transport system for the Perth metropolitan region I believe that the plan which was presented was half-baked in some respects. The situation was not completely analysed and the concept was premature. I consider it was a political move in an attempt to inform the people of the State that the present Government was doing something imaginative. However, the previous Government could easily have introduced a similar measure.

Mr. Graham: No it could not because the previous Government did not have a clue about this.

Mr. THOMPSON: The plan introduced to this House by the present Government was nothing more than a few lines on a drawing, which could have been produced by anybody.

Mr. O'Connor: The plan was not half-baked; it was not even warmed up.

Mr. THOMPSON: It was interesting to learn that the Bill concerning the metropolitan regional railway was amended in another place today. The effect of the amendment was to ensure that the Government obtained the approval of Parliament for the various stages of the development. It is unfortunate that only in that way are we to be assured of some sort of rational approach to a very important matter.

I would now like to refer to town planning within my own electorate. The Shire of Kalamunda, which principally comprises my electorate, has one of the highest growth rates of any of the local authorities in the State. From time to time it has problems, and it will continue to have problems in the future because of the growth rate which is occurring.

A good quantity of excellent building land exists in the foothills. Two suburbs have commenced, one at Forrestfield and one at High Wycombe. However, I have been assured by the M.R.P.A.—or one of its principal officers—that neither of those two suburbs would have been permitted had the M.R.P.A. been set up at the time.

It seems that the two suburbs will be allowed to develop until they have a population of about 15,000 which is necessary to support the facilities required. I refer to a reasonable shopping centre, a high school, and sporting and recreational facilities which can only be supported by a population of the size contemplated.

I honestly cannot visualise that such desirable building land as that which exists in the foothills will be allowed to remain vacant in the future. However, it was the considered opinion of the M.R.P.A. that the land ought not to be developed. So who am I to argue with the opinion of the authority on that matter? I am prepared to accept what the authority suggests as a plan of development for the area, and I accept that it ought to be continued.

I would like to point out that the Shire of Kalamunda is placed in a fairly awkward position. It is bounded on the west by the ban on development. Whilst that land is very desirable building land it will not be developed because of the concept of the M.R.P.A.

The shire is bounded on the north by public open space in the Helena Valley, and on the east by a water catchment area. The water catchment area extends from the east and covers most of the southern area. The Shire of Kalamunda is fast reaching a stage where it will not

be able to develop further. It would have a greater percentage of unratable land than any other local authority in the State.

One of the first approaches I made to a Minister of the present Government was to the then Minister for Town Planning concerning the principle of whether the owner of a piece of rural land ought to be able to make some of that land available for his son or daughter in order that he or she may build a home.

I must say I was extremely impressed with the attitude of the then Minister for Town Planning. He supported the principle that an orchardist, for instance, ought to be able to make available to his son a piece of land on which to build a home. The particular case which I put to the Minister was that a person named Ferrari—who was employed on the orchard owned by the father—desired to get married. He clearly understood he had a right to build a second house on that piece of rural land. He was also aware that he could not get a title to any part of that land and therefore could not raise a loan in order to build himself a home.

The Minister accepted the principle that in these circumstances people should be able to raise loans to build homes for their children or that the offspring should be able to raise loans to build houses for themselves. In the case of Mr. Ferrari, the Minister upheld an appeal lodged against the decision of the Town Planning Board not to allow the subdivision. In his letter to me—of which, unfortunately, I have not a copy—he pointed out that although the Minister for Works and Water Supplies objected, he had taken into consideration the fact that two homes could be built on that piece of land, anyway, and he would not stand in the way of the owner in this case raising a loan to build a home.

I was extremely pleased that that young person and two or three others later on were given the opportunity to build homes on land made available to them by their parents. However, in recent times there has been a change in this attitude, particularly in relation to the Pickering Brook area. A Mrs. Colgan has 30-odd acres at Walliston which she desired to subdivide into four pieces—one to be retained for herself, one to go to each of her two offspring, and one to be made available to the Salvation Army. The application she lodged with the Town Planning Board was refused, as were others in similar circumstances. On my advice, Mrs. Colgan lodged an appeal against the Town Planning Board's refusal and, to my surprise, the Minister dismissed the appeal. One paragraph of the Minister's letter rejecting the appeal which is pertinent to the point I want to make reads—

Furthermore, the land is in the catchment of the Lower Helena Pipe Head Dam which has now been con-

structed. The Public Works Department wishes to safeguard the purity of runoff to the dam and strongly objects to the subdivision.

I applaud any Government or group of people which stands to ensure that water supplies will not be polluted and I thought that explanation was reasonable, although it had come to my notice that, despite that policy of the Public Works Department, in the same water catchment area literally tons and tons of fowl manure are being applied to orchards. If that is not a more serious threat to water purity than the provision of three or four lots on which homes may be built, I will be surprised.

However, with that in mind I again took up the matter with the then Minister for Town Planning who said, "This is not my problem; I have just gone along with the attitude of my colleague the Minister for Works, who strongly opposes this subdivision." The Minister for Town Planning suggested I take up the matter with the Minister for Works. On the 24th May the Minister for Works replied to me with a fairly long letter, and I will read part of it—

As you are no doubt aware, the Public Works Department is opposed not only to this subdivision, but all proposals to subdivide on the Lower Helena Catchment Area where the land is zoned rural. The reason for this opposition to the subdivision of rural land is that such subdivision will only add to the further indiscriminate development of the catchment instead of containing orderly growth of small restricted areas already zoned urban. Subdivision within these urban areas is not opposed.

I was prepared to accept that the Government was coming up with a policy which would be adhered to. To my surprise I found that on about the 29th June, some days after I received the letter from the Minister for Works saying he intended to oppose the fragmentation of rural land in that area, the then Minister for Town Planning gave preliminary approval for the subdivision of 80 acres of rural land located in the same water catchment area.

I was nonplussed, so I made some inquiries of the department and was advised by departmental officers that the Public Works Department had not opposed the subdivision of the 80 acres of golf club land into half-acre lots, although a few weeks previously it had opposed the subdivision of 35 acres into four blocks. They tried to tell me that the reason for the rejection of the subdivision of Mrs. Colgan's land was not that it was contrary to town planning considerations or that the department could not supply it with reticulated water and roads; the reason was that it was likely to pollute the water. Then approval was given to the subdivision of 80 acres of land.

Is it any wonder that I and many other people in the area find it difficult to understand the attitude of this Government and the actions of some of its Ministers? I was told in this House some time ago by the then Minister for Town Planning that the Shire of Kalamunda strongly recommended the subdivision of this golf club land. I dispute that, but even if the Kalamunda Shire Council did strongly recommend it, it is not the responsibility of the council to guard the purity of the water. That is the responsibility of the Minister for Works and no matter what the Kalamunda Shire Council said, the Public Works Department should have adhered to a policy he had laid down. That policy applied to an individual who, on compassionate grounds, wanted to make land available to her offspring, but it did not apply to a golf club which caters for many people in the area.

The Kalamunda Shire Council's recommendation for the subdivision of that land was no stronger than the recommendation it made for the subdivision of Mrs. Colgan's land, Mr. Ferrari's land, and the land of many other people at that time. In each case the same stereotype recommendation went forward from the council. In fact, I have been told by several shire councillors that the reason for the shire recommending the subdivision of the golf club land was to enable the council to say to the golf club people, "We have put it up but it has been rejected because of the likelihood of polluting the water." That was what the councillors presumed, but the preliminary approval was given by the Minister.

There is a sequel to all of this and to some extent it will come to a head tomorrow night, when there is to be a public meeting sponsored by the Shire of Kalamunda in response to a demand by many ratepayers. One petition that was presented to the shire bore 400 signatures. I have received letters from many individuals within my electorate who are opposed to this subdivision, and I am sure the Minister for Town Planning has also received many letters about it. Some of the people who have approached me on this issue have contended that the golf club land should be allowed to remain in its present state. I would like it to remain in its present state, but I also concede that the Kalamunda Golf Club has rights as a landowner. The club owns a piece of freehold land, and it should be able to do with it whatever is permissible under the law. Good luck to it if it can get the subdivision through.

As I said earlier, I would like to see the land retained in its present state. Some of the people who have written to me have asked that it be purchased by the local authority and set aside for public open

space. Earlier in my speech I referred to the fact that the Shire of Kalamunda already has a great deal of public open space which not only serves the people of the Shire of Kalamunda but is also available to the many people from the metropolitan area who use the area at weekends and on public holidays. I believe that as time goes by the areas of land that have been set aside for public recreation in the hills will become more valuable. They will be used by more people because, as the metropolitan region develops, natural bushland of the type that is available in the Helena Valley and at Piesse Brook will diminish. There will not be very much of this sort of land available, and more people will use it as the population grows.

I do not think the ratepayers of the Shire of Kalamunda should pay for public open space that will be used by people from outside the authority's area. It is reasonable that they should accept the fact that some land will be used by others, but not to the extent to which the land will be used in the future. I therefore think it is the responsibility of the Government to ensure that there is available in the Perth metropolitan region adequate public open space of the type that exists in the Helena Valley and at Piesse Brook.

I have written to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority requesting that it purchase the land that is now owned by the Kalamunda Golf Club and put it aside with other land it holds adjoining the golf club for the use of future generations. The matter is now receiving consideration. I hope the request will be acceded to and that more open space will be made available for the future.

I conclude by saying I believe I have given positive evidence of inconsistencies that are being perpetrated by the Government. The instance I have given of the Kalamunda Golf Club land clearly indicates that the Government does not know where it is going, and if it does not watch out it will finish up in a mess as far as town planning is concerned.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [8.29 p.m.]: It is quite obvious from what was said by the Minister that the Government had no real reply to this motion. The Minister said he found it difficult to find justification for the motion. He said the Government was using the M.R.P.A., but I think the Government is using the M.R.P.A. in a way that is different from that conveyed by the Minister. I think the Government is using the M.R.P.A. for its own convenience and disregarding the authority when it wants to. It is difficult for us to realise that, although the Ritter report and comments on it were presented to this House, one of the members of the M.R.P.A. advised that the Government did not refer the Ritter report to the M.R.P.A.

This is a very important report and one which can have a tremendous effect on the future of this city.

The Government of the day has been in office for something over 20 months—getting on towards the two-year period. When the Government came into office it had before it an organised plan for our metropolitan region. This is the plan referred to as the corridor plan and it set out a pattern for our development. It set out the future for our transport systems.

Mr. Graham: It set out some recommendations which were not accepted by your Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR: What were the recommendations? The Deputy Premier has been very quiet during this debate. He did not feel inclined to make any comment on it.

Mr. Graham: I will get up when I feel inclined.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier will not get up in connection with this motion.

Mr. Graham: I will get up at the appropriate time, and not on your indication.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier was very quiet, and I can understand this because he was the Minister who handled or mishandled this plan in the early stages. He was replaced, and it was clear—

Mr. T. D. Evans: I think it is fair to point out that the Deputy Premier was not present during the early part of the debate.

Mr. O'CONNOR: He is interjecting at the moment about something of which he knows nothing.

Mr. Graham: If you were fair you would not use the word "replaced."

Mr. O'CONNOR: He is not in charge of that portfolio now.

Mr. Graham: The change was made at my request.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Was it?

If I may return to my reply to the motion. Two years ago we had the corridor plan. This plan was prepared by competent people to show where they thought future development of this city should be.

Mr. Graham: Your Government refused to accept it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We did not refuse to accept it.

Mr. Graham: Yes you did. I have seen the Cabinet minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We did not refuse it.

Mr. Graham: You do not know what you are talking about, as usual.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I ask the Deputy Premier to table this minute.

Mr. Graham: I will give you a photocopy of it.

Sir Charles Court: Haven't you seen Sir David Brand's policy speech in regard to this question?

Mr. Graham: The Minister for Town Planning recommended its adoption and your Government did not agree to this. I have seen the Cabinet minute.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: I say that our Government did not reject this plan. The corridor plan was put forward after detailed study by competent individuals. It was drawn up in conjunction with a transport report organised by Dr. Nielsen. Members of the Government indicated at that particular time that his report was very good.

To develop a proper metropolitan region plan, one must co-ordinate two points: The first is the pattern of the city's development, and the second is the transport details. These two items must run hand in hand, and this is what we endeavoured to do when the two reports were before us.

What do we have before us now? Absolutely nothing. We have not approved the corridor plan. We have not approved the Ritter plan. We have not approved the Nielsen plan.

Mr. Graham: Because of party politics. This is because of the Liberal Party in another place.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is strange that the Deputy Premier is having so much more to say now than he was prepared to say earlier.

Mr. Graham: Because of Royal Commissions and party politics up there.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It was necessary for some action to be taken in another place.

Mr. Graham: What did your Government do? It held things up for 12 months.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It has made the present Government get off its tail and do something about it. It was doing absolutely nothing.

Mr. Graham: From an empty head!

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr. O'CONNOR: I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: What was the remark?

Mr. O'CONNOR: He said I had an empty head.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mt. Lawley has asked the Deputy Premier to withdraw his remark. I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The point is that when certain things are obvious, one draws certain conclusions. However, if the words

are offensive to the honourable member, and it is your request Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw them.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. O'CONNOR: We are used to hearing rude remarks from the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Graham: You are the greatest muck-raker in this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: If such remarks are to be allowed, I suppose they will be made and it is no good trying to shut down on them.

Mr. Graham: Why don't you shut down on them?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier is very game in here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mt. Lawley.

Sir Charles Court: Very sensitive!

Mr. O'CONNOR: Some members of this House are prepared to say things here which they—

Mr. Graham: Why don't you control him?

Mr. O'CONNOR: If I were the Deputy Premier's leader I would be ashamed of some of the things he says.

Mr. Graham: If you are a leader, why don't you control him?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Members will keep order.

Mr. Rushton: On which side?

The SPEAKER: The member for Mt. Lawley will continue.

Mr. O'CONNOR: As I was saying, in this State it is necessary to have a transport pattern co-ordinated with housing development. At this time we have virtually no ideas at all from the Government. The Minister said that there was no chance of the Government's doing anything before the Honorary Royal Commission's report has been received. At this point of time the Government could have a plan prepared and be ready to go forward.

Mr. Davies: How do you know we do not have a plan prepared? I am not going to insult the Honorary Royal Commission by announcing a plan now.

Sir Charles Court: How convenient that is!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Minister has given no indication of having done any work on this at all.

Mr. Davies: And neither I will, because it would be an affront to Parliament.

Mr. O'CONNOR: As I pointed out, the Minister has given no indication of any work carried out in this connection. Neither has he indicated any knowledge of the operation of the M.R.P.A.

The Government has gone ahead and announced plans to build a \$546,000,000 underground railway in the centre of Perth. We know this plan is quite unco-ordinated.

The plan for the underground railway was put forward and yet the Government itself admitted that no engineering work had been undertaken and very little study had been made of the overall concept. It has been admitted in this House by members of the Government that they know very little about the plan and yet they are prepared to commit the State to the expenditure of \$546,000,000 on the biggest project ever undertaken. The problems which could confront us with such a project are so numerous that it would take far too long to explain them to the House.

Mr. Graham: You are reflecting on some of the top officers in the Public Service when you say that.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We have the parrot on the job again.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: That particular report was from the steering committee and not the M.R.P.A.

Mr. Graham: It was from the officers who co-ordinated the PERTS plan.

Sir Charles Court: That is not in accord with what we were told in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Nielsen report and the corridor plan were prepared in consultation with the members of the Transport Commission, the Railways Department, the Town Planning Department, the Perth City Council, and the M.T.T. When we look at the competent individuals and authorities involved, such as Dr. Carr, Mr. John Knox, Sir Thomas Wardle, and Mr. Shea of the M.T.T., surely we must realise that these are not irresponsible people who submitted reports after the minimum of thought.

Mr. Graham: These are the very people who advised the Government on the underground electrical railway system—the same people.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier is indicating that some of these people have changed their minds in some way since the report came out.

Mr. Graham: There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. O'CONNOR: These are the people who submitted the report to the Government which was later submitted to Parliament. Yet today we are more than 20 months further back than we were when these reports were submitted. At least our Government had something concrete with which to proceed. Today we have absolutely no plan in connection with our town planning.

Mr. Graham: We made the decisions. You did not make the decision—we did.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We have the opportunity to make our city one of the most beautiful in the world. We have a chance to improve its environment before the traffic takes over.

Mr. Graham: You want to put up multi-storeyed buildings on the Perth railway site. That is how you want to beautify it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Again the Deputy Premier is talking about something of which he knows nothing. No plan of that nature was ever approved.

Sir Charles Court: Remind him of the shortage of land under his management.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier is prepared to say anything in this House but he chickens out when he gets outside. He has always operated in the same manner.

Mr. Graham: Windbag the second.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Number one is over on the Government side.

Mr. Graham: No prize for second.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: It would not be a bad idea to ask the Deputy Premier how the shortage of land generated under his management.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is obvious that the Deputy Premier was dismissed from this portfolio and is very touchy in this area.

Mr. Graham: Into the gutter again! I'll bet you feel at home there.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I do not blame the Deputy Premier for being touchy. When a man is removed from a portfolio he cannot handle—

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I do not know why you keep saying that. He was not replaced in the way you are implying.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I said he was replaced.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Of course you did.

Mr. Graham: A filthy insinuation, as befits you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: As I said, the Deputy Premier was replaced, and he is very touchy about it. It is quite obvious that while he handled the portfolio, he did absolutely nothing.

The Deputy Premier has accused me of leaving a file in connection with the Nielsen report on my table for four months when he knows it was there for only four days while we were studying it. He knew that the statement was not true when he made it in the House.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr. GRAHAM: I will stand a lot from the member for Mt. Lawley. We have become accustomed to it. However, when he accuses me of being untruthful, he is

honour bound to substantiate his remark or withdraw it. I would ask that he withdraw it without qualification.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier asks the member for Mt. Lawley to withdraw his remark.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Could I ask a question? The Deputy Premier gave me the opportunity to withdraw the remark or substantiate it. I wish to state that the substantiation appears in *Hansard* where the Minister stated that the file was on my desk for four months and then later on, in figures he gave to the House, he admitted it was four days.

Mr. Graham: I did nothing of the sort, of course.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The figures are in *Hansard*. Do I have the option as the Deputy Premier suggested?

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Mt. Lawley going to withdraw the remark as requested? I asked the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In that case I will withdraw the remark. However, as I pointed out, the Minister stated I had this file on my table for four months and that is an inaccurate statement. I did not have it on my table for four months—it was there for four days only. I would ask the Deputy Premier to look at the Cabinet file and the reports. He will then see that his statement was inaccurate. He knows the file was there for four days and not four months as he suggested.

Mr. Graham: I know nothing of the sort.

Mr. O'CONNOR: You know nothing.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. O'CONNOR: As I pointed out, we should be developing Perth in a proper way. We should take the opportunity to co-ordinate all our facilities. This is not being done at this point of time.

When we look at overseas countries, we can see the difficulties which have arisen. It is quite obvious that we should learn from the mistakes they have made. London is a very beautiful city in many ways, but traffic chaos reigns. The traffic problem in London will be very difficult to rectify, if it ever can be rectified.

Here we have a young city in a young country. We are in a position to co-ordinate and properly plan our traffic and housing development and we should do just this. The members for Darling Range, Floreat, and Dale gave some details in connection with their own electorates. This indicates some areas of concern, not only immediately in the centre of the city but also in other parts of the metropolitan region. These members believe that certain town planning schemes are being mishandled and feel

that the planners are being overridden. I also believe this is happening too often today.

The Government has now decided to build a bus terminal in William Street. It intends to spend several hundred dollars on a temporary building which later will be pulled down. The Minister for Works has told us that this is only a temporary building. Why are we not proceeding in a proper planned manner and co-ordinating for long-term development?

When I mentioned to the Minister for Works that this bus terminal should be placed underground, he said that this would cost thousands of millions of dollars. Of course, this is a ridiculous figure when we consider how much could be done with thousands of millions of dollars. Certainly an underground parking bay and a through-road underground for buses would do much for the environment of our city.

It would obviate the necessity to have an underground railway through the centre of the city; it would improve the flow of traffic north and south of the railway line and, also, would improve the environmental aspect overall.

I believe that when the present Minister was appointed as Minister for Town Planning he was faced with a great number of difficulties. I believe he had a tiger by the tail, and what we are trying to do, in effect, is to tame that tiger and lead it in the right direction. This motion is a timely one of which we hope the Government will take some notice and get on with the proper planning of this city in the future.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Reid
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Ridge
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Williams
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Nalder	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes—22

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Graham
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brown	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes	Noes
Sir David Brand	Mr. Taylor
Mr. O'Neill	Mr. May
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Bateman

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.

2. Public and Bank Holidays Bill.

3. Interpretation Act Amendment Bill.

4. Inheritance (Family and Dependents Provision) Bill.

Bills returned from the Council with amendments.

FISHERIES ACT

Amendment of Regulations: Motion Withdrawn

Debate resumed, from the 20th September, on the following motion by Mr. Jones:—

That regulations made under the Fisheries Act, published in the *Government Gazette* on 21st September, 1971, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 5th October, 1971, be amended as follows:—

Regulation 2, being amendments to regulation 3AA of the principal regulations. To insert after paragraph (a) of sub-regulation (2B) a paragraph (aa) as follows:—

(aa) is in receipt of a pension under the provisions of the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act, 1943; .

MR. JONES (Collie) [8.52 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to withdraw this motion in view of the fact that the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has advised me that the Government will amend the regulations in accordance with the terms of the motion.

The SPEAKER: If there is any dissentient voice leave will not be granted. As there is no dissentient voice leave is granted to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th September.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [8.53 p.m.]: This Bill, introduced by the member for Wembley, preceded by a very short time the Bill introduced by the Government to amend the Companies Act which is more comprehensive in the field of amendments. However,

if members will refer to clause 59 of the Government's Bill and compare it with the measure introduced by the member for Wembley they will realise that the subject matter in both measures is similar; that the provisions in both Bills seeks to effect the same remedy.

Therefore it is obvious that the Government supports the move by the member for Wembley, the reasons he has given for introducing the Bill, and the need for the passage of the legislation to be expedited, as explained by the member for Wembley. However, I point out that in Committee I intend to amend the Bill introduced by the honourable member. In clause 2 of his Bill reference is made to a new subsection (1A). To be consistent with other provisions in the Companies Act—one may have to refer to sections 171 and 173, and to the various references in the Government's Bill—where the large letter "A" is used in this Bill it is desired that this should be amended to "(1a)," and I intend to move an amendment accordingly in Committee.

I would point out that paragraph (b) of clause 2 which seeks to add a new subsection after subsection (1), does not empower the Minister to revoke or vary any notice published. Such power is deemed to be essential and therefore I intend to add certain words which will have the effect of placing paragraph (b) of clause 2 in exactly the same form as the relevant clause in the Government's Bill.

It will be necessary to provide that, in cases where the Minister has indicated his approval in the past, such action and such decision taken pursuant to that approval will be recognised, and to achieve that I intend to add a new provision.

Finally, because of an amendment made to section 38 of the principal Act on the last occasion an amending Bill was before Parliament, the need for a small procedural amendment has been indicated, and therefore I wish to take the opportunity to effect this amendment.

It is my purpose now to indicate to the House that the Government supports the rationale of the Bill that has been introduced by the member for Wembley.

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [8.58 p.m.]: I thank the Attorney-General for accepting the principle of this Bill, and I advise the House that I have considered the matters referred to by him. In particular I accept the principle that discretions exercised by the Attorney-General prior to the commencement of this Act will be deemed to be lawful. By the Attorney-General's amendment that principle will now be encompassed by this Bill so that, in effect, that which will become law as a result

of this measure I have introduced to the House will be, by and large, what was intended by clause 59 of the Government's Bill.

I think it is worthy of mention that it is essential that we deal with this particular aspect of company legislation before we attempt to deal with the Government's amending Bill, because of the time factor mentioned by the Attorney-General. To my knowledge there is at least one, and perhaps two, property trusts that would like to have their deeds registered at the Companies Office but which, at the moment, cannot do so. They are anxious to attract investment to Western Australia by registering these deeds as soon as this Bill becomes effective.

Therefore I appreciate the Attorney-General recommending the speedy passage of this Bill before the Government's amending Bill is dealt with. I agree in principle to the amendments proposed by the Attorney-General, and I hope the Committee will accept them when we reach the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. A. R. Tonkin) in the Chair; Mr. R. L. Young in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 80 amended—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: For the reasons outlined during the second reading debate, I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 4—Substitute for the subsection designation "(1A)" the subsection designation "(1a)".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Insert after paragraph (a) the following new paragraph to stand as paragraph (b):—

(b) by substituting for the passage "subsection (5)" in line nine of paragraph (d) of subsection (1), the passage "subsection (7)"; and

This is a procedural amendment to which I referred as being necessary to correct an error which became obvious after the previous amendment to section 38 of the Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 8—Substitute for the subsection designation "(1A)" the subsection designation "(1a)".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Add after the word “notice” in line 19 the passage “and the Minister may, by notice so published, revoke such a notice or vary it in such manner as he thinks fit”.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: This is an amendment which requires a little more clarification by the Attorney-General. I can understand that some circumstances could arise under which the Minister would desire to revoke or vary his discretion to waive certain requirements. However, the purpose of the Bill is to enable unit trusts to be registered on the Stock Exchange and the only way that can be done is by the Minister waiving the requirements under the trust deed.

I can imagine the situation which could develop on the Stock Exchange if the Minister revoked his discretion to waive the requirements. For that reason I desire the Attorney-General to explain the situation in order to convince us whether the amendment is necessary.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: It would be a very rare circumstance indeed which would compel the Minister to vary or revoke his approval. However, this uniform legislation has been passed in New South Wales and Victoria and I believe we should benefit by the experience of Sir Richard Eggleston and his learned committee members and be guided by the steps taken in those other two States.

Although it would be a drastic step for the Minister to take, the power should be available should it be necessary for the Minister to revoke his approval. However, I cannot envisage this action being taken by the Minister as an every-day practice.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I accept that explanation and would like to make a couple of comments in respect of it. Firstly, I do not accept the premise that the Eggleston Committee report is necessarily the criterion which should be adopted. A great deal more can be said on that subject when we deal with the Government Bill. However, I do recognise the problems involved—and I am aware that the Attorney-General himself has them in mind—should the Minister revoke any waiver he makes under this provision in regard to the listing of unit trusts on the Stock Exchange. Great confusion could reign. However, I accept the Attorney-General's explanation, but add the warning that if ever that particular waiver is revoked tremendous problems could be created in regard to the Stock Exchange. Nevertheless, because the trust deed covers many more aspects than that particular item, I accept the explanation of the Attorney-General and support the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Add after subsection (1a) the following new subsection to stand as subsection (1b):—

(1b) Where at any time prior to the commencement of this Act, a notice was published under section eighty-eight purporting to exempt a company, subject to such terms and conditions as were specified in the notice, from complying with the provisions of subsection (1) of this section in respect of a deed specified in the notice, the notice—

(a) shall, notwithstanding any provision of this Act, have effect and be deemed always to have had effect according to its tenor; and

(b) may, notwithstanding any provision of this Act, be varied or revoked by the Minister by notice published in the *Government Gazette*.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I support the amendment because it goes further than the Bill. It provides that at any time the Minister may, by using his discretion, waive any requirement of the trust deed, and according to the tenor of that waiver it shall be accepted as being legal notwithstanding the fact that at the time it may not have been legal. The amendment maintains the spirit of the legislation and extends what we are trying to achieve under the Bill. I therefore support it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

LAND: BUILDING BLOCKS

Availability and Price: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 4th October, on the following motion by Mr. O'Neil (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):—

This House views with concern the deterioration of the position relative to the availability of reasonably priced residential lots in the metropolitan region, which has resulted in:—

(a) an escalation of land prices, and

(b) public concern as to future availability and cost.

The House also expresses concern at the conflict between statements made by the Government and those made by

real estate developers as to the real position and calls upon the Government to give a clear and precise statement of the position showing:—

- (a) location and numbers of useable residential allotments in the region, and
- (b) details of action being taken and proposed to be taken to maintain stability in the supply and price of residential land.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Town Planning) [9.15 p.m.]: This is the second occasion tonight on which I have had to deal with matters concerning my portfolio. I am sorry I was not present in the Chamber last week to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition introduce his motion on the availability and price of land. Of course, I have had the opportunity since then of reading the motion, but it was only this morning that I found it had been moved. I did not receive a copy of the notice paper until this morning.

I had made inquiries as to whether or not any action had been taken in the Parliament on the price of land, but the reply was in the negative. Either members of the public were not impressed with the motion or else the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not make any impact.

Since last Wednesday I have been able to make public the results of the investigations which have been promised over a period of about a fortnight. On a matter which, I believe, is as serious as this, I wanted proper research to be undertaken. It was not possible for this to be done in the short time available to me before I was required to go to the Eastern States. I was not able to do it on Friday afternoon when I returned; I could not absorb it. The first opportunity was Monday last and I appreciate the fact that the news media did not mind coming along to talk the matter over with me. I was certainly very appreciative of my own officers who gave up their Monday holiday to ensure that all the information I wanted was made available to me, and was made public.

When I made my Press statement last Monday I appealed to the Press to show a community responsibility in this matter; to examine the facts; and to present a balanced picture. I did this, because I felt some sections of the Press in particular were indulging in scare headlines and seemed to highlight prophecies of doom which some people delight in casting abroad.

There were, of course, many other counter-balancing arguments to be put forward, but these were either not available, as I have said, or if they were available, I feel they were being ignored.

It would seem from the wording of the motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and from some of the speeches and comments which have been made over the past several weeks that I must reiterate my appeal to members of this House. I believe that in both the wording of the motion and the speech made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, a degree of irresponsibility was shown, because I feel there was a blatant disregard for the facts, as they exist. I consider there was a lack of community responsibility in the manner in which the matter was brought forward.

Let me be perfectly clear. Nothing is easier than to start off a scare and a price boom in regard to the price of land. Once this is under way, it is the hardest thing in the world to stop it or reverse the trend.

To speak as the motion does of a deterioration in the availability of reasonably-priced residential lots in the metropolitan area and also of an escalation in prices is simply shutting one's eyes to the facts and I believe this tends to make the public panic.

Let me talk about some of these counter-balancing arguments which I believe should be investigated. In the main I have been asked to make a clear and precise statement of the position, showing the location and numbers of usable residential lots, and to give details of the action being taken and proposed to be taken in the supply and price of residential land. This, Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed now to do. Members will notice that in the main I have used the wording which appears on the notice paper.

As has been already stated in the Press, it was estimated that some 40,000 blocks were available within the metropolitan region upon which buildings could be erected. This information was given to meet the Premier's request. The information was not given off the top of his head, as has been suggested. It was quite unfair to suggest this. The information was sought from my department and the figure given was the one which was known to be correct at the 30th June last year.

It was estimated that the number of blocks that had come onto the market would have had a balancing effect on the number of blocks which had been sold, and that the figure would still be somewhere in the vicinity of 40,000 sites available in the Perth metropolitan region.

I always speak of the Perth metropolitan region, or at least I mean to. I am afraid that on occasions I have been guilty of referring to it as the metropolitan area; in fact I was guilty of doing this in a TV interview on Monday evening. The department works on the basis of the Perth metropolitan region, which is the Perth statistical area. This is the only area upon which to work effectively and it is the

area under the department's control. To define any other area would have meaning only to a person who was making that particular definition. As it is, there is a more or less statutory area—the Perth metropolitan region—about which I always try to speak.

I asked my department to carry out a new survey to see what it came up with. I thought this was the first and obvious step which needed to be taken. This was also a comprehensive exercise and involved studying aerial photographs taken by the Lands and Surveys Department, zoning maps, and subdivisional plans.

Further, in response to comments which have been made since the Premier's statement, I also instructed the department to prune out, as far as it could, any of the serviced or close-to-serviced lots which may be regarded as unsuitable for immediate development for a variety of reasons, but generally for reasons of water table. From this survey it was discovered that there are estimated to be 35,100 blocks in the metropolitan area upon which buildings could be erected. I am referring, of course, to half-acre blocks and not to two-acre or five-acre blocks, although a great number of these are available. I have kept it down to what can be regarded as the average size and for this reason I am referring to the number of half-acre lots—and less—available.

As I have said, 35,100 lots were available, but I suggested to the department that it should prune out any doubtful land. After the figure of 1,500 blocks had been pruned, the resultant figure was 33,600. This is the number of blocks my department is able to substantiate as being available in the metropolitan region for building purposes. I regard this as a reasonably satisfactory number, and I will justify that statement later on.

I notice that mention was made of the discrepancy between what so-called authorities claim to be the number of blocks and the number which my department claims are available. This was causing some concern. Indeed, I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that he felt that when the figure was known the difference would be astronomical. To make such a comment is typical of the scare tactics which are being used. The Opposition could not wait to see what the figure was. Instead, the Opposition said the difference was likely to be astronomical. The figure is not astronomical.

The figure of 40,000 blocks available was a very good one, everything considered, and compares very favourably with the numbers I have already quoted.

I regret also that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition seems to be obsessed with the number of lots only. It seems many people are considering only one question: How many lots are available? As I have

said before, if the whole question is looked at coolly and dispassionately—and is understood—this is only one of a number of factors which must be taken into consideration.

The first is the demand for residential lots, because until this figure is known any assessment of the adequacy or inadequacy of the stockpile is completely meaningless. Current housing statistics indicate that this demand is for about 10,000 lots a year to cope with the needs of approximately 30,000 people. The figures of population increase and of house and flat commencements match up closely to this estimate. The present population within the region is about 725,000.

I think we have been fairly generous with the figures I have quoted. We have allowed for a population increase of something like 4 per cent. a year, but this is likely to be in excess of the actual increase. The increase, in terms of actual people, is, I believe, 30,000. The assessment is made on the basis of three persons to one house and, consequently, 10,000 building blocks will be required. As I have said, the first thing to look at is: What is a reasonable assessment of the number of blocks which will be required annually? On the basis of these calculations, the answer is 10,000.

The second point is the stockpile of blocks. I have already referred to this on a number of occasions and I do not think there is need to repeat my remarks.

The third question is the number of approvals for lots by the Town Planning Board. The most up-to-date figures for the last 12 months to the 30th September, 1972, were that the board had approved of approximately 16,500 lots. If members set that against the estimated demand of 10,000 lots a year, it is quite obvious that the Town Planning Board is approving more lots than are required. As I have said, the board has approved 16,500 lots and it is estimated that 10,000 blocks will be required each year.

If it were as simple as that, it would mean that nothing further needs to be done. The Opposition seems to have taken its consideration of the whole question only to the point of, "How many blocks of land are needed each year and how many are coming onto the market?"

I really do not think members of the Opposition did much homework on this subject. The motion tended to imply that insufficient blocks of land are available and the Government ought to do something about it.

The fourth factor is the actual creation of lots by subdividers. This, I believe, is where the crunch lies. Once the subdivider has received his approval in principle to develop lots, the Town Planning Board has done its job. The next step is up to the subdivider. The Town Planning Board says to

company A or B, "You can subdivide"; but it is up to the subdivider to go ahead and do it.

The figures for the number of diagrams of survey approved—which indicates the actual creation of a lot—were 5,360 for the same period; that is, to the 30th September, 1972. This figure cannot be directly compared with the number of approvals by the board in the same period. These approvals must be proceeded with and completed, I understand, within a two-year period. Extensions can be granted under certain conditions, but it does not mean to say that an approval granted in this financial year will be brought to completion within the same financial year. Really, there is no relativity to the number of Town Planning Board approvals and the number of diagrams of survey actually completed.

Although there may be an abundant flow of approvals to subdividers, there is clearly a smaller flow from the subdividers to the market. I am afraid there are several reasons for this. There is evidence that because of the effect of holding charges and development costs, land subdividers are tending to regulate the flow in connection with market demand. I suppose this is the free enterprise system. A developer will not go ahead and spend a lot of money on subdivisions to reduce the price of his own land if he is still holding some.

Of course, as I explained recently, developers have to pay taxing charges on land which is on their hands at the end of the financial year. Therefore, they will make certain that as little as possible is on their hands at that time. This is another factor which could be affecting the problem as we see it at the present time.

A further factor could be that lots are being held back until the last possible minute in the hope of a price rise.

Finally, we have to look at the likelihood of services not being available in the area within a reasonable time.

I feel that what I have described as a pinch in the pipeline exists at this time. Sufficient approvals are being granted, but insufficient of those approvals are being taken through to the diagram survey stage and then eventually, onto the market. As I say, although it is not strictly correct to relate one figure to another, in the past 12 months 16,500 approvals have been granted, but only 5,360 blocks have got onto the market, as far as we can ascertain.

The fifth factor, of course, is the amount of land either zoned for residential purposes or perhaps lying in reserve, ready to be opened up to augment the stockpile. This land may be divided into three sections, and I realise I am repeating my comments of Monday last.

Much of the land that is available to produce more residential lots is that which is affected by local authority town planning schemes. This has a potential of something like 20,000 lots. Then there is the land which is being developed by project developers, under plans approved in principle. Under this heading I refer to such places as Whitfords, Melville, Kelm-scott and Armadale. These areas, and similar, give a calculated figure of 53,300 lots.

Finally, in the more distant future, there is land in broad-acre reserves which is at present subject to negotiation with project developers. The lot potential under this heading is 47,000. Taking these lots, together with the figures I quoted earlier of the net number of vacant blocks now available, 33,600, the number of unserviceable lots, 1,500, and the land approved for town planning schemes, 16,500, the total reserve comes to 172,100 lots.

In looking at these figures, there is one point I wish to stress. Along with the land price boom of 1966-1969, we had the problem that although considerable areas of urban and urban-deferred land were at our disposal, the services were not available in many areas for up to seven years ahead. The situation today is quite different. As a result of the efforts of the Metropolitan Water Board and the developers, most of the remaining areas of urban and—

Mr. Rushton: And the Brand Government.

Mr. DAVIES. —urban-deferred land, representing about 120,000 lots, can be serviced within two years of the decision being made that a particular area is to be developed. The balance can be serviced within a further 12 months. I believe this is a vast improvement on the earlier situation. I do not think the previous Government can take any great credit for this.

This problem had been a matter of great concern for quite some time, and I believe that the departmental officers have accomplished a great deal in this regard.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that the planners seemed to have forgotten the policy of releasing more residential land. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition feels that is so, perhaps he would like to look at the current amendment to the regional scheme in the Mul-laloo area which has recently been announced and will be before the House in due course. I do not think it is fair to say that the planners have forgotten this policy.

Having dealt with the availability of land, I would like to turn to land prices. Here again I must deplore the alarmist tactics being adopted by the Opposition about a price boom. We must look at the record. Everything is centred on the results of two auctions at Karrinyup and

Daglish. No significant price increases have been noted anywhere else in the metropolitan region. These two auctions have commanded all the attention. I emphasise that this is quality land, all with ocean views, and in some instances close to the city. Furthermore, in some areas it was the last land remaining in that area and, naturally, it had a scarcity value. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition admitted that in areas where there was a scarcity of land, the obvious result was a high price. This is precisely what happened in this instance.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition further said that when a shortage of land with a river frontage occurred, the price would rise as each block was sold. He did add, however, that the motion is not directed at that kind of land. Therefore, I will not deal with that land, but I will comment on what I may call average-priced blocks.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition recalled with pride the stability of prices obtained during the regime of the previous Government. He stated that the price of land had stabilised at between \$3,000 and \$3,500. I do not think even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be prepared to say that these prices applied to prestige blocks. However, if he wishes to regard that as the general level for lower-priced land, ample evidence is available that this is still the case. I would like members to examine some of the advertisements which appear in the weekend papers. I have some of them here. Actually, such advertisements may be seen almost every day. It does not need very close examination to see that the headlines scream in large type that land is available at prices within the range I have quoted.

Of course, land is also available through the State Housing Commission to people who qualify for assistance. I have lists here which show that land is available to people who qualify in a price range from \$2,750 to \$4,000 per block. It would appear from a casual glance that the majority of the land is in the \$3,000 to \$3,500 price range. This, of course, indicates that ample land is still available at prices which the honourable member felt were average.

However, we can do even better than that. Amongst the advertisements to which I have just referred members are two relating to land at Rockingham. One advertisement is dated the 8th October, 1972—last Saturday—and the other is dated Saturday, the 11th October, 1969—exactly three years ago today. In 1969 the Brand-Nalder Government was still in office and it had—to use the words of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—“stabilised land prices.” The price mentioned in the advertisement of the 11th October, 1969, for land at Rockingham Park was in bold headlines, and it was \$4,980 a block.

The advertisement which appeared in last Saturday's newspaper indicated that comparable land is available in the same region of Rockingham for \$2,990 a block.

Mr. Rushton: You have just made my point and destroyed your argument.

Mr. DAVIES: That is a difference of \$2,000 a block in a period of three years.

Mr. Rushton: You have shredded confidence in the area.

Mr. DAVIES: I suppose that, as smiling lad over there erroneously claims his Government was responsible for everything that has been done, I could just as erroneously say our Government is responsible for that drop in land prices. But, of course, that is not so. The fact is that the developers are setting the price of land, and in the particular case I mentioned what has happened is very apparent. A drop of \$2,000 occurred in the price of comparable land in the same area within three years.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition devoted some time to the land owned by the Rural and Industries Bank at East Hamersley. In this regard he made some rather extraordinary statements. He compared the number of lots auctioned at each sale and expressed concern that the average number auctioned under the present Government at each sale was lower than the average number auctioned at each sale under the previous Government. He said that the number of lots marketed by the bank was about half what it used to be, and he asked the question, “What can we expect as a result of this?” He then gave the answer, “The price must increase.”

This is complete nonsense, as anyone who looks at the facts will see. The average price of the land has remained remarkably stable over the last four years at around \$4,500 a block. In fact, the average price at the February, 1962, auction was \$4,595 a block—a figure which is below the average price paid in four of the seven auctions held during the term of the previous Government. Further, in the three auctions during the period 1971-72, the price paid never exceeded \$5,600. Top prices paid in 1968-69 were up to \$6,000 a block.

Sir Charles Court: Which estate are you talking about?

Mr. DAVIES: The Hamersley estate. The Leader of the Opposition must listen. It must surely be appreciated that the exercise to stabilise prices in East Hamersley calls for a nice judgment as to the number of lots which should be offered when mounting each auction. Had the bank continued to flood land onto the market, the only result would have been substantial reductions in values, which would have upset the real estate section of the economy and eroded the equities held by many people.

Sir Charles Court: When you referred to the prices, were you talking about comparable blocks?

Mr. DAVIES: From what I can gather the last lots sold in Karrinyup and Hamersley are more or less comparable.

Sir Charles Court: Isn't there a wide variation in the type and the value of the blocks?

Mr. DAVIES: What is the Leader of the Opposition talking about?

Sir Charles Court: The estate to which you referred.

Mr. DAVIES: Is the Leader of the Opposition referring to Karrinyup or to Hamersley?

Sir Charles Court: Both. They have wide variations within them.

Mr. DAVIES: But the price has remained fairly stable. I think the fact that at the last auctions the price was a little lower indicates that plenty of land is available and the people know it. However, when we consider the land sold at Daglish we must realise that Daglish is one of the few remaining areas which are strategically placed between the ocean and the city, and it is to be expected that the land would command higher prices. Also, as I understand it, the lots sold at Karrinyup were the last remaining lots in the area with ocean views. This created a certain demand which was admitted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he introduced his motion.

I think the bank has performed a splendid job in balancing the number of blocks being placed on the market and in adjusting the sale of lots to maintain a stable situation. It is to be applauded for doing that. I think the figures for auctions held over the last four years indicate how successfully the bank has achieved its objective.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also referred extensively to Mr. John Worthington's predictions about East Hamersley. Mr. Worthington predicted that prices would jump by 74 per cent. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also quoted a previous prediction of Mr. Worthington, on which he appears to place a great deal of reliance, as evidence of that gentleman's infallibility.

I am glad the honourable member referred to Mr. Worthington, because I would like to make a few remarks about him. The first is that if anyone is responsible for the current scaremongering it is he. In effect, we are now having a one-man boom, sparked off by his prophecies of doom about what would happen at the next Hamersley auction.

Sir Charles Court: Why do you pin your faith on that? The present situation was triggered by a series of announcements.

Mr. DAVIES: At two major auctions—one at Karrinyup and the other at Daglish—the price rose more than I would have liked it to. As a result of that Mr. Worthington, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe many other members of this House, said that we are in for another land price boom. I believe they showed lack of community responsibility in saying that.

Mr. Hutchinson: The initial Press report started that.

Mr. DAVIES: I agree, but then people came in behind it and gave it impetus. I have already mentioned the scaremongering tactics which I deplore. Fortunately I do not need a block of land, and I will not need one for many years; but I have a great concern for those many people who need blocks of land now and those who will need them in the years to come.

I was speaking about Mr. Worthington and what I termed his prophecies of doom about what would happen at the next Hamersley auction. Members need not take my word that he is a prophet of doom, because on a recent "This Day Tonight" programme they may have heard Mr. Worthington, in answer to the question, "Do you think you are really helping a price boom?" admit, "Yes, I think I did contribute to that price boom." I have heard a tape recording of that interview. I think it was very honest of him to admit that he contributed to the boom; but I think it is irresponsible of him to have contributed to it.

Mr. Mensaros: A minute ago you said there is no boom, and now you say that he has caused a boom.

Mr. DAVIES: I am speaking of those persons who are trying to create a boom, possibly to their own advantage. This man said there was a boom and he seemed to take pride in the fact that he had helped to create it, because he said, "Yes I think I did contribute to that price boom."

Mr. Thompson: Did you imply that he got some benefit from it?

Mr. DAVIES: I did not imply anything. I am merely pointing out what actually happened. I am talking about prophets of doom who, in many cases, are proved to be wrong, and Mr. Worthington has proved to be wrong in this instance. He is a man who holds a responsible position in the community, and I am sorry he made such a statement.

As a matter of fact, I think I should take a little time to deal with some of the statements that have been made, because this gentleman, on all the evidence published and spoken, for reasons best known to himself, seems to take a delight in forecasting price spirals and becomes despairing when prices level out. Let me draw attention to the *Weekend News* of

the 29th November, 1969. I have the relevant cutting in my hand, and the heading is, "WA Land Boom takes nose-dive." It is interesting to notice Mr. Worthington's reaction to this situation. Did he rejoice? Not on your life! He was quoted as saying—

When land prices fall by as much as \$4,000 to \$5,000 people who bought it on a 10 per cent. deposit find they are in an absurd position.

In other words, he seems to have expressed displeasure rather than pleasure.

Mr. Hutchinson: Is he not referring to the "bust" that follows the boom?

Mr. DAVIES: I agree that he could be, but he seems to have expressed displeasure rather than pleasure at that time.

Mr. Hutchinson: No, it is just a bad feature.

Mr. DAVIES: Perhaps I can give some heart to the member for East Melville who said he shuddered to think of what would happen if Mr. Worthington's forecast of a 74 per cent. jump in prices at East Hamersley were realised. I hope I can also give some heart to all those who may have looked upon Mr. Worthington as a faultless critic.

In the publication, *Economic Activity* of October, 1967, Mr. Worthington made a number of predictions on what prices would obtain over a number of areas at future auctions. One area to compare is City Beach. Mr. Worthington predicted that by the first half of 1971 City Beach prices would be at \$18,522. In fact, there was no auction in the first half of that year, but there was one in November, 1971. The reality was that at that auction the average price was \$12,169—some \$6,360 below the estimate made by Mr. Worthington.

There was also an auction in April of this year when the average price was still nearly \$6,000 below that forecast; that is, \$12,887. On the basis of Mr. Worthington's quoted annual rate of increase, the price should have been around \$22,000. Those figures are set out in this extract I have here from a publication to which I have already referred.

There is one further sidelight to this comment. It says that the prices at the last City Beach auction were for fully-serviced blocks, with underground power. When Mr. Worthington made his original forecast he could not have foreseen this added amenity which makes the discrepancy even greater.

I hope these figures get some publicity, because I think if a man is to be headlined as an expert and he succeeds in convincing gullable people like the member for East Melville that all his predictions will unfailingly come true, it is only right to have a look at all his predictions, and those I have quoted have fallen far short of the mark.

I would urge those people who are thinking of buying land at East Hamersley at the next R. & I. Bank auction to bear in mind three factors as follows:—

1. There has been a remarkable stability in East Hamersley prices over the last four years and this price averages out at about \$4,500.

I believe this is the first factor to take into consideration. This is the salient point to remember. We do not want people to attend the next auction thinking that they will be expected to pay \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000 for a block, because the average price has been maintained around the \$4,500 figure. Continuing—

2. The lots to come up at the next auction are not the last remaining lots of the holding. In the four years during which auctions have been held 660 lots have been sold. There remain—including those to be sold at the next auction—668 lots.

So there are almost as many lots yet to be sold as have been sold in that particular subdivision—that is, 660 lots as against 668 lots. If they were sold on prior releases over four years and the prices have been maintained, surely we should expect new releases to be sensibly placed on the market and the existing prices maintained. I continue with the third factor—

3. Do not be panicked by the prediction of \$8,000 as the next price level. The expert who made this prediction was \$6,000 too high at City Beach in November, 1971, and this was an area more favourable to his calculation, because it was prestige land of a limited quantity.

There is not a great deal more I want to say. However, it is a pity that this expert did not adhere to his statement that was quoted in the *Weekend News* of the 17th April, 1971. His statement was, "So I'm not going to make any more predictions." He was also quoted as saying, "I've already made guesses—wrong ones."

I would like people to keep that in mind. Lastly, I come to the courses of action the Government is now considering. It should be clear from my earlier remarks made both this evening and earlier this week, that though the reserves of land are most satisfactory, the flow-on from the Town Planning Board is satisfactory, and the stockpile is reasonably good, there is this pinch in the pipeline which is causing fewer blocks to flow onto the market than is desirable. I will not repeat the circumstances surrounding that situation.

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has indicated to the land and housing consultative committee some courses of action it thinks should be pursued. One is to transfer 600 acres of Crown land at West Hamersley to the

R. & I. Bank so that it will have a follow-on holding to develop after its East Hammersley holdings run out. There will be something like 2,500 blocks in the area. Another is to examine the urban zones to see whether there are some areas where subdividers are doing nothing to get lots onto the market; they are just waiting for prices to rise. Here the improvement plan machinery could be invoked.

Lastly, there is a request to consider the effect of land tax on undeveloped urban land to see whether this is inhibiting project developers from putting more lots onto the market.

I have one or two other thoughts on this matter which I am conveying to the Premier later this week, and possibly they will be dealt with by Cabinet early next week. I also expect the land and housing committee's recommendations to be handed on to me for forwarding to the Premier, so members will see that no time at all is being lost.

We have no problem over land reserves, as I have shown. The pinch in the pipeline is the crux of the matter, and it is being tackled. The Government is prepared to be quite ruthless in nipping in the bud any recurrence of a land price boom. Anyone who examines all the facts of the situation—not just one, or the prices and the availability of blocks—will realise that we are in a healthy position; and we most certainly intend to keep it so.

For those reasons I very much oppose the motion which has been moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Mensaros.

House adjourned at 10.01 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 12th October, 1972

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

QUESTIONS

Postponement

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.35 p.m.]: I ask leave of the House to postpone questions on notice and questions without notice until a later stage of the sitting. I do not have the information available to answer the proposed question without notice, but expect to receive it later in the afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is granted.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION BILL

Third Reading

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

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [2.36 p.m.]: On this occasion this Bill comes to the Legislative Council from another place with a request for our concurrence. Such are the machinations of politics that a Bill passed in the second reading stage in this House last year and defeated in Committee by the casting vote of the Chairman is this year introduced in another place and then sent here to us.

I referred to the machinations of politics because the same fate was not apparently experienced by two Bills we debated yesterday afternoon—one a private member's Bill, and the other a Government Bill to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act. For some reason the Government decided to present the latter Bill to this House for the second time; but the legislation before us was introduced in another place, the object no doubt being to give members there the opportunity to address themselves to the matter before it was dealt with here.

It is strange that the Minister's opening remarks should read—

In view of an expression of surprise by certain members of the Opposition in another place that the Government has made another effort to introduce daylight saving legislation, I feel that I should enumerate to this House the steps that led up to such a decision being arrived at. In actual fact the first step in such a move was initiated by a member of the Opposition in this Chamber and I refer to The Hon. I. G. Medcalf who moved a resolution—

Mr. Medcalf moved his motion in an endeavour to be of some help and assistance to the Government. As members are aware the motion reads—

That in the light of recent experience of daylight saving in the Eastern States and bearing in mind the varied results and conclusions reached in those States, this House is of the opinion that the Government should arrange for a properly qualified committee of persons to report on the likely effects of daylight saving on the Western Australian population having regard for health, sociological, climatic and meteorological considerations so that if some Eastern States propose to reinstitute daylight