

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

### WUNDOWIE CHARCOAL IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

#### *Annual Report: Availability*

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

As the report for the Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry, for the year ended the 30th June, 1965, has not been laid on the Table of the House, could he obtain a copy for me and other members who may require it?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

I will have inquiries made during the day to ascertain—

- (a) whether the report has been completed; and
- (b) whether it is available, and will advise the honourable member in due course.

## QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed to a later stage of the sitting.*

### SCIENTOLOGY

#### *Investigations and Action by Government*

2. The Hon. N. McNEILL asked the Minister for Health:

In view of publicity given in other States to the practice of Scientology, I ask—

- (a) has the Government carried out any investigations in Western Australia; and
- (b) if so, what action, if any, does the Government intend taking in this matter?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) Not specifically on the organisation in this State. The Government has been in very close touch with Victoria. Copies of the report of the Board of Inquiry into Scientology, as presented to the Victorian House, and the appendix, which was not so tabled, have been made available to this Government and have been carefully studied. A copy of the Bill "to provide for the Registration of Psychologists, the Protection of the Public from Unqualified Persons and Certain Harmful Practices and for other purposes", as presented in the Victorian Legislature on the 10th November, 1965, has been received and studied, along with the speech introducing this measure as prepared by the Minister for Health, The Hon. V. Dickie, M.L.C. Reports have also been received from the Commissioner of Public

Health, the Director of Mental Health Services, the Solicitor-General, and the Commissioner of Police in this State.

- (b) The Government is of the opinion that the publicity given in the national Press to this subject has highlighted the undesirable aspects of Scientology and the dangers involved in the use of hypnotherapy and psychotherapy in the hands of any but fully qualified practitioners.

At different times the writers of Scientology have claimed that it is—

- (i) An organised science of thought, built on definite axioms.
- (ii) The modern science of mental health.
- (iii) An organised body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources in the mind, including practices that improve intelligence, state and conduct of persons.
- (iv) Latterly, and particularly since the Victorian inquiry, a philosophy of life and a religion.

A brief examination of the variations in definition given above will indicate some of the difficulties which will have to be faced in arriving at a satisfactory method of control.

What is clear from an examination of the report and of Scientology literature is that in reality this is no science, but merely a conglomerate of some psychological half truths mixed in with some ill-defined philosophy—the product of a lively but irrational imagination. Its danger to society lies not so much in its hocus-pocus of beliefs as in the ritual of its indoctrination. This involves "auditing" of "pre-clears" by a prolonged system of repetitive questioning which exhausts the pre-clear and produces in him a state bordering on hypnosis.

In view of these various matters the Government has decided to watch the situation carefully over the ensuing few months. This matter of hypnotherapy and psychotherapy will, no doubt, be discussed by State Ministers for Health, and I am further advised that the State Attorneys-General are also examining certain aspects. If found to be desirable, this State will take positive steps in the 1966 session.

## TOMATO GROWING AT GERALDTON

### *Agricultural Spraying: Damage, Compensation, and Precautions*

3. The Hon. J. HEITMAN asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Department of Agriculture ascertained the amount of damage caused this season to thousands of tomato plants in the Geraldton area by—
  - (a) the Agriculture Protection Board spraying units; and
  - (b) aerial spraying of crops?
- (2) Is any compensation for loss of fruit contemplated?
- (3) What precautions will be taken in future to prevent destruction of tomato plants by indiscriminate weed spraying?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) (a) It has been proved that Agriculture Protection Board spraying units are not responsible for damage to tomato plants.
- (b) There is no evidence available of damage caused by aerial spraying.
- (2) As investigations showed that Agriculture Protection Board units were not responsible for the damage, the question of compensation is not one for the Department of Agriculture.
- (3) Consideration is being given to any additional precautions that may be taken, bearing in mind the interests of both farmers and tomato growers.

4. *This question was postponed.*

## PICNIC AND RECREATION CENTRE AT KALGOORLIE

### *Development of Lake and Government Financial Assistance*

5. The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the existence, in Kalgoorlie, of a decentralisation committee which has, as one of its objects, the developing of a lake near Kalgoorlie as a picnic and recreation centre for the benefit of local people?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", will the Government give consideration to granting assistance to the committee to bring about the early completion of this project?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) Yes, there is a decentralisation committee in Kalgoorlie and its objects are the general development of the area, but it is not

known that the lake development referred to is one of the objects of the committee.

- (2) If the local authority supported this scheme and made application to the Tourist Development Authority it would receive consideration.

## CROWN LAND AT ALBANY AND DENMARK

### *Inspections by Tribunal and Areas Released*

6. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Mines:

In connection with the Crown Lands Tribunal, can the Minister advise the House—

- (a) Which areas within Albany and Denmark shires has the tribunal inspected since its formation?
- (b) What areas have been released as a result of its recommendations?
- (c) Has the tribunal given attention to small reserves which were formerly held for the cutting of staves and firewood, and which now appear to be cut out and harbouring vermin?
- (d) If these reserves have not yet received attention, is it intended that they should be considered in the near future?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Vacant Crown land between the northern boundary of the Albany Shire and South Coast Highway, the Denmark catchment area, and the great southern railway. Also various areas of surveyed and unsurveyed areas of Crown land within the boundaries of the Denmark Shire.
- (b) No releases have yet taken place.
- (c) The Crown Lands Tribunal investigated areas of land for which applications were received and areas requested for inclusion in State forests.
- (d) The tribunal will consider specified reserves if they are applied for.

## NARROWS BRIDGE TRAFFIC INTERCHANGE

### *Sand Filling: Location*

7. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN (for The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery) asked the Minister for Mines:

Further to my question on Tuesday, the 19th October, 1965, relating to sand filling for the

traffic interchange at the Narrows Bridge, and in view of the article which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 29th October, 1965, will the Minister ascertain whether the information contained in the publication relative to the four embankments is correct?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The article appearing in *The West Australian* on the 29th October, 1965, is correct. It provides details of the lengths and heights of the embankments as they will appear when the interchange has been consolidated by sand draining, and excess sand removed.

Essentially, my answer of the 19th October, 1965, gave the same information without going into details.

### **THE BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY COMPANY LIMITED (EXPORT OF IRON ORE) BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

### **STATE TENDER BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North-East Metropolitan) [11.12 a.m.]: The Bill before us is unusual to the extent that it seeks to amend the legislation which we passed in this House on the 7th October and which has not yet been proclaimed. This measure seeks to do nothing more than to ensure that the present chairman retains his office when the Bill introduced in October is proclaimed and becomes an Act; because in the intervening short period it has been realised that the present chairman (Mr. A. H. Telfer) will retire as a civil servant of this State, and, because of his outstanding qualifications and the great knowledge he can bring to bear in his office as Chairman of the Tender Board, it is considered wise that he should retain this important position, but to do so it has been found necessary to bring forward this amending Bill.

I feel it is perhaps a pity that this contingency was not thought of at the time the previous Bill was framed, but, unfortunately, these things do happen. Nevertheless, the Bill we now have before us will enable the Minister, at any time,

to appoint someone from outside the scope of the original Bill introduced in October. I am not saying that these words will be a disadvantage, but they will widen the conditions of appointment compared to what was contained in the measure introduced in October.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That would have been the case had we included this provision in the original Bill.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Yes, if the Minister had included it in this way, it would have; but had he included a specific provision to provide that the chairman would be available for a number of years it would not have been the case. However, I am not against the Bill; I am just mentioning that difference between the two pieces of legislation—as I think I am entitled to—and I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

#### *Third Reading*

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

### **ROAD CLOSURE BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [11.18 a.m.]: I have examined the plans and the context accompanying them relating to the road closures in this Bill, and although some of the proposed alterations are very minor, in the long run they may be very important in regard to what shall be done in some out-of-the-way places, as well as in some parts of the metropolitan area.

There is nothing in the plans or the information accompanying them to indicate they have not had the wholehearted approval of the local governing bodies involved, and I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

## RESERVES BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [11.21 a.m.]: The reserves dealt with in this Bill, though fewer than those presented on many occasions when such Bills are introduced, nevertheless include some that are very important. Some are relatively small in area and are situated near country towns; but two of the towns involved are nevertheless very important in the scheme of things.

The reserves that are of striking importance are those dealt with in clauses 2, 3, and 7. It is most important that reserves with the designation of Class "A" should at all times be jealously guarded. That applies whether they are the subject of excision of certain portions, or whether they are the subject only of proclamation or are being proclaimed by the effect of this Bill when it becomes law.

We are at a stage in the history of Western Australia when the State Government, in my view, should reach out and look far ahead when proclaiming areas as Class "A" reserves. Time passes on, and the instinct of the average citizen, if there is a broad arrow on a plan, is to endeavour to obtain such an area from the Crown. Yet we find that in this year of 1965 we have had more than 20 years of repurchasing land from individuals to meet the needs of Government instrumentalities near towns.

In addition to this the outer fringe of the State—those places far removed from the centre of Government—require, in my view, very urgent examination to ascertain the islands, strips of coastline, areas near potential sites for ports, and developing towns with a view to preserving them for the State.

For example, I have in mind a group of islands not far from King Bay; islands of the type of Lacrosse Island which is at the entrance to Cambridge Gulf. I suggest that much of our north-western coastline should be looked at quite urgently to prevent the intrusion of exploiting interests sponsored by go-getters—some of them may be well-doers, but in the main they are go-getters—who endeavour to exploit something that should belong to the people for all time. I refer particularly to that aspect, because of one or two areas referred to in this Bill.

I think the area south of Albany and that right around the coast is a very important one indeed. While I have no desire to lessen attempts to provoke

tourist interests by personal development, private development, or company development, I think the Crown should take stock of the situation through the Lands and Surveys Department to see how far we can think ahead, as is being done in this Bill in the case of the Abrolhos Islands. There is enormous scope within the department to preserve the interests of succeeding generations.

After an examination of the clauses of the Bill I can find nothing which is contrary to the public interest, and I support the measure. I do suggest, however, that my earlier remarks be heeded to make certain that greater effort is made by our skilled officers—and we have them—to ensure these areas are preserved to the State. I know that some officers in the survey section are hardpressed, but with regard to the work I have suggested, we have those who can do it admirably from one end of the State to the other, because they know the State best.

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [11.27 a.m.]: I can assure Mr. Wise that his remarks will be passed on to the Minister for Lands. The honourable member had an opportunity to speak to this Bill while the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna was present in the Chamber. I understand that some of these islands are already gazetted as fauna and flora reserves, but I do not know, at the moment, which of them are. I daresay however that the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna will be apprised of the situation, and that he will give consideration to the remarks made by Mr. Wise.

In dealing with many of these reserves, we are not taking away anything from the public. It is our desire to ensure that they are put to better use, than they are at the moment, for the public generally.

**The Hon. F. J. S. Wise:** And better control.

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** That is so. The question of the Abrolhos Islands has been under consideration for a long time, and many attempts have been made to use those islands and develop them from a tourist point of view. Those efforts, however, were impeded by the lack of decent aerodrome facilities; and probably just as well!

**The Hon. F. J. S. Wise:** You can trace all the early explorers if you fix the spots!

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** In this connection I do not think we can mix tourism with fishing. At the moment the tourists are not causing much trouble to the fishing industry, but the position is being watched very carefully. I think the tourists are doing the right thing in this matter at the moment.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

## CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee:—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [11.33 a.m.]: A study of this Bill, which has been introduced by Mr. Willesee, and of the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act will indicate there is a duplication of the provisions in section 7 (3) (b) and (c), except that in the amalgamation of these two paragraphs there is provision for the widening of certain streets. I see nothing wrong with that, because during the debate on the Local Government Act Amendment Bill in relation to the Fremantle proposal we accepted the principle that some of the parking revenue could be used for street widening for the benefit of the motoring public.

I do not know whether the City of Perth will have any funds available for that purpose, but if provision is made in the Act we cannot find fault with the legislation. Some representations have been made to me that this Bill would enable the City of Perth to build multi-storied car parks, to the disadvantage of at least two private companies which are anxious to build such structures. My answer is that provision is already in the Act, because section 7 (3) provides—

The Council shall utilise the moneys in the Fund—

- (b) for the purchase, acquisition, maintenance, alteration, and improvement of land, buildings and other structures . . .
- (c) for the establishment, provision, extension, the maintenance in good order and condition and operation of parking stations . . .

Therefore I am certain the people who have made the representations were not aware of the provisions in the Act, otherwise they would not be so concerned.

The use of parking funds for the purpose of street widening will not alter the existing powers of the Perth City Council. I am sure it has the power to do what

it wants to do in regard to the provision of multi-storied car parks. I have been endeavouring to find the cause of the delay on the part of the Perth City Council. I understand that action was delayed, because of the survey which was conducted by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority in regard to parking facilities, and also because of the survey by the Main Roads Department in regard to the origin and destination of vehicles. Now that these two surveys have been completed it will be possible for the City of Perth to make some decision on the applications by the two firms I have mentioned. I make these comments because of the representations that have been made. I am certain that under this Bill we are not increasing the powers of the Perth City Council, because the necessary powers already exist.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee, and passed.

## PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS SITE RESERVE BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [11.38 a.m.]: This is a very important Bill. It deals with Class "A" Reserve No. 1162, which is the site on which the Houses of Parliament of Western Australia are constructed, and which embraces all the area surrounding those buildings. I would like the indulgence of the House to track back a little in order to show how this area first came to be selected and what has happened in the intervening years.

The first record I would quote is under date the 22nd June, 1864. In the minutes of the Legislative Council of that date there is reference to the refitting of the Supreme Court house, and it states that the first meeting under representative Government was subsequently held on the 5th December, 1870, in the Town Hall chambers. It continued meeting there until 1890, when it was moved to the old Agricultural Department building where it met until 1904, when it moved to the present Parliament House.

There was a Select Committee dealing with the site for Parliament House in each of the years 1858, 1865, 1866, 1868, and

1869. As I will show, there were subsequent committees of inquiry in which Lord Forrest—then Mr. Forrest—took a very active part.

I would like to preface the remarks I am about to make by saying I am deeply indebted to the Clerk of Parliament (Mr. Roberts) for his efforts, through the years, in compiling bits and pieces from wherever he could glean information into records which, in my view, are very important to this institution. Indeed, I think they should be put together and scrutinised with other papers that are in the archives of the State. This would give a lot of satisfaction to the person undertaking the work, irrespective of whether it be a trained Pressman in special articles, or someone compiling a permanent record.

Reserve "A" No. 1162 (Parliament House Site), before it was proclaimed as this site, was originally surveyed by Charles Evans in 1863. It was resurveyed by W. J. Crowder in 1900 when the area was 12 acres 1 rood 16 perches. In the *Government Gazette* of 1897, page 1780, the reserve was declared for public buildings, and numbered 1162. Executive Council approval is dated the 11th September, 1897. So that since 1897 this reserve has retained its number, and it was classified "A" in the *Government Gazette* of the 23rd March, 1900, for the purpose of parliamentary buildings. No provision was made for the excision of the area containing the Public Works Department and the Water Supply buildings; and the reserve was not vested.

There is no record in the files of the Lands Department as to why the purpose of the reserve was changed from public buildings to parliamentary buildings, but presumably when it was decided to erect Parliament House the change was made. That was the situation in 1897; and in 1897 when the Parliament of Western Australia met in the old Agricultural Department buildings, the site was considered by many people to be unsatisfactory and, with the development of responsible government, considerable discussion took place on whether that site was a suitable one.

You will recall, Mr. President, my coming to you in a great hurry when the old Agricultural Department was being demolished. I did this, because I walked in through those doors for 11 years as Minister; and when I saw the demolition crew with their hammers close to an important coat of arms I reported to you that in the next hour or two that coat of arms, which is now over the doorway at the entrance to this Chamber, would be destroyed. We know of the immediate and subsequent action you took to preserve, for all time, the coat of arms that is over the doorway of the passage into this Chamber. How old that coat of arms is, or whence it came, I think we still do not know; but, be that as it may,

in 1897 a motion was moved in the Legislative Council to select a site for parliamentary buildings.

It was decided by the Select Committee that the site on which Council House now stands—where the old Agricultural Department once stood—should be the site. From that point, considerable activity took place, both inside and outside of Parliament. This motion was moved by a Mr. Simpson on the 16th December, 1897—

That this House, having taken into consideration the report of the Commission appointed to select a site suitable for Parliament Houses, disagree with the report, and recommends the site occupied by the Barracks in St. George's Terrace.

The move is as old as that. Lord Forrest took a particular interest in this site and, with the then Mr. J. W. Hackett, played a very important part in the selecting of Class "A" Reserve No. 1162, the reason for this Bill being the excision of certain parts of it. I have in my hand reports of the Joint Parliamentary Committee of Advice; and there are several of them dealing with sites for parliamentary buildings; and the chairman of one of those committees, the late J. G. Lee Steere, reported that there appeared to be only two available sites belonging to the Government possessing sufficient space on which to erect the buildings. He continued in his report to say—

One of such sites is in St. George's Terrace, where the present Legislative Council building stands, the other is in a position abutting on Harvest Terrace, behind what is known as the Pensioners' Barracks, at the west end of St. George's Terrace.

The Commission, following the recommendations of Select Committees appointed to consider the question of the position of Public and Parliamentary buildings both in England and in the other Colonies, and which were adopted by their Parliaments, is of opinion that it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament should be in near proximity to the various Public Offices, and as centrally situated as possible, as regards the convenience of Members of Parliament and of the public.

He referred to this site in these words—

The site abutting on Harvest Terrace, at the back of the Pensioners' Barracks, is too far removed from the central position of Perth, being 1,400 yards from the General Post Office, and would not fulfil any of the conditions which the Commission deems to be necessary. Beyond being in an elevated position, and having an extensive view, it possesses no recommendations as a site for new Houses of Parliament.

That was the report of one parliamentary committee in the year 1897. John Forrest was very unhappy with that position.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He said so.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes; and in no way that could be misunderstood. The file from which I first quoted placed very great stress on the need for the site selected to be one in an outstanding situation. I will not quote the full speech of John Forrest, but in the course of it he said—

For my part, I believe in making a country's Houses of Parliament as convenient, as beautiful, and even as splendid as possible, so that those who enter them may regard them as something like sacred ground, and be impressed with a certain amount of reverence for their surroundings, and so behave themselves.

In several speeches he made in those days Lord Forrest made it very clear that this was the site he would insist upon. In a report under date the 14th November, 1900, Mr. F. Illingworth, who was chairman—and that is another old Western Australian name—said—

It was found that these plans could be easily adapted to the rising ground immediately at the rear of the "Old Barracks," and that a noble building, worthy of Parliament and an ornament to the City, sufficient for all present and future requirements, could be fully completed in stone for £100,000. Further, it was in evidence that the internal portion, exclusive of the outer stone work, the dome, and embellishments, could be erected for the sum of £25,000, and that this portion of the building, giving accommodation for both Houses of Parliament, could be made ready for occupation in time for the session of 1902.

Your Committee therefore recommend:—

That a Parliament House be at once commenced upon the rising ground at the rear of the "Old Barracks;" the internal portion only to be now erected and fitted up ready for the occupation of both Houses of Parliament in time for the session of 1902, at a cost not exceeding £25,000.

That is perhaps a little less than the amount paid recently for only the carpeting. The next recommendation was—

That such buildings be completed and embellished year by year in accordance with the plans (now laid upon the table, and adapted to the changed site) . . .

In this volume are some remarkable records of the planning of the original site. I do not know whether members can see this plan from where they are sitting,

but it shows just what was contemplated as long ago as 1897 when this area, the subject matter of this Bill, was planned. According to this plan, the Barracks were to be demolished. There was no compunction about that on the part of the leading thinkers of those days because the demolition was referred to several times. There was not the feeling there is today that all or portion of the Barracks should be preserved. As they were only 24 feet in width they were unsuitable for anything but pensioner barracks, and it was felt they should therefore be disregarded in the bigger scheme.

This plan shows Parliament House on the spot where it now stands fronting Harvest Terrace, with the ceremonial approach and the rights of entry both from Hay Street and from Malcolm Street in almost the same positions as the entrances from those streets are placed in the plan of 1965.

In addition, in this volume are not only the details and plans of the size of the rooms, but also the actual measurements of those Chambers in which Parliament now works. The actual floor space is given and from these plans the original part of the building was developed. I thought it a bit important in these days to have recorded somewhere a bit of the background although I realise my inability to do justice to the subject at this stage. However, I felt it important to have clearly set out chronologically and in detail the history of this site.

It will be noticed on the plan the Minister made available that the area which was originally 12 acres 1 rood 38 perches has now been frittered down to 8 acres 1 rood 11 perches. This is the best site for any Parliament House in any part of Australia, and in many other places.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is, too.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If Parliament is to continue to be moulded on the British Mother of Parliaments it is, in my view, very important that we retain the old traditions. Many folk find it very easy to deride the institution and the people associated with it, but if the parliamentary system as we know it disappeared, so would very many of those in prominent places who also deride the institution.

We have been asked to sanction the excision of three acres for the requirements of the Mitchell Freeway, but I wonder whether all the alternatives associated with this road complex were fully examined in an endeavour to solve the problem without the necessity for the passage of this Bill. If members have studied the plan and the fact that the Mitchell Freeway will pass through reserve 834 they will realise that once more a piece of Hay Street is to be taken from

this reserve. It is to have a substantial truncation at the corner of Hay Street and Harvest Terrace; and also, although a piece was taken some years ago to widen Malcolm Street, there is provision for another piece of Malcolm Street to be taken and for the truncation on the corner in case Harvest Terrace is not to be closed as provided for by Parliament a few years ago.

In speaking on that point, I am wondering why it is that there should be any concern over what should happen to that part of Act No. 74 of 1961 which includes the closing of part of Harvest Terrace from Parliament Place to Malcolm Street. This has been a subject keenly discussed, I understand, at House Committee meetings. Considerable correspondence has passed between that committee and the Ministers concerned and meetings have been held in the halls of this Parliament with officers associated with the departments involved indicating why this excision should take place.

I hold the view most strongly that since most of the traffic through King's Park Road and thence to the city comes from Thomas Street, we should not attempt to anticipate that Harvest Terrace itself should be the main traffic line northwards for the convenience of traffic.

Surely there are parts in that 70-odd chains of King's Park Road to divert and disperse traffic long before it reaches this point so close to the city. I do not think there is an argument in support of it. What other traffic intrudes into King's Park to be diverted through Harvest Terrace—apart from some traffic out of King's Park itself—except traffic from Thomas Street?

There is a very easy solution in my view to this problem. That is, the Government should not allow itself at any stage in these considerations to be wagged, as it were, like a dog's tail by opinion, however expert in its sphere, because in my view there are several ways to avoid bringing down through Harvest Terrace all of the traffic which approaches the city from the west. There is three-quarters of a mile of opportunity to include Thomas Street as the main diverging artery to contain that traffic. Section 12 of the 1961 Act can only be put into effect by proclamation as distinct from the other sections of that Act; Harvest Terrace was singled out so that it could be closed by proclamation and all rights over it should cease. That is what I understand will be the situation from what the Minister has said.

A letter has been received by the House Committee from the Minister for Works in which the Minister states, that when the whole complex has been built up to the point where Harvest Terrace will be involved, that section of the 1961 Act will

be proclaimed and Harvest Terrace will be closed. I understand that to be the position.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It will be closed at the appropriate time.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Well I am prepared to take the word of the Minister of the Government in that connection. I am quite prepared to believe that when it becomes necessary for the complex to the east of this point and to the west of it to be firmly made, that portion of the 1961 Act will be proclaimed. I think we have no alternative in this Bill but to leave it at that. Any amendment to this Bill could affect section 12 of Act No. 74 of 1961, because we are not dealing with any matter except the reserve in Harvest Terrace at this time. The only thing to do in order to hold that section would be to introduce a Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Surely it is not logical to close Harvest Terrace until the rest of the road system has been built?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is right, and we must believe that will be the situation in the future. The closing of Harvest Terrace will mean much in the years to come. We do not want 100 or 200 vehicles an hour—some paying one third of a penny per ton mile—trundling past. Members will recall that when the excavations were being made for the public buildings opposite Parliament House, steps had to be taken by Mr. President and Mr. Speaker because of the noise occasioned by large vehicles. So we may not readily agree to Harvest Terrace being a through artery for traffic travelling north. I hope that all members who are in Parliament when that time is reached will find it has not been the problem imagined and the matter will be agreed to.

So far as the Bill is concerned, the House has agreed that this area should be excised for the purpose, and I think it is a very generous attitude. I hope that all those who are concerned with propounding schemes such as the Mitchell Freeway will concede that the public men of our day were generous enough to say, "We believe in what you have done; that it is the right approach to the completion of Mitchell Freeway; and that it has all been done in the public interest." I support the Bill.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [12.6 p.m.]: Mr. Wise has given a very interesting history of the Parliament House site and the original purpose of the reserve. There is a little sidelight of history attached to the site which I think should be placed on record, and it is dealt with in the last clause of the Bill.

At the time the Main Roads Department structure was being erected on the Parliament House site, our very attentive Clerk of Parliaments (Mr. Roberts) became aware that the building was being erected



on Parliament House property. He took the matter up with the then President, The Hon. Sir Harold Seddon, and the outcome was the Parliament House Site Reserve (A1162) Act of 1956.

I bring this matter forward not only for the record of what happened, but for the information of the newer members who perhaps might wonder what the last clause in this Bill means. It will be remembered that we had to pass a special Act to allow the Main Roads Department to continue with the building, and the Act has been subsequently retained by being reviewed every few years up to this stage. Of course, this Bill will mean a big part of this section reserved in the 1956 Bill will be, as far as I know, included in the excision.

I could not agree more with the remarks of Mr. Wise in regard to the demolition of the Old Barracks, because I believe they are not a wonderful architectural structure by any means. The bricks are not good quality and the building is only an example of certain types of building put up during that period. In my opinion, it could not be regarded as being beautiful, or of period architecture, as was the case with the T. & G Building which was recently demolished. I cannot see anything at all attractive or useful in retaining any part of the Old Barracks when the demolition takes place.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I quite agree.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am glad that some members agree with me.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Weren't the bricks imported from the Old Country?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: As far as I can gather, they were made close to the site. They are just wirecuts, and the mortar between the bricks has been fretting for years and has had to be renewed. So far as the structure itself is concerned, it could not be compared with some of the cathedral buildings which have been preserved in England. When one thinks of older buildings, one can think of the cathedral buildings constructed around the year 1100, which are still standing today. Those are buildings one would want to retain, not only because of the age, but because of the architecture and wonderful work put into them.

I had the privilege some time ago of hearing a lecture on cathedrals in England and of seeing some slides. It is an interesting topic when dealing with buildings of that nature, but the old Public Works Department building, or Barracks, is no such building.

In regard to the question of Harvest Terrace, I am fully in agreement with Mr. Wise and other members. I could not think of a worse approach to Hay Street, or a worse entrance to the Mitchell Freeway than along Harvest Terrace, because one would have to drive down a steep slope

to connect with the freeway. If the engineers tried to pick out the worst approach possible to the Mitchell Freeway, when it is built, they could not do better than use the northern end of Harvest Terrace. When one looks back towards Thomas Street one sees much wider streets than Harvest Terrace, and streets which could be widened still further to take the traffic for the freeway when it is completed.

I conclude by supporting the measure. We know that to progress we have to build projects like the Mitchell Freeway otherwise I, like other members, would not agree to the excision. I support the Bill.

**THE HON. J. G. HISLOP** (Metropolitan) [12.11 p.m.]: To me it seems that as a small community we are living in a fantastic era. I cannot imagine that any other city in the world, of only 100 years of age, or a little over, has been brought to the point where it must incur enormous expenditure in order to make the city one of easy ingress and egress. However, I wonder whether in doing this we are going to build roadways in order that the work of Henry Ford may continue or whether we are looking at it from a really aesthetic point of view. I trust sincerely that the finalised Mitchell Freeway project will be such as the town planning authorities envisage it.

I remember when the building on the other side of Harvest Terrace was first envisaged. We wanted to appoint a landscape artist to assist in designing the surrounds of that building, and we were fortunate that Mr. Oldham took the job in hand. I can see, as others can see, that while it appears that a great amount of traffic along King's Park Road goes down either Malcolm Street or Mount Street—and a good deal of it goes down Mount Street—its origin is not in the West Perth district. These vehicles come from much further out in the western suburbs. One can see cars in large numbers coming along Thomas Street turning into King's Park Road and making for Mount Street.

To me there is no reason at all why the alteration of journey, to get on to the Mitchell Freeway, should not be west of Harvest Terrace. I am certain that roads such as Colin Street, or even a small road like Emerald Hill Terrace could be widened sufficiently to take the traffic away from a centre such as Parliament House.

I have been practising in King's Park Road for some four years now and I have watched the traffic very carefully over that time. I have noticed a growing tendency for cars coming from the Sublaco direction, and even those coming from the ultimate end of the Mitchell Freeway, to turn into King's Park Road and so add to the traffic coming from other directions.

Surely a lot of that traffic could be diverted in a much more simple way in relation to Hay Street itself.

Therefore, like other members who have spoken, I feel it is essential that this building be centred in an area of quietude, and I do not think that could ever happen if Harvest Terrace were made a main thoroughfare; and, what is more, it would have to be considerably widened if it were to be a traffic outlet. Also, some of the area on the other side of Harvest Terrace, which has been allotted to Government offices and so on, would have to be taken away and the whole section would have to be widened.

I believe we should emphasise quite strongly that we desire the traffic to be diverted as far from Harvest Terrace as possible. If that is done we will certainly preserve this building in its sanctitude.

Like Mr. Wise, I think what we have done in the way of permitting an excision of land from this site is very generous and something that possibly future generations may come to regard either as very generous or very foolish. To take three acres from this building site is certainly diminishing the original holding by a considerable percentage. I sincerely trust that when we have agreed to this, and the Mitchell Freeway is finished, we will leave something for posterity and not be regarded by those who come after us as having been rather foolish in lessening the area we hold.

We have to submit to the experts in this field on many occasions, but at times I think we must use a little of our own judgment in not allowing the land to be excised. However, I think we have done the right and proper thing and I am sure all of us, in allowing any excision of land or any alteration of our city, to take place, are doing it with the interests of the citizens at heart, not only those of today but also those of the future. I support the measure.

**THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON** (North-East Metropolitan) [12.19 p.m.]: I am not supporting the measure. I was not going to speak but after listening to members who have spoken I cannot in all conscience believe that a crime is not being committed with the excision of land from the Parliament House grounds for the purposes of the freeway. One would think there was no room in Western Australia to build a great road, which the engineers seem to want, and to provide routes around the city. This proposal will be virtually destroying that land for all time because it will never be used for any purpose other than roads.

I do not see any merit in the Barracks building, either. It has nothing to recommend it from an architectural point of view and its history is such that when it

is taken down it will not matter to me at all. But for members to allow land to be taken from the little we have in the Parliament House site is a crime. A crime was committed when the Narrows Bridge was built. I had courage enough to say it—I told the then Minister, and that honourable member agrees with me now.

Perth has one beauty—the Swan River. In this respect it is unlike other cities which are surrounded with great lakes, mountains, or other scenic grandeur. Perth's real beauty is the Swan River. This is a jewel of a city, and would be especially so if its original site had not been impaired; but what have town planners done with it? In my opinion the Narrows Bridge could have been constructed further down the river which would have prevented the city proper from being hemmed in. The men who engineered this project have gone down steep steps in my estimation. They should be regarded as people possessing some vision, because they hold the privileges and the rights of people in their hands in so far as they concern the beauty of a city.

Following the construction of the Narrows Bridge we have only one little block of land, and there is no alternative way to reach it. It is now proposed to construct another huge freeway which will encroach on Parliament House grounds, and this is occurring in a State which is still in its infancy. I feel quite sure that the next step to be taken will be to destroy King's Park. Some excuse will be put forward to do away with that beautiful reserve.

Much the same action, and lack of vision has been shown in the construction of several of our other main roads. For instance, engineers are already starting to cut through the University grounds so that a through road can be put down. As members of Parliament we are custodians of the land which belongs to the people, but we are permitting these things to happen; and in addition, we are seeing a great mass of land reclaimed from the river—and it is extending to the vicinity of the University—which, in the future, would otherwise have been the subject of great pride and great solace to the people of the large city which Perth will eventually become. The preservation of the river in its original state could have been accomplished so easily.

When, from King's Park, one looks across the river towards the city, what can one see? All that can be seen are lines of rapidly moving traffic creating great noise and hubbub when, instead, we could have retained something that would have been of benefit to the health and welfare of the people of Western Australia. I am the only woman among 80 men in this Parliament, so I do not think my voice will carry much weight when a decision is made on this measure. But I would point out that this Government will not hold a proud place

in history. A more destructive Government I have never known. A more unethical Government I have never known. It does not recognise ethics in any shape or form because, if it did, it would not be acting in the way it is in constructing this great horror on the banks of our river for the purpose of completing the Mitchell Freeway, when such a structure could have been erected further down the river and where the traffic would have been able to cross the river at a more convenient point.

I have listened with interest to my Leader (The Hon. F. J. S. Wise) in regard to what he said about the history of Parliament House site, and I have also read a great deal about it. There is no question that every Parliament which sits makes history and this is one year, 1965, that we will eventually be ashamed of, if we live long enough; and, if not, I am certain our grandchildren will be ashamed of us for what we have done to our heritage.

I wish to voice my disapproval of what is being done by men in this Parliament, and it is about time the women of Western Australia made their voices heard on matters such as this. Western Australia has women who are just as able as any men in this Parliament, but today the same pattern is being followed as was followed many years ago. This only indicates what a young nation Australia is, because women have not yet been accepted in public service to any great extent.

Today women are regarded in much the same way as they were when my mother landed in Western Australia in 1897. I was a very tiny person then. My mother left a lovely home in Victoria. She was gently bred, well educated, and was a lovely singer. She ventured out into the eastern goldfields, and eventually became a pioneer in the Murchison goldfields and endured all the subsequent hardships without a murmur. She was only one of a band of intrepid women who went out into the backblocks in the early years of the history of this State.

However, women are not waking up fast enough to realise that they are equally as intelligent as men. There is no difference between the sexes in that regard. Intelligence is bestowed quite impartially on the human race. The decisions on town planning that are being made today are destroying not only the beauty of our river but also of our parks around the city. On such questions the voice of women should be sought. Instead of that a woman's voice is only heard around the camp ovens in the outback, and men keep it there because in many instances men are extremely selfish.

I am not going to vote against the Bill, because I want Harvest Terrace closed. I can only hope that in the future someone will read what I have said today and will say, "Well, in 1965 one woman in the

Parliament had sufficient courage to rise to her feet and say what she meant, and today she has been proved right."

**THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT** (South-West) [12.26 p.m.]: My contribution to the debate will be brief, but it arises from something mentioned by Mr. Wise when he was outlining the history of the selection of this site. During his speech he referred to a man by the name of Simpson as being the one who moved the motion that this should be the site on which Parliament House should stand. The name Simpson rang a bell in my mind and I proceeded to check the Parliamentary Debates of the 16th December, 1897, to ascertain if the initials of that man were G. T., and I found my surmise to be correct.

The reference to a man named Simpson interested me because, in 1904, my father purchased from Mr. G. T. Simpson a property in Bridgetown called "Applewood" on which I was raised. It struck me as rather a coincidence that the Parliament of Western Australia firstly, had as a member Mr. G. T. Simpson, and that in 1914 my father (The Hon. F. E. S. Willmott) was elected to the ninth Parliament on the 21st October of that year. Now that I am a member of this House, this means that I am the third of a line of three men who owned that one property at Bridgetown.

My reason for specifically mentioning the initials "G.T." was that the cattle brand on that property is still "G.T. 2." Originally it was "G.T.S.," the initials of G. T. Simpson, and that was the brand of the Applewood property until the regulation required a numeral in the brand, when it was changed to "G.T.2," which is still the cattle brand of the property. That is all I wish to say because, as I had already stated, when Mr. Wise referred to the name "Simpson" it rang a bell in my memory.

**THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND** (North) [12.28 p.m.]: I have not very much to say on the measure, which I support. At the risk of adding my ideas and impressions to those held by town planners, and at the risk, perhaps, of being criticised, I often wonder when we are going to have a town planner coming to Perth who will make a definite decision on channelling some of the traffic away from Parliament House and out of the city rather than directing the great volume of traffic along a route in the vicinity of these grounds.

As I see the position, town planner after town planner appears to have varied ideas, but all of them seem to be directed towards concentrating as much traffic as possible in the heart of the city—

**The Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** And destroying what we have.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND:—rather than diverting some of its flow and channelling it away from the city. I heard the ideas held by Mr. Wise in regard to traffic being directed along Thomas Street. One of the greatest hindrances to the flow of traffic between Perth and Fremantle is the lack of a crossing over the Swan River between both cities. This is a requirement which town planners seem to think will not be necessary for another 15 or 20 years. I do not profess to be a planner, but in my opinion this facility is required now, not in 15 or 20 years' time. However, that is the opinion of the experts from all I have read in the Press.

It seems ridiculous that people living in the Claremont area, midway between Perth and Fremantle, or those living on the other side of the river in Attadale and similar places, who wish to cross from one side to the other should have to travel a distance of 10 miles, particularly when it is no more than one mile across the river.

The flow of traffic from the northern suburbs to the southern beaches like Rockingham, Mandurah, Bunbury, and so on, must all be channelled through the bottleneck at Fremantle. There is a very definite bottleneck here. Nor is it at all easy to pass through Fremantle. We find, however, that though the port is a busy area the traffic congestion will be further aggravated by a standard gauge railway which will approach from somewhere around the southern end and feed the port.

It is ultimately proposed by the present planners that wheat and bulk cargoes for export will not pass through the Central Railway Station or through the city area at all; they will be carried around to the southern end. That will further restrict the traffic flow.

It is high time that Parliament had some say in this matter, and that we took some action on the views expressed by professional men.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There seems to be no other opinion but theirs.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The professional men claim, and apparently get away with the fact, that these are their plans, dictated by them, and that is all there is to it. As I have said, they get away with their ideas and their suggestions that we can further put up with a concentration of traffic through the City of Fremantle and the City of Perth for another 15 or 20 years before any attempt is made to relieve the pressure and congestion by crossing the river somewhere between the two cities. The whole position is absolutely ridiculous.

Whenever any action is mooted in this direction there is generally a public outcry from the people who will perhaps be affected by any such scheme. We can see

this trend in the Dalkeith area at the moment, because the town planners propose that it should be utilised for the purpose suggested. This trend in opposition develops in the form of deputations, letters to the Press, and the formation of bodies that are against river reclamation, and so on. In spite of their opposition, the traffic must flow, even though some people are likely to be upset as a result.

People cannot live in the happy seclusion of the Dalkeith area, or anywhere else on the river front, without being affected to a certain extent by traffic noises. At the moment we are discussing, and agreeing to, a proposition that will soon disturb the area around Parliament House, because of the traffic noises that will be involved. While we cannot be completely immune in this matter, I do suggest that we protect ourselves as much as is possible.

We have an area close to us through which traffic could be channelled—and I refer to King's Park—but, of course, we are told that King's Park must not be touched. On our northern boundary we have the railway. As a result of this we are completely boxed in. To make matters worse we find that the concentration of traffic is getting worse around Parliament House.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Why are you supporting the Bill?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do hope there will be more discussion on these points in Parliament, and that we will be given an opportunity in the early stages of next session to suggest a remedy, and perhaps take some action to keep up with the realities of the day, rather than look 15 or 20 years ahead while, at the moment, concentrating all the traffic in the heart of the city. I support the measure.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (Lower North) [12.36 p.m.]: I wish to support the Bill and, in doing so, I desire to express some sympathy for our town planners. There is no doubt that our town planners who have the responsibility of coping with the problems associated with this growing city and its expanding future are faced with tremendous difficulties. Theirs is not an easy task. On the one hand we have Mrs. Hutchison regretting that the Narrows Bridge was built.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Where it is.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: On the other hand we have those who constantly complain about the reclamations that have been made from the Swan River, and so on. I often think, however, that the people responsible for these projects have few, if any, alternatives which they might adopt.

The city is growing at a tremendous rate, and I feel we should be a bit careful when adopting the attitude that this area

of Parliament House is entirely sacrosanct, and that other sections of the city must give way to us.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Do not forget ours is only a small city.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If traffic is diverted down Thomas Street, for instance, it will mean this traffic will be taken straight past the Children's Hospital and a school. It is as well to bear in mind that there is also a vast volume of traffic running right through to the Royal Perth Hospital—which is a very important unit in our community life—quite apart from that around the Supreme Court, the Perth Local Court, and the Mount Hospital.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: People cannot even park their cars at the Supreme Court.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: We have to be careful to ensure that we do not go too far in respect of Parliament House site. At this moment there is a lot of traffic proceeding along Hay Street, but I do not think the noise causes very great inconvenience to us. Members should not think that I am not sympathetic to doing everything possible to preserve the amenities of this delightful site, but we should be careful not to adopt an attitude at the expense of other people and other institutions.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: That is not my attitude. I am complaining about what is being done to the river and to the whole place.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The town planners try to weigh up the situation honestly, and to cope with the problem to the best of their ability. Those were a few of the thoughts which occurred to me in the course of this debate. It is as well to bear in mind that in protecting our rights we should not jeopardise the rights of other people and institutions—rights which are deserving of consideration.

#### *Personal Explanation*

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: May I make a personal explanation? Mr. Heenan implied that I was speaking about Parliament Place, but in fact I was speaking of what is being done in the whole area, and not of our rights.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I think that is thoroughly understood by members.

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

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [12.42 p.m.]: I think each and every one of us is indebted to Mr. Wise for his very complete and concise resume of the happenings which have taken place up to date in respect of the Parliament House site, and his remarks will go on record for the benefit of future generations.

I can give an assurance on one of the points raised by the honourable member; it is in regard to the eventual closure of Harvest Terrace. It is well known by the Government, the town planners, and the Main Roads Department engineers that it is the desire and wish of Parliament that Harvest Terrace be closed eventually.

This morning I referred to the debate which took place in 1961 in regard to this site, in order to refresh my memory. I noticed that at the time Mr. Strickland was very much opposed to the closure of Harvest Terrace, as was Mr. Lavery, but the House agreed without dissension that Harvest Terrace should be closed at the appropriate time. Mr. Strickland went on to say that it was a good idea to permit left turns into and out of Harvest Terrace. This was an aspect dealt with by Mr. Aitken at the meeting between the members of Parliament and officers of the Town Planning Department and the Main Roads Department.

During such period as Harvest Terrace remains open the danger of the alignment between Harvest Terrace and Malcolm Street will exist. Members generally were not very happy in 1961 about the closure of Harvest Terrace.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: We have seen the light since.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The majority must have been happy.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Those are some of the thoughts which were expressed in 1961. It was my lot at the time to handle the Bill on behalf of the Government, and the debate is recorded on pages 2661 to 2669 of the 1961 *Parliamentary Debates*. No-one doubted at the time that it was the desire of Parliament that Harvest Terrace be closed at the appropriate time.

During the introduction of this measure I gave an assurance that the small truncation from Malcolm Street into Harvest Terrace shown on plan 10063 would be closed, when the closure of Harvest Terrace was proclaimed.

I have no doubt the town planners and engineers are looking for some alternative to overcome the problem in regard to going on and off the ramps which will connect the Mitchell Freeway. Dr. Hislop said he was not aware whether Perth was the only small city in the world which was attempting some scheme like this. I would point out that when I was in Seattle in 1962 I saw a broad swath being bulldozed through the middle of the city. The work was being done for the benefit of the community. These developments are undertaken to meet the demands of the community and generally they are brought about by the pressure exerted by the people.

It seems that the town planners are being criticised by some members for putting into effect development which it

is their responsibility to undertake. The town planners make plans after they have been given the required advice and information. In the first place the traffic engineers of the Main Roads Department carry out investigations through surveys of origin and destination of vehicles. Such information is then passed on to the town planners.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is the Government which is guilty on this occasion.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The crossing over the river was referred to by Mr. Strickland. It will probably be implemented in 15 or 20 years' time. There are possibly one or two other spots where crossings can be established, and where there is a greater need. We have been told of one that is to be built at Fremantle, and under the Metropolitan Region Planning Scheme another one is to be established further up the river. From a study of the direction from which traffic flows, a duplication of the Causeway will be required before the provision of the one further up the river. Mr. Strickland referred to a crossing midway between Perth and Fremantle, and Mrs. Hutchison said the crossing at the Narrows should not have been established. They should work this out among themselves.

*Sitting suspended from 12.50 to 2.15 p.m.*

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Before the suspension I was about to make some remark in reply to a request from Mr. Wise in regard to the extent the planners and engineers have studied the ramifications of the Mitchell Freeway route; and whether everything had been taken into consideration. This is not an easy question to answer as it all took place before my time as Minister. The plan was defined and marked on the map. As far as I know, from this side of the river the line of the Mitchell Freeway was to a certain extent defined by the alignment of the Narrows Bridge. I think this had quite a lot to do with it. I do not know to what extent other physical disabilities were taken into account.

However, by going further north it would have been necessary to go through the brewery and the Mount Hospital; and the cost of resuming those two buildings would have been enormous. I think Dr. Hislop will agree with me when I say that it might have been better in the long run to have gone through the Mount Hospital and to have replaced that hospital at another site.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: With respect, I can recall the suggestion made by our President as to how to obviate it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: When we talk about noise, I suggest to members they have a sojourn in the corner room at the

Mount Hospital on a Saturday night. It was my unenviable experience to do this on the final night of the Empire Games, and nobody can tell me anything about the noise.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You did not enjoy the celebration.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I did not. Dr. Hislop mentioned the traffic from Subiaco coming up King's Park Road near here. If the traffic came down Wellington Street it would meet the traffic at the markets where, from 8.30 a.m. to 9 a.m. it is very congested.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is the point Mr. Strickland made about bringing the traffic into the town.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There is only one decent righthand turn into Milligan Street; and George Street is a bad crossing in order to get to Hay Street. So for ease of access the traffic goes this way.

Mr. Baxter recalled the happenings in this House back in 1956 when a Bill was before the House dealing with the erection of the supposedly temporary/permanent buildings for the Main Roads Department. Some members will recall that this House at that time was evenly divided as to whether those buildings should be allowed to be erected or not. If my memory serves me aright, I was against the Government. I voted against the erection of those temporary/permanent buildings, and the Chairman of Committees, with his casting and final vote, voted in favour.

I am rather surprised Mrs. Hutchison is opposing this measure. I would have thought the number of times she has tried to get rid of the Legislative Council would be sufficient cause for her to want to increase the area to more than three acres so as to undermine the Legislative Council and thus accomplish her purpose.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I can do it a better way than that.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think the approach to this measure by Mr. Heenan was very fairminded. He gave all sections of the community some thought in this matter; and, as members of Parliament, that is the attitude we should take. From our own point of view, I know it is nice for us to isolate ourselves, but we cannot do that entirely; we have to look after all sections of the community in our deliberations.

However, I feel sure that the Minister, the Government, the planners, the Main Roads Department, and everybody concerned, are well acquainted with the views of this Parliament in regard to Harvest Terrace. I think I can give the assurance that when the time arrives that Harvest Terrace should be closed, it will be, and

the portion which is being excised according to this plan will revert to the Parliament House reserve. By giving that assurance, I think that is all that is required by Parliament at the present time.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

**Clause 1 put and passed.**

**Clause 2: Reserve A† 1162 amended—**

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I just want to make it clear that my intention when I spoke against this Bill earlier had nothing to do with the closing of Harvest Terrace. My objection was to the truncation of the grounds of Parliament House. I do not want any misconception about my intention; I want Harvest Terrace closed very definitely. I am opposed to the plan for the new freeway.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I was not present in the House this morning; I was at Medina together with other members and the Premier. I will make one final request on a matter which I have mentioned on many occasions. I request that when this land is alienated—and I will support the alienation by supporting the Bill—the piece of land at the foot of Parliament House where a cutting is to go will be made into a type of tunnel. I hope that further consideration will be given to this matter. It should be an easy matter to make a cutting with bulldozers, construct the tunnel, and then cover the tunnel with filling. We could then have a very beautiful park in front of Parliament House instead of the cutting.

The Minister also mentioned the problem of noise, and we know that in cities such as Sydney, where there are such cuttings, the noise is terrific. I know it will cost some extra money, but what a difference it would make to the appearance of the city and to the entrance of Parliament House! In Japan one can travel for 11 miles under the sea; and if that can be done there, surely we can have a tunnel four or five chains long.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know that Mr. Lavery has mentioned this before. The engineers examined three methods: tunnel, cut and fill, and open cut. The three methods were examined in regard to feasibility and cost and I am afraid that cost was the final factor in the determining of the open cut.

We have been assured that the open cut will be beautified and it will not be an unsightly structure. As I have said before, we trust that this will be the last time that Parliament will be called upon to excise any more of the Parliament House reserve.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would like to thank the Minister, because he does know of my interest in this matter. However, I have been assured by an engineer that this cut and fill could be done elaborately for £200,000 or £300,000. At Hyde Park in Sydney 3,000 motorcars are able to park underground, and there is a beautiful park on top of that structure. It has a concrete entrance and exit and it is a job to find it if one does not know Sydney.

I know this is my final word on the question, but I still feel that further consideration should be given to the matter. I would even give up my salary increase of £700 a year, for the next five years, if I thought it would help.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have not the figures offhand regarding the extra cost, but I do know it was considerable. I would like to remind members that, when talking about Sydney, as compared with Perth, Sydney has a population of over 2,000,000 whereas our population is about 450,000.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: But it is granite there whereas we have only sand.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I realise that, but the work would cost a great deal of money. I am sorry I cannot give the exact figures because I had them at one time and I would not like to guess in regard to them. However, I know the cost was considerable.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 3 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

### *Report*

**Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.**

### *Third Reading*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) (2.32 p.m.): I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

**THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND** (North) (2.33 p.m.): I just want to make a few comments on the Minister's reply to the second reading. He appeared to take umbrage at the fact that anybody should criticise his town planners.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I would suggest that what the town planners say the Minister accepts as gospel. However, as I said, there are planners and planners; and as planners go more will come in to take their place and each one of them will have a different plan.

Planners, after all, only estimate what is going to happen; but the Minister seemed to think that my suggestion of another bridge over the river, between Perth and Fremantle, was a little crazy. However, I think he will find that the increase in the

volume of traffic has far exceeded the planners' dreams. I cannot recall exactly by how much Professor Stephenson and Mr. Hepburn estimated the traffic flow would increase in the next 20 or 30 years, but I do know that we have already reached their estimate. I should like to quote from the report on the plan for the metropolitan region, Perth and Fremantle, prepared by Professor Stephenson and Mr. Hepburn. In relation to the traffic flow, on page 114, chapter 7 of the report, they have this to say—

In estimating, therefore, what volume of traffic is likely to be imposed upon the regional roads within the next three or four decades, it could reasonably be assumed that the ratio of 1 to 3.5 might eventually prevail and, indeed, it might be higher.

For a regional population of 1,000,000 a vehicle ratio of 1 to 3.5 would mean a registered total of 285,000 vehicles, or some 200,000 more than in 1953. When the population increases to 1,400,000, for which the plan has allowed, the total number of vehicles would be some 400,000 or an increase of 320,000.

Noticeable in regard to the figures of vehicle registration is that during the years 1947 to 1953, the proportion of passenger cars to the total number of vehicles has remained practically constant. If the ratio, which is 58 per cent., persists, and the present rate of population increase is maintained, by 1974 there might be 122,000 passenger cars on the regional roads.

It is interesting to note that they say by 1974 there might be 122,000 passenger cars on the regional roads.

I should now like to refer to a monthly statistical summary for November, 1965, issued by the Government Statistician. On page 6 we find that the number of motor vehicles registered in the metropolitan traffic area, which I think is the same as the regional area, in 1955, according to the census figures, totalled 91,783. The latest figures available to Professor Stephenson and Mr. Hepburn were for 1953 and in that year there were 80,029 vehicles; and it was on that figure that they based their estimates.

At the end of December, 1955, the number of vehicles—and this includes motorcars and station wagons, utilities, vans, trucks, omnibuses, and motorcycles was, as I said, 91,783, but at the 30th June, 1965, that total had increased to 173,132. It is rather interesting to segregate these figures to see the difference between 1955 and 1965. There were 60,210 motorcars and station wagons registered in 1955 but that number had increased to 136,719 at the end of June, 1965. The number of utilities, vans, trucks, and omnibuses increased from 22,743 to 30,025 in the same period, and the number of motorcycles decreased from 8,830 to 6,388.

In 10 years, or a decade, all but six months, we find that the number of vehicles has almost doubled and our population is still less than 500,000. So when we look at the planners' estimates—and we all agree they are only estimates—we see that by 1974 they estimate there will be 122,000 vehicles on the regional roads whereas the number today is 137,000. Planners certainly do their best, but they can only work on estimates, and I do not think I was out of order when I suggested they might think about doing something to ease the traffic flow between Perth and Fremantle by the building of another bridge across the river now instead of waiting for 15 years.

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [2.39 p.m.]: I think the figures given by the honourable member only emphasise the point I made—that the increase in the volume of traffic has been terrific and much more than the planners estimated. But because of this increased traffic it was necessary—and this has only just been done—to take an origin and destination survey in regard to all vehicles to give us some idea of where the next river crossing should be and what priority it should have.

That is what I said and I was not opposing another river crossing. I said that the origin and destination survey showed where the next river crossing should be and what priority it should have, and I mentioned where it should be built. I did not say anything to the effect that there should not be another bridge across the river at Point Resolution. The day will eventually come when it should be there. But when the day comes and it is decided that a bridge should be placed there I will suggest to the Government that Mr. Strickland be appointed as public relations officer to go around the Dalkeith, Claremont, and Nedlands areas to get the people there into the right mood to accept the proposition.

**The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery:** Surely you are not frightened of objections after what has happened in the last 10 years!

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** I have a number of letters here which show the attitude of people towards this sort of thing. I am sure Mr. Strickland will appreciate what we run into when we try to carry out this type of development for the benefit of the community. I was not criticising Mr. Strickland; I was merely pointing out that the recent survey has shown where the next river crossing should be. In the matter of crossings—whether they be bridges or tunnels—a considerable amount of finance is required, and we can only take them in their turn; and it is for this purpose that surveys have been carried out.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.



# THE BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY COMPANY LIMITED (EXPORT OF IRON ORE) BILL

## Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [2.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is to authorise the export of iron ore from B.H.P. deposits in Western Australia ahead of the time foreshadowed in clause 20 of the 1964 B.H.P. agreement subject to—

- (a) The issue of the necessary export license by the Commonwealth from time to time; and
- (b) Payment of the full scale of export royalties provided in sub-clause 2 of clause 20 of the 1964 agreement.

Members will recall that the Government in the course of negotiating with a number of companies, negotiated with B.H.P. for the development of the iron ore deposits over which B.H.P. had a temporary reserve in the Deepdale area as an extension of its activities already committed under the 1952 and 1960 agreements in respect of Yampi, Koolyanobbing, and Kwinana.

Briefly stated, the company's commitments under the 1952 and 1960 agreements provide for: The development of the Yampi deposits, the main ones of which are Cockatoo and Koolan Islands; the development of Koolyanobbing deposits, which include Koolyanobbing, Bungalbin and Dowds Hill; and the establishment of an integrated iron and steel industry at Kwinana, with all the necessary port and other developments that go with it.

The 1952 agreement provided for a ban on export of Yampi ore, whereas the 1960 agreement did not provide a ban on the export of Koolyanobbing ore but made this only subject to the consent of the Government.

The circumstances surrounding the ban on the export of Yampi and other deposits are well known to members. Suffice it to say there was a time when Australia felt its iron ore resources were fairly limited so far as high grade ore was concerned and the Commonwealth imposed an embargo on the export of iron ore.

Following the lifting of the ban, exploration took place on a most skilled and spectacular basis and large deposits have been discovered and proved, and it can now be said that the known deposits of good grade ore in the north of this State are in excess of 15,000,000,000 tons.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Are you sure there are enough noughts there?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have used the expression 15,000,000,000 tons in many places. This is the quantity of ore which the geologists in the Mines Department now consider we have as an assessable quantity. But I agree with the honourable member that the figure could very easily be much greater.

At the time when the 1964 agreement was being negotiated by us with B.H.P. it was thought desirable to advise the Commonwealth that the State Government felt B.H.P. should be given the right to export iron ore from Yampi if certain conditions were complied with. One of these was a provision that the other companies which were seeking to develop deposits in the Pilbara and Ashburton areas should write substantial contracts in excess of 30,000,000 tons over reasonably long periods so as to demonstrate the Government's good faith in granting the temporary reserves and entering into agreements with these several companies.

These companies at that time were well advanced in their planning and in their negotiations with the Japanese steel mills. It was not very long after, that decisions were made by the Japanese steel industry, and announced progressively, covering a wide range of agreements including ore and iron ore pellets. These contracts already written, which exceed 250 million tons, are far in excess of what was thought necessary as a qualification in agreeing to export by B.H.P.

In other words, it is safe to say that contracts have been written on such a large scale that it could not reasonably be claimed that B.H.P. entering the iron export field on what is expected to be a fairly modest basis by comparison with the other companies would in any way influence the price, the markets, or the economics of the several other companies.

In 1964 the Commonwealth would not agree to change its policy in respect of Yampi, Koolyanobbing, Bungalbin, Dowds Hill, and Middleback Range, the last-named deposit being in South Australia.

However, in recent times the Commonwealth has advised that it can see no valid reason why B.H.P. should not have a right to export and it has also pointed out that B.H.P. could achieve some export income for the Commonwealth fairly quickly through the Yampi deposits and ahead of exports by other companies which are undertaking development to commence deliveries under the terms of their various contracts and the agreements they have with the State Government duly ratified by the State Parliament.

In view of this the State Government thought legislation should be introduced to clarify the position and in particular lift the ban relating to Yampi. It is pertinent to point out that under clause 20

of the 1964 agreement it was fore-shadowed that when the Deepdale development was completed by B.H.P. the ban on export so far as State approval is concerned would be lifted and the company would then only be subject to granting of Commonwealth export licenses from time to time.

Members will have read of the recent announcement by the Premier in respect of Cleveland-Cliffs and B.H.P. This very desirable arrangement arrived at between Cleveland-Cliffs and B.H.P. was fore-shadowed when their respective agreements were presented for ratification last year and attention was drawn to the special provisions in their respective agreements for the tying together, or for that matter, the later untying, of the activities of these two companies so far as their Robe River area deposits were concerned.

It was very logical that the company should by joint arrangement develop towns, and railway, port, and pellet facilities, thus overcoming duplication and uneconomic construction and operating costs. It is significant that the estimated cost of the joint operations will be in excess of the combined total of the minimum commitment entered into by the two companies.

It is also significant that the fairly early establishment of a pellet plant to be developed up to a 5,000,000 tons per year capacity in the Cape Preston area will give the north its biggest industry so far as processing is concerned and in fact one of the big industries of the State. Furthermore it represents the coming together of an American and an Australian concern which is something we all seek to achieve in the course of attracting capital, know-how, and development to this State.

It is not expected that B.H.P. will enter into long term commitments in respect of iron ore exports from Yampi. Rather is it likely to enter into more "spot" types of orders because of its peculiar position as a steel producing company within Australia and a company which naturally is in competition with Japanese and other steel mills. Nevertheless the amount of business it can undertake from Yampi and later from its other deposits, with particular reference to the export of pellets from Cape Preston, can be important to Australia at a time when export income is badly needed.

It is, of course, also important to the Australian steel industry that B.H.P. should be given access to some additional revenue to assist it in the provision of the very heavy capital expenditure it will undertake as part of its total development in this State, widely spread between Koolyanobbing, Kwinana, Deepdale, and Yampi.

This investment is expected to exceed £100,000,000 within the next few years and knowing the necessity for industries of this

type to expand as part of a general programme to take advantage of economies of scale, we can expect its investment and its capacity within this State to keep on expanding. Perhaps this is best illustrated by the fact that this company was originally obligated to install a 50,000 tons per annum rolling mill at Kwinana. This has already reached 250,000 tons per annum and is employing over 500 men. This particular part of the company's activities is not an economic function at this stage, but it is consistent with our experience with this company in honouring its commitments under agreements entered into with the Government.

It appears to the State Government that it is unreasonable to place the Australian company at a disadvantage with other companies developing iron ore deposits in the north and this, quite apart from any other consideration, is one of the most important reasons why this Bill is brought to the State Parliament—particularly as it cannot be claimed by any stretch of the imagination that other people developing deposits in the State are disadvantaged by allowing B.H.P. to export from its established Yampi facilities.

One important point covered by the Bill which should be emphasised is the fact that the provision to export only applies while the company complies from time to time with the provisions of the several agreements. Australia's iron ore reserves are assured for the future both for internal use and for supply of raw materials and partly processed materials to the steel industries of the world.

Under the circumstances, it would be both foolish and undesirable so far as Australia is concerned to miss the opportunity to earn some additional export income by allowing the Australian company to compete immediately as well as under the rights already given to it following the establishment of Deepdale in terms of the 1964 agreement.

I would just like to add that I recently paid a visit to the north and had a look at some of these deposits and the development that has taken place. It certainly is a fascinating experience to see the progress being made.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Were you at the Deepdale-Robe River deposits?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not go to Deepdale because there is not much development there at this time in comparison with that at Mt. Goldsworthy, Mt. Tom Price, and the port at Hedland itself, and also the port at King Bay.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You would think they were up to their responsibility at Deepdale?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: My experience of B.H.P.—and I am sure it is the Government's experience—is that whatever the company says it will do and whatever it sets out to do it always does. It has always honoured its agreement and has done better than that. It has exceeded it by far.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: We of the north know the company has spent thousands of pounds in the approaches to the port, but I was wondering about the position from the land side.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All this is being worked out at the present time. It is being worked out on the wants and needs in relation to the situation of where the port will be, where the railway will be, and where the two quarries will be in respect of the deposit at Deepdale and all the deposits held by both companies. I think when the Premier made the announcement there was a small sketch published in the paper indicating somewhat basically how these operations would be combined.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you think this concession will materially or substantially slow down the Deepdale operations?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: You refer to—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I mean the export concession.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is a matter of choice of words. Frankly I do not refer to this as a concession. In all the circumstances I feel the company is entitled to this.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This permissive right for export. Put it that way.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think it will, because plans are being made for the development and if B.H.P. earns any money, as undoubtedly it will, from the export of the island's ore, then this is the sort of money that will be immediately ploughed back into further development in Western Australia. After all, first it would earn income in the national interests and then it would be ploughed back into Western Australia in the development of further of its deposits to our benefit in this State. I think we could not have a better or more attractive situation than this.

It was felt last year, as I said when I introduced the Bill, that the other companies may be disadvantaged if B.H.P. had an export license at that time, and B.H.P. readily accepted the condition that it would not have an export license until so many million tons had been sold by the others; and now of course, we know what these companies have contracted to sell.

I feel prompted to say this: When one goes to these deposits and looks over the huge expanse of country—and I cannot

tell the north-west members anything about that country; they know it infinitely better than I do—and then one reads the stories about turning Western Australia into a quarry and selling a national asset, one realises how ridiculous they are; because over this tremendous expanse of country the companies have actually contracted to sell something of the order of 2½ per cent. to 3 per cent. of the total reserves of iron ore, if we can call them that, amounting to 15,000,000,000 tons; and we still have 97 per cent. of this national asset remaining; and this asset is of no value to Western Australia or to Australia unless it is taken out of the ground and sold in the form of direct shipping ore, or processed and sold as pelletised ore. This is what the Government wants to see; and more particularly does it want to see the iron ore processed into pellet form because this is a job-giving and industry-creating factor that we want in relation to this mineral.

Of course this goes for all minerals that the country owns; they are of no value to us unless we can extract them from the ground and sell them at an economic and profitable price so that everybody gets some benefit as a result. I hope the Bill will be well received and that it will be passed by the Legislative Council, it having come from the Legislative Assembly.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

## TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [3.2 p.m.]: I asked for the adjournment of the debate yesterday evening because I wanted to look at the various questions that were raised so that I could deal with them to the best possible extent. In the first place, I think Mr. Wise quoted from the two speeches I made—the one in connection with the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill, and the other in connection with this measure. He correctly said I had used similar words in introducing both Bills. Of course the two measures are, to a large extent, related. On checking my notes of the introductory speech on the first measure—the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill—I found I made reference to the Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 4)—the one before us now.

It is apparent that members speaking both for and against it—and Mr. Wise opposed it—have given a good deal of study to the Bill and its implications.

The matter of concessional licenses granted to farmers has been a somewhat contentious subject for a number of years, and I was particularly pleased to hear the expression of opposition of members who have had a number of year's experience in local government affairs.

Mr. Wise referred to an amount of £3,776,000 being the short-fall over four years of money required to attract the matching moneys from the Commonwealth, and he implied that we were seeking to raise this amount from both the road maintenance contributions and from the increase in license fees. As I have said, the two are associated, the one with the other, and both measures will be used in respect of the raising of the amount required; but there is no suggestion of a double-up, and I do not think that is what the honourable member meant.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Instead of a short-fall, what sort of an over-run do you expect?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know about that. As I said on the first Bill, the Government is of the opinion that, to the best extent possible, it has calculated the income over the next four years, and it considers the rises provided for in this Bill, and the imposition of the tax, will in fact be sufficient to cover the situation. The honourable member, when speaking to the other measure, said he thought it would not be long before we would come down to four tons instead of eight.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I did not know then that you were going to introduce this measure.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think the honourable member must have known, because I had made reference to it.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yes, but only to the 50 per cent. reduction.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I referred to the traffic Bill that had to come forward.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I did not then give you credit for the ingenuity that has been displayed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Knowing the way the honourable member delves into and sifts Bills, I do not think he would have expected the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill to raise £3,776,000 on its own.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I was only going on the Minister's figures.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I seriously think that from the way the honourable member goes into Bills, he would have suspected the introduction of another measure.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I still think you will have a very big surplus.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I repeat, both measures will be used to raise the amount required; and there is no suggestion of doubling up. As an example, the estimated short-fall in 1965-66 was £670,000, and the estimated additional collections in 1965-66, as a result of the passing of this measure, are £495,000.

When I moved the second reading of the Bill, I enumerated, if I remember rightly, what the maximum grant available would be—the estimated increase—and the short-fall for each year, giving the total figure I have just mentioned.

Motor vehicle taxation in Victoria has not been reduced, and recently there have been some very severe increases in that State. The fees we propose will be close to the average of the two standard States—New South Wales and Victoria—and the per capita cost will be roughly the same.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If you get above them, do you expect a credit from the Grants Commission?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member knows the answer to that as well as I do. I will tell him shortly what our good friend, the late Gilbert Fraser, had to say about that situation when he introduced a Bill which increased traffic fees by £650,000 in one year.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is when they were very low.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They were not as low after the Minister had finished with his Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They were not as high as these.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is all a matter of relative values. I do not think we can argue about that. The other day, just as a matter of interest, I went through a number of Supply Bills which had been introduced from time to time, and I found one, introduced when The Hon. F. J. S. Wise was Treasurer, and it provided the princely amount of something less than £3,000,000 on which to run the affairs of the State.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: We had to give a greater account than than you do now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The account given was that the Bill was introduced and the vote was taken without one speech being made on it; it was just passed through without question by the Opposition of the day.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: A very responsible Government—one that was believed in.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: These quips are so easy to make from time to time.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are inviting them.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: My word you are! You are certainly inviting them!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What was that?

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You are inviting them.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am quite enjoying this, Mr. Lavery, so the honourable member need not worry.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The purpose of the Bill is to provide extra funds for road works which will attract matching money, and it would be defeating the object if, as Mr. Wise suggested, a large portion of the money collected was to be paid into Consolidated Revenue.

Apart from the cost of the collections, the moneys will go wholly into trust accounts associated with road expenditure. Furthermore, it is proposed to pay into these trust accounts moneys which are at present paid into Consolidated Revenue from fees collected for overload permits. It is not correct to infer that there will be discrimination between various makes of vehicles. Mr. Willmott had something to say on this last night, and it was interesting to hear him pointing out some serious anomalies that exist under the present rating system.

The examples quoted have been taken at random of vehicles of various sizes and carrying capacity, and they were not intended to convey an impression that certain makes would have an advantage over others. For instance, an example can be cited of the license fees of an International R.D.F. 195 prime mover and semi-trailer rising from £196 19s. to £210, and of the license fee of a Leyland Comet prime mover and semi-trailer falling from £173 2s. to £147. Both those vehicles will be subject to 50 per cent. rebate, because they come within the category of vehicles in excess of eight tons.

I can assure Mr. Wise that Crown Law Department and Treasury officers have had a very close look at the implications of the 50 per cent. concession to be granted to road users, subject to the payment of the road maintenance contribution.

When Mr. Willmott commented on this point yesterday evening it will be recalled that I interjected by saying that the State of New South Wales was making this 50 per cent. rebate. I have since made a check and have found that that statement is correct. The only difference is that in New South Wales the concession is based on a vehicle over four tons in weight, and in Western Australia it is proposed that it should be based on a vehicle over eight

tons. Therefore, I believe Mr. Willmott is correct when he says there will be no discrimination. Every person subject to the payment of the road maintenance contribution will be entitled to the concession I have mentioned. As I have said, a similar concession has been granted in New South Wales for many years, and I do not believe that this measure will be challenged in the courts.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Let us hope there is no High Court litigation over it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will accept that statement, thank you. Mr. Heitman referred to the effect on local authorities of the granting of the 50 per cent. concession on license fees for vehicles which are subject to the road maintenance contribution. It was felt that local authorities could lose fees, and consequently matching money, as a result of the passing of this measure. However, the proposal should be considered as a whole, and not in part.

It is anticipated that the total revenue collected by local authorities from traffic fees will increase, and whilst the collections from road maintenance contributions will go to the funds of the Main Roads Department I draw the attention of members to the fact that 75 per cent. of all Commonwealth road grant money is spent on country roads other than main roads. This is a very large percentage of the whole.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Could I ask you to repeat that last remark you made, please?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will repeat it to make sure I have read it correctly. I said that 75 per cent. of all Commonwealth road grant money is spent on country roads other than on main roads.

Mr. Heitman and Mr. Syd Thompson both referred to the cost of collecting license fees in the metropolitan area. Over a number of years the amount of £120,000 provided at present has fallen short of the actual costs and the difference is a burden on the social service expenditure of the State, which is closely scrutinised by the Grants Commission. The simplification in the licensing formula is expected to keep the costs of collection to a minimum.

There are many views held on the question of matching money, and some very forthright ones have been expressed, both on this Bill and the other measure. However, I do not think there is much purpose in my pursuing that line of thought any further except to repeat once again that this is a matter upon which the Commonwealth Government has embarked.

Whether we agree with it, endorse it, or criticise it, we are still left with one of two choices. We either go ahead and raise the matching money in order to receive the money from the Commonwealth, or we refuse. If we agree

to go ahead—and the Government is convinced that it should raise the matching money—we know the answer. If we do not propose to agree to this measure we know equally well what the answer will be.

May I conclude my remarks by thanking members for their contributions to this debate. I assure Mr. Wise that I do not introduce these taxing measures on behalf of the Government with any glee. I cannot feel that anybody, shouldering this responsibility, would carry out such a task gleefully. I can recall that a man for whom we have a great deal of respect (the late Hon. G. Fraser), and who once stood in the position in which I am now standing, with the responsibility of introducing Bills from time to time which imposed some measure of taxation or impost upon the people of the State, did not, in my opinion, carry out this task gleefully, either. However, I do believe he carried out his duties on behalf of the Government soberly and with the view that it was necessary to perform them at the time.

I took the trouble to look up a speech he made on one occasion, when he told us that if the imposition of licensing fees was not made at that time a penalty would be imposed by the Grants Commission. His actual words were—

Last year a penalty of £250,000 was imposed by the Grants Commission because of the fact that the W.A. license fees had not been brought up to the Australian average.

The Bill provided for an increase of 45 per cent., generally, and was estimated to bring in £630,000 in a full year.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You have not your speech in reply to him on that occasion, have you?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, I have not, but I will be fair enough to say, Mr. Wise, that the speech I made was in reverse to some of the speeches I have heard the honourable member make this session, even though they may have been in critical terms. The honourable member has had more experience than I have, but both he and I have learned now that it is the responsibility of the Government to do these things.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I am still learning.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am glad to know that, and I hope I will always be able to learn something. I am always willing to take object lessons from the honourable member.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Thank you very much.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not propose to continue speaking in these terms. This Bill has been introduced with the Government being fully aware of its

responsibilities and the necessity to introduce it, and it is in this spirit that I ask the House to receive and pass this piece of legislation.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

**Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.**

**Clause 5: Section 11 amended—**

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I refer to the local authorities which will be out of pocket as a result of the introduction of the half-license fee.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is it because of the time factor?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: No, but that comes into it. Where local authorities are greatly affected by this proposal the Government should give an undertaking that they will be reimbursed. Surely it is possible to keep aside the amounts which are received, and when allocations are made to local authorities those which are down on their receipts should be reimbursed. The Government should make sure that money received for the maintenance of roads is returned to the local authorities.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I make a plea for the 30-cwt. vehicle, especially where it is the only vehicle used on a farm. In such cases the vehicle should become eligible for a concessional license. The majority of young farmers starting out on new blocks buy a utility to serve as an all-purpose vehicle.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You would have to delete paragraph (5b) on page 4 of the Bill. I could help you to do that.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: There is a very strong case to support the inclusion of utilities for concessional licenses. One member referred to the instance where a utility under a concessional license had been taken all the way to Queensland; but that is no argument against the granting of the concessional license. After all it travelled on roads in the Eastern States, and it did not damage the roads in our State. A person who has worked hard on a farm is entitled to take his utility to Queensland on a holiday, even if it is under a concessional license. I am absolutely convinced that the number of such vehicles involved would not cause financial hardship to local authorities.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That person has paid the license fee required under the law.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: That is so, but he does not have to pay 3d. per person mile.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The charge is 4d. per ton mile, not per person.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I thought if the Minister has heard of this person travelling to the Eastern States under a concessional license he might be tempted to assess the charge at the rate of per person mile!

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: The annual conference of the country local authorities dealt with this matter. It was through the decision of that conference that the Government decided to discontinue the concessional licenses on vehicles of 30 cwt. In the majority of country shires for many years the farmers have not been able to obtain a concessional license for a utility. I regard it as a pleasure vehicle. If we want to help young farmers who are starting off then we should extend the concession to a vehicle heavier than a utility, because a heavier vehicle is required to cart super and wheat.

I realise this legislation must be taken into account as a whole, although some shires will suffer. Under proposed new subsection (7) on page 4 of the Bill the Minister may direct a local authority to issue a license at a reduced fee for a semi-trailer or for a vehicle coming under the heading of the heavy haulage class. It will not be hard for the Government to reimburse the local authorities which find themselves out of pocket. In some shires concessional licenses are granted in respect of vehicles which travel on roads in other shires.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That must happen in every shire.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Not every shire would have many heavy haulage vehicles licensed. Some have only one or two.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: A heavy vehicle might be licensed in Geraldton, but it could be working mostly in the Pilbara or the Gascoyne.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: It could work anywhere, but the local authority would forgo the 50 per cent. concession fee. In many cases a person who licensed his truck at the 50 per cent. concession rate at a particular centre could be carting along roads of other local authorities. Where one or two concessional licenses are granted the amount involved is not great but where a few thousand pounds are involved then the shires should be compensated.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In the debate on the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill I said that whilst no specific undertaking could be given, the matter raised by Mr. Jones had been, and would continue to be, closely examined. It is not expected that shires will in the long run lose from this proposition in the Bill before us, although in the examples given

by some members in the debate on the first Bill I mentioned that could be the position. This matter is going to be examined. I have here the notes I used to introduce the second reading of the Bill, and these words appear—

There is provision in the Act for the issue of a free license in respect of primary producers' vehicles used solely on a farm or pastoral holding and not used on a road otherwise than in passing from one portion of the property to another portion thereof. A concession license of 50 per cent. of the normal license fee is also available for one vehicle owned by a primary producer; and, at the discretion of the local authority, this concession may be extended to additional vehicles, if the authority is satisfied that the vehicles are used solely or mainly for the carriage of the products of a farming or grazing business.

The Hon. E. C. House: Would that include utilities?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know. I should think it would, but the discretion is in the hands of the local authority.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This Bill is mandatory—page 4, line 16 onwards.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, because there it states one vehicle; and that makes it mandatory. I do not know whether there is any conflict between the notes and the Bill, but if there is, it is the Bill that counts. I would not deliberately re-read that portion of the notes in order to mislead members. That is all I can say about the matter.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I would draw the attention of the Minister to subsection (5) of section 11 of the parent Act. I think this would be fair enough provided we restricted it to one vehicle.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Paragraph (a) of subsection (5) is deleted by this Bill.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Perhaps we could cover the situation by reducing the 30 cwt. to 15 cwt., so as to bring utilities into it.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: It was not my intention that this be so elastic that the concession would apply to anyone with a truck and a utility. However, where there is no truck and a person is dependent on a utility on his farm for primary production, that utility should be included. In spite of what Mr. Heitman said, a lot of people do start off with utilities. I did. As far as I can see I think the number involved would be reasonably small and, therefore, it would not break the bank.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If section 11 (2) is not taken out of the parent Act—and I cannot see that that is being done—there is still some discretion. If this be the case, then all I can do is ensure the

remarks made by members in relation to this clause will be drawn to the attention of the Minister. Without giving any undertaking, I cannot see at this point of time that the classification will be altered from what it is now, but I can say it was not intended to give the concession to utilities.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: This clause amends section 11 of the principal Act and in many particulars, one of which is specified on page 4 of the Bill, and which makes it perfectly clear that a local authority shall not extend the provisions of subsection (5) (a) of this section to the licensing of three different classes of vehicles, one of which is not less than 30 cwt. No matter what is said, once this provision is passed, there is no exemption for a utility.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I say it was not intended to exempt a utility.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is specifically stated it shall not, and I am perfectly clear.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I move an amendment—

Page 4, lines 19 and 20—Delete paragraph (a) of proposed new subsection (5b).

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: At this stage of the session I think it is fair enough for me to inquire whether it is proposed that any other amendments will be made to this Bill. There is no need to keep them secret from me. Amendments moved now do not give me an opportunity of dealing with them and going into them with the Government and the department to see what can be done. If there are any other amendments, as with this one, I cannot go ahead and will just have to say, "No" and leave it to the Chamber without really knowing the answer to the problem.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I can assure the Minister if something is done about this matter, I will be satisfied.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This amendment would include motorcars.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: We should not include motorcars, but it can be said that a lot of farmers do start off with a utility or an old car containing a flat top. Apart from the agricultural areas, this also applies to market gardens and small orchards. I think something should be done for these people; but we should not include cars in anything we do. The weight specified in paragraph (a) should be amended to 15 cwt.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I would like to assure the Minister that I am not trying to break this open at all. I moved the amendment as a desperate move to see if anything could be inserted so that there would be a restriction. I knew there would be a protest. The restriction was to a person who had only one utility working in connection

with primary production. It was not my intention to try to upset the general theme of the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I want to say in a somewhat kindly manner that it is not at all unusual for a member, who wants to make some amendment to get a concession of this nature, to have a talk with me or the Minister dealing with the Bill, or with the Minister controlling the particular department.

This piece of legislation has been on the notice paper for some time and the amendment has taken me by surprise. On examining the amendment I can see that if it were accepted the gate would be left open. The proposed subsection reads—

(5b) a local authority shall not extend the provisions of subsection (5a) of this section to the licensing of a vehicle—

and without the proposed paragraph (a), which is as follows:—

the weight of which is less than thirty hundredweights;

it would be left wide open.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It would only apply to light trucks and utilities.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It does not say that. The mere deletion of the words leaves the gate wide open.

I will make the following suggestions on the basis that there might be other queries and intended moves: I would like to suggest that we let the Bill pass the second reading and the committee stage. I will not take the third reading, but will take the matter up with the Minister to see if anything can be done. I certainly do not undertake that it shall be done but I will see whether it can be done.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I would suggest that if there are other amendments, instead of postponing further discussion, progress be reported on the relevant clauses until such time as the Minister has given consideration to them.

If any honourable member intends to move an amendment to the Bill would he be good enough to give the Minister notice?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I intended to ask the Minister to postpone clause 8. Despite the remarks which were made I feel it would be in order to amend this clause and I propose to amend it in the following manner:—

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): The honourable member need not state his amendment until we get to the actual clause. At the moment we are letting the Minister know of any intention to amend the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am wondering whether a proviso at the end of paragraph (5b) might meet the situation in so far as country members are concerned. I understand they will be affected very



vitality by the total exemption of utilities. Such proviso could read something like this—

Providing that paragraph (a) shall not apply where one utility vehicle is the sole vehicle in use on the farm.

That simple proviso would assist those people who are battling in remote areas to get established, and who have only one vehicle.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not mind resorting to the process of postponing clauses. We got through 42 clauses of the licensing Bill by this process with the co-operation of members. I do not mind co-operating in any way but I do mind getting these things landed on me when I do not know they are coming and I cannot give the answer.

I am a little concerned because the need to get this piece of legislation through is increasing for the reason that the license notices have to be sent out. We have three more days to the end of the session. Would the honourable member accept this proposition: That we pass clause 5 now. I have noted the amendment and if it is acceptable the Bill can be recommitted at the third reading. It can be recommitted at the third reading anyway. The only difference between doing that and reporting progress is that we gain a little time. If the Bill is amended it has to go to another place. With regard to the foreshadowed amendment to clause 8, there is a whole page of it and I will certainly want more than a minute to consider it.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I think that is a fair thing. I was wondering if the provision which relates to invalid pensioners when they apply for a concession on their licenses, could also work in this case. There would not be many applications and we do not want to make the charge too high.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The provision would apply in regard to some utilities, but not to all utilities.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I do not intend that it should apply to all utilities.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The provision would have to be put in the Act.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes; but I think it might work.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If my suggestion is acceptable members may rest assured that the passage of the Bill will not be completed until such time as I have made inquiries. Anyway, the passing of the third reading is in the hands of members.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): If Mr. House is agreeable, would he seek permission of the Committee to withdraw his amendment?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I seek leave of the Committee to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.6 p.m.*

Clauses 6 and 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 14A amended—

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I am prepared to accept the Minister's suggestion that he reply to this question on the third reading and, if he has a satisfactory answer—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Reply to what?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: To my proposal.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I suggest the honourable member sit down and I will explain the position.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Very well.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member has given me a copy of the amendments he proposes to move and, without being offensive, they are in pretty rough form and I have not had an opportunity to look at them properly. I would encourage members to let me have any proposed amendments as soon as possible so that I may have an opportunity to examine them. I have a Treasury officer in the Chamber with me but we have not had an opportunity to prepare an explanation why the amendments will not be acceptable. I have a copy, the Chairman has a copy, and I think Mr. Wise has a copy of the amendments—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Through the courtesy of the Clerks, yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —but I do not think anybody else has a copy, and therefore members would be at a disadvantage. I think it would be better if the honourable member put forward his reasons for wishing to move the amendments, moves them, and then withdraws them so that the clause can be passed. I will give reasons—and there are reasons why this cannot be accepted—why we do not think the amendments should be agreed to; but I would reiterate: 150 local authorities are waiting for the passage of this legislation before sending license notices out.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This will make only 24 hours' difference.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I grant that, but I want to complete the Committee stage and I will give an explanation tomorrow regarding the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I suggest to Mr. Syd. Thompson that he gives a short resume of the amendments and then he can place them on the notice paper to be moved on recommitment of clause 8.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I would be happy to do that. My amendments are as follows:—

Page 5, line 32—Insert after the word "amended" the paragraph designation "(a)".

Page 5, line 32—Delete the word “deleting” and substitute the words “substituting for”.

Page 5, line 34—Add after the passage “subsection (1)” the passage “an amount of £250,000, annually for”.

Page 5—Add a new paragraph (b) as follows:—

- (b) by adding after the word “administration” at the end of subsection (1) the following passage, “excepting that where the cost of collection and administration exceeds the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand pounds in any one year after the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, the amount allowed under this subsection may not be increased by more than twenty thousand pounds in any one succeeding year”.

When speaking last night I said I was very much opposed to the fixed amount being taken out of the Act so that it left the position completely open. This means any amount could be collected for administration and collection charges. My amendment merely replaces the sum of £120,000 with the sum of £250,000.

My amendments also include a new paragraph to provide that where the cost of collection and administration exceeds the sum of £250,000 in any one year after the 30th June, 1967, the amount allowed may not be increased by more than £20,000 in any succeeding year.

We have to bear in mind that licenses are increasing by something like 30,000 a year and some additional costs must be involved in collection and administration. However, I think the figures I have set out would cover the position quite adequately. I shall place the amendments on the notice paper and perhaps it might be better if I asked for the clause to be deferred.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: My understanding is that the clause will not be deferred. Let us pass the clause and then I will give an explanation tomorrow.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You must be very confident of your case.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not, except on checking with the Treasury I believe there are reasons why these proposals are not desirable. I have the story but I have not had a chance to commit it to paper to ensure that I get it right.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is it not desirable because of the upper limit of £250,000 or the £20,000 increase in the year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to commit myself one way or the other at the moment. I would rather be

cautious than make a mistake. If the honourable member will accept that undertaking I will explain why the amendments are not acceptable and I will ask the Committee not to agree to them.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: On the other hand, if you accepted them now we could recommit to take them out if your case was acceptable.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would rather not take the risk.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I didn't think you would.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is making some very unusual suggestions to me this afternoon.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I am prepared to accept the Minister's proposal and the clause can be recommitted tomorrow.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Third Schedule substituted—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman (The Hon. N. E. Baxter), to a printer's error on page 12. In clause 7 (a) of the proposed new schedule under the words “exceeding” and “not exceeding” will be found the abbreviation “cwt.”. This should read “tons” in each case. There is a further error in clause 8 of the proposed new schedule. Under the heading “tare weight” we have two subheadings “exceeding” and “not exceeding”. The first figure of “10” under “exceeding” should be substituted by a hyphen. I trust you will authorise the Clerk to make these corrections.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I will authorise the Clerk to alter the printing errors.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I would like to refer members to clause 2 of the proposed new schedule. I would call this Bill the Cassius Clay Bill—it knocks them groggy, but does not knock them right out. I feel the provision with regard to farmers' trucks has been a confidence trick. We were assured the license fees on these trucks would only go up 25 per cent. Yet when the tare weight ratio is brought into it, we find the license fees have gone up as much as 75 per cent. The group of people with trucks of eight-ton capacity will bear the main burden of the tax in their particular sphere, because they will have this one-third of a penny per ton mile placed right in their lap. They pay their part of the original matching money to the Commonwealth. So actually we have the farmer concerned paying three times, and I think that is grossly unfair, particularly when it applies to one section of the community.

I suggest these people be allowed a licensing period of three months. The only time I want my own trucks on the road is between the middle of December and the middle of January. Apart from that it would not matter if they never went on the road. We are told that the purpose of the tax is to get money to provide better roads, and that the people who use the roads must pay the tax. That is fair enough. The farmer will also be paying the license fee for a long period when his truck is not on the road; and money will be lost by farmers keeping their trucks off the road. We should try to license these trucks whenever possible, and not drive them off the road by placing a tax to get this money the Government requires.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like to ask Mr. House who has performed this confidence trick on him? Since he said that this Bill constitutes a confidence trick, I think it is fair we should know how it has been done. Has it been done by the Minister for Traffic?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: If my words offend the Minister I am prepared to withdraw them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They do not offend me, but they might offend one of your colleagues.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: We were originally told the license fee would go up 25 per cent.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who told you that?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: It is in black and white.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who tricked you? Was it the Minister for Transport?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am not sure.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In other words, this is not very good language.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I said I would withdraw my remarks. The half license fee allowed would be completely nullified by this rise. The farmer is asked to pay something out of all proportion to the use he gets out of his truck.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Can you quote a particular instance?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: In the case of the 3½-ton International truck the present license fee is £36. The new rate will be £56, on that same tare weight. The license fee for a Bedford tipper with a tare weight of 4½ tons is £53 11s. The new rate is to be £76.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is this a confidence trick?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: We were led to believe that the increase would be 25 per cent. on the old license fee, which is a different thing from 25 per cent. on the tare weight.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said you had the wool pulled over your eyes.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I still claim it was, but I am prepared to withdraw the words if they offend the Minister.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It does not alter the fact.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: We naturally thought that the increase would be 25 per cent. on the old license fee.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Were you told it would be on an average, and are you taking an individual case?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: No.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will have Mr. House's remarks examined. He is picking out one case and quoting this as an increase.

The Hon. E. C. House: No, I am not.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But he is not picking out the case where the license falls as a result of the new method of licensing.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: He cannot find that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would not expect the honourable member to find it. This new method of licensing will bring us into line with the rest of the States of Australia, which license their vehicles on a tare weight basis. In one instance a car was mentioned where the engine power was reduced, and the license fee was correspondingly reduced. Because of this horse-power rating under the present system, the license fee would be down in one case and up in another. That cannot be helped.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I agree with the Minister on that. But seeing the increases are so steep, I think a three-month period should be brought in.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I can only undertake to let the Minister have a look at this, but I can promise nothing.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Thank you.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: We were told that the average would be a 25 per cent. reduction. I am inclined to doubt that. I admit that some trucks have been reduced.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you say the average would be 25 per cent.?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think that is probably a fairer way of saying it.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I am inclined to doubt this because although admittedly some trucks have been reduced, the major proportion of the popular types have gone up quite considerably judging by the figures Mr. House read out. I believe that farmers should be permitted to have a three-months' license for a staggered period, say, from the 1st December

to the 28th February, the principal reason being to cover the bulk-handling period. Some farmers have two trucks, but the second one they use for only these three months. Under this legislation those farmers will have to license the second truck for a full year when in fact they would use it for only three months.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They would have to return the plates every time?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Yes. It would be well worth it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I just wonder how the local authority is going to police it.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: That is the local authority's job. That is what we have them for. I am not worried about the policing side of it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They will have to increase the rates to increase the staff.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Not necessarily. It would not apply to a terrific number. It would have to be a staggered period in order that all districts might be catered for.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It would be lovely if you could get it.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Let us try to get it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will convey the remarks made to the Minister concerned. It is certain we cannot alter this Bill.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: No.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Again I am endeavouring to be helpful. I am sure everyone is in sympathy with the suggestions made both in regard to the first proposition of limiting it to one vehicle on the property by making a suitable proviso; and also in this case.

If my reading of the parent Act is right the authority under section 74 is given for regulation-making. Therefore under that section a period could be stipulated in connection with a license. Surely it is reasonable that when the wheels of a vehicle do not turn on a road for more than a quarter or a third of a year, consideration should be given to the suggestion made, particularly when we know the license fees are so extremely high. I make that suggestion because it might help in the Minister's consideration of what has been requested.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. Section 74 contains the regulation-making power. I will do as I have said and bring this to the notice of the Minister.

Reverting to the previous comment, section 11 (2) of the Traffic Act remains because this Bill does not interfere with it; and that is the section under which a T.P.I. person can obtain a concession license. The machinery is there for the

local authority to make a recommendation to the Minister if it so desires. Therefore on that point I do not think I need come back tomorrow with a further explanation in regard to the amendment which was desired to clause 5.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You think the same thing as applies to the T.P.I. would apply to a case—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am so informed, yes; but it is entirely at the discretion of the local authority. If the local authority feels that utilities should not be included, it will not recommend that they should be. I do not think we should go any further in directing a local authority what it shall do; but it can if it so desires.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: While the Minister is making those inquiries would he also ascertain whether there is any provision under which pensioners can be granted a concession?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Whatever is done is done under this section.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes. I realise it can be done under the regulation-making section to which Mr. Wise referred. Several years ago when steep increases were made in license fees I battled for some days to have an amendment passed under which pensioners could be granted a rebate in fees. I felt it was just and necessary then and I feel it is just and necessary today. Pensioners on fixed incomes who are fortunate enough to own a vehicle should be entitled to some form of rebate as far as their license is concerned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will endeavour to ascertain the information for you.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Can the Minister indicate the type of person who has in the past received some concession under subsection (2) of section 11?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am told the T.P.I. is a typical case.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: Ministers of religion, too, I think.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that in giving this concession license for a three months' period—

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: Not a concession.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: What would it be?

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: A license for three months.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: A local authority depends on license fees as part of its income and if that income falls short of the amount required the ratepayers will have to make up the difference. It is all very nice to suggest that a farmer with

two trucks should have one licensed for only three months; but by doing that, ratepayers will have to pay a little more. If a farmer can afford two trucks he must be in a fairly sound position and should therefore pay the full license for them both.

The Hon. E. C. House: Don't look at me. I only mentioned one truck.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He is only a poor cockie.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: After all is said and done local authorities must receive a certain amount to carry them through the year and if we give all these concessions they will not know where they are and the ratepayers will have to pay more in rates to make up for what should be paid by the vehicle owners.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: As I see this, all the vehicles mentioned are covered by section 11 (2). This section places the power in the hands of the local authority, where it should be. It is up to the local authority to decide and to make a recommendation to the Minister. I am quite sure all these cases are covered by that section.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I would like to disagree with Mr. Willmott on that one. I do not think we should make the shire council apply for every concession.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Only in the cases you mentioned and you said there were very few.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: The three months' license on the truck?

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The local authorities can make any conditions they like under this. Read it.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: If they can recommend a three months' license on a truck, that is very nice. Mr. Willmott believes that it can be done under this?

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: I do. It says so.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No. You have to make regulations.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: One argument against this was that it would cost too much for the shire. I do not think we should consider that at all. I do not agree it all hinges around these two trucks. A person with one truck would need this three months' license even more than a person with two trucks. I think far too much emphasis has been placed on the shire councils and their revenue, and not enough on the farmers whom we should be considering. These electors are appealing to us to make these concessions. We have received letters along those lines from the Farmers' Union and other organisations and individuals. It is up to us to take some notice of them and I am very pleased the Minister said he will do so.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think we should be quite clear on what subsection (2) of section 11 states because there has been a bit of wishful thinking. It reads—

Where in the opinion of the local authority exceptional circumstances require it—

That is the first "if"—

—and where the local authority has obtained the approval of the Minister to do so—

That is the second one—

—it may—

That is the third—

—grant a vehicle a license subject to such conditions as it attaches to the vehicle license to the owner of the vehicle without requiring payment of the appropriate fee for that vehicle license.

I repeat, there is a lot of wishful thinking in regard to that provision.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Mr. Heitman mentioned the effect of the clause on the shires. They will lose, because the carriers at present are being inundated with orders to cart wheat this year instead of the farmers licensing their own trucks to cart it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We have had a pretty fair go on this clause. Previously I said there was no guarantee that anything would be done; that it is in the hands of the individual local authorities to make a recommendation. I do not want to hoodwink anybody into thinking it will be done.

The Hon. E. C. House: No confidence tricks.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Certainly not. Experience will teach the honourable member that. I will convey what has been said to the proper quarter so that I can give members the necessary information before the Bill is read a third time.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

*Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

## BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

### 1. Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 4).

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

### 2. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning), read a first time.

## TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

## ARTIFICIAL BREEDING OF STOCK BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd November, on the following motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. J. DOLAN** (South-East Metropolitan) [4.51 p.m.]: This Bill and the next one on the notice paper are interrelated, consequently whatever I say on this measure will, to some extent, apply to the other. Probably the only misgiving I have about this Bill is that I have not had as much time as usual to engage in research, with the result that I may not be able to present a better case than I hope now to put forward.

I say at the outset that the authority for the information I propose to give comes from R. B. Kelley—not related to Ned—O.B.E., and a Doctor of Veterinary Science. Dr. Kelley was formerly, and recently, a geneticist with the C.S.I.R.O., and at present he is animal breeding specialist for the Government in Singapore. I feel that what he has written is excellent and is based on experience and knowledge, so that what I convey can be regarded as absolutely reliable.

The subject of the Bill—the artificial breeding of stock—was first recorded as being used successfully by an Italian named Spallanzani in 1780, and between 1884 and 1896 similar experiments were repeated in England, and at the beginning of the century the potentialities of this method began to be well recognised throughout the world.

In 1909 a Russian named Ivanov reported successful experiments, and in that year a laboratory was established for the purpose of training veterinarians in the technique. Their studies and experiments were interrupted first of all by World War I and then by the Russian revolution. The experiments were not resumed until about 10 years later.

To give some idea of the advances that were made in the course of only 10 years, I point out that in 1929 33,200 animals were artificially inseminated, and 10 years later, in 1939—and this figure embraces all types of animals—no less than 17,506,000 animals, of which 1,200,000 were cows, were successfully inseminated. In the United States, although experiments had been carried on for a long while, in 1945 there were 145 associations in 23

States, and 342,012 cows were inseminated, 650 bulls being used. I quote those figures to give members some idea of the proportions of the relative comparisons between artificial methods and natural methods.

Investigations have been carried on in England, the United States, Denmark, Canada, New Zealand and, comparatively recently, Australia, and a large volume of information on the subject has been collected and recorded. The general trend of all the experimental procedures has been to improve the collection of semen; to evolve methods of handling it; to store it for long periods at sub-zero temperatures; and to develop optimal procedure for the actual insemination.

I propose first of all to deal with the actual collection of semen. I would say it is absolutely essential wherever this form of operation is undertaken that only the best possible donors should be used. I could probably go into more detail in regard to the method employed if I were lecturing a group of biology students at the University, but the method involves the training of the male animals, or the donors, that are used in order to overcome their natural instincts.

The object is to secure what is known as a conditioned reflex. Members have heard the expression, "A cat dancing on hot bricks." We can start a cat dancing on hot bricks, and eventually it would acquire what is called a conditioned reflex, and if we took the hot bricks away and put cold bricks there, the cat would continue to dance because of this conditioned reflex. I give that explanation in order to let members know what I mean.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We know what you mean.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The idea is to arrange the surroundings and use so that when the male finds himself in those particular conditions he will have the reflexes to which he has become accustomed or trained. It is customary to take the males always to the same places and in the same manner, and all the circumstances have to be the same on each occasion.

The necessity for training of this nature should be obvious to members. Difficulty would be experienced in taking animals from one set of surroundings to another, and that emphasises that particular points at which these operations take place must be set up so that there will be no necessity to transfer animals from one place to another. Some of the most valuable sires in Australia will probably never be trained by their owners because they could not afford the time, and they probably would think it was not worth while.

It is customary and proper to examine the semen after collection. The points to be considered are—

1. Volume.
2. Colour and cloudiness.

3. Consistency.
4. Motility of sperms.
5. The number of normal sperms per cubic millimetre of semen.
6. Freedom from bacteria or cells that indicate disease conditions of the male genitalia.
7. The degree of acidity or alkalinity.
8. The respiratory rate.

Examination of all these aspects is most important because every one of them has some effect on the fertility of the semen. Perhaps it is unnecessary for me to state that in the collection process all instruments and vessels used must be bone dry and absolutely sterile; if not, the value would be lost.

The time taken between the collection and the use of the semen governs the treatment it may receive. For example, if it is to be used to inseminate a number of females in the same flock or herd as the donor male, the collected semen need only be kept out of the light, and in relatively cool surroundings. That it has to be used so rapidly would mean that its effectiveness would not be lost in any way. When some days are likely to elapse between the collection of semen and its use, a more or less standard treatment has been evolved to meet varying conditions. One method of treatment is that immediately after the semen has been collected it is diluted with other of several possible media which generally is made up with egg yolk as its base. The dilutant has several functions. First of all it increases the volume of the semen which simplifies accurate division, and it acts as a preservative during the process of storage.

In addition, it appears to protect the sperms from temperature shock, and it may provide them with nutriment. On this particular score experiments are still being carried out. Efficient storage of semen depends upon temperature control. Temperatures near the freezing point of water are optimal for short term storage. In long air flights fluctuations of temperature are controlled by replenishing the ice, or dry ice, which surrounds the vessel containing the semen, which vessels are used to convey semen from one country to another.

The transference of sperms over long distances depends on the tolerance of the sperms. They appear to be tolerant of low temperatures and, in effect, these temperatures put them to sleep just like apples placed in storage. Progeny have already been secured in Poland from semen collected in England, and in Brazil from semen collected in Washington, U.S.A. The semen of bulls in the United States of America has also been successfully used to inseminate dairy cattle in Australia.

Research is still being conducted in many countries in order to preserve, and then to distribute, the semen to other countries throughout the world. We can, I think, safely look forward to remarkable advances in the future in this particular respect. The outstanding feature of artificial insemination is that it permits males to leave more progeny than they could if working under natural conditions. The advantage to the small dairy farmer—and I use the word “small” in the sense that he may run only a few animals—in not having to keep a bull and in being able to use the services of a better animal through artificial insemination should be obvious.

At this point, I would like to make one statement which I feel is of exceptional importance. It is absolutely true that the present state of livestock excellence in the world has been achieved without the use of artificial insemination. One country which does not view favourable this new advance in animal husbandry is Germany. I regard that as somewhat significant, because German scientists and geneticists have always been to the forefront with experimentation and have always had leanings towards adopting new methods and ideas.

We must, of course, consider the effects of the widespread use of artificial insemination on our leading stud breeders of both cattle and sheep, because of the economic factors involved. The figures I obtained as a result of questions asked last year in the House will indicate the extent to which this particular subject has advanced in Western Australia. This information was provided by the Minister for Agriculture.

In 1957-58—only seven or eight years ago—8,310 animals were inseminated and the numbers have gradually increased until, in the last year, 14,717 animals were similarly treated. The operating costs in 1956-57 were £4,585 and there was a slight loss because the revenue was only £4,178. In 1960-61 the operating costs had increased to £22,618, and the revenue had increased to £23,058. This showed a profit in that year of about £400. In 1963-64—which was the last year for which I could obtain these figures—the operating costs were £20,876, and the revenue had jumped to £26,932.

I might say that those operating costs do not include any charges for depreciation, administration, or management. The principal justification given for commencing the artificial breeding scheme in Western Australia was that the farmer—that is the small farmer to whom I have referred—could get the services of a better bull for his cattle than he could afford to purchase for himself. These figures might be interesting also in view of the fact that this is the first occasion a Bill of this nature has been introduced. In 1957

the non-return ratio from 1,562 first inseminations was 61.7 per cent., and the ratio for the past year was 74.8 per cent. from the 14,717 first inseminations I mentioned earlier.

This indicates, first of all, the growth of the scheme, and, secondly, its success over the very short period during which it has been in operation. The artificial breeding service is now firmly established. It has been felt that it is time the industry should be responsible for its continuance. Commercial concerns do not seem to be interested, but they have strongly urged that the artificial breeding service should be continued together with relative experiments. The interests that were approached favoured the establishment of a board which is the subject of the next Bill on the notice paper.

I would like to know what will happen if, and when, this service becomes a highly-profitable, and assured financial proposition. I wonder whether the Government will consider handing it over to private industry when it is proved to be not only successful, but also a good financial proposition. Seeing that commercial concerns are not interested now, but are still desirous of the service continuing, and should it perhaps become the success we think it will, I was wondering whether those interests will want to step in and take over then.

In summing up, this aspect of animal husbandry is with us and we must provide for it to be properly regulated and also ensure that we establish good conditions so that it is used under the best possible circumstances. That leads me to the suggestion at this stage that the next Bill will provide for that particular operation. It must be obvious that centres will have to be established, not only for the collection and storage of semen, but also for ideal conditions to be established for its distribution. It must also be obvious that as time goes on, the quality of the donors must be improved so that the animals used will be the absolute best that can be afforded. All these factors must be watched most carefully.

Although great benefits can accrue from the scheme, I would also suggest that unless its operation is closely watched—and that is where a board may be necessary—there could also be grave dangers arising from it. Members can well imagine how flocks would be affected if a disease were introduced among their numbers in this manner. That is why it is necessary that the utmost precaution should be taken to ensure that nothing like that can ever happen.

I would conclude by referring to an article which appeared in *The West Australian* on Monday, the 22nd November, 1965. At Esperance, Messrs. J. T. and F. I. Kelman, who were former graziers

in Queensland, and who sold their property in that State to take up land at Esperance, have become some of the leading pastoralists at that centre. They had seen the artificial breeding scheme operate successfully at Longreach, Queensland, where a merino stud had been established, and no less than 6,000 ewes had been inseminated. Last Tuesday at Torradup stud, 60 miles west of Esperance, the Kelmans flew a Queensland veterinary surgeon (Mr. S. Miller) to Esperance to supervise the operation of breeding by artificial insemination. This is skilled work and the Kelmans made sure that nothing would go wrong. It was proposed that 6,000 ewes should be serviced and it was necessary to use only between 15 and 20 rams.

Those figures not only show members what progressive pastoralists today think about artificial insemination, but also indicate the tremendous saving that can be effected. In concluding, I would again express the warning that we must be sure that we do not create a danger by the overuse of this service to the flocks run by stud breeders of both sheep and cattle. I support the Bill, and although I felt the matter had to be treated rather delicately, if any member desires further information on the subject, I have carried out sufficient research to be able to inform him on any matter he would like to inquire upon.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you think there will be a lot of contented cows now?

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West) [5.13 p.m.]: The purpose of the Bill before the House at the moment is to authorise the establishment of an authority which can provide a measure of control for the artificial breeding of livestock. I feel the House can be grateful to Mr. Dolan for his—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is the breeding stock Bill we are on now.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes, it is not the one which seeks to establish a board or its functions. This Bill is purely to seek control over artificial breeding as such, in general and in the widest terms.

Referring to Mr. Dolan's contribution to the debate—and it was a contribution—I will pay him the compliment that it was in keeping with so many of the treatments he has given to other Bills which have come before us and, to use an expression, he has certainly done his homework on this subject. I am most grateful to him because he has saved me a great deal of trouble in speaking to the Bill. In the circumstances, on this measure, I will make what I will call a complementary contribution to the debate.

Before doing so, I would like to comment on one or two statements that were made by Mr. Dolan. This does not refer to the learned researches he has made into the work of Ivanov. I am not a



person to dispute any reference he has made. I know enough to say that he has long been recognised as being a world authority in this field; nor indeed do I wish to dispute the reference to R. D. Kelley, because in my experience over many years it is understood that he is the acknowledged authority on the livestock industry in Australia and, in particular, in the tropical part of Australia, and on the overall improvement of the stock industry. He has long been regarded as the most eminent authority in this country.

I wish to make some reference to the honourable member's remarks regarding the operation of this scheme in Western Australia. I do not wish to enter into a dispute; I merely wish to make some observations. He referred to the information supplied last year on the costs and the operating charges of the scheme. I am referring to this aspect now, but I shall enlarge on it when I take part in the debate on the next Bill on the notice paper.

This is an important feature in respect of the establishment of the board. I am referring to the cost structure. I do not attempt to refute the figures which have been given to us by Mr. Dolan.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They were supplied by the Minister for Agriculture in the House last session.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I do not query those figures. Mr. Dolan said those figures did not include costs of management, administration, or depreciation. I do not know whether or not that information was supplied by the Minister.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It was supplied by him in answer to a question.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is not my understanding of the operation of the scheme as centred in the Wokalup Research Station, because from my experience and knowledge an allowance is made for depreciation and for certain other features of administration, bearing in mind that much of the administration and management is exercised by the Department of Agriculture. There is what might be called a peculiar system of accountancy adopted. This could provide for some figure to be produced to allow for the calculation of depreciation in respect of this particular service.

It has been said that the operating charges and costs are not correct. I think this is open to question. Because endeavours have been made to have this artificial breeding service placed in the hands of some authority—whether it be private enterprise or farmer organisation—these figures should and have been examined in the light of those certain circumstances. I make no more than a passing reference to them at this stage, but I shall refer to them in greater detail in the debate on the next Bill.

The Bill before us arises from the growth of the practice of artificial breeding of livestock throughout the world. There is a necessity for a measure of control, and it must be exercised in the most responsible manner. Mr. Dolan indicated the number of stock that were used throughout the world, in Australia, and in Western Australia, and said that a good deal of private work was going on in this field. This highlights the necessity for some measure of control.

The Bill places the control fairly in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, and in particular under the administration of the Chief Inspector of Stock. I would like to raise one query. This Bill and its associated measure have been framed on the experience of the other States of Australia. We find that similar legislation has been introduced in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania; but there are differences and these differences are important.

In New South Wales the artificial breeding of livestock is operated by the milk marketing board, which is not strictly a government service. In Victoria the artificial breeding programme is controlled by a farmer co-operative society; and in South Australia it is controlled by a board. In Tasmania it is also controlled by a board, but in that State the functions which are contained in the Bill before us have been retained by it. In South Australia, however, the position is different and parallels our proposed legislation.

In view of the fact that the Government in Western Australia intends to set up a board and give it certain statutory powers, I am wondering whether the control of artificial breeding should not be placed in its hands, as it is in Tasmania. I repeat that I do not dispute this provision; I merely query it.

In regard to the Bill I would ask members to reflect on the fact that power will be given to persons, enterprises, or organisations to enter into the practice of artificial breeding of livestock, for which they will have to obtain a license under conditions imposed by the Minister and announced by the Government. I suggest to members that they closely examine the position to see whether the opportunity is provided to allow for a monopoly in artificial breeding. I do so, because my somewhat suspicious mind noted that in one clause of the Bill it is provided that the Minister may, in his discretion, grant or refuse any application made under that section. In my further reading of the Bill I find there is to be no right of appeal against a ministerial or other decision. Again I do not dispute this provision; I merely query it.

Seeing that the Bill authorises the licensing of such premises and controls the artificial breeding of livestock, one wonders whether it is intended to grant power to the Minister to approve or refuse any

application. This is a very real problem, because, while Mr. Dolan has referred to the further development of artificial breeding, he did not mention the development of the deep freeze techniques and particularly the use of liquid nitrogen, whereby this service becomes far more readily available throughout the world and throughout Australia. It will facilitate the service provided in this State.

This development will enable certain concerns which have a particular interest—I have in mind dairying concerns—to establish it as a service to their clients. With our knowledge of these matters we can foresee interesting developments where factories will apply for licences to conduct the business of artificial breeding of livestock, and they will be covered by the provisions of the Bill.

I do not wish to pursue my canvass of this subject at any great length at this point of time. I hope to deal more fully with it in the debate on the next Bill. I support the measure, because there is a necessity for control. My hope is that this Bill will provide for the overall improvement of the industry, as there is a great potential in the artificial breeding of livestock in Australia.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.25 p.m.]: I thank the two honourable members who have spoken in this debate for their support of the measure. Regarding the queries which have been raised I can only guess the answers, so it would be unwise for me to try to supply the information now. I will secure the information for Mr. McNeill in due course. The comments raised by Mr. Dolan are interesting, but they do not require any answer from me.

*Question put and passed.*

*Bill read a second time.*

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

*Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and passed.*

## **METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

*Second Reading*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West—Minister for Town Planning) [5.29 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes a clarification of the town planning legislation by giving in one comprehensive provision precise expression to the powers of land acquisition and disposal in the Metropolitan Region

Planning Authority that appear in general and largely unconnected terms in the Town Planning and Development Act and the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act. For instance, authority for land resumptions is not set out in the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act: it has to be imported from the earlier Town Planning and Development Act.

Legal advice has been that having regard to the extensive character that some of the schemes that will be going forward may have it would be wise for the powers to be spelt out in a special provision. But, apart from considerations of legal caution, it is most desirable that the machinery for land acquisition for urban improvement should, during the coming critical years, be clearly understood to be a careful balance between private rights and the public interest in the expedition of development programmes.

By its unavoidable nature, resumption is a clumsy instrument, costly and time-consuming for both the public sector and the private owner. It must not be further bedevilled by the slightest uncertainty in the official mind and in the public mind.

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority will have to put up to the Government a variety of progressive improvement plans if the region is to employ the full range of modern planning techniques. Its efficiency will be greatly facilitated if it has the assurance that its thinking and research activities and resultant proposals are not in peril of being viewed merely as academic exercises, but are in the clear terms of the legislation and in the informed opinion of the public capable, if they are approved by the Government, of reasonably quick implementation.

Good planning practices are progressing beyond the passive function of merely allocating and policing land-uses and then hoping—often vainly—that somebody will do something enlightened and constructive. Throughout the world they are becoming dynamic; the public sector is actively setting out to create new and better townscapes in which it can by itself or in co-operation with private enterprise produce a new economy, convenience, and efficiency in urban living and working.

There is an awareness that it really is technologically possible for us to take from an improvident past the uncomfortable legacy of a sprawling, uncoordinated, irritating, and messy environment that is unnecessarily expensive to keep going, and to change it for ourselves and for our children into a place that is cheaper to run, because it is efficient, and that is pleasant and even beautiful because it has been designed in the large with loving care. And there is a dawning vision that these things are also

political and economic possibilities. But they are only possible if the people through their political representatives recognise very clearly that all the symbols of the old individualism cannot be perpetuated if these improvements are to have any real chance of coming into being.

In most cases it would be impossible for the individual, working alone, to achieve these grand results. The authorities will have to pave the way—they will have to gather into workable areas all the little blocks that are held in separate ownership, to reorganise them on modern lines and dispose of them in the best interests of the region's development.

In many of the improvement plans it will be consistent with the public's interest that land can be returned in rearranged form to the original owners in proportion to their former holdings. In other cases it may not be possible, and these owners will, of course, be fully compensated.

Before dealing individually with the clauses in the Bill I shall describe its general set-up. The proposed procedure is—

- (a) The authority to certify to the Minister for Town Planning that the acquisition of certain land is necessary for progressive town-planning; its certificate will be accompanied by a detailed improvement plan showing why the land is needed and how it would be used.
- (b) If the Minister approves of the application—he may call for any supporting documents—he will submit it to the Governor who will rule upon it with the advice and consent of the Executive Council.
- (c) Approval having been given, the land may be acquired by agreement; failing agreement, recourse shall be had to the full land-acquisition procedures of the Public Works Act. The Minister for Town Planning will have to publish notices of intention to take or resume the land, to receive and consider objections—conducting hearings, if necessary—and, after considering all representations, confirm the notices or cancel some or all of them, with the result that the improvement plan is either given the final stamp or is varied or completely withdrawn.
- (d) Any land that is eventually acquired after all these preliminaries will be used by the authority in terms of the improvement plan and with the approval of the Governor, the uses to include—
  - (i) returning it in rearranged form to the original owners;

- (ii) handing it over for development to other agencies of government, with suitable inter-departmental financial arrangements;

- (iii) disposing of it to the private sector, in which event particulars of the disposal will have to be published in the *Government Gazette*, ensuring that all disposals will have to be negotiated and concluded in the knowledge that they will become subject to public scrutiny.

I shall now refer to each clause in the Bill, discussing the points that I have not covered in my general summary.

Clause 1 is procedural. Clause 2 provides, by proposing a small amendment to an existing section of the Act, that any purchase money that may flow from land allocations under an improvement plan shall be paid into the existing Metropolitan Region Improvement Fund. Clause 3 is the paramount provision. It describes the new section that is proposed to be added to the Act.

Subsection (1) of the proposed new section 37A gives a list of the ways of re-planning and rearranging land that could form the basis of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority's certificate to the Minister that the land should be acquired. It also sets out the permissible ways in which the land could be reused, with the proviso that all these purposes and uses shall be consistent with the land's zoning classification in the metropolitan region scheme and shall be presented in an improvement plan. It may be of some interest that a good part of this clause was taken virtually word-for-word from a piece of North American planning legislation. The purposes and uses are designedly comprehensive.

Subsection (2) of the proposed new section provides that land may be bought by agreement or resumed under the Public Works Act, 1902, as modified by the new section; and subsection (3) lays down that the only modification to the Public Works Act shall be the substitution of the Minister for Town Planning for the Minister for Works. In all other respects, the full provisions of the Public Works Act apply. There is precedent for the substitution of Ministers. Under the Public Works Act the term "Minister" is defined, as regards railways, to mean the Minister for Railways.

Subsection (4) of the new section provides that the authority, with the approval of the Governor, may itself improve the land or may return, sell, lease, or exchange it with or without improvements to any person or public authority. These dealings will have to be in accordance with the approved improvement plan and with the zoning classifications in the metropolitan region scheme that relate to the land.

Particulars of land allocations to the private sector will have to be notified by the authority in the *Government Gazette* within one month of the Governor's approval of the allocation.

Subsection (5) of the new section seeks to make it clear that the new section does not prejudice the generality of the existing legislation that relates to town planning. This is consistent with the intention that the new section shall clarify and particularise rather than abrogate or substantially alter the existing law.

Clause 4 proposes by an amendment to an existing section of the Act to make it clear that the authority's existing power to apply money represented in the Metropolitan Region Improvement Fund to the payment of all expenditure incurred by it for the purpose of formulating, carrying out, and giving effect to the region scheme embraces the payment of capital expenditure, costs, and other expenses incurred by the authority in connection with the acquisition, whether by agreement or compulsorily, of all property including property acquired under an improvement plan.

In conclusion, it is believed that the optimum balance between private rights and public interests has been struck, while keeping in mind the absolute need to keep the red tape within reasonable bounds. Procedures must be careful and fair, but they must not be unduly complicated and prolonged. The most splendid schemes can all too easily be frustrated by unnecessary delays.

The authority must by the presentation of a detailed improvement plan convince the Minister and, through him, the Government that the proposal is sound in principle. The Minister must then receive and consider the interested parties' representations and review in their light the precise effect that the improvement plan would have on individuals. Only after all these preliminaries will the plan reach the stage of final approval; and, if it is approved, the land allocations under it to the private sector will become public knowledge, obviating unnecessary and undesirable secrecy.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.38 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 24th November, 1965

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE : SPECIAL</b> .....	2870
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Artificial Breeding of Stock Bill—Returned	2870
City of Perth Parking Facilities Act Amendment Bill—Returned .....	2848
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 4)—3r.	2848
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 4)—2r. ....	2848
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
2r. ....	2850
Com. ....	2850
Report ....	2850
3r. ....	2850
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r. ....	2851
2r. ....	2851
Message : Appropriations .....	2855
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill—2r. ....	2848
Parliamentary Buildings Site Reserve Bill—Returned .....	2850
Reserves Bill—Returned .....	2848
Road Closure Bill—Returned .....	2848
State Tender Board Act Amendment Bill—Returned .....	2848
Swan River Conservation Act Amendment Bill—2r. ....	2855
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—Council's Amendment .....	2851
<b>GOLDMINING INDUSTRY—</b>	
Committee of Inquiry : Tabling of Report	2870
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Closer Settlement Act—Board : Appointment .....	2844
Department of Agriculture Vehicles : Number, and Brands and Average Mileage of Tyres .....	2840
Electric Meters in Flats—Rockingham Block : Application of Departmental Policy .....	2841
Great Eastern Highway : Lakes Junction—Traffic Right of Way .....	2842
Housing Commission Homes—Gas Connections .....	2845
Rental Homes : Policy on Gas Connections .....	2845
Housing Commission Vehicles : Number, and Brands and Average Mileage of Tyres .....	2839
Kent Street High School—Science Block : Site, Commencement, and Cost .....	2843
Land at Eastern End of Causeway : Vesting Lands Department Vehicles : Number, and Brands and Average Mileage of Tyres .....	2839
Mines Department Vehicles : Number, and Brands and Average Mileage of Tyres .....	2840
Motor Vehicle Licences : Half-yearly Registration .....	2845
Motor Vehicle Third Party Insurance : Premium Rates for Each State .....	2844