

GRAIN POOL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 16th August, on the following motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HALL (Albany) [9.22 p.m.]: The measure before the House is not very large and seeks to make an amendment to the 1932-61 Grain Pool Act. How this matter was overlooked previously, I am at a loss to understand. If the Act is followed through from its beginning it will be realised that the trustees are definitely entrusted with considerable wealth and the destiny of a very strong organisation.

I feel no qualms about agreeing to the amendment, but I do consider the legal fraternity must have been soundly asleep when the measure was being considered. I do not see any reason for opposing the Bill, and therefore support it.

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.

SUPERANNUATION AND FAMILY BENEFITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 16th August, on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [9.26 p.m.]: Last year Parliament passed a Bill to enable the Government, in the name of the State, to subsidise the fund in respect of those civil servants who are not eligible to belong to the Superannuation and Family Benefits Fund but who are eligible to belong to a provident fund set up under the provisions of the Act.

This Bill has become necessary because the amending Bill passed last year did not lay down anything in regard to retrospectivity. It has been found in the meantime that last year's Bill would have application only to those who joined the provident fund from the beginning of this year. There are some 20 persons who were in the service before that time and who are affected, and this Bill proposes to provide legislative authority for the Government,

in the name of this State, to subsidise the provident fund in regard to those employees.

Clearly the Bill is in every way deserving, and it is the intention of all members on this side of the House to support it.

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 9.30 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 29th August, 1962

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| QUESTIONS ON NOTICE— | |
| Conditional Purchase Blocks : Forfeiture and Reallocation | 722 |
| Housing at Esperance : Purchase and Rental Homes | 722 |
| Housing for Natives : Provision on Norseman Reserve | 722 |
| Infective Hepatitis at Norseman : Report of Medical Department Team | 723 |
| Main Roads Department : Work on Coolgardie-Norseman and Norseman-Esperance Roads | 723 |
| BILLS— | |
| Amendments Incorporation Act Amendment Bill : Returned | 732 |
| Associations Incorporation Act Amendment Bill : Returned | 732 |
| BP Refinery (Kwinana) Limited Bill : 3r. Building Societies Act Amendment Bill : Returned | 732 |
| Business Names Bill— | |
| Com. | 733 |
| Report | 734 |
| Cemeteries Act Amendment Bill— | |
| 2r. | 734 |
| Com. | 735 |
| Report | 735 |
| Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill : 3r. | 724 |
| Grain Pool Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Receipt ; 1r. | 732 |
| Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Bill— | |
| 2r. | 724 |
| Com. | 730 |
| Report ; 3r. | 732 |
| Law Reform (Statute of Frauds) Bill— | |
| Receipt ; 1r. | 732 |
| Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Receipt ; 1r. | 732 |

CONTENTS—continued

| BILLS—continued | Page |
|---|------|
| Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Receipt ; 1r. | 732 |
| Reprinting of Acts Authorisation Act Amendment Bill : Returned | 732 |
| Superannuation and Family Benefits Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Receipt ; 1r. | 732 |
| War Service Land Settlement Scheme Act Amendment Bill : 3r. | 723 |
| ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE : | |
| SPECIAL | 735 |

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HOUSING AT ESPERANCE

Purchase and Rental Homes

1. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:

How many Housing Commission homes for purchase or rental—

- (a) were built at Esperance during the last financial year; and
- (b) is it intended to build at Esperance during the current financial year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Five houses were erected.
- (b) Nine.

HOUSING FOR NATIVES

Provision on Norseman Reserve

2. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it proposed to carry out a building programme at the Norseman native reserve for the provision of housing for native families?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) when is it contemplated that a start will be made; and
 - (b) what type of housing will be provided?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) Subject to the necessary finance being available it is planned to erect, during the current financial year, three two-roomed and four three-roomed cottages grouped around the existing communal facilities on the camping reserve. In addition it is planned to erect one five-roomed self-contained house on the housing reserve. All buildings will be steel-framed sheet metal construction and will have concrete floors.

CONDITIONAL PURCHASE BLOCKS

Forfeiture and Reallocation

3. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:
 - (1) On being allocated a conditional purchase block, what is the order of priority of improvements to be carried out by the lessee?
 - (2) Have any conditional purchase leases been forfeited during the period from the 1st January, 1958, to present date for—
 - (a) non-compliance with the stipulated conditions; or
 - (b) contravention of subsection (2a) of section 143 of the Land Act which came into operation on the 6th October, 1960?
 - (3) As applications for conditional purchase blocks are always in excess of those available for selection—
 - (a) is a close scrutiny maintained to ensure that the lease requirements are being carried out; and
 - (b) are forfeitures being enforced?
 - (4) (a) How many blocks have returned to the Crown as a result of forfeiture; and
 - (b) How many of these have been reallocated in the period referred to in No. (2) above?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) The lessee—
 - (i) shall provide an adequate water supply within the first two years of the term of the lease, if required by the Minister to do so;
 - (ii) shall expend in prescribed improvements an amount equal to one-fifth of the purchase money in every year of the first ten years thereof, and shall fence in at least one-half of the land within the first five years and the whole of the land during the said period of ten years. Provided, however, that if the purchase money exceeds two pounds per acre, the purchase money shall be deemed to be two pounds per acre for the purpose of improvements, if the Minister in his discretion so directs; and
 - (iii) shall, in addition, comply with any particular requirements as to improvements and the value or quantity thereof as the Governor may specify in the notice declaring any particular lands as open for selection. This applies principally to

special settlement lands where special improvement conditions appertain and vary in nature and effect according to the locality in which such lands are situated.

- (2) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (3) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (4) (a) For the period the 1st January, 1958, to the 29th August, 1962, a number of 773.
- (b) Except for a very small proportion withheld for public purposes the whole of these blocks have been, or will be, reallocated.

MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Work on Coolgardie-Norseman and Norseman-Esperance Roads

4. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

What work is contemplated by the Main Roads Department in the 1962-63 works programme in connection with the—

- (a) Coolgardie-Norseman; and
- (b) Norseman-Esperance roads?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Coolgardie-Norseman: 104 miles.

Reconstruction and widening of various sections to a sealed width of 20 ft. Some 6.4 miles will be dealt with including the rail crossings at Higginsville (1) and nearer Norseman (2). Some of the sharper curves and crests will be dealt with. Some widening of seal in Widgiemooltha town is also proposed.

- (b) Norseman - Esperance: 127 miles.

Shoulder improvements by gravelling 6 ft. each side are proposed between Esperance and Shark Lake. Funds available: £5,000.

In addition to the above road works, increased shoulder maintenance is proposed. Maintenance improvements involving grading of shoulders, clearing for visibility on curves and widening of cuttings on some crests is at present in progress.

New standard warning and direction signs are being erected as required, and the white lining of some of the sharper crests will be carried out at an early date.

INFECTIVE HEPATITIS AT NORSEMAN

Report of Medical Department Team

5. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) As Professor Stanley and Dr. Joske, a Medical Department team, visited Norseman early this year to carry out certain investigations and examinations in connection with the incidence of infective hepatitis at that centre, will the Minister advise whether their report has been released?

- (2) If so, what are their findings?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Investigation of material collected at Norseman early in the year involves special and protracted laboratory procedures, which are not yet complete.
- (2) The provisional findings suggest that whereas the 1958 outbreak was probably infective hepatitis, the recent outbreak was a different disease associated with a member of the ECHO virus group, on which studies are proceeding.

BP REFINERY (KWINANA) LIMITED BILL

Third Reading

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

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [4.41 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

I have some figures which I have been able to obtain and in which I think the House might be interested; because they apply to settlers who have left their properties. Forty-one early settlers on acquired properties have voluntarily sold their leases at prices ranging from £1,500 to £37,000; these prices being for the leasehold bare. These leases were all voluntarily sold. Six project settlers have voluntarily sold their leases bare at prices ranging from £8,750 to £15,000. Six settlers have sublet their properties at rentals ranging from £912 to £1,750 per annum, with an option to purchase at amounts from £16,000 to £32,000. The rentals payable to the department on these leases range from £115 to £220 per annum.

Five lessees have sublet their farms, without an option to purchase, for annual rentals ranging from £1,400 to £2,250. The

annual rentals due to the department on these farms range from £115 to £227. In 12 cases settlers have been forced to sell by the department, and only four of them have been unable to do so at some profit to themselves.

I thought those figures would be interesting to members, and that it would be a good idea to have them on record. Of those who have disposed of their leases most have done so on a voluntary basis, and only 12 have been forced off by the department; and even out of those 12 only four have not been able to show some profit for themselves. They are really interesting figures.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FIREARMS AND GUNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [4.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [4.44 p.m.]: Unfortunately, I was not able to be present last night when the Bill was read a second time; because I wanted to make a few remarks in regard to the section of the Act which this Bill seeks to amend. On looking at the penalties for offences under section 12 of the principal Act, which is contained in vol. 9 of the reprinted Acts, I find the penalties are only £10. The majority of these penalties were inserted in the Act some years ago when £10 was worth quite a bit more than it is today.

Because of the danger there is to the general public, stock, and so on, I view with real alarm the fact that a person can discharge a firearm on a public road. Take the Great Northern Highway, the Great Eastern Highway, the Great Southern Highway, and the South-West Highway, as examples. A person who discharged a firearm on those highways would be a definite menace because of the number of people travelling over those highways these days. A person who discharges a firearm on any public highway and who can get away with a £10 fine, even if his gun is confiscated and his license taken away, is getting out of it very lightly; and I suggest that the department have another look at the penalties mentioned on page 10 of the Act with the idea of reviewing them and increasing them at the next session of Parliament.

After all, the £10 penalty is the maximum; and there is no reason why the maximum should not be increased so that a magistrate can use his discretion and take into account the danger caused by a person

when he discharges a firearm in any particular area. I know from personal experience that many people use firearms on public roads without the least thought of the danger they are to others. There is not only the danger to somebody using the roads, but there is also the danger of somebody on adjacent properties being on the receiving end of a bullet. I have had experience on my own property of these indiscriminate shooters shooting at everything they see, and it is high time the penalties were increased in an effort to deter people from indiscriminate shooting. With those few words I support the third reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

IRON ORE (MOUNT GOLDSWORTHY) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 28th August, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North) [4.48 p.m.]: This Bill has reached a most interesting stage in that after all the academic discussion we had upon it last night it would appear, from information that I have received from my leader, that we have found a way whereby the measure can proceed smoothly, and whereby the principle embodied in the Constitution of Parliament will be adhered to. Because of that I think we can carry on with the second reading debate and discuss the various aspects of the measure.

Point of Order

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I think, before I can allow this Bill to be debated, I should have an assurance that it is either to be accompanied by another Bill authorising the construction of the railway, or that some suitable amendment will be made to it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, with the greatest respect, I fail to see how you are in a position to ask for an assurance that another Bill will accompany this one at this stage of the proceedings. Nevertheless, when I get an opportunity to reply to the debate, I will tell the House that another Bill will be presented; but it certainly will not accompany this Bill, and neither is there any necessity for it to accompany this Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am wondering whether the Minister might prefer to tell the House, as a point of information, what he intends to do. It would clear the atmosphere and would make for a more

harmonious debate. I am sure he would find the House ready to support him in that direction.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will be very pleased to do that. I sought the advice of my Crown Law advisers this morning on the points taken last night in relation to the decision which you gave, Sir, and I naturally find myself in the position that I should—and I intend to—accept the decision of the House in the matter while still retaining my own convictions which, I am sure, you will permit me to do.

Nevertheless I am quite prepared to accede to the decision of the Legislative Council in order to get over the difficulty in which we find ourselves. Will members be good enough to refer to the Bill and turn to page 2? I hope I am not going too far in giving this explanation, Mr. President, but it is necessary.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I think it is necessary, Mr. Minister, and I am prepared to give you the consideration you seek.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When the Bill is being considered in Committee, I propose to add after the word "law" in subclause (2) of clause 3, words which will have the effect of making this clause read as follows:—

Notwithstanding any other Act or law, but subject to the provisions of Section 96 of the Public Works Act, 1902, being complied with in respect of the railway to be constructed under the Agreement, the Agreement shall be carried out and take effect subject to its provisions, as though those provisions had been expressly enacted in this Act.

I took the course of conveying this intended move to the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the day, and at the same time I told him that the railway Bill would follow the introduction of this measure. You will forgive me if I became a little alarmed when you, Mr. President, said I would have to give an assurance that the railway Bill would accompany this Bill. That is a practical impossibility. The company, in conforming with the rule of the Legislative Council, made last night, has immediately set about to define the railway route and to confer on the terms of the agreement with me as the responsible Minister to find a route which would be mutually agreed upon.

I am afraid that when the Bill comes to Parliament I will have to ask for a fairly wide variation, because, as I said last night, it is quite difficult at this stage to determine just where this railway is going to be. Nevertheless, if Parliament will agree to a fairly wide variation under the Public Works Act and it is found after getting the matter under way that the

Bill does not suit the purpose, then there is only one other course open to me and that is to come back with another railway Bill seeking to amend the first Bill. If that course does have to be adopted, I would like it to be appreciated that every effort will be made to ensure that the Bill will be introduced in the current session of this Parliament.

Members—particularly Mr. Wise and Mr. Willesee with their knowledge of the country—will know that this will be quite a difficult matter. Nevertheless, the best possible job will be made of it. It will be my desire to present a Bill to Parliament which is sincere in its approach and not merely an excuse to fulfil the instruction of the Legislative Council in this regard. If the House will accept the assurance that the Bill will follow, then I think we can carry on and do the important thing; that is, ratify this agreement knowing that the Bill to authorise the railway will follow.

The railway Bill is a separate entity and not something that must accompany this iron ore Bill on the same day or the next day, or even within a certain number of days. The House has the knowledge that the railway Bill will be brought down in conformity with section 96 of the Public Works Act, although it is debatable in some legal minds as to whether this is necessary. However, I repeat my assurance; and I hope that this explanation will be satisfactory to the Legislative Council, and that we will be allowed to proceed with the passage of this Bill.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Thank you. I have no doubt that the assurance which the Minister has given is in conformity with the motion as agreed to by the House last night, and the second reading debate will proceed forthwith.

Debate Resumed on Motion

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: In the first instance, I think that any fair-minded person—and particularly the representatives of the area—would applaud the fact that some use is being made of a material which has lain dormant in the ground for so many years. Had the Commonwealth Government maintained its action of not allowing export of this ore, it could possibly have lain there until a time when iron ore was of no value in world commerce.

This agreement means much to the area of Pilbara. Not only will it create great activity within the province itself, but it will be a further progressive step towards Western Australia becoming known internationally, because this commodity will be sold on an international basis and will be produced by an international company. The project will bring to the area itself an immediate population, and with that population will come new townships which are so badly needed in this area, about which we read so often, because of its sparse population.

I congratulate the Joint Venturers on being the successful tenderers; and I hope their life span as a joint company will be a long and progressive one in that area. I feel sure that the diamond drilling that has taken place up to date is only the fore-runner of much more diamond drilling; and I am confident that there will be found a great deal more tonnage at depth than is required by this Bill.

The problems associated with the development of this project are very great; and it is fitting that there should be, at the end of the rainbow as it were, favourable results which should prove very great to the investors. I had great sympathy with the Minister when he referred to the simple fact of constructing a railway from point A to point B, particularly when we know that there are five immediate problems which have to be overcome; and I refer to the crossing of rivers in the course of that construction—rivers that have never been associated with the problem of railway construction. Who knows that with all the emphasis we lay upon a railway it may yet be found feasible to introduce low-level crossings and perhaps heavy transport on a main road or highway. That statement may not be as silly as it sounds, despite the fact that at the moment we are discussing a future railway.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not silly at all.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: This is a virgin area, and experts who come into the field may find something we have not thought about that would be the most economic in the end result. The same thing applies with regard to a jetty. It is probably a simple thing to design one and, with engineering experience, build it for a given amount of money; but when one deals with water as an obstruction in a given situation, one cannot forecast what the result might be.

To briefly diverge, the siltation from the Ord River scheme is assuming greater proportions as the scheme develops. The newly-proposed extension of the jetty at Derby also poses a fresh engineering problem—again, that of siltation. Therefore, the company has these problems to face, as well as having the obligation of producing a consistent tonnage of ore and the responsibility of building the townships that go with the signing of this agreement.

Therefore, it would be churlish not to wish it the utmost success; not to congratulate the Government on the success that has come its way; and for me not to hope as a private member in that area that the success is continued for a long period of years. I hope the project will result in the building of a community that will become integrated with the north-west; one that will become associated with its problems; and one that will further the population of that area.

If I have any regrets at all they would be that the townships will not be built on the same basis as they are in other areas of the State. However, I accept this: That it is an unusual area and unusual things must be done. At the moment we enjoy a geographical situation in regard to world markets which may not exist forever. Therefore, I sincerely applaud this venture and hope the company is successful, because in its success lies the success of that area.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [5.4 p.m.]: I am pleased that this project is to be established. I am familiar with part of that country as I have worked there in the past. Therefore, I know the problems that will have to be faced in the building of a railway in that area due to willy-willies and the heavy run of some of the rivers. I have seen the Gascoyne, the Ashburton, and many other rivers, and the volume of water that comes down is terrific. In addition, this water comes from miles and miles away and sweeps everything in front of it. Therefore, the building of the railway is going to present a problem.

I am pleased to know that it is the intention of the Minister to introduce a further Bill when it becomes necessary.

We have been trying to dispose of our iron ore for many years but we were unable to do so until the present time. It is just as well, because the time has arrived when, if we do not do something with the iron ore in this area and increase the population of those parts, we may lose the area altogether to some foreign country. Foreign people are close to our shores; and Australia is a very rich country and underpopulated. We must remember that with modern air travel Western Australia is only a few hours away from some foreign countries.

I am pleased with the steps that have been taken in regard to this agreement. I hope, however, we do not dispose of larger quantities of iron ore than is necessary, but that there will be sufficient reserves to last Australia for many years. I support the Bill.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [5.7 p.m.]: I have a few thoughts in connection with this matter. I feel this is undoubtedly going to be a wonderful thing for Western Australia and particularly for the northern part of the State which, for so long, has presented many problems. A venture of this size will undoubtedly bring about a new era in that under-developed portion of our State; and I join with other members in congratulating the Government and the Joint Venturers in their undertaking, and wishing all concerned the best of good fortune.

I have read through the agreement with a good deal of interest, and there again I think that whoever was responsible for

the drafting of this difficult measure is deserving of congratulation. I assume, of course, it was the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman. The Bill strikes me as being a splendid example of his craft, and I think he is worthy of our congratulations.

Another thought that has gone through my mind relates to the deposits of iron ore which are in the Wiluna district and in the Cue district. I am informed that both of these deposits are extensive and could be developed on a large scale. As we know, both Wiluna and Cue are passing through difficult times. A small township remains in each of these centres and a few people are living on and keeping the flag flying, so to speak.

It has occurred to me that it would be a wonderful thing if we could do something with the deposits of iron ore which are waiting in these areas for development. I saw in the recital to the agreement that the Government recently called tenders for the mining, transport, and shipment of the iron ore at Mount Goldsworthy; and apparently these two American companies have thought it worth while to tender and enter into this agreement which will involve the spending of many millions of pounds.

I am wondering what would happen if tenders were called for the mining and shipment overseas of the ore at Wilgie Mia and the ore at Wiluna. I do not know whether tenders would be attractive, or whether the proposition would attract overseas companies; but iron ore is undoubtedly a very vital commodity in the world of today and it seems that it will become more so.

There seems little hope for a revival at Wiluna or Cue from goldmining. For many years they were prosperous towns, but they were solely dependent on the gold-mining industry. Unfortunately, however, those times have gone. The pastoralists there are producing wealth and making some contribution to the development of the areas; but it seems to me that any worth-while development can only come about if the wealth in the shape of iron ore can be developed on some scale. That is just a thought that occurs to me.

I extend my congratulations to the people in the north who are going to benefit from this vast proposition; and I hope that possibly something may come about whereby some other overseas organisations will show an interest in those deposits which I have mentioned and so bring development and prosperity to those areas.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [5.15 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill and make a few observations and ask one or two questions which I trust the Minister will be able to answer, if not "off the cuff," at some later time.

I, too, join with those members who have spoken. I wish to say how glad I am that this industry has begun—or that it looks like becoming an industry, particularly as it is placed in the north-west where we want population and industry. It could be the forerunner of many more mining shows being commenced in the northern part of the State.

It does appear to me that we will today overcome the little deadlock which occurred last night. The explanation given by the Minister has cleared my mind. Yesterday I could not make up my mind whether what was being done was right or wrong, and therefore I did not vote on the matter. The Minister has now promised that added words will be placed in this document, and I feel that it will be a fair Bill which we can all support.

The Minister has asked that we should allow a big tolerance in respect of the Bill that he will bring down to deal with the railway. I think the Public Works Act allows for that, inasmuch as it says, "A mile either way or more." When it says "or more," it could be many miles, provided it does not go to the ridiculous. I think we would all support any Bill the Minister brings down.

Having scrambled all over the iron ore deposit of Wiluna and having read some of the history of it, I would like to add one or two words to those spoken by Mr. Heenan. The report on the iron ore is to the effect that it is one of those deposits which, in the future, must be given consideration; because the report says it is a deposit of no less than 100,000,000 tons, and the quality is no less than 60 per cent. If I remember rightly, it is a little more than 60 per cent. In addition, the deposit is situated not very far from the existing line which runs between Wiluna and Meekatharra—I think it would be some 10 or 15 miles away—and it would be no further from Geraldton. I believe, than is the Koolyanobbing deposit from Fremantle. The mine site, if one were established at the Wiluna deposit, would, on that basis, not be far from Geraldton.

So I feel, with Mr. Heenan and the other members representing that area that some consideration could be given to establishing a project in that area. I do not know of the deposit at Cue, but I am led to believe that the one at Wiluna is a good proposition.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: I suppose the line would need upgrading?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I do not think so. The iron content is just as high—

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: I am referring to the railway line.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I thought the honorable member was referring to the deposit. The line probably would need to be upgraded, but that would not even be a fleabite to one of these concerns which can spend £12,000,000 to £14,000,000.

Another point I wish to put to the Minister is this: I notice that Consolidated Gold Fields (Australia) Pty. Limited is one of the companies mentioned in the schedule. I take it the shareholding in that company is definitely Australian with, a fair proportion of Western Australians in it. I assume that in the Cyprus Mines Corporation there would be no shareholding by Western Australians, or Australians generally, and that the same thing would apply to the Utah Construction & Mining Co.

One thing concerning me is that when these deposits are thrown open for development, the people of Western Australia should have a fair chance of buying shares in any organisation which might undertake that development. I just wonder whether the Minister has considered this matter; that it be made a part of the agreement with such a company that the company should allow so many shares to be taken by people in Western Australia, in the first instance, and in Australia in the second instance. That would at least give the public the opportunity of acquiring some shares in these companies.

I feel that most people have at least a few pounds to invest, and if there is a good investment offering in Western Australia, it is only right that Western Australians should have some opportunity to acquire shares in it. I ask the Minister to give consideration to that aspect.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.21 p.m.]: I think the House should congratulate all concerned in bringing this project to fruition. Great credit redounds to the Minister involved, the Department of Industrial Development, and the members of the Joint Venturers.

This project does emphasise the need for overseas capital, in great quantity, to develop Western Australia to its highest peak. I am certain that no-one in the State could have contemplated signing an agreement such as has been signed by these companies—companies that can undertake to spend £12,000,000 in building towns, railways, and jetties, and setting about the project generally. Only those who have the capital could contemplate such a project.

From time to time we have heard right throughout Australia that Australia is being sold to outside nations, and that we should build it up ourselves. But if we look back at the building of America, we find that America was built by European capital being poured in in large amounts. Today, however, America owns the whole of that country; and, in the time to come, no matter how much overseas capital is spent in Australia, Australians will still own Australia and, in the main, the projects that have been undertaken. Australians will own them and their country exactly the same as Americans own America today.

If we look at this project from a financial point of view we find it is difficult to understand what profit private companies, such as these are, can make out of this venture; and we realise, if we look at it quietly, that the word "venture" is the proper one. The amount these companies are credited with being willing to spend is £12,000,000. But, as the Minister has already told us, in any of these projects the amount actually spent is always considerably more than the figure contemplated. So the estimated amount could quite well go to £15,000,000 or more.

If we look at the quantity of ore that the companies are allowed to mine in the period, I think it amounts to 15,000,000 tons. Is that so?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No. There is a provision in the agreement for the mining of greater quantities subject to the approval of export licenses by the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The amount is 15,000,000 tons at present.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It depends on export.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I said that it is subject to the Commonwealth's export licenses.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: As the agreement stands, it looks like 1,000,000 tons a year for 15 years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would not say that. I think it envisages more.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I have been trying to work out for myself what the business aspect of this could possibly be. I find that the views expressed in regard to the value of iron ore vary from £2 to £6 per ton; and, since large quantities of iron ore have been found, the value will probably go lower and drop to about £2 per ton at ports and possibly £4 per ton f.o.b.

If one works out these figures, one realises that even on a mighty project like this, the companies will need considerable acumen to achieve success. They will need the acumen which they possess and which they have been credited with for many years. I am trying to emphasise that I believe that by the agreement the people of Western Australia have received a fair deal and that the companies themselves are accepting a great amount of responsibility. Therefore one must wish them well and hope they make a success of the venture; and I think everyone in Western Australia hopes they do; and one feels that from the size of the companies and their experience there is very little doubt but that they will succeed.

A lot will depend on how much is found by diamond drilling. From the Minister's statement, and from the general view expressed publicly, it seems that this is a very sound venture. Let us hope it is,

because in that event it will be the fore-runner of others and the State will benefit considerably from it. I feel the amount the State will receive from this will be adequate, and I believe that the company will receive an adequate return, provided the venture turns out to be the success we all hope.

This is an interesting project. It is probably one of the biggest ventures we have ever contemplated in this State, and I am sure everybody wishes the companies well. At the same time I feel we must add our congratulations to all those concerned in arranging the agreement.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.28 p.m.]: I wish to make a few brief remarks in reply to some of the points that have been raised. First of all, we seem to be out of the corrugations and travelling on a smoother road than we were last night, for which I am very pleased.

I want to thank those members who have had something to say about the Bill. It is pleasant indeed to hear Mr. Willesee speak on the measure because he knows, and Mr. Wise does, too, the difficulties that the companies expect to encounter, and, in fact, have encountered.

The success of the project, may I say to Dr. Hislop, is not assured by any manner of means yet; there is still a long way to go. I feel, however, the company will finish up making a success of the venture.

There is, as I indicated by interjection, a clause in the agreement which states that the parties to the agreement contemplate that there will be a tonnage of iron ore greater than 1,000,000 tons a year for 15 years going out from the deposit. That is all we can say on that point, because the control of export licenses is a matter for the Commonwealth Government. Whatever we may want to do, the position is subject to the Commonwealth Government's export license. But I think it is quite safe to say that a project of this nature cannot be economically successful on 1,000,000 tons of iron ore a year—it just cannot be.

Whilst these sorts of enterprises commence with one figure, as I said last night, they usually finish up with a greatly increased figure. Another point is that they sometimes finish up with an increased figure in respect of the estimated tonnage of the mineral. If they do not, of course, the enterprise becomes a flop from the start, because the basis of success in respect of any mineral deposit is that there must be a sufficient quantity of the mineral to work on. I do not think there is any doubt that the diamond drilling that has been conducted to date has proved tonnages considerably in excess of the estimate of 30,000,000 tons which the Mines Department drilling programme revealed a year ago.

We should not lose sight of the fact that tenders for this deposit and the Talling Peak deposit were called as a result of an arrangement I entered into with the Japanese steel mills when I was in Japan negotiating with their representatives. I left Tokyo after giving an undertaking that the Government of Western Australia would call tenders for these two iron ore deposits for a start, and that has been done.

For the purpose of establishing cordial trade relations with foreign countries it is most essential that we should honour our word; and the relations between Japan and Australia are very favourable in regard to the commencement of trade in iron ore.

I would explain to Mr. Heenan that every mineral deposit has to rest upon its laurels and rely upon its own economics. I have climbed all over the Wilgie Mia deposit in the Cue district where the Mines Department is conducting a drilling programme at the moment. I have told the residents of that district that if the ore can be economically mined, transported, and shipped we will do something about it, bearing in mind that the Japanese technical commission that visited this State investigated both the iron ore deposits at Wiluna and the one at Wilgie Mia, and it was found that each of them presents real problems. Both deposits present transport difficulties and both are a long way away from points of shipment. The Wiluna deposit is about 300 miles from Geraldton, and the Wilgie Mia deposit is approximately the same distance from a shipping point.

That is an extremely long way to haul a commodity such as iron ore which, I repeat, is by no manner of means in short supply in many countries throughout the world. However, the mining of it all hinges on the question of whether the deposits can be economically worked; and another important factor is whether the country in which the iron ore deposits are situated is politically stable. Fortunately Australia is regarded by foreign countries interested in iron ore as being politically sound, which expression simply means that our parliamentary system is politically sound and agreeable to them. I have been told that by people to whom I have spoken in Japan.

In reply to Mr. Jones I would say that at the present time it is difficult for me to give any information on the method that will be used to finance this project. The position at the moment is that the three companies—Consolidated Goldfields, Utah, and Cyprus Mines—are finding the money between them to meet the initial diamond drilling and survey costs. When they are in a position to go ahead with the project, that will be the time to consider what method of finance they will employ. I believe the representatives of the companies concerned will be in a position to talk to me on that subject in the not-too-distant future.

It is not within the power of any Government to direct, by an Act of Parliament, that the companies shall make a certain number of their shares available on the Western Australian stock market; but it is a matter I certainly will not lose sight of, and if some arrangement can be made to make shares available on the local market it will be most desirable. Beyond that, I cannot answer the question, because I do not know the method that will be used to obtain the necessary funds to finance the project. It is quite certain that, in the ultimate, the original estimate of 30,000,000 tons could be conservative.

To Mr. Bennetts' comment that we should make sure we do not ship all our iron ore out of Western Australia, all I can say is that the recent discoveries of iron ore deposits can relieve us of any fear of such an event happening. We have heard all kinds of stories about the quantities and tonnages of iron ore that have been discovered in the north.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: In the year 1962, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; and some other people have had something to say about it as well. I think it is a fair thing to say that for years and years people have walked over, ridden over, and flown over these areas containing iron ore deposits without realising the wealth that lay under them. The exploration that has been carried out in the last two or three years has proved, without doubt, that we have enormous resources of iron ore. I repeat, however, that each and every deposit depends for its ultimate success on the question of finance.

Nature, unfortunately, seldom puts these deposits in places where they are easily mined, where there are easy methods of transport, or where they are close to points of shipment.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yampi might be the exception.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, that is quite right. Without a doubt Yampi is the exception. If we only had two or three more Yampis, this State would be in a very favourable position.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If Depuch Island contained an iron ore deposit it would be different.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; if the deposit were at Depuch Island it would be a different matter entirely. The island is about two or three miles long, but it is very small, and whether a port can be successfully established there has yet to be proved. It has been said to me, by a person who might even be listening to me now, that if I gave him enough money, nothing would be impossible so far as the engineering of the project was concerned. This leads me back again to the statement that any deposit of iron ore must, first of

all, be proved to be an economic proposition; and that is where the story starts and finishes.

I thank Mr. Heenan for his comments on the drafting of the Bill. I am pleased to hear that the drafting staff of the Crown Law Department is receiving some credit, because it has often been subject to criticism which it is prepared to take because nobody can be regarded as being perfect. Drafting mistakes have been made in the past and they will continue to be made in the future. The drafting of this Bill was done by the Solicitor-General (Mr. Good) who, with solicitors representing both parties, and myself, burnt much midnight oil whilst engaged on the formulating and shaping of the clauses which make up this agreement. I thank the House for its support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Minister for Mines (The Hon. A. F. Griffith) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3: Agreement approved and effect to be given thereto—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 9—Insert after the word "law" the passage ", but subject to the provisions of section ninety-six of the Public Works Act, 1902, being complied with in respect of the railway to be constructed under the Agreement".

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The words proposed to be inserted by the amendment meet entirely, I feel certain, the desire of our President in his ruling, and, in my view, therefore, meet the wishes of this Committee on the passing of the Bill.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this comment: It is unfortunate that the circulation of *Hansard* is so restricted, but it is fortunate that it accurately reports the proceedings in this Chamber. I say this because, in my view, it is regrettable that what transpired in this Chamber last evening should have been so badly reported in this morning's issue of *The West Australian* either because of crass ignorance on the part of a reporter who did not understand the purport of what was going on and aimed at belittling all we religiously endeavour to do to protect and support the rights of Parliament; or his report was so mutilated that it was published in a coloured form, unwarrantedly, in the paper this morning.

To be fair, it would not be suggested, for example, that the President used his deliberative vote, leaving the inference to be drawn, by those not knowing, that he had used his casting vote to save his own ruling without the report suggesting who supported or who opposed his ruling—it would not be fair to do that without making a reference to the succinct but eloquent comments of Mr. Watson and Dr. Hislop which they made deliberately and definitely in support of the rights of Parliament on this point, and insisting—in the words of one of those honourable gentlemen—that this is the last time a Bill similar to this should be presented to Parliament.

If the article had been fair comment, those who had spoken in favour of the President's ruling and his arguments in support of it would have had their statements published in the Press even though they had voted against the Bill on another point, but such was not the case; and I suggest that this wilful misrepresentation of parliamentary proceedings—

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I hope the honourable member will endeavour to link his remarks with the amendment before the Chair.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, I will definitely, because this amendment meets the requirement of Parliament which the members of this Chamber voted for last evening, but the report of those proceedings gave no suggestion of it being a requirement of Parliament, but a move by Labor to delay the legislation on iron ore; and this is false, whoever is responsible for the headline. Having said that, I support the amendment because it meets the requirement of the existing statutes; it meets the requirement of the President, as given in his ruling; and it meets the decision of this Chamber. It will put this Bill in order and enable it to be passed in all good faith expeditiously.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Having given the explanation and the undertaking, I do not propose to go over what I have said, except to repeat that, together with the project manager of the companies, I am now doing everything as expeditiously as possible to produce something to Parliament before the present session ends. It might be necessary to ask for a fairly wide tolerance, and also to ask Parliament next year to amend the railway measure which will be introduced during the session.

I am sorry that Mr. Wise was displeased with the Press report, but we cannot blame any particular reporter for that state of affairs. It is no use saying that the reporter did not understand the situation, because neither did some members of this House. Some members intimated that they did not understand the ruling which had

been given. I am always prepared to accept the ruling of this Chamber, but I formed the conclusion that the amendment before us was not necessary.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do not cast a reflection on this Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is not casting a reflection. It is certainly not intended to cast a reflection on the ruling of the President. In saying that he is wrong in his decision I am not casting any reflection on him.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I hope the Minister will connect his remarks to the amendment before the Chair. He had every opportunity during the second reading to make the points which he is now making.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was glad that you allowed me sufficient latitude to enable me to explain how I felt.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I gave both the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister a certain amount of latitude and tolerance when they referred to matters which were not concerned with the amendment before the Chair.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: To get back to the amendment, I have moved it because it meets the wish of this House. It would be a great tragedy if through a technicality the Bill was lost.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There is no chance of that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The passage of the Bill will mean very much to the State.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The Minister referred to section 96 of the Public Works Act. This amendment, if agreed to, will make it a statutory requirement for a certain procedure to be followed as soon as practicable; but it also provides for a very wide tolerance in the delineation of the anticipated route. I suggest that neither House of Parliament would find much, if any, difficulty in agreeing to a provision which conforms with the amendment and with the Public Works Act when a Bill covering the likely route of the railway line is presented in good faith.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What tolerance do you think we could ask for?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I will not be caught in that trap! I know the distance between Lalla Rookh and Mt. Goldsworthy, but it might be preferred to route the deviation close to Port Hedland or Pun-dano. Whatever is a reasonable distance to take in existing deposits, Parliament will take a tolerant and generous view when a Bill relating to the route is presented.

I suggest that will be the view of Parliament when it deals with the Bill to be introduced by the Minister for Mines, because it will only be a matter of conforming with the law. If the Bill has to be amended subsequently there should be no difficulty.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Schedule—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would like the Minister to clarify clause 7 (m) of the agreement on page 22 of the Bill which relates to labour conditions. It states—

That during the currency of this Agreement and subject to compliance with their obligations hereunder the Joint Venturers shall not be required to comply with the labour conditions imposed by or under the Mining Act in regard to the mineral lease.

Will this clause enable the Joint Venturers to override the provisions of the Mining Act in respect of labour conditions?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Clause 7 (m) of the agreement provides that the Joint Venturers will not be required to comply with the labour conditions in respect of the number of people who are employed on mining leases. Under the Mining Act a certain number of persons have to be employed, but the Minister for Mines can give to the holder of a mining lease an exemption from complying with the prescribed labour conditions. The labour conditions on a mining lease or a mining claim are applied so that there is an assurance that such lease will be worked constantly. If it is impracticable to work the lease then an application can be made to the Minister for a release from the labour conditions. Even if clause 7 (m) was not included in the agreement the Minister could still grant the Joint Venturers an exemption. The same provision appears in the agreements covering the Talling Peak deposits, and others.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with an amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.58 p.m.]: I want to draw attention to an article in the Press wherein it was

stated by a leading officer of the B.H.P. in the Eastern States that he was disturbed that it would be possible for iron ore, now proposed to be exported from Australia, to be returned to Australia as manufactured steel at a much lower cost than that processed in Australia on account of the cheaper labour available in some overseas countries, such as Japan.

I am not opposing the Bill because I am delighted that the impasse reached last night has been overcome, and that the correct step is to be taken for the passing of this Bill. I do not wish the management of the company to think I am opposing the Bill.

I want to ask the Minister if he has read or heard of such a statement; if so, will he enlighten the House?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I did not see the statement and cannot make any comment.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

BILLS (5): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Law Reform (Statute of Frauds) Bill.
2. Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment Bill.
3. Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment Bill.
4. Grain Pool Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

5. Superannuation and Family Benefits Act Amendment Bill.

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

BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. Amendments Incorporation Act Amendment Bill.
2. Reprinting of Acts Authorisation Act Amendment Bill.
3. Building Societies Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Assembly without amendment.

Sitting suspended from 6.5 to 7.30 p.m.

BUSINESS NAMES BILL*In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. A. R. Jones) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 19 put and passed.

Clause 20: Use and exhibition of business name—

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I would like the Minister to explain how paragraph (b) will operate in practice in the type of business I instanced last evening. There are many different types of businesses where the business name of the firm cannot be displayed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In the first place I would refer the honourable member to section 11 of the existing Act which, I think, is the section which now operates. It is the same in its complexion as this clause. When the honourable member was speaking last evening he said he thought it might be difficult in some cases for a person to display his business name. A man has to operate from somewhere. If he has his office in his own private house, he has the business name displayed outside the premises. He cannot be a nomad and have no place from which to operate; and I cannot see that the application of clause 20 will be any more difficult than has been the experience under section 11 of the existing Act.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I cannot agree with the Minister when he says that people cannot be nomads in business. I maintain they can. A firm which readily comes to mind is a firm of pest exterminators trading under a certain name. There are three or four persons associated with the business. They have no place of business whatsoever. Their operations take them to various points of the metropolitan area and the country.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: One flick and they're gone!

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Those people pay all of their liabilities and their commitments by cheque on a syndicate bank account; and they bank all of their moneys into their bank account.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: How do they get their money if one is unable to find them?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: They travel from place to place in order to carry out their work. Their actual accounts, and everything else associated with the administration of the company, are handled by a public accountant. In such an instance how on earth are they going to display, and where are they going to display, their business name? As I say, there are many

such cases. If we are going to put something into the Act which cannot be enforced and which is ridiculous, then it is a very wrong thing for us to do.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is a long bow which has just been stretched—a very long bow indeed! I have seen these pest control people and their vans which operate around the city and the suburbs; and, if my memory serves me correctly—in some cases, anyway—they have their address on the van. It is important for them that they should advertise where they can be located. Where do they sleep? Where do they live? If they have not got an office, what is their address for service? If they open a bank account, what do they give as their address? The Esplanade?

The Hon. J. D. Teahan: If you don't get a good job done, where do you go to obtain redress?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: How has the pest control company been operating under the Act as it exists now? The company has an address, surely.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The address is in the telephone book.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I really do not think there is a great deal of merit in the honourable member's suggestion.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I draw the Minister's attention to the words "outside of every place." Suppose there is a company whose offices are on the third floor of the A.M.F. building. Does it mean that the business name shall at all times be displayed in a conspicuous position on the outside of the room in which the company is conducting its business, or that the business name shall be displayed on the street or in the passage which leads to the lift?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think experience has shown that if a business is being conducted in a large building, the business name is displayed in the foyer of the building where the lift is situated, so that clients may see on which floor the business is situated; and when the client reaches that floor, there is a nameplate outside the particular room. I do not think—

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Is that what is meant by this?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —it could be on the footpath.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: A lot of them do have their signs on the footpath.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They do; and the fact remains that a person who wishes to display a business name for the purpose of advertising his business tries to display it in the place where it will attract the most attention. I think that is the interpretation of the clause.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I hope that this legislation, if passed as it now stands, will be interpreted or administered in the same way as is the existing legislation, because there is a very stiff penalty provided; and I hope that in the type of case I have instanced, no undue pressure will be put on a lot of small traders.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 21 to 25 put and passed.

Clause 26: Invitations to the public to make deposits or loans—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. A. R. Jones): A printing error has occurred in this clause and it will be necessary for a correction to be made. The correction involves the proper alignment of paragraphs (a) and (b).

The Clerk was authorised to make the correction.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 31 put and passed.

Clause 32: Regulations—

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: This is the clause which provides for the making of regulations which may fix the fees. In dealing with the clause on which we last had a discussion, the Minister referred us to the corresponding provisions in the Act of 1942. I am directing my attention particularly to paragraph (a) of subclause (1). The paragraph hitherto has read, "The fees to be paid to the Registrar under this Act," but now it will read, "The fees (not exceeding Ten Pounds) to be paid to the Registrar under this Act."

I understand that hitherto the fee for registering a business name has been 10s. for a registration which lasts three years; but the proposal in the regulations which will be gazetted under this Act is that the fee should be increased to £2 for a registration lasting three years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is correct.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Having regard for the change in money values, I do not think a fee of £2 for a period of three years is out of the way; but I would consider a fee of £10 excessive; and, inasmuch as £10 is mentioned in the Bill, there is the danger that the maximum may become the minimum. For that reason I am inclined to move for the deletion of the words which appear inside the brackets, that is, "Not exceeding Ten pounds." It may be argued that by doing so I make the sky the limit; but my answer to that is that since 1943 no amount has been mentioned; and, rather than making the sky the limit, I feel the mention of £10 in the measure indicates that Parliament approves of a fee up to £10. For my part I would not approve of a fee up to £10. To test the feeling of the Committee I move an amendment—

Page 27, line 20—Delete the passage "(not exceeding Ten Pounds)."

That will make the paragraph the same as it has existed for 20 years.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to use this as an argument, but I did say when I introduced the Bill that we wanted it to come into operation at the same time as the Companies Act; and if we agree to an amendment at this stage the Bill will have to be returned to the Legislative Assembly. That is not an excuse for not having it amended, but I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. Mr. Watson said that by taking out the words we might lift the roof, and I think that is the argument which should be used. Whatever fee is made it will have to be by regulation; and Parliament can have its say about a regulation.

Regulations prescribing the fees are now being drafted, and they will be laid on the Table of the House. The fee mentioned by Mr. Watson, namely £2, will be prescribed. If the amendment is agreed to a fee of £11 could be prescribed by regulation, and in the circumstances I cannot see the force of agreeing to the amendment.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would like to hear some other members on this. I would be quite happy if the Minister would agree to alter the words to read, "not exceeding £2" or some such thing.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Or some such thing is £10.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I mean £2, £3, £4, or £5, but I would make £5 the limit. If any member is disposed to reduce the limit, I withdraw my amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

CEMETERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 28th August, on the following motion by the Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [7.56 p.m.]: Although, as the Minister stated, this Bill is somewhat lengthy, it contains clauses which rectify anomalies which have arisen through the years; it groups together certain principles in a new presentation and therefore requires the deletion of certain sections; it brings up to date references

to Her Majesty the Queen, who has been dead for 60 years; because references in the parent Act are to her late Majesty, without saying Queen Victoria, and they are hardly appropriate.

It is obvious that the Cemeteries Act has been scrutinised to bring it into line with present day requirements; and it struck me, on reading the Bill, that the amendment to section 13 broadens in effect the right to proclaim areas within burial grounds for denominational purposes: the provisions are much wider than they were previously. I note, on referring to the third schedule in the parent Act, the form which has to be used, and I presume that it is simply an example of what is to be used and is not the actual form. It is an example for any group or denomination which is applying for certain lots or areas within the boundaries of a cemetery.

The repealing of several sections of the Act which have been introduced since 1897 is simply bringing up to date the requirements so far as the verbiage is concerned, and also bringing the Act into line with present-day conditions. I see nothing whatever objectionable in the Bill and I propose to support it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. E. M. Davies) in the Chair: The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6 put and passed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. E. M. Davies): I would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that there are two clauses numbered 6. It will be necessary for the following clauses to be renumbered, and I ask the Committee to give the Clerk the authority to make this correction. Nothing having been said to the contrary, I will instruct the Clerk to make the necessary correction.

Clauses 7 to 29 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [8.6 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 29th August, 1962

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| CONDOLENCE— | |
| The Late Mr. G. F. Roberts : Letter in Reply | 738 |
| QUESTIONS ON NOTICE— | |
| Churchlands High School : Students for 1963 | 740 |
| Fish in Monger's Lake : Cause of Death | 740 |
| Government Instrumentalities : Employment of Married Women | 742 |
| Hay Street Land : Plan for Future Use | 738 |
| Housing for Pensioners— | |
| Building in Stirling Highway for Elderly Women | 741 |
| Single-unit Flats at Albany | 741 |
| Leederville Highway : Sutherland Street—Osborne Park Section | 740 |
| Manning Road-Ley Street Intersection : Improved Layout | 737 |
| Manufacturing Enterprises : Number of Employees | 738 |
| Milk Production : Decline in Western Australia | 739 |
| Mineral Claims : Decision of Minister for Mines on No. 292 | 742 |
| Mt. Henry Aged Women's Home— | |
| Air Conditioning of Lounge and Dining Rooms | 737 |
| Cooling Facilities | 737 |
| North Kimberley Pastoral Area : Establishment of Port at Mission Cove | 742 |
| Palmyra Flooding : Compensation for Persons Affected | 738 |
| Pensioners : 1971— | |
| Number of Pensioners and Amount Paid | 742 |
| Pharmaceutical Products : Approval for Sale | 737 |
| Railways Department City Land : Rental Conditions | 737 |
| Railway Standardisation : Quantity and Cost of Steel Rails | 738 |
| Roads in Pilbara Area : Bituminisation Programme | 738 |
| School at Wittenoom : Desirability and Commencement of New Building | 738 |
| Sewerage at Mt. Hawthorn— | |
| Extension to Glendalough Home for the Aged | 741 |
| Extension to Unsewered Districts | 741 |
| State Building Supplies : Sale— | |
| Amount Received from Hawker Sideley | 739 |
| Stator Ltd. : Establishment at Maddington | 742 |
| Tobacco Industry— | |
| Allocation from Research Fund | 739 |
| Government Research Programme | 739 |
| Traffic Lights : Main Street—Green Street—Scarborough Beach Road Intersection | 740 |
| Tuart Hill High School : Students for 1963 | 740 |
| Victoria Park Traffic Office : Licenses Issued and Value | 742 |
| Water Supply for Nullagine : Latest Developments | 738 |
| Wildflowers : Preservation— | |
| Introduction of Protective Legislation | 741 |