

It is undoubtedly a fact that the housing situation is worse than it was when the Premier went to the Premiers' Conference in 1968. He did not get any money from the Commonwealth Government because the Prime Minister told him he could not spend what he already had. We have the Minister for Housing saying that he was short of money, and the Premier saying he was not. If this is not a hopeless mess and muddle then I do not know what it is. No wonder we are not getting any result!

Although this motion may not be carried I am satisfied it will ginger up the Government to the full realisation that the housing position is not as the member for Mirrabooka would have us believe through his weighty contribution that everything in the garden is lovely, and we should just let things go on as they are, and the problem will resolve itself. According to him there are no people needing homes and there is no distress; that is the burden of the song he sang this evening.

On the contrary, we believe the housing situation is desperate for the people in the low income group, and that is why the Minister for Housing appealed to the owners of empty houses to let them to tenants in order to relieve the Minister of a big part of the responsibility and worry which he is now shouldering because he is short of money.

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

Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Norton
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Toms
Mr. Graham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Harman	Mr. Davies
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller)

Noes—25

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Sir David Brand	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Burt	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Stewart
Dr. Henn	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Young
Mr. Kitney	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hall	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Moir	Mr. Rushton

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

House adjourned at 11.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 19th March, 1970

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

KEWDALE LANDS DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

QUESTIONS (47): ON NOTICE

1. CHILD CARE CENTRES

Provision of Funds

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government given any consideration to the provision of funds or subsidising local authorities for the erection and/or conduct of child care centres in order to cater particularly for families where there is a necessity for a mother to have employment?
- (2) If so, what decisions were arrived at and why?
- (3) If not, will he consider the matter?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes. The Government has provided assistance in respect of two such centres, and, because of the expected establishment of a number of other centres, is currently evolving a policy covering assistance to this type of activity.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Answered by (1).

2. TRAFFIC

Motor Vehicle Modifications

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Is any action being taken to require motorists to discontinue using vehicles whilst these vehicles have certain fittings and extras which were not fitted by the makers?
- (2) If so, will he give details of the action being taken, including the type of fittings objected to; the number of vehicles the subject of such action; the action which has been taken against owners or drivers, or in respect of the vehicles?
- (3) What are the reasons for the action?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes. Action is being taken under Vehicle Standards Regulation 1106 (1) which reads—

"(1) A motor vehicle or trailer shall not be altered from the manufacturer's specification, or from its form on the occasion of its first registration in regard to chassis frame, wheels, suspension, steering, brakes, axles, engine, body structure or exhaust system without the prior approval of the licensing authority."

- (2) A number of motorists have been instructed to correct alterations made in respect to the vehicle components described in regulation 1106(1) which have not met with approval. The number is not known.

If the alterations have not met with approval, work notices have been issued to have correction carried out within a reasonable time. Only in extreme cases is the vehicle ordered off the road.

- (3) Regulation 1106(1) was adopted from the Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee Draft Regulations and originated at a national level because of the growing practice to alter and modify components of a vehicle regarded as essential to safety performance without subsequent inspection and approval of the appropriate authority.

In many instances the workmanship is substandard and carried out by amateurs with no regard for safety or consideration for other road users. Minor modifications correctly carried out are not objected to, but there are cases where suspensions have been lowered to the extent of leaving insufficient ground clearance, noisy exhausts have been fitted, overpowered engines placed in vehicles with standard gear boxes, transmissions and braking systems and many other alterations made without regard to the manufacturer's tested and proven vehicle design.

3. POLICE

Patrol Cars and Stations South of the River

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many patrol cars are on duty each evening in the metropolitan area south of the river?
- (2) How many police stations are in the metropolitan area south of the river?

- (3) How many of these police stations are manned in the evening for public use?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Eleven patrol vehicles operating full time in the evenings, together with 14 station vehicles that carry out intermittent patrols.
- (2) Fourteen.
- (3) Three operate full-time during the evening, these being Victoria Park, Victoria Quay and Fremantle. The remaining 11 stations operate intermittently as required.

4. *This question was postponed.*

5. DYSLEXIA *Advisory Council*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What stage has been reached in the establishment of an advisory council for dyslexia?
- (2) When is it likely that finality will be reached in this matter?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Discussions have been proceeding between officers of the Public Health Department, Education Department and Dyslexia Association as to the constitution of the most desirable advisory body.
- (2) Finality will be dependent upon agreement being reached between the negotiating authorities.

6. POLLUTION *Pinpointing*

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

- (1) Has he read an article in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 10th March, 1970, headlined "New system will pinpoint air pollution"?
- (2) Has he any information to hand regarding this system; if so, would it be applicable in Western Australia?
- (3) If information is not at present available, would he call for a report as soon as possible and give his findings to the House?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The system operates on and transmits a signal at a set level of sulphur dioxide. It is primarily intended for areas of very high industrial concentration, combined with low level sulphur dioxide emission from domestic coal fires and where thick fogs are experienced. As there are no such fogs

and no domestic pollution in W.A. and measured levels of sulphur dioxide are negligible compared with those at which warnings might be considered necessary, the system is not warranted here.

(3) Answered by (2).

7. *This question was postponed.*

8. LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT

Amendment

Mr. T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Is he now able to give a definite answer to my question of the 2nd October, 1969, concerning amendment of section 20, paragraph (a) of the Legal Practitioners Act?

Mr. COURT replied:

Recent proposals from the Law Society are being considered and legislation is likely to be submitted during the next session.

9. CHILD WELFARE ACT

Section 20

Mr. T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the comments of the Court of Criminal Appeal (W.A.) made on the 6th October, 1969, in the case *The Queen v. Gill* (see W.A. current Law, Volume 5, No. 7; case 143) concerning the many problems associated with the construction of section 20 of the Child Welfare Act and the hope expressed that the legislature may give further consideration to this provision?

(2) If "Yes" what action is contemplated and when?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) and (2) These questions should be directed to the Minister for Child Welfare who administers the Child Welfare Act.

10. UNCLAIMED GOODS

Legislation

Mr. T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) Has the report from the Law Reform Committee touching upon the question relating to the right to sell uncalled for goods yet been received by the Government (see question Legislative Assembly the 12th August, 1969)?

(2) If "Yes" is legislative action contemplated and when?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) and (2) The committee has advised that the report will be submitted in the near future.

11. TITLES OFFICE

Statement by Leader of the Opposition, and Effect of New System

Mr. CASH, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) Has he seen a statement by the Leader of the Opposition in the "Political Notes" column of *The West Australian* of the 6th March in which the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly stated that the Titles Office proposed to close the Titles Office to the public and pass over the preparation of land transaction documents to members of the legal profession?

(2) Is there any substance in fact for such a statement?

(3) In relation to the submission of documents to the Titles Office will he state the effect of the new documents system, as compared with the previous system on—

- (a) the general public;
- (b) real estate agents;
- (c) banking institutions;
- (d) settlement agencies;
- (e) the legal profession?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) This is really an inadmissible question—see May's *Parliamentary Practice*, 17th Edition, page 353 (15). However, there is no substance in the assertion contained in the report.

(3) The office will continue to accept documents from any person or organisation as under the old system.

Mr. Tonkin: Who told the Minister that?

12. SHARK BAY INLETS

Closure

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

Referring to his answer to part (2) of question 47 on the 17th instant, wherein he states that the closing of Useless Inlet and Useless Loop could reduce the fish population by from 5 to 10 per cent., can it be assumed that this statement does not include the additional 8,800 acres of Useless Inlet to be added to the already enclosed areas?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:
No.

13. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Policies

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Has the State Government Insurance Office a policy in respect of insuring a dwelling against flood if the dwelling is insured with them against fire, storm and tempest?
- (2) If such a policy is not available to individuals is one available to group insurers?
- (3) What are its premiums for—
 - (a) fire only;
 - (b) fire, storm and tempest; and
 - (c) fire, storm, tempest and flood?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. O'Neill) replied:

- (1) Yes. Both the fire policy and the houseowners and householders policy may be extended to include flood for an additional premium. Acceptance of the risk or the amount of the additional premium would depend upon the location of the dwelling.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) This is information of a competitive nature. However, rates vary with the construction and use of a building and its location. Because of this there are numerous rates for the categories requested.

14 and 15. *These questions were postponed.*

16. TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATIONAL FACILITY

Rockingham-Kwinana Area

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

Relating to establishing a technological educational facility in the Rockingham-Kwinana region—

- (1) Has a decision been taken to establish such a school or institute in this region to provide for the needs of a large and growing community?
- (2) If "No" can an immediate survey be undertaken in conjunction with the industrial organisations in the area to ascertain the need for such an institution?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

It is assumed that the questions refer to the establishment of facilities for technical education.

- (1) No.

- (2) Surveys are carried out each year to provide information as to the number of classes required at the Fremantle Technical College for students from the Rockingham-Kwinana area.

The situation is being closely watched by the department to determine the stage at which the number of students will be sufficient to justify the establishment of a technical institution in the area.

17. *This question was postponed for one week.*

18.

HOUSING

Building Programme: Pilbara

Mr. BICKERTON, to the Minister for Housing:

Will he supply details of the State Housing Commission's building programme for the next 12 months in the following towns—

- (a) Port Hedland;
- (b) South Hedland;
- (c) Karratha;
- (d) Roebourne;
- (e) Onslow;
- (f) Marble Bar;
- (g) Nullagine;
- (h) Wittenoom?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. O'Neill) replied:

- (1) Year 1969-1970—
 - (a) Nil.
 - (b) It is proposed to commence building forty-one single units in two blocks of inward facing lots at South Hedland; also, eight courtyard houses at Cooke Point (near South Hedland).
 - (c) Nil.
 - (d) Nil.
 - (e) There are two houses under construction at Onslow.
 - (f) Nil.
 - (g) Nil.
 - (h) Nil.
- (2) Year 1970-1971—
 - (a) and (b) Twenty housing units.
 - (c) Five housing units.
 - (d) Two housing units.
 - (e) Nil.
 - (f) Nil.
 - (g) Nil.
 - (h) Nil.

19.

TRANSPORT

Pinjarra and Mandurah: Permits

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

In view of the development and changing status of the towns of

Pinjarra and Mandurah, will he give consideration to having both towns declared permit free areas?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

It is intended that the policy of granting licenses for road transport as agreed to for the alumina refinery will be extended to other business firms and traders at Pinjarra. The policy in regard to Mandurah is being reviewed and this will be considered in consultation with the Mandurah Shire Council.

20. *This question was postponed.*

21. WATER SUPPLIES

Plastic Pipes

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When did the Public Works Department approve of the use of plastic piping in water mains within the city areas?
- (2) When will the policy be extended to cover country areas?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) Both the Metropolitan Water Board and the Country Water Supplies have approved as from 1st January, 1970, for use in private consumer services—not water mains—pressure pipes for water provided they meet the following requirements:

Type "P" pressure piping suitable for potable water and approved brands with safe working pressure as set down in Australian Standards for rigid P.V.C. and Polythene pipes.

The size of pipe is limited to a maximum of one inch nominal diameter in all but farming services and the pipe must be laid underground to a depth of not less than 18 inches unless otherwise approved.

As with other piping, installation must be carried out in accordance with appropriate By-laws, and fittings used shall be of the same manufacture as the piping.

The approval is on an owner/onus basis and neither water supply authority will be held responsible for water regarded as used due to failure of piping and the water so used will have to be paid for by the consumer. Supply of water shall be terminated in the event of excessive wastage of water due to either materials, installation or operation.

There is an additional condition in the case of Country Water Supplies emanating from pressure requirements—that in country areas prior application must be made to the local water supply office where the district engineer will determine whether it can be used and, if so, what type.

Approval was given for plastic piping for water services on farmlands on the 1st February, 1968.

22. WATER SUPPLIES

Dams in South West

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is the Government investigating the possibility of constructing similar dams to the Glen Mervyn Dam in the south west portion of the State?
- (2) If "Yes" what has the investigation revealed?
- (3) If "No" will he have a survey implemented?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Investigation is not completed.

23. COLLIE COAL

Reserves

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

Does he consider that the recommendations of R. A. Menzies and D. T. Hanrahan wherein it is recommended to put down nine bore holes can adequately prove the coal reserves at Collie?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

The drilling recommended in the Menzies and Hanrahan report will be sufficient to bring the knowledge of the coal measures at Collie to a stage where any company or authority wishing to develop a new colliery will be able to decide where detailed drilling for colliery development is required.

24. AGED PERSONS HOMES

Mt. Henry: Cooling

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

In view of the extreme discomfort experienced by the aged people at the Mt. Henry Home during recent summer months, will he give urgent consideration to improving the conditions prior to next summer?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The term "extreme discomfiture" greatly exaggerates the situation. The very few areas where there have been justifiable complaints have been airconditioned.

A programme of upgrading the Mt. Henry hospital has commenced. Because of the magnitude of the task the work will be spread over several years.

25. **HOUSING**
East Manning

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) In view of the sewerage and drainage works now being carried out in the State Housing Commission land at East Manning, will he advise when housing development will commence?
- (2) Has the final plan for this area been completed?
- (3) If not, when is it anticipated the plan will be available?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. O'Neil) replied:

- (1) It is expected that some housing development on Commission land at East Manning will commence in 1972.
- (2) There is no final planning design for the area.
- (3) It is anticipated a plan will be completed in 1971.

26. *This question was postponed.*

27. **SUPERANNUATION AND FAMILY BENEFITS ACT**
Amendment

Mr. BRADY, to the Premier:

- (1) Are any amendments being prepared in connection with the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act for the current session?
- (2) If "Yes" could an outline of amendments be given to the House?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is intended to introduce legislation to extend cost-of-living adjustments to pensioners who retired during 1968 and to increase the allowance to pensioners who retired in earlier years. Other improvements to benefits are under consideration and it is expected that further legislation will be brought down in the next session of Parliament.

28. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Unapproved Mineral Claims: Rating

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

- (1) Is he aware that minerals claims which have been pegged and applied for and recommended for approval by a warden, but have not as yet been granted by the Minister for Mines, are being actively prospected and, in some cases, bought and sold for substantial amounts?
- (2) Is it permissible for a shire to rate such mineral claims if situated within its boundaries?
- (3) If so, what system of rating mineral claims should apply?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Mineral claims are ratable on issue of a certificate of registration after approval of the Minister for Mines.
- (3) Answered by (2).

29. **RAILWAYS**

Employees: Retrospective Pay

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Railways:

What greater jurisdiction was possessed by the industrial commissioner who heard and determined the second hearing of the railway employees' claim for retrospective pay than was possessed by the industrial commissioner who heard and determined the claim in the first instance?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

The claim by locomotive engine-men for retrospective payment of wage increases was heard in the first instance by an industrial commissioner who made a recommendation only—not a determination—as he had no power under the Industrial Arbitration Act to make a determination giving retrospective application to an order of the industrial commission.

The second hearing was before a private arbitrator—not an industrial commissioner—as a term of settlement of a dispute which had placed a ban on the operation of the "Indian-Pacific" passenger trains. In addition to the parties agreeing to the matter going to private arbitration they also agreed to abide by the decision of the arbitrator.

30.

HOSPITALS

Armada-Kelmscott

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

What is the present position regarding the addition of a maternity wing to the Armada-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Tenders for earth works were called on Saturday, the 14th March, and it is anticipated that tenders for construction of the building will be called within a few weeks.

31.

POLLUTION

Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee

Mr. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) On what date was the Cockburn Sound Conservation Committee established?
- (2) Since its establishment—
 - (a) how many specific instances of pollution have been reported to the committee;
 - (b) how many specific investigations have been carried out with regard to pollution;
 - (c) how many warnings have been issued with regard to pollution;
 - (d) how many prosecutions have been initiated with regard to pollution?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I will make the necessary inquiries of the secretary of the committee so that the honourable member's question can be answered.

32.

POLLUTION

Cockburn Sound

Mr. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has the interdepartmental committee set up to investigate pollution of Cockburn Sound from industries in the Robb Jetty-Coo-gee Beach area reached any conclusions with regard to this problem?
- (2) If "Yes" what decisions were arrived at and what recommendations made?
- (3) Can the committee predict at this stage whether the area concerned should be pollution free by next summer?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The committee established to investigate pollution of Cockburn Sound is not an inter-

departmental committee. The Cockburn Sound Special Industries Committee has been established by industries in the area which discharge effluent into the Sound.

Negotiations are current with the committee on final details of a proposed expert study to investigate methods of treatment and disposal of effluent.

- (3) A proposal by a consultant for investigation of effluent treatment and disposal has been received, and is currently being examined by the Government and members of the committee. The proposal estimates that the study would take three months, after which firm proposals for treatment and disposal of effluent would be available. This would include the time required to solve the problems. I should clarify that by saying the report will make a definition of the time required to solve the problems; they will not be resolved in the three months.

33. *This question was postponed.*

34.

HOUSING

Local Government Participation

Mr. DAVIES, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Government made any official or unofficial approaches to local government councils to take part in housing development?
- (2) If so, what has been the result?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. O'Neil) replied:

- (1) Yes. The commission has vigorously sought to encourage local government councils to participate in housing development.
- (2) The Government and local authorities have assisted in the promotion of rural regional terminating building societies located in country areas. Similarly, the response by country shires to use their borrowing powers to build units of accommodation for Government employees has resulted in a capital contribution approaching \$1,000,000.

35. **INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Nickel Refinery: Outlay for Land

Mr. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) When the Government acquired land at Kwinana for and on behalf of Western Mining Corporation for a nickel refinery did the company advance the necessary funds to cover the cost of all land

acquired or was payment made by way of reimbursement after the land had been acquired?

- (2) If advances were not made prior to the land being acquired what was the total outlay of Government funds before reimbursement by the company on whose behalf the land was acquired?
- (3) What was the total area of land so acquired at Kwinana?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Except in the early stages of acquisition of land at Kwinana for and on behalf of Western Mining Corporation for a nickel refinery, the company advanced the necessary funds to cover the cost of land acquired.
- (2) In all, the amount the Government outlaid, and was reimbursed by the Company, was \$116,400, made up of—Options—\$700, Deposits—\$21,522, in settlement of purchases—\$94,178.
- (3) 141 acres 1 rood 15 perches. (The answer of 99 acres 1 rood 15 perches given in answer to Question 9 of the 18th March, 1970 was incorrect, as inadvertently an area of 42 acres acquired by the Government between 1963 and 1966 for general future industrial use was again deducted, although it had previously been taken into account.)

I would like to clarify with the Leader of the Opposition privately whether his question was directed at the amount of land acquired under this particular system, or whether he wanted the total acreage of the whole refinery area.

36. OMBUDSMAN *Appointment*

Mr. BRADY, to the Premier:

As Press reports indicate an ombudsman is to be appointed in Tasmania, will he give an indication if it is likely an ombudsman will be appointed in Western Australia in the near future?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

Nothing has occurred of recent times to cause the Government to change its views on the appointment of an ombudsman. However, the result of the proposed appointment in Tasmania will be watched with interest.

37. HOUSING

Rent: Charges and Rebates

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How are maximum and minimum rentals for State Housing Com-

mission homes arrived at under the scheme for rebating rents on the basis of family income?

- (2) Is the size of the family unit taken into consideration when applying rebates in rent?
- (3) Can he provide a scale of rental charges in relation to income?
- (4) What is the maximum rent charged for a State rental home or flat and what is the relative income of the tenant?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. O'Neil) replied:

- (1) Under the provisions of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, rental rebates are granted where a tenant on limited income will suffer hardship in meeting the required economical rental. The relative provisions of the agreement are tabled herewith.
- (2) The size of family unit is not taken into consideration when applying rebates of rent.
- (3) Scale of rental charges in relation to family income calculated as in (1) is tabled herewith.
- (4) The maximum rental of a four bedroom house in the metropolitan area is \$15 per week. Under the rebate scale, any tenant whose "family income" assesses to \$59.50 per week and above, would be expected to pay this rental.

The papers were tabled.

38. SURF BOARDS *Safety Measures*

Mr. BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has any further consideration been given to the need for some action to be taken for the proper co-ordination of manufacture and design of surf boards?
- (2) Does the Government feel action is warranted; if not, why not?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes. A report by a special sub-committee of the Water Safety Division of the National Safety Council of Western Australia has recently been received.
- (2) The report is currently being studied and further action will depend upon the conclusions reached.

39. RAILWAYS *Outdoor Signs*

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Railways:

Regarding the upgrading of outdoor signs on railway property—

- (1) On what date were tenders called and when did they close?

- (2) What were—
 - (a) the number of tenders received;
 - (b) names of firms tendering;
 - (c) tender prices submitted in each case?
- (3) How many of the firms tendering were based in Western Australia?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Tenders were called on the 14th January, 1970, and closed on the 14th February, 1970.
- (2) (a) Six.
 - (b) (i) London and Provincial Poster Group;
 - (ii) Silk Screen Arts (W.A.);
 - (iii) Levingston Pty. Ltd. (Vic.);
 - (iv) Shelter Advertising Pty. Ltd. (W.A.);
 - (v) Outdoor Advertising of W.A.;
 - (vi) City & Suburban Billposting Co. (W.A.).
- (c) This contract has not yet been let and it is considered inadvisable to disclose such information.
- (3) Four.

40. HEALTH *Cyclamate*

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

- (1) What products are being sold in this State for human consumption which contain the substance cyclamate?
- (2) Has he taken action to identify the said products to the public?
- (3) If "Yes" when and how?
- (4) If "No" why?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Certain foods labelled in accordance with the food and drug regulations as "low calorie" foods or as "suitable for diabetics".
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Food and drug regulations made in 1961 require all foods containing cyclamate to carry on the label of every package in capital letters of not less than 8 points measurement the words "THIS FOOD CONTAINS CYCLAMATE, A NON-NUTRITIVE SWEETENING SUBSTANCE." All foods mentioned in answer to question (1) are labelled with statements to this effect.
- (4) Not applicable.

41. BERNARD KENNETH GOULDHAM *Compensation*

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government now refused a request made by the solicitors for Bernard Kenneth Gouldham to compensate Mr. Gouldham for the grievous loss and damage he has sustained by reason of the miscarriage of justice which occurred in his case?
- (2) If "Yes" will he state each of the reasons for this refusal?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It was considered in the circumstances of the case that payment of compensation was not applicable.

42. *This question was postponed.*

43. STATE TAXATION AUTHORITY *Staff*

Mr. DAVIES, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the staff establishment of the new State taxation authority?
- (2) Have all positions been filled?
- (3) When will the authority operate in its own right?
- (4) Is it a fact that several female junior drafting assistants, partially qualified, were not needed when staff transferred from the Commonwealth?
- (5) Is it a fact that these employees had to revert to clerical duties?
- (6) Is it likely that positions suitable to their training could eventually be offered to them?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) 319 positions, including existing Commonwealth branches engaged on valuation and taxation duties, together with the Probate Duties and Stamp Offices of the State Service, and new executive, administration accounts and records sections being set up.
- (2) No. Offers have been made, or are in the process of being made, to Commonwealth officers involved in the takeover. Other positions are being progressively filled by State appointments.
- (3) It is proposed that the department will commence full operations from 1st July, 1970, subject to suitable arrangements being finalised in regard to accommodation.

(4) The position is that one senior drafting assistant and two junior female clerical assistants who were acting as drafting assistants were not offered employment by the State. Two of the officers have only progressed to the initial stages in becoming qualified, while the other has no qualifications and is not studying.

(5) This is a matter for the Commonwealth Taxation Office, but it is understood that the senior officer is now occupying a clerical position, the duties of which are predominantly of a drafting nature, at a considerably higher salary than she previously received.

It is also understood that the two clerical assistants have elected to resume in clerical positions, but both have been given opportunities to apply for drafting positions in other departments. Neither has suffered any reduction in salary and in fact one is receiving a much higher salary than before.

(6) Answered by (5).

44. PROBATE DUTIES

Valuations: Farming Areas

Mr. GAYFER, to the Treasurer:

Apropos my question on Tuesday, the 17th instant, concerning taxation values of farming land for probate and other purposes, as sales compared to the number of farming properties on the market are virtually nil, what is embraced under the terms "and such other factors as bear on the question of values"?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

The first step in making valuations in a rural area is the analysis of sales within the district. Once a pattern of land values according to soil type is established, final values are adopted after making due allowance for such factors as the situation of the property, its rainfall pattern and accessibility to public utilities and amenities within the district.

45. RAIL AND BUS TRANSPORT

Suburban Parking Areas

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware of cars being parked near suburban railway stations so that the owners may presumably travel by train to the city to avoid traffic and parking difficulties?

(2) If so, or in any case, will he consider establishing parking areas where feasible on railway property adjacent to stations between Midland and Fremantle?

(3) At stations where this is not possible, will he seek the co-operation of local authorities to acquire areas to achieve this purpose in relation to—

- (a) rail transport;
- (b) M.T.T. transport?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Parking areas have been established at most suburban railway stations. As patronage increases and where land is available, extensions to these areas and additional parking areas are proposed.

(3) (a) This has already been done and will be pursued whenever necessary.

(b) The M.T.T. is examining the concept of park and ride transport, especially adjacent to express routes which enables the trust to give fast transport to the city.

46. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Pilbara Region

Mr. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Will he supply details of the Government's overall scheme for both short and long-term major developments planned for the Pilbara region?

(2) In what respects does the projected iron ore development of Hanwright partnership and interests negotiating with it run counter to the Government's regional concept and threaten to frustrate it by fragmented development?

(3) What are the main differences in the terms upon which new iron ore agreements will be negotiated compared with those contained in existing iron ore agreements?

(4) Has he made any approach to iron ore companies for the purpose of obtaining agreement for an increase in royalties?

(5) If "Yes" with what result?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) It is impracticable to set out in detail within the limits of an answer of permitted length, the full planned developments for Pilbara. The plans for Pilbara iron ore may be very briefly summarised by saying that the Government's overall plan for the Pilbara region provides for development on a

properly co-ordinated regional basis including all matters such as towns, railways, ports, water, power, etc.

To achieve the maximum economic result and to remain competitive in later years in the world markets—where the future of Pilbara region lies—the regional concept is necessary to ensure that the economies of scale both in respect of individual company operations and regional facilities are achieved.

It goes beyond this so far as the actual ore deposits are concerned. In this regard it would be wrong to look at the region as a series of separate deposits with emphasis on the high grade deposits only.

The better approach is one where the region is looked at as an iron ore province and rationalised plans of mining and processing developed in co-operation with the operating companies to ensure that ore of varying grades and qualities is mined, processed, and marketed to produce the maximum continuing and stable result.

- (2) We have not at this point been able to determine how far the current Hanwright proposals would fit into or cut across the Government's regional concept and create a degree of fragmentation we are anxious to avoid because at this juncture there are no detailed Hanwright projects before us. They have—quite independent of the Government—negotiated, or are in the process of negotiating, a series of proving options to various firms, which options I understand are intended to be for periods longer than the duration of the current temporary reserves.

It is in the public interest as well as in the interest of those with whom negotiations are being undertaken that it should be clearly understood the final decision as to whether temporary reserves will be renewed and on what conditions rests with the Government.

Public statements by Hanwright indicate they are demanding identical conditions to those in existing projects.

- (3) It is not practicable nor desirable—because of the obvious effect on our negotiating position—to be specific. But there could be a number of very important areas of negotiation where new agreements would differ from those currently in existence.

I would take it for granted that the community at large and the Opposition in particular would expect us to keep matters of this kind under review in the light of experience and market and other trends.

- (4) and (5) Not beyond the negotiations that have taken place to clarify the interpretation of the original royalty definitions to ensure maximum benefits to the State.

Unless there are some important changes of circumstances it is unlikely that any renegotiation would be attempted in the immediate future so far as the established and pioneer projects are concerned.

This does not of course rule out the possibility of negotiations for higher and different forms of royalties in any additional projects such as the ones that presumably Hanwright or their nominees will want to discuss with us nor does it rule out renegotiation where there are changed circumstances.

47.

TRANSPORT

Intrastate Air Services

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When intrastate airline timetables are altered or amended are they submitted to his department for approval?
- (2) If "Yes" does his department examine them to see that reasonable opportunity is afforded for smaller towns to be able to commute with one another?
- (3) Is he aware of the difficulty that civil servants and others are having in planning their trips between Port Hedland and Carnarvon and other towns in the north-west?
- (4) Is he also aware that due to the present M.M.A. timetable Carnarvon has lost the services of an Infant Health Sister?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes—to the Road and Air Transport Commission.
- (2) Consideration is given to keeping services in operation to the smaller towns and to ensure that they have an air link with a centre of commercial importance but owing to the paucity of loading it is not always economically feasible to provide that the smaller towns have direct contact with each other.

- (3) No complaints have been received but efforts are always made to ensure that the timetables of feeder services out of Carnarvon and Port Hedland are co-ordinated with those of the mainline service from Perth.
- (4) I am informed that while there are three flights per week from Geraldton to Carnarvon, the only return flight is on a Saturday. As Infant Health Services staff are not prepared to work on a Saturday the visit of a Sister to Carnarvon has been discontinued. I am arranging for the position to be investigated.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Pilbara Region

Mr. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

As it would appear from *The West Australian* this morning that the Minister had available to him yesterday the necessary information to answer the question I had on the notice paper, was his reason for postponing the question that to have given the information yesterday would have interfered with his plans of a pre-release, in view of the fact that he had already taped the information for the Press?

Mr. COURT replied:

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition there was no such intention on my part. The tape recording I gave to the Press was, I understood, for the Press merely to get general information as to the situation that existed in respect of this controversy that is waging.

The Leader of the Opposition can be assured that I was just as surprised as he was when the information was released. I did not make the information available yesterday, only because the answer was so long and there was the possibility that the Speaker would have ruled it out of order, but as I have reduced it more or less to a précis, I hope it is now within the acceptable limits when the Speaker looks at the answer I have given.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th March.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [2.46 p.m.]: On Tuesday evening the Minister introduced some amendments to the Police Act which

no doubt the House will accept, but for my part I am a little critical of the fact that it is only three or four years ago that the Minister introduced a Bill to amend section 81, which covers fines and penalties imposed for the removal of boats, and to my mind it seems that a great deal of time is wasted by having officers reviewing penalties and fines at such short intervals. I therefore hope that in future when amending legislation is brought forward, it will be a comprehensive cover of the Police Act incorporating any contingency that may arise with regard to the removal of boats, motorcars, acts of vandalism, and so on, instead of having legislation brought into the House piecemeal.

Some of the amendments have relation to sections 23 and 24 of the Act to allow the commissioner to reduce the status of non-commissioned officers, or those who commit breaches of discipline, and to reduce senior and first-class constables to constables when they commit breaches. In the main, I do not think we can object to those amendments, because they will give the commissioner some additional power to maintain discipline within the Police Department and yet, at the same time, if he feels so disposed he can go the full limit by dismissing an officer who has caused some trouble in respect of himself or his senior officers.

By and large, I believe the amendments can be given the approval of the House. However, I consider the proposed penalties relating to the removal of boats, flats, and so on, from the river or some other place, could be considered to be extremely stringent. For example, it is proposed in the Bill that instead of the penalty being \$100 fine or six months' imprisonment it shall be \$500 or imprisonment for two years. The basic wage and even the remuneration of professional men that I know—despite the fact that such men do get a lucrative return today for their services—have not increased at a rate proportionate to the proposed increase in penalties in this Bill.

It seems to me the Police Department might take the view that these fines should not be so steep; but to be fair to the Minister and to the Commissioner of Police, who no doubt has recommended these alterations, as a past Minister for Police I recognise the great difficulties of running the Police Department of Western Australia. It may be that the department feels if the fines and the other penalties provided are stiff enough they will, in turn, reduce the number of crimes and reduce criminal acts. This may be so, but I have my doubts because very often I feel that the people who indulge in these practices do not pay very much regard to the penalties.

It seems there could be better education of the people either in the schools, on television, in the Press, or through

other channels of mass media for the purpose of obviating many of the crimes which are committed today. As a responsible member of Parliament I am not unmindful of the fact that the Police Force has been increased from about 1,000 members in 1959, when I was the Minister for Police, to over 1,500 members today, or an increase of approximately 50 per cent. in a period of 10 years.

We must give some consideration to the question of protection, and ascertain where we are heading. I am one of those persons who believe in police protection and that the police should be given all the assistance possible by the Government and the public, generally, in order to enable the police officers to carry out their duties. They have a most difficult task, and if they did it properly they would command the highest respect from the community; on the other hand, if they only half did the job, or did not do it at all they would bring a great deal of discredit on the department generally.

I think I am entitled to say that in recent times a section of the community has advocated the running of its own private police force. Members of Parliament will recall that recently a number of jewellery shops were broken into, not once but on a number of occasions. The master jewellers, the wholesalers, and the retailers felt that the time had arrived when they should provide their own police force. I hope the time never arises when organisations—whether they be of retailers, wholesalers, commercial interests, industry, or professional people—are allowed to run private police forces. I am not even happy that some retail establishments in the city have appointed private policemen to move around their stores. It shows weakness on the part of the Government to allow that. While we are dealing with amendments to the Police Act I thought I should refer to this matter, because we are all concerned with it. The Police Department is a very important one, and we must give it every consideration.

At this juncture I should mention that I believe the Commissioner of Police should be invited to express the view whether the time has arrived, as a result of his experience, for an overall inquiry to be made into the efficiency of the Police Department. In saying that I am not having a shot at the commissioner or his officers. In the 1968 annual report of the department the commissioner himself has published enough for members of Parliament—if they read between the lines of the report—to indicate that the department requires much more assistance than it is getting. As a past Minister for Police in the previous Labor Government I have always felt that this is the Cinder-

ella department of the Government departments. I think we have passed the stage where any department in Western Australia should be considered a Cinderella department. For that reason the commissioner should be invited to institute an inquiry, either internally through his own officers or externally with assistance, to review the whole position.

There are many people who are concerned with the crimes being committed, the perpetrators of which are not being apprehended. In recent times there have been some shocking crimes in Western Australia, and in some instances the criminals have not been brought to book. I recall the murder which was committed in Geraldton not so long ago, and in this case, as far as I know, the criminal has not been apprehended. There are similar cases to which I can refer. So, while the Police Act is being amended I think the time is ripe when some of these matters should be mentioned.

People have been complaining about the police not arriving promptly on the scene when their notice has been drawn to the committing of misdemeanours. Other people have complained that there are insufficient traffic police officers. Yet we read that nine or 10 police officers are engaged in carrying out activities in the police boys' clubs. These officers do a good job, and I am not taking anything away from their efforts. In fact, I take my hat off to them, and I give the Police Department full marks for undertaking these activities. At the same time I ask myself whether we can afford to have policemen acting as instructors in police boys' clubs when the commissioner is experiencing difficulty in maintaining the strength of the force and in apprehending criminals.

In the last 24 hours I heard the Minister for Police say that consideration was being given to instituting highway or road patrols. That might be a step in the right direction, or it might not be. Some people think that much of the work that is involved with traffic patrol and with police action on traffic matters should be taken away from the Police Department. I go along with that view partly, but the fact remains that we do not always get the opportunity to refer to the Police Department. So, on this occasion I am referring to a few of the matters which have been brought to my notice. I could dilate at length on this aspect, but I shall not do so at this juncture.

I do, however, want to draw attention to some of the comments of the Commissioner of Police contained in the annual report of the department, to show that consideration should be given to what I have pointed out. In the 1968 annual report, among many other matters which are important to the running of the Police Department, the following paragraph appears:—

There is an obligation on the general public to recognise its responsibility. For a crime to be committed there must be an opportunity and too frequently the police observe an absence of responsibility by both private persons and business concerns for the protection or security of their property. Valuable property is frequently available in circumstances which constitute a temptation to those who are susceptible.

So the Commissioner of Police is, in effect, concerned because many people invite criminal action on the part of the public, whether those members of the public be vandals, teenage youths, or mature men and women. These boat owners are virtually inviting criminal action and the Minister now proposes to increase the fines and other penalties in connection with the removal of boats, dinghies, flats, and utensils used on boats. Boats on trailers can be seen on almost every beach. Also in any sort of storm, many boats are washed up onto the beach because they are not properly moored.

The other night the Minister stated that over 100 reports had been received of boats that had been removed in recent times. I believe many of the missing boats have not actually been stolen, but are missing merely because they have not been moored in the correct fashion to ensure their safety.

Some boats and dinghies lie on beaches month in and month out, and in some cases they create problems for those people who desire to make use of the beach. Therefore, referring to the commissioner's report, I believe that a great number of boat owners invite people to steal their boats. Therefore, why should the penalties be increased two and a half times in the space of four years? I would ask members to give some thought to this aspect. Better still, I would ask members to read the 1968 and 1969 reports of the commissioner in order that they might ascertain the true position.

Let us have a look at what the commissioner said in his last report which was tabled in the House only two days ago. After all, we must realise that these reports are not laid on the Table of the House merely in order that they might be filed away. They are made available in order that members might be kept in touch with the situation covered by each report. The commissioner is facing difficulties which will be reflected in our social peace in the future. He said—

The year under review was one of continued industrial activity with intense interest in large scale mining development throughout the State. The rapid growth has brought problems of a large increased permanent

and itinerant population and labour shortages; these have both affected the Police Force.

So we see the commissioner is in the same position as many other industrial and commercial enterprises. He is faced with staff shortages, but he cannot do what private and public companies can do. He cannot offer another \$5, \$10, \$15, or \$20 over the award rate. He has to maintain his staff at the award rate or in accordance with an agreement arrived at with the Government. Therefore the Minister and the commissioner should have our sympathy in some respects with regard to their difficulties. In connection with another matter the commissioner says—

Transfers from the Metropolitan Area to country districts has caused quite a number of resignations, in many instances the member is prepared to transfer but his wife resists and finally comes resignation, probably where the wife is also working and earning fairly good wages.

Now it seems members of the Police Force in the metropolitan area have, to some extent, certain advantages over those in country districts, and it may be that some of these aspects must be recognised. It is in this respect that perhaps an internal inquiry could highlight the situation and, as a result, something might be done to improve the position before crime gets out of hand. Another important statement made by the commissioner reads as follows:—

Crime continues to rise resulting in my decision to increase the Criminal Investigation Branch by an additional twenty men during the next year, provision having been requested and approved by the Government for inclusion of these in the fifty additional strength authorised for the year 1969-70.

I could read many other important paragraphs but I do not think you, Sir, will approve if I do so, and, personally, I do not think it would be desirable to do so at this time. However, I referred to those paragraphs in the 1968 and 1969 reports to indicate that the Commissioner of Police is confronted with certain difficulties. It may be that much good would result if the Minister invited the commissioner to give consideration to the establishment of a comprehensive inquiry concerning the difficulties being experienced.

I come back to the amendments. I do not think that by and large we can oppose any of them, having regard for all the circumstances. I am as sympathetic as anyone else towards the genuine man who moors his vessel properly in order to deter interference by vandals or removal by thieves. But I have no sympathy for those who more or less invite vandalism or

theft by leaving their boats lying around where they can be easily taken and used by all and sundry.

With regard to the disciplinary clauses under which the commissioner will be able to reduce the status of various types of officers to constables, while I think that this is a weakening of the overall position, I believe we must face up to it and give the commissioner this power.

With those remarks I support the Bill. However, if the Minister intends to make any further amendments to the Police Act, I do hope he will try to include them in one Bill each session, rather than deal with them piecemeal.

I could go on to mention many other activities for which I feel greater penalties, fines, or other punishments, should be imposed, but I am not going to do so at this stage. From questions asked in the House, even as recently as today, I know that throughout the metropolitan area concern is felt regarding the efficiency of the Police Department. However, let me say in conclusion that I believe the commissioner and his top-ranking officers are doing an excellent job, and sometimes they are not given full credit for this. We must realise that they are doing the best they can with the facilities available, and it is our fault if we do not give them the power and shot to do a better job and improve the overall efficiency. I support the Bill.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [3.9 p.m.]: I have nothing to contribute to the amendments concerning disciplinary action for members of the Police Force for dereliction of duty, but I believe I have a responsibility to comment on the amendments dealing with unauthorised removal of any boat, flat, or barge, or any fitting or equipment. I think this definition could be broadened to include craft other than those mentioned. However, I assume a pretty wide interpretation would be put upon that provision.

Protection is afforded also in respect of motors, parts, fittings, furniture, etc., and I have in mind the crayfishermen in my electorate who have been inconvenienced as a consequence of something as simple as an oar or rowlocks being removed from the boats they use as tenders to get to and from their cray boats.

Even the dinghy itself, or its outboard motor, might be missing—either borrowed or stolen. The proposed increase in penalties will be a deterrent. A crayfisherman and his crew, even on the present-day deflated price of crayfish, could lose hundreds of dollars as a consequence of unauthorised people interfering with their craft.

The equipment carried by fishing boats is extremely expensive. I refer to the electrical system, the radio, and the echo

sounder, not to mention the engine and other such parts. The craft also carry ropes, nets and anchors which are very expensive.

I would also point out that repairs to and maintenance of fishing craft is very expensive. Those who carry out repairs seem to assume that fishermen are like farmers and can be charged prices out of all proportion to the services rendered. A fisherman recently pointed out to me where a simple installation had cost him \$70. The installation was one which I, as a tradesman, could have done in approximately two hours, and the cost of the material involved was infinitesimal.

However, that is the type of charge made for work done on fishing craft. Such repairs could need to be made through no fault of the owner, and the owner should have some redress at law. Also, a craft might have to be slipped as a result of vandalism, and slipping charges are not low. The maintenance associated with ordinary wear and tear costs many dollars per hour. That is bad enough, but when the damage is inflicted by vandals, it is even worse.

The Minister will remember an instance of an escapee taking charge of a craft and heading north. He was overtaken in the vicinity of Ledge Point. That fellow would have got away with, say, \$50,000 worth of equipment and could have ruined it or lost it entirely.

Unlike the member for Swan, I do not think that the penalty to be imposed in an instance such as that would be inconsistent with the crime committed. I do agree that for lesser offences the penalties might be excessive, but I will deal with that matter later. The occasion I mentioned concerned a fishing boat, but the same could apply to pleasure craft associated with yacht clubs within my electorate, and in other areas along the river foreshore. I want to see protection afforded to the owners of those boats.

I refer not only to the craft which are anchored on the river or in the yacht clubs, but also to boats in the fishing boat harbour. I would go so far as to say that in my electorate the value of water craft would run into millions of dollars. I refer to the boats in the fishing boat harbour, those in the various clubs, and also the fishing boats which come from Fremantle and are fishing off our coast. Those craft all need protection.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Just as well we have the fishing boat harbour.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is so, and I am pleased that there is some supervision. The previous speaker referred to haphazard mooring of boats and I admit that does occur. I also wish that more facilities were provided for safe anchorage and care.

I submit that craft which are trailer-borne cannot be parked in the living room for safekeeping, and are usually parked

outside. There should be some protection at law for people who own such craft. For example, a relative of mine left his trailer outside his house in Mt. Pleasant. When he got up one morning the trailer was missing. He could have had on the trailer a craft worth \$500 or \$5,000 and whoever took the trailer could have been many hundreds of miles away on his way to the Eastern States or the north-west by daylight. I ask: What redress would that person have unless there were some teeth in an amendment such as this?

As I have said, I have many yacht clubs and fishing craft in my area, and I do not think a fine of \$500 or a gaol term of two years is inconsistent with the major offences I have mentioned.

I assume that some discretion will be used in the case of minor offences. The maximum penalties should not be imposed if, for instance, some young people who were swimming in an area took possession of a dinghy or the oars or rowlocks. I do believe that the penalties are for those who commit the major crimes of stealing or deliberately damaging a craft. As a consequence, I feel there is a responsibility upon me to support the Bill which is at present before us.

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [3.17 p.m.]: It is difficult, of course, to speak to any Bill without having had a proper opportunity, and the time, to study it first. I am in that category. This Bill was introduced not yesterday, but the day before and as one has many duties to perform—one of which is to remain in this Chamber whilst the House is sitting—I have found it most difficult.

I was stunned to find that this Bill is now before the House at three o'clock on Thursday afternoon. I do not think it is fair. If a matter is important enough to be brought before Parliament in the form of a Bill, then surely it is important enough for members to be given an opportunity to study it, and not just glance at it, so that when the Bill becomes law it is effective and not a botched-up job as is too often the case.

The Minister has told us that this Bill was for the purpose of achieving two objectives. One, broadly speaking, was to bring up to date, sections 23 and 24 of the Police Act. I do not think there is anything I can add in debate to what has already been said; the amendments seem to be necessary.

The other amendment has to do with section 81 of the Police Act. The Government is concerned—as it ought to be concerned—about the number of boats, flats, barges, and the like which are being unlawfully taken possession of—something different from stealing. If a craft is stolen the provisions of the Criminal Code are

quite adequate to deal with the situation. In the case of a stolen motorcar the Criminal Code can quite adequately deal with the situation. What occurs in the case of a boat being stolen is similar to that which occurs when a motorcar is stolen.

Far more often than not the boat or the motorcar is not stolen, it is merely unlawfully taken. That is to say, the offender has decided he will borrow it for the time, but he certainly has not in mind taking it permanently, or depriving the owner of it permanently.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the proposed amendment to section 81 in respect of unlawful possession through the taking of boats, flats, and barges will make the law somewhat similar to section 60 of the Traffic Act, which deals with the unlawful taking of motor vehicles. The proposed amendment to section 81 will delete quite a portion of the existing section 81, and it also seeks to make the provision more effective in that it will include within its operation boats which are taken when they are not actually in the water.

Apparently legal advice has been given to the effect that the section, as it is now worded, does not apply if the boat does not happen to be in the water at the time it is taken. To overcome this, the section has been reworded to include boats, barges, and the like which may be taken at a time when they are on slips or trailers. Nobody would object to this proposition, which is very reasonable.

At this point, it comes down to one matter which is worth consideration; namely, a trailer is a motor vehicle. Section 4 of the Traffic Act gives the following definition:—

“motor vehicle” means a self-propelled vehicle that is not operated on rails; and the expression includes a trailer, semi-trailer or caravan while attached to a motor vehicle;

It seems to me the situation could arise in the unlawful taking of a boat on a trailer when the offender could find himself being charged twice and found guilty twice for what is really one offence. The penalties involved are fairly heavy. I do not complain about that; but, on the other hand, I do not think a person should be charged twice for the one offence.

Under the proposed amendment to section 81 the penalty could be a fine of \$500 or imprisonment for two years in addition to other things. Section 60 (1) of the Traffic Act reads—

Penalty—

(i) for a first offence,

Maximum: Imprisonment for twelve months or a fine of five hundred dollars;

Minimum: Imprisonment for one month, or, at the discretion of the court, a fine of one hundred dollars, but, whether imprisonment or a fine is imposed, the minimum penalty is in each case irreducible in mitigation notwithstanding the provisions of any Act.

That penalty applies to a first offender. Of course, the penalty for a second offence is much greater and this, too, is enumerated in that section.

I am aware that from time to time the situation does arise where a person finds himself convicted on a number of charges for what, in fact, is really one offence. Of course, courts take these matters into consideration, but Parliament should be aware of the situation. When the situation is as apparent as it is in connection with a boat on a trailer, some provision should be written into the legislation to let the courts know just what Parliament thinks of a situation of that sort. We should not leave it to luck and guesswork in the hope that the law will be just when it is administered.

If a person takes a boat at a time when it is on a trailer, that should be one offence. It is as simple as that and there is no need to charge a man under the Police Act and under the Traffic Act. This sort of thing is quite unnecessary and makes hard work of a simple matter, although that is something Parliament is inclined to do.

Consequently, I suggest thought should be given to this matter and, above all, if a person offends by taking a boat on a trailer he should not be convicted on two charges. One conviction is quite sufficient and will achieve what we are seeking with this measure.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Minister for Police) [3.26 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the Bill. The member for Swan was critical to the extent that he said the opportunity was taken two or three years ago to amend the penalty applicable to section 81 of the Police Act which deals with the removal of boats and that Parliament was taking the same action again. He asked why Parliament had not taken the action at that time to provide the penalty which is included in the amending Bill.

I remind the member for Swan and the House that the purpose of the amendment to section 81 at that time applied to all sections of the Police Act. In other words, there was an overall increase of penalties in all sections of the Police Act.

Since then the number of pleasure craft on our waters has increased considerably. My colleague, the Minister for Works, could correct me on this point, but I think there are between 18,000 and 20,000 on our waters today which are registered with his department. The value of these craft is very considerable indeed. One has only to take into consideration the value of an outboard motor on some of the craft to realise that the suggested penalty of \$500 is not excessive. Also we should bear in mind that a penalty of \$500 will not necessarily be imposed by a magistrate, because that is the maximum penalty.

The member for Swan said that the solution to the problem of stealing boats and fittings from craft is a matter of education. I could not agree more. We are trying to achieve this through our schools and other media, particularly youth clubs.

On the other hand, because this educational programme is carried out in police youth clubs and the like, where police officers devote a considerable amount of their time, the member for Swan was critical and said that the police officers should be engaged on law enforcement work and should not carry out educational programmes through youth organisations.

I remind him that many police officers do this work in a voluntary capacity. I do not know the number of police officers who are engaged full-time on police youth work but I do know that a considerable number of them do this work in a voluntary capacity.

I was rather concerned when the member for Swan went to the extent of saying that he thought it was time to initiate a comprehensive inquiry into the Police Force. This is going to be misunderstood.

Mr. Brady: The commissioner's reports indicate that he wants some assistance.

Mr. CRAIG: I am coming to this. The honourable member said there should be an overall, comprehensive inquiry into the Police Department.

Mr. Brady: Brought about at the request of the commissioner.

Mr. CRAIG: This is a severe reflection on the ability and efficiency of the department.

Mr. Brady: I made it clear that there was no reflection on the commissioner or his main staff.

Mr. CRAIG: I am glad the honourable member said that because I want to clear this up here and now. This is a reflection on the department and every officer who works for it. The commissioner himself constantly has these matters under review and only last year we appointed an assistant commissioner to assist him. Many other measures have been carried out in the department to ensure that every

possible officer is available for the work for which he was engaged—that is, law enforcement.

I was rather concerned when the honourable member made this statement; and, adverting to his interjection, I would say that no request from the commissioner for additional manpower or equipment has ever been refused. What the commissioner wants by way of assistance is the co-operation of the public. If we could get this co-operation from the public our problems in solving crime would not be as great as they are today. That is what we are looking for, and what the commissioner is looking for in seeking assistance. Over the eight years I have been the Minister, not one request from the commissioner has been refused. I want to clear that matter up for the member for Swan.

Mr. Brady: Why the criticism from the jewellers?

Mr. CRAIG: I will come to the jewellers. We have taken other steps to ensure that we get the maximum from the force we have available to us. Only recently we have introduced the infringement notice system to reduce court work. We have introduced a system whereby traffic policemen can give evidence by affidavit to save court appearances. We are also serving summonses on Government departments and semi-Government departments, as we have done in the past. These things have been done to free policemen for other duties. We are engaging cadets to release policemen from desk work. We investigated the possibility of replacing certain uniformed policemen in the traffic office, and the like, with civil servants. This was done in a number of cases. We then had objections from the union and there was a compromise. Nevertheless, quite a number of policemen were relieved of those duties.

The honourable member also mentioned murders. I do not want to delay the passage of this Bill, but I must correct some statements that were made—I would say irresponsibly made—by a responsible member of this House. The honourable member referred to a recent murder for which the criminal has not been brought to book. But how many murders have been committed in this State where the murderer has not been brought to book? I can recall only one. That is a very good record.

Mr. Jamieson: What about the young fellow at Fremantle a couple of years ago?

Mr. CRAIG: That is the one I have in mind—a seaman who was stabbed—and it is the only one I can recall in my time. This does reflect great credit on our Police Force, which I would say is second to none in Australia. The people of this State should be proud of this department.

As far as the jewellers are concerned, I have already made some comment on this matter. I might say they are coming to see me and the commissioner next week. The member for Swan referred to private police forces, which apparently he considers the jewellers want in order to overcome their problem. I do agree with the honourable member on this aspect; I would not consider a private police force; we would not have one in this State; but there is nothing to prevent these people from having their own security organisation. We do have private security organisations operating in this State, but we would not consider for a moment giving them full police powers.

Mr. Jamieson: They are in effect private police forces within their own confines.

Mr. CRAIG: Within their own confines, yes, but their powers are limited.

I do appreciate the comments of other members. I agree fully with the member for Fremantle. I know the difficulties that crayfishermen have in protecting the valuable equipment on their boats, and the proposed amendment does make provision for a penalty when such equipment is removed.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn made a good point in drawing attention to the fact that there are offences committed under two Acts; that is, the Police Act as far as the boats are concerned, and the Traffic Act as far as the trailers on which the boats are carried are concerned. The same thinking applies to the Police Act and the Criminal Code. The charges could be laid under the Criminal Code, but the process of justice is different, of course. However, I feel sure that the commissioner will take notice of the comment of the honourable member in this regard.

Finally, I again thank members for their support of the Bill, and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

KEWDALE LANDS DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th March.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [3.38 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, the Kewdale Lands Development Act was originally in the nature of an experiment, as the Minister indicated in his second reading speech. As far as I am able to judge, it has proved to be quite satisfactory. There were problems. Some of the land that was acquired was

at a higher cost than was anticipated and some of the development costs were a little higher. However, this was not unusual for the type of land that was taken over.

There are always problems when there is an indication that there is likely to be industrial development in an area, and this occurred in the Kewdale development area right back at the time when the late Gilbert Fraser was the Minister for Town Planning. As a result of the town planning scheme brought down many years ago during the Hawke Government's term of office, whenever there is any suggestion that an industrial complex will be set up anywhere there is a rush for land in the area.

Speculation was carried on, in the main, I think, by individual firms that were anxious to get hold of a piece of land so that in the ultimate they could expand and rearrange their activities in line with modern thinking. At that stage they were paying up to £1,000 an acre for land that one could swim on for half of the year, and feed animals on lush summer pasture for the rest of the year. It was planned to develop railway marshalling yards in the Kewdale development area, but this project was ultimately transferred, as you probably well know, Sir, and finally the area was reallocated to industrial development. This was a good example of how organised planning can aid the community.

I do not think anybody would argue against the need for organised planning, and we were fortunate to have a master plan which, no doubt, has been deviated from in many aspects since it was first proposed by Professor Stephenson. That master plan laid down guide lines for what should be done and what should not be done when developing areas of land for industry, housing, commercial purposes, and, indeed, recreation. So when the authority was created it had some background, which was a help, as a result of the original planning of the area.

The development of the area was carried out in concert with the local authorities which, in the main, have been able to provide service roads and assist with drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the development authority. Indeed, of late I think one of the engineers who formerly belonged to one of the local authorities concerned has been retained for this purpose by the Kewdale Development Authority.

This brings me to the point that it appears to me that the organisation which is proposed to be set up under this new legislation embracing the whole of the State would need far more than the supervision of the few men who are allocated to the present committee because of their positions in the Treasury Department, the

Lands Department, the Department of Industrial Development, and the like. I believe it will be a full-time job for not only an administrator but also some sort of essential committee to watch over this development. This will be a job that probably could be carried out in concert with the Town Planning Department, or an offshoot of the Town Planning Department. It will have to have a full-time staff which will, of necessity, have to be made up of good and efficient personnel.

If this is not done, the proposed Industrial Lands Development Authority could run into trouble if it was unable to attract the best personnel to development areas. So far the Kewdale Development Authority has been confined to certain areas which are probably well inside 1,000 acres in the Kewdale-Welshpool-Cloverdale area, but this will not be the case in future. The proposed authority will have responsibilities from Wyndham to Albany and Esperance, and these will require constant observation and service on the part of the staff of a department which will apply itself specifically to the task of looking after the requirements of industrial land in this State for the foreseeable future.

As it will be a department, I am sure we all want to know what sort of organisation the Minister proposes shall be at the head, other than the honorary committee, as it were, which will be the overall administering trustee authority. It is important that we have some idea of what the Minister proposes in this regard.

Are we to conceive that as well as the committee some other organisation will be set up to have a hand in the development of the areas? Apart from an engineer, who would be essential? Would that organisation have its own plant? Is it proposed that any such function should be the responsibility of this authority? If not, are we to expect that it will be the responsibility of the various local governing bodies?

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.7 p.m.

Mr. JAMIESON: Having dealt in general terms with the proposals, there are a few specific observations I want to make, because of the development that has occurred under the parent authority—as we may call the Kewdale Development Authority. I feel sure the Minister must have been alarmed when he read in this morning's newspaper a report that two or three organisations, including the Department of Civil Aviation, are moving in right alongside this area and more or less dictating what should be done.

The only fault I can find with this suggested proposal is that it may run—when it is not running in concert with the plans of the Town Planning Board—in opposition to the activities of the board in many ways and a little trouble could occur. Even at this juncture I would suggest that the Minister have a look at the proposals in and around this area, because he becomes

involved in it, and I asked him previously to give particular consideration to including another area, as all the activities of the Kewdale Development Authority have now been completely cut off. However, some airy-fairy town planner suggested that no access could be provided to it. That was the reason given for not proceeding with the proposal, and therefore another group of people on about 1,100 acres are left lamenting.

That tract of land is an excellent industrial development area which should be retained for selected industries. It could also suit the needs of the airport so that it need not even be bothered with the activities in the general area. The area to which I refer is right alongside the land which is the subject of the original Act and action should be taken whilst the present development is being made. The officers of the Town Planning Department who keep on insisting that access cannot be obtained to this land have rocks in their heads.

This land is extremely valuable. Even if it were necessary to give some authority to the Commonwealth Government to enable it to put an underway under the Guildford Airport runway, as was proposed, this would open up this area of 1,100 acres and it would be more than an economic proposition. There would be no problem whatsoever. The position is that those in authority are just not trying with this area of land. It is only seven miles from Perth. Part of it was the area that was under option to General Motors-Holden, and there is a good deal of other land available there. It would be a suitable industrial area, and I doubt whether it could be used for anything else. It certainly could not be retained for rural purposes because one cannot obtain a license to run pigs there now. Also, poultry farmers have transferred their operations to places further distant.

Further, the price of land has gone beyond that which one would expect to pay for rural land but not as high as for industrial land, this no doubt being due to the interest that speculators have shown in this land. Portions of many of the areas are used for market gardening, etc. This indicates that the land is fairly rural. That aspect should be taken into consideration, even if all this land will not be used for a long while. The Government should give a clear indication of its intention for the use of the land in this area. No useful purpose is served by leaving the matter in abeyance, because the land is too close to the city to be left as it is. It is very suitable for development as industrial land.

Let me now turn to the part of the legislation which I like. Even though members on this side are in the Opposition, you, Mr. Speaker, must appreciate that

we are pleased to be associated with various modes of socialistic legislation. When I first mentioned this matter to two or three people they came up with the view that it appeared to be socialism in practice. If ever there was socialism in practice, this one of creating an estate agency run by the State for the express purpose of dealing in industrial land is such a step.

I commend the Minister for Industrial Development on the step he has taken. I do not think he has taken a greater step into socialism than this one since he voted in favour of widening the functions of the State Government Insurance Office, even though that was on the direction of a former Speaker.

This makes me think that sometimes even Lang Hancock can be right, if I might be pardoned for using the expression. I well remember when he started *The Independent* he said that one of the reasons he had done this was to give him a say, because the Labor Party preached socialism and the Liberal Government practised it. He made some mighty comments in that newspaper. As each year passes we realise how well he was in command of the situation. However, I would be the last one to discourage the Government from proceeding with such a venture because of Hancock's reasoning. I think it is high time that such things as industrial land was orderly developed, because too often have members of Parliament been in strife with their electors as a result of piecemeal development of industrial land.

I think that orderly development of industrial land can only be achieved by a specific organisation which has as its purpose the safeguarding of the welfare of the people in regard to aesthetics, and to the prevention of nuisances from occurring, so that areas of land may be developed to fit in with the overall plan of development, not only for the metropolitan area but also the country urban areas as envisaged by the Bill.

Mr. Davies: What about the occasion when the creeping hand of socialism took over the Geraldton railway?

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes. The Midland Railway Company fell to the talons of socialism in that case, and I say that, too, was a mighty step. What concerns me is that this organisation is to become an estate agency, and it will not have any real opposition. If some party is looking for industrial land in the future, no doubt it will approach the Department of Industrial Development, which will direct this party to the authority set up under this legislation, to find out what is available before it approaches any private industrial landholders.

What I want to know is this: When this authority starts to accumulate funds beyond its requirements, how will the

money be diverted to the Treasury? There seems to be no machinery in the Bill by which the Treasury can obtain the excess funds. I know the Treasurer is interested in this aspect, and if there is an accumulation of funds in excess of what is required, he will want to get the money. The Bill empowers the Treasurer to invest the money and to do other things with it, but there is no power to enable him to take over any surplus funds. I envisage that this large organisation will deal in industrial land, and somewhere along the line it should have the right to pay its excess funds into Consolidated Revenue.

Sir David Brand: If ever such a delightful situation occurs—

Mr. JAMIESON: —the Premier will rush through an amendment.

Sir David Brand: That would cover the situation, but I can assure you there would be some intervention.

Mr. JAMIESON: This is an authority which will be empowered to acquire and develop industrial land. Under the proposal, land in the metropolitan area required for this purpose will be acquired under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act. As I understand the position, land outside the metropolitan area will be acquired under the Public Works Act for the purposes of public works. I think that is stretching the Public Works Act a little too far. I would far rather that this authority be given the power to resume land in its own name, subject to Government approval.

To suggest that land to be resumed for the purpose of industrial development is in any way a public work is well beyond my comprehension. It may be to the advantage of the public to have it done that way, but I do not think we can construe it to be in any way a public work—as in the case of land which is required for Government offices, for roads, to meet the needs of local authorities, or for reserves. When we stretch the powers of the Public Work Act to cover the acquisition of industrial land, it is taking things too far. No doubt it can be done legally, but we should be more specific. We should give the authority the right to acquire industrial land outside the metropolitan area under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act.

Now that we have an authority it is just as well to tie up the loose ends in one neat parcel instead of having to determine in the first place whether land to be resumed lies, say, within the boundary of the Serpentine Shire, so that a decision can be made as to the Act under which the resumption will be made. A further difficulty arises if the land proposed to be resumed lies within two shires; in that event part of the land might have to be acquired under the Public Works Act, and part of it under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act.

This seems to be an untidy way of achieving a worthy end. I suggest that such resumptions should be undertaken by this authority alone, subject to the usual safeguards. My leader will say that on such an occasion one necessary safeguard is the appointment of an ombudsman to ensure that everybody gets a fair deal.

I would say that, in the main, when land is resumed most of the parties concerned get a reasonable deal. Early in the negotiations somebody might be tossed around a little, and I find that on occasions a problem arises because some people do not realise there has to be a starting point, and there has to be an offer. In a proposal to buy something I do not suppose that the intending purchaser would offer the zenith; he would offer the minimum he is prepared to pay. In the main the people do not understand this system of bargaining and bartering; and they understand only the fixed prices shown on tags in the shops. When offers are made some of them become concerned, but generally when everything is reasoned out they receive a fair price. I agree with the comment of the Minister that as soon as land looks like changing from a rural classification to an industrial classification the sharks come in, and they create all the problems.

Of course, when one person gets a certain price, others in the same area are not only entitled to receive the same price, but should do so; and it is then too late to safeguard the situation for the future. That is why we must do it now. I can foresee that this authority may acquire a whole farming property at a place like Northam or Narrogin. This would be a sensible action. The purchase would not eat its head off because the property would remain there for use when required and could be leased in the meantime. This has not been done so far and this has been the problem in the near metropolitan area. When it is known that a certain firm desires to establish itself in a particular area those owning the land want to get a good cut out of the firm involved.

Most people look at the profits and balance sheets of these firms and are determined that they should get a dollar or two out of the sale of the land. Of course, those who have owned the property previously will pass the area later on and realise that is where their houses used to be and will be a little disgusted to feel that the land is then being used by the firms involved to make millions of dollars. That, of course, is a human attitude. We all adopt it. We own a home and we believe it should not be taken from us. If it is necessary that our home should be taken we feel we should get more than a fair price for it. As a matter of fact, sometimes exorbitant prices are demanded. However, in the main I believe that at

least a good replacement price for a property should be forthcoming without any argument at all, if it is necessary for the Government to resume it for industrial or any other development.

The Minister said that near the metropolitan area there are now not many sites of big acreages available, perhaps with the exception of the Kwinana area; that is, areas of 50 to 200 acres. He mentioned that this type of land was more readily available in other capital cities. However, he failed to mention, of course, that many of those sites available in the other capital cities are much further out even than they are here, although in some cases, of course, they may have better facilities in the way of sewerage services and so on. However, such areas are not readily available in any of the other capital cities.

A perusal of the weekend papers of the other capital cities does not indicate that industrial land is readily available. Not all of the advertisements include a price, of course, but those that do, indicate that the prices being asked are fairly comparable with what is being paid in the Kewdale area. We must bear in mind, of course, that Kewdale is only six miles from the city, but in the other capital cities at the present time such industrial land is only available at a much further distance from the city.

I believe it is most important that we should disperse our industrial activities. It is high time the Government made a real effort to encourage development north of the city. The situation is becoming completely lopsided. Our major sources of work are to the east and south of the city, but our biggest load of residential area is north of the city. This is creating the situation referred to by the Minister. Personnel are being involved in a long haul to their place of work.

I know it is not possible for all to live alongside the place where they work, but at least they should be able to live within a reasonable distance of it. However, unless some keen effort is undertaken to develop an industrial centre north of the city, things will get out of hand. Of course, I hope we do not have the same experience the Playford Government had in South Australia when it established a few industries in Elizabeth, but was unable to interest people in living in the town. However, the situation has sorted itself out somewhat now.

We did have much the same experience concerning the Kwinana complex when many of the Medina houses were vacant for quite a long time because people did not like to live in synthetic surroundings. However, after having had the experience of travelling long distances from their homes to their places of employment, the workers have now found it much more

convenient to live reasonably close to where they work rather than commute over long distances each day.

Therefore I hope that very soon some development is established north of the city. Indeed, I hope that some of the more noxious industries might be established in the hills in the electorate of the member for Darling Range, because such industries would worry very few people—probably only a few fruitgrowers in the nearby valleys, and such problems could be suitably overcome by the Government acquiring the orchards and vineyards so that such orchardists and vignerons would be kept happy, too.

This leads me to another problem of industrial development north of the city. It appears that the Lang Hancock organisation has had some 500 acres under option at Upper Swan near where the Caversham Road runs into the Great Northern Highway. If this development takes place, it might be the start of an industrial complex in that general area, and I cannot see why this should not take place. We must be sympathetic and assist the people who might develop industry to the north of the metropolitan area by providing some form of port facilities which I understand this particular group has been considering for some time in the region of Yanchep, or thereabouts. It is true that so far no success has been achieved. However, such development is far better than the concentration of industries in one area with their associated smog problems and so on. Once these industries are in a concentrated area, the smog is hard to dissipate and we would have all the difficulties which are associated with such problems.

No doubt as time passes we will find parts of this legislation wanting. However, I think that probably the orderly development of the industrial requirements of the State is the most vital consideration when we are applying ourselves to the legislation. We will not achieve orderly development if this legislation is not passed. The Minister has said that other forms of urban development should be left to look after themselves. However, if we do not have organised industrial development, we will find the whole harmonious concept will be spoilt and the comfort of the community, to which the Minister referred, will not be as it should be.

The Minister anticipates we will require over 2,000 new factories in the metropolitan area between now and 1980; that is, some 200-odd a year. This seems to be quite a large number. As a matter of fact, if you will allow me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I will digress for a moment to say that it seems we will be making more provision for areas for factories than for houses. However, that is a subject of another debate.

If we are to have these 2,000 new factories—some will be small, including all sorts of maintenance and ancillary factories and works associated with present industrial development—then, of course, this is the time we must take action to ensure such factories are comfortably housed in the community. We must do this for our own well-being.

The Minister mentioned that control of this development was necessary, and then he quickly corrected himself—I suppose because of his anti-socialistic mind—and he used the word “management.”

The Minister used the words “management” and “control.” I think the manager is in control of an organisation, and the management obviously would be in control of the situation in this instance. The Minister was only playing with words by using one or the other.

One final point I wish to make was drawn to my attention by local authorities. Local authorities have become somewhat concerned as they usually do when the Government sets up trusts which can resume land. The point I wish to raise is that of local authority rates.

The State Housing Commission does not pay rates on broad acres of land until it has held such land for two years. After two years it pays rates at the valuation applying to broad acres. If the land is subdivided into residential lots or business lots for the complex which is being developed, then the blocks immediately become subject to the local authority rates which apply to private residential lots. I understand that arrangement was arrived at because of some problems which occurred in the days when my colleague, the member for Balcatta, was the Minister concerned. Since that time the arrangement has gone along fairly smoothly and the broad-acre rates have been paid in lieu of what would have been the apportioned rates on the property.

The areas of Canning and Belmont, which have been associated with the Kewdale development, will not have any kick coming. Those local authorities should not want this provision applied, because it is obvious that the development will take place very quickly and the increased valuations will far more than offset the loss in the rates over the year or so during which the development and the sale of land takes place.

However, if the Government is to acquire land in the future then that land should be subject to rating. No doubt, land acquired in the country will be leased, but even if it is not leased and is held as a parcel of virgin bush, then some rates should be paid. The local authority should not be penalised.

If land was acquired for some future project in the Colle area then that local authority would be in trouble. It has already had enough trouble trying to pay

its way because of the Government-held reserves, both forestry and others, in the area. If a private farm were taken over it would cause embarrassment to the local authority's financial programme.

I suggest that the Minister look at the situation and give an assurance in Parliament that if the authority is to hold land for a long time, that land will be treated along the same lines as that held by the State Housing Commission. If a piece of land was to be developed and sold within a short period of time, I would not press for any action, but if the land is to be developed over a long time I feel that local authorities are entitled to receive rates in some form from the land being held. Obviously, the land will be sold at a future market price and the development authority will make sure that it recoups its outlay by loading the costs onto the sale value. Those costs could include the rates which were paid over a number of years.

I think the legislation is good, so far as it goes, for the orderly acquisition of industrial sites for future industries which might come to this State. We will have problems, as is always the case with legislation which gives the Government power to resume property. This is not a singular problem of the present Government; I think every Government has faced this problem since the railways started to move across America.

Governments are faced with the human frailty associated with the loss of land; and the problem of convincing people that they are receiving a fair price from the Government is in the hands of the administration and the administration officers. Those officers cannot give away money which the State cannot afford, but they should be encouraged to give reasonable, and better than reasonable, prices. If that is the case the Government will not have very much trouble.

Unfortunately, in the past there has been too much Government direction to the land resumption officers with regard to the maximum cost of the project. The officers are told that the maximum cost of the project is to be X number of dollars, and they must keep within that figure. Such directions have put the valuation officers, and others negotiating with individuals for the land, in the position where the valuations offered were not as reasonable as they should have been.

That is the difficulty which has to be overcome. If the land is to be sold for industrial purposes, then a fair price should be paid. I do not agree that the full industrial price should be paid for rural land but, as the Minister has agreed, a price somewhere between the two seems to be equitable.

If the authority moves in good faith, particularly in the country areas, and buys farms or orchards, there is no reason to pay any more than a just price for the

agricultural land it is securing. The authority should not be a Father Christmas to everybody; and, of course, if that was the case it would get nowhere and the Premier would for ever be needing to supply funds from the Treasury. I support the proposition.

MR. TOMS (Ascot) [4.37 p.m.]: I, too, want, very briefly, to support the proposition now before the House. The member for Belmont, who has just resumed his seat has given a rather wide coverage of the subject under discussion. He went right back to the start of the Kewdale development and gave a comprehensive history. I feel that most of the points touched on are salient and I would like to emphasise, perhaps, two in particular.

The first is, of course, that of town planning. When the authority does acquire land, either near the metropolitan area or in a distant country area, there will be a need for consultation so that the setting up of an industry in a particular area will not have an unsatisfactory effect on the residents.

It is apparent that one of the members of the committee will be the Town Planning Commissioner and this, in itself, will provide some safeguard in the positioning of industry. I feel that we are, perhaps, singularly fortunate that bigger mess-ups have not occurred in the metropolitan area, even though town planning is a comparatively recent innovation.

Several industries in the metropolitan area are situated where they should never have been allowed to start. The classic example is the Rivervale cement works which affects many suburbs within the environs of the factory.

On the whole, I believe Western Australia has been quite fortunate that there has not been more chaos in the positioning of industry in the metropolitan area. I hope this will prove to be the rule in country areas. Once industry is set up in country areas, we must expect development in the way of homes for the work force. Consequently, the positioning of the various industries will be very important.

The other point I wish to mention was made very well by the member for Belmont. I refer to dealings in respect of the acquisition of land. I hope that the powers of resumption conferred upon the Public Works Department will mean that people are treated very fairly and not in the way which applied, perhaps, to some of the earlier acquisitions of land along the Beechboro-Gosnells Highway when cheese-paring occurred and the people were offered ridiculous prices, as the member for Belmont mentioned.

I know of a New Australian who was offered a ridiculous price for a plot of land. I was afraid the Government of the day

would use that price which the person accepted as a lever against his fellow Australians.

Posterity must pay for a great deal of so-called progress and, as individuals, we must be prepared to play our part now. In the overall picture, however, we are doing only the spadework, and the generations to come will be those who will reap the benefits.

They are the only comments I want to make upon this Bill. I trust that everything will be in accord with the wishes of the Minister for Industrial Development. I do not agree with all he does from time to time, but I join with the member for Belmont on this occasion in saying how much I appreciate the socialist step which is being taken by this measure. My only hope is that he will have a few words with the Minister for Housing in the near future and perhaps be able to bring stability to that sphere. I support the Bill.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [4.43 p.m.]: I wish to pass a few brief remarks on the measure. Its title does not truly explain the purpose of the Bill or its implications.

The measure will have a wide application, not only to the metropolitan area but also to country areas. I do not have a copy of the Minister's second reading speech, but I took a few notes for my own benefit. It seems he is endeavouring to ensure that well located industrial land in Western Australia is available at reasonable prices. In company with other members on this side of the House I can say that I wish other Ministers were equally concerned about residential land being available at equally reasonable prices for an equally important—or even more important—and desirable purpose.

The Bill seeks to establish an industrial lands development authority which will have even wider powers than the Kewdale Lands Development Authority. I notice that areas outside the metropolitan area can be compulsorily acquired and, when and if the areas are acquired, I hope the Minister will bear in mind their location so far as residential areas are concerned. I hope that land acquired for proposed industries in the future will be better sited than industries in the metropolitan area. The prevailing winds which blow over the Kwinana industrial area carry various smells, dust, and fumes into the Medina-Calista area. These come from the superphosphate works, BP, Alcoa, the cement works, and the new nickel refinery, to mention just a few. Further north there is the power house, the abattoir, and a fellmonger.

Country areas are mentioned in the Bill, and the Minister again referred to them in his second reading speech. I hope that

industry in country areas is sited so that it will not cause the nuisance which it causes in and around the metropolitan area and, particularly, in the Cockburn electorate.

I have mentioned these instances to indicate the nuisance which industry can cause. With proper planning, I suggest that industry could have been located inland, instead of on the coast, and the housing areas I have mentioned could have been located on the coast, instead of being inland. This could apply to many industries with the exception of the power house, which needs circulating water to operate condensers and for cooling purposes. There may be other industries which require unlimited quantities of seawater for similar purposes, but, generally, industries could have been located inland allowing access to the coast through narrow corridors. These corridors could have provided access to the wharves, and discharge pipes, and so forth, could have been located in them.

If this had been undertaken, the thinly populated areas of the Darling Range would receive the fumes, dust, and smells to which I have referred. I ask the Minister to bear these things in mind when any land is acquired in and around the metropolitan area and in country areas.

To justify my submission, I shall mention the inconvenience in my own location. As members know, I live in Hilton Park and smoke and dust from the power house, as well as industrial smells, are blown into my locality. We are disturbed at night from the banging—for want of a better word—which comes from Rheems. A terrific noise is caused in the forging of tanks for underground petrol storage. When one has to put up with smoke and smells during the day and noise from industry at night, it does not take much imagination to realise it is not a very salubrious area in which to live.

Debates in *Hansard* record the objections I made to the establishment of an industry in the O'Connor area. The product manufactured by the company and the fumes from it were killing garden plants and shrubs. If the member for Geraldton were in the House he would recall the circumstances, because I remember he objected to the product because its fumes—even from an empty tank—killed the tomato crop in Geraldton. With the help of the Fremantle City Council I was eventually able to have that particular industry shifted.

Those remarks support my contention that the Minister must carefully select areas where the establishment of industry will not interfere with the residents.

At the intersection of Preston Point Road with Canning Highway, which commands a high position over the city and suburbs, one can see a blue haze which

is carried on the prevailing winds over Melville, East Melville and even into Perth itself.

The Fremantle area was mentioned by the Minister, but unfortunately I did not hear what he had to say. I got the impression that he said there were two industrial lots in the Fremantle area. Naturally, I am anxious to hear him elaborate further on that, because the Bill says in effect that these areas can be acquired, and so on. I want to ensure that, as Fremantle at present has only 6.9 square miles of rateable area because of land that is owned either by the Commonwealth or the State, no further encroachment is made on the area from which rates can be acquired. I have in mind legislation that was introduced to exempt Co-operative Bulk Handling from the payment of rates; it now pays a token amount in lieu of rates.

My concern with this legislation will be understood. In view of the comment by the Minister when he was introducing the Bill, I am endeavouring to obtain from him an assurance that there will be no repetition of the experience I have just mentioned, to the detriment of Fremantle. With these few reservations, I support the Bill.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.52 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the Bill. As could be expected, the members for Belmont and Ascot referred to this as socialistic legislation. I was only disappointed that the remarks were left until so late. We seem to agree on the principles involved in the Bill but I can assure the members the objectives of the Government in respect of this legislation are slightly different from what could be termed "socialistic" objectives. However, I thank the member for Belmont for his support and I also thank the members for Ascot and Fremantle for their comments.

I wish to deal first of all with the last point raised by the member for Fremantle. I cannot recall referring to any land we wanted to take over in Fremantle. The only thing I can recall is a passing reference to the prices at Fremantle and some other areas that I nominated.

Mr. Fletcher: I thought you said two lots.

Mr. COURT: I cannot recall referring to any specific lots in Fremantle, and I agree that the area is so small that any further encroachment would cause an irritation not only to the local member but also to the worthy mayor.

The member for Belmont, who has always taken an interest in this type of legislation and development, summarised the Bill extremely well and I am grateful to him for the considerable interest he has shown and the comments he has made

because I was very anxious that the Parliament should understand what was being attempted with this legislation. I can only repeat the assurance I gave; that it is the wish of the Government—as it would be, I am sure, of any succeeding Governments—to acquire land by negotiation rather than by resumption. However, I do not want to hide the fact that in an extreme case there is provision for resumption in respect of both metropolitan and country land.

The member for Belmont questioned the wisdom of including the resumption procedures under the Public Works Act. I point out to the House that the reference to this particular power is only “as if it were a public work”. It is not suggesting that this is a public work. In other words, some legal machinery has to be laid down and I think it has been generally accepted that it is better to have one resuming authority than to have a number of people applying different yardsticks and different techniques. It has been the practice, when resumption is required for a multiplicity of purposes, to use the Public Works Act machinery, which is fairly clearly understood.

I repeat, however, that in my experience the most desirable objective is negotiation. In most cases one can achieve a sensible arrangement. Occasionally one gets the odd case when somebody is not available, or people are stubborn, or they think that by holding out they can hold the Government or a project to ransom. Only then need the resumption machinery be used. The whole objective is to make land available to the *bona fide* industrialist and to avoid speculators getting land through the Government's development or redevelopment, as the case may be. In other words, we want to ensure that the land is directed to the purpose for which we intended it. By this means I am sure we can achieve the objectives referred to by the honourable member, to make it easier for industry and the community to live side by side.

I do not think we have done too badly in the metropolitan area, compared with some other cities, but there is always a chance to do better, and I think we are unanimous that where practicable through early planning we can make it possible for industry to live and work in harmony.

The question of town planning procedures is adequately covered. I would not like the impression to get abroad that this authority could make up its mind that it would rezone land and develop it on its own initiative. Quite apart from the fact that the Town Planning Commissioner is on the authority and would not stand for this, if one takes the parent Act and the amending Bills they provide for the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority machinery to be used in the case of metropolitan land, and for the general town planning machinery applicable to

the State to be used in other cases. There is no intention, nor is it possible, that the authority should ignore town planning procedures. If it wants some land zoned industrial, it will have to go through the proper machinery and it cannot by its own resolution cut across the town planning procedures.

The member for Belmont raised the question of staff, which is a very pertinent question. We have endeavoured to keep the staff to a minimum. There is always a tendency for “Parkinson” to walk the stage—

Mr. Jamieson: To take over.

Mr COURT: —and he can take over from the legislation and the Minister if we are not careful. However, we have endeavoured to keep this down to a minimum. We have been fortunate in having Mr. Jack Hodgson seconded from the Department of Industrial Development; he is available for full time management and secretarial duties at the moment, if required. We have also followed the procedure of using existing officers from the Department of Industrial Development and other specialist departments. As we reach out and go to the outer country areas more and more, we shall have to develop a skilled staff. I hope it will always be a compact staff and not just grow on itself, as so many departments do. In my experience, if there is a tight, dedicated, efficient staff, a better result is achieved.

The remarks of the honourable member regarding D.C.A.'s announcement and Newburn have been noted. I have always been interested in this Newburn area and, as the honourable member knows, I was very anxious that it should be incorporated into our original design; but technical and professional objections ruled against it and to date we have had to accept the fact that it is outside the Kewdale development area. However, the point made by the honourable member will be followed up.

I think there is a great deal of merit in this area being controlled to the extent that we do not allow industries there that would be incompatible with aviation activities and vice versa. However, there are industries that could exist right under the aircraft path, for that matter, and not be affected because of the type of noise and type of work that goes on within the industry. I cannot give any undertaking about it, but I will have it re-examined.

The honourable member raised a further point concerning the accumulation of funds. It will be a grand, glorious, and happy day if this authority ever finishes up in a situation with much money after it has done its work. I think the present machinery provides safeguards, because it will be noted that in the financial clauses of the Bill it is stated that the funds have

to be applied by way of temporary investment as directed—not as authorised, but as directed—by the Treasurer, who has a representative on this authority. However, when mention is made of having surplus funds for distribution and payment back to the Treasury, I think it will be like the boy who was asked for the core of his apple and he said, “There ain’t going to be no core.” As I see it, the work of the fund will never end, particularly as we are now expanding into regional and provincial areas.

A query was raised regarding the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act and its continuation. When the Bill was first under consideration I suggested that it might be a good time to get rid of the old legislation; that is, the three Acts referred to in my speech notes. However on reflection it became apparent that it may be desirable, at least for the time being, to keep the old legislation current. We still have some land which is dedicated under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act. That Act has special provisions concerning the leasing, mortgaging, and selling of land, which have to be authorised by the Minister. Therefore, of course, speculation is prevented.

Some of this land will not come within development schemes and, therefore, it will have to be dealt with in isolation; that is, land which is, in the main, already dedicated for industrial purposes as well as being dedicated under the Act. I can also foreshadow a situation where by the effluxion of time—and we are not legislating only for today and tomorrow—we could have the position where an area like Kewdale, or another development area, was complete—fully sold, fully developed, and in its proper use—and then through a set of changing circumstances some of this land could become available again. An industry might cease to be economic through a change in techniques and so on; and it could be possible that the land would temporarily come back into the hands of the Government through the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act. In those circumstances it would be very desirable to have the Act still available. However, I might be looking too far ahead and it may be that after a few years we shall find it is necessary to wind up the old legislation.

A reference was made to development north of the city. I agree that it is time we started to get more industry north of the city. There are one or two locations that I, personally, would like to see developed. I would like to see a balanced type of industry north of the city and, here again, having control of some areas means that we can influence and encourage the right type of industry to establish, having regard to communal interests and the type of nearby residential development.

The honourable member touched on urban land and, as I mentioned in my second reading speech, this is something that is the subject of a separate consideration by the Minister concerned and is hardly appropriate at the moment.

The honourable member made a further point regarding the early acquisition of rural land, and I entirely agree with him. There are times when we could go in and acquire a farm in a regional area that is on the market at a reasonable price and then, because we have purchased the land prematurely and might not need it for five or 10 years, according to the local demand, it could be leased back. This is a practice that has been followed on quite a few occasions not only in respect of farm land, but also other land. The approach suggested by the honourable member is a practical one.

The last note I have here concerns the question of local authority rating. I cannot give the categorical assurance sought by the honourable member. I appreciate the merit of the case he put forward, and I appreciate the irritation to local authorities. If, as he suggested, we could be sure that redevelopment or development, as the case may be, was going to be undertaken immediately, then there is no reason to have any rating provisions because the shire would very quickly obtain the benefit of much higher rating values from the redevelopment to be undertaken.

However where the land is to remain in the hands of the authority for some years, the situation is different. I can only undertake to discuss the matter with the Treasurer to see whether we can work out some understanding; because it can be a heavy burden to a local authority if, through fortuitous circumstances, we acquire 2,000 acres in a shire and, because it was Government land, it ceased to be ratable. I assure the honourable member that I will have a look at the matter and endeavour to make some comments while this session is still current.

I think I mentioned this when I introduced the Bill, and I want to say it again because there appears to be some misunderstanding. The land to be developed by this authority will not be the only industrial land available. It could very easily be that a number of industrial estates in their own right will be developed. If somebody comes up with a plan to develop, say, 1,000 acres, or 500 acres, as the case may be, in his own right—such as the Sorrento-Mullaloo plan—this would be preferred by the Government.

This could still happen because industrial land has a number of peculiarities. For instance, there are certain lands where we can have light industries, such as clothes-making, and that type of thing, and these need to be established in a certain type of locality; whereas in another

locality there would be land where we can have a heavy industry. I can foresee a situation where there could be a number of industrial estates developed privately to a predetermined plan approved by the local authorities and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. These would be private developments and we would not want to get involved in them. We want to be able to get ahead of the developments and get industrial land located in proper relationship to residential areas.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Williams) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

Mr. JAMIESON: I would like the Minister to give an undertaking that a printed consolidation of this Act will be available at an early date after it has been assented to by the Governor. As the Minister will appreciate it is a ridiculous situation when a member is checking up on an Act of Parliament and reads the original Kewdale Lands Development Act and its amendments and then has to chase up the Industrial Lands Development Authority Act. This legislation may be used by people at an early date if the authority starts to move in various spheres. This matter is not important but if it is not noted at the time it could become more complicated when people try to read one Act into the other.

It would be far better if a new print of the Act were made, and I am sure, if the Minister makes a note of it now and gives us some sort of indication of the Government's intention with regard to it, we, and others who need it will be able to obtain possession of a consolidated copy of the Act after assent has been given to this Bill.

Mr. COURT: I am only too pleased to give the assurance the honourable member seeks. I will confer with my colleagues on the matter. I realise that as this Act will now have State-wide application it will be of greater interest than the specialised Kewdale Lands Development Act.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 11 put and passed.

Clause 12: Amendment to section 8—

Mr. TONKIN: This clause, in certain circumstances, provides for compulsory resumption of land. This causes me to wonder why the Government is taking power to resume land compulsorily for industrial purposes when it is so reluctant to resume land for public purposes. I

am led to believe that the chief opponent of the resumption of land for school sites is the Minister for Industrial Development. This means that the Government is acquiring land for schools at about \$800 to \$900 per acre, whereas it will acquire land for industrial purposes at less than \$1,000 per acre.

The figures relating to the acquisition of land at Kwinana, which were given to me today, indicate that land there was acquired—as far as my memory goes—for about \$800 to \$900 per acre. Yet school sites are being purchased by the Government for approximately \$8,000 to \$9,000 per acre. This means that the Minister for Education is obliged to use a large proportion of his funds before he begins to place a building on the site.

Under the administration of this Government there has been a tendency for large businesses to be made larger, and if there are little businesses in the way, they are closed. If requested, I could give several instances. I have in mind some businesses situated in the Rockingham district. They are quite good businesses, built up from practically nothing, but smallish. However, they had to go in order to make way for the larger businesses.

As far as I can see there is not much protection for the little fellow, and if the Government decides it will acquire areas for the establishment of large businesses, the small businesses will go by the board. Some people will argue that this is inevitable because it is progress and the little fellow has to put up with it. That is not my philosophy. I do not think we should close some businesses in order to make way for large businesses unless there is no satisfactory alternative.

I hope that in the administration of this Act due regard will be had for the interests of the small man to the same degree as it is given to the big man. I hate to see small businesses put out of existence because the Government is preparing the way for some larger businesses to take over subsequently. That is the concern I have in connection with this proposal. I can see it is desirable to have power to acquire land as industrial sites to ensure, as far as possible, that industry shall be grouped in the proper places, like industry with like, and unless there is some compulsory power this purpose cannot be adequately achieved. Nevertheless, I see danger in the proposal and I am bound to express my concern in view of what I know has happened in the past.

Mr. COURT: I have no knowledge whatsoever of how the Leader of the Opposition gets the idea that I am the one who opposes the resumption of land for school sites.

Mr. Jamieson: There must be a leak in the Cabinet.

Mr. COURT: From time to time the Leader of the Opposition gets the most extraordinary information. The simple fact is that he has really pulled a boner on this occasion. As a matter of fact, the best way to acquire school sites is to follow the same course as will be followed with this type of development; that is, to get ahead of the field, so that when the time comes to develop the land it is already in possession of the Government.

Mr. Tonkin: That is not what you are doing. You are allowing subdivision of land to take place.

Mr. COURT: We are thinking of the future. If the Leader of the Opposition is dealing with a few isolated instances at the moment, I must plead not guilty, and, in any event, those concerned would not take any notice of me if I said they were not to acquire the land for schools. If they wanted the land for schools they would buy it.

As I said before, the question of urban land is another matter altogether, being the subject of consideration by the Government, and the Minister for Town Planning and Local Government will be introducing legislation in that regard in due course. Therefore, I think we will deal with urban land at the appropriate time. I do not want to get it confused with industrial land, because they are two distinct issues and the less we get them confused the better.

The Chamber has accepted the general principle that what we seek to do here is desirable. The only point I want to mention in reply to the Leader of the Opposition is that I am not quite sure about the land he referred to as being purchased at \$800 an acre. If he is referring to the answer he obtained today, what he says is not correct.

Mr. Tonkin: That is what it works out at.

Mr. COURT: I think the thoughts of the Leader of the Opposition and mine are at cross purposes, if it is the same question about which I am thinking. The other day the Leader of the Opposition asked for some information regarding money that had been outlaid by the Government. In answering his questions, the officers thought the Leader of the Opposition was referring to the amount of money that had been paid by the Government, and therefore the answer was that the cost to the Government was nil. In my answer today I explained that in the early part of the project some money had been paid by the Government for a deposit and some for actual acquisition, but this represented only a small part of the total outlay.

Mr. Tonkin: It was 140 acres was it not?

Mr. COURT: This was the total amount of land acquired under the system employed. However, if the answer is still ambiguous I would like the Leader of the Opposition to let me know what he wants.

Mr. Tonkin: I want an answer to the question I put on the notice paper.

Mr. COURT: We have given the Leader of the Opposition the answer, because the cost of land to the Western Mining Corporation was well over \$1,000,000, but we did not handle all the purchase money.

Mr. Tonkin: You did not tell me the total amount of land acquired. You told me the amount of land you acquired, for which you did not receive the money in advance—

Mr. COURT: I think the Leader of the Opposition had better frame another set of questions, or let me frame them for him.

Mr. Tonkin: Oh, yes, and give you a Roman holiday!

Mr. COURT: No; so that the Leader of the Opposition will obtain a true interpretation of the position. The fact is that we had no money and it suited us for the company to put the money up and to pay for the land direct. It cost the company a great deal more than if we had been able to purchase the land on the open market, especially when people knew that we wanted it for industrial development.

However, that is not the subject of argument. I would like to feel that the honourable member has the right impression of the cost of that land.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th March.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.21 p.m.]: The Bill before the House, which is quite short in content, seeks to amend the Anzac Day Act which was enacted in 1960 and subsequently amended in 1964. Very briefly, the 1960 Act was brought into operation for the purpose of regulating the holding of public entertainment, and particularly of extending the right to persons to enter hotels during certain specified hours on Anzac Day. The revenue which is derived from persons who pay for the right to enjoy public entertainment, and from the right to sell and to consume liquor on this day, is paid into a trust fund. From

this trust fund the trustees are authorised to expend moneys for the benefit of ex-servicemen who have served in a theatre of war, and their dependants.

The governing section of the principal Act relating to the extension of benefits accruing in this fund is section 10. It provides that for an ex-serviceman and his dependants to qualify in this regard, the ex-serviceman must have served in a war in which Her Majesty or the Commonwealth was, or is, engaged. It is a question of constitutional law, and also a question of international understanding, when a state of war is, in fact, declared; or when a state of war is deemed to be in operation.

In the case of Australia it has always been the procedure that when the country is at war a proclamation to this effect is issued by the Governor-General. However, we have had examples of Australian servicemen serving in areas of conflict not covered by proclamation. I would give as examples the entry of Australian soldiers into the conflicts in Malaya and Malaysia in the 1950s, and also during that period the entry of Australian forces into the conflict in Korea; and in recent times, since 1962, the commitment of Australian soldiers in Vietnam. Notwithstanding the declaration made by the late Prime Minister (The Hon. Harold Holt) in speaking in terms of the Vietnam commitment that Australia was, in fact, at war, legally Australia was not at war at all. There was no declaration, and no proclamation has been issued by the Governor-General of Australia. So the trustees of the fund have been unable to extend the benefits accruing in the fund to ex-servicemen who have been involved in these overseas conflicts in Malaya, Malaysia, Korea, and Vietnam, or to their dependants.

While some people and some communities in other parts of the world have strongly dissented from the *factum* of having Australian soldiers involved in the commitment in Vietnam, I do not think anyone would take the view that the ex-servicemen who have been involved in this and similar areas, and their dependants, should be deprived of any benefits flowing from the trust fund created by the principal Act which might be made available to them.

So, on behalf of the Opposition, I would indicate that the amendment in the Bill to provide that the trustees may extend the benefits under the Act to persons who have served in a theatre of war or in a prescribed area meets with our approval. The principle of the amending Bill is that section 10 is to be amended to provide that the benefits of the Act may be extended to ex-servicemen who have served in an orthodox theatre of war—that is, an area which has been involved in war

as proclaimed by the Governor-General of Australia—and in areas to be proclaimed, and also extended to their dependants. The Bill then provides for regulations to be made whereby these areas may from time to time be included. On behalf of the Opposition I indicate our support of 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.

House adjourned at 5.29 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 24th March, 1970

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (22): ON NOTICE

1. LANDS

Ownership of Pastoral Leases in North-West

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many pastoral leases in the Kimberley area have changed ownership in the past six years?
- (2) How many companies in that time have taken over more than one station in group ownership?
- (3) Will the Minister provide a list of the properties which have changed ownership during the past six years, giving the names of the former owners, and the names and addresses of the present owners or shareholders?
- (4) In cases where share transfers or share participation is involved in the ownership of pastoral leases, has any check been made to ensure that there are no dummy shareholders?
- (5) Where sales have taken place, what tests or examinations are made to ensure that equity participation conforms with the provisions of the Land Act as interpreted in regard to million acre ownership restrictions?
- (6) On what grounds was the request of the Roy Hill Pastoral Company to sell to a family group interest, refused?
- (7) Can this refusal be justified when there appears to be no limits imposed on companies such as Australian Land and Cattle Company?