close relationship to the fishing industry and to members in this House, particularly to the member for Beeloo who raised the point previously during this session. The action which I propose to take endeavours to stamp out the trade in undersize crayfish, in regard to what is happening in the craymeat industry.

Mr. Jamieson: The Bill covers that point?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is not mentioned in the Bill. I am relating what I propose to do.

Mr. Jamieson: You will do that by regulation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes. A good deal of publicity has been given to the growing trade in crayfish meat. For some considerable time—at least twelve months—the department has been well aware that the trade in crayfish meat was growing. Consideration has been given to finding ways to combat this trend. The solution which was eventually arrived at is a rather severe one, and I am a little reluctant to agree that such a step should be taken. When the trade in crayfish meat first commenced it comprised, in the main, the meat from the legs, and the meat left in the carapace after de-tailing. However, in the past 12 months a great number of undersize crayfish tails were cut up for craymeat.

I think it is pretty well certain that the practice has grown up because of the amending Bill introduced last year which cracked down with stronger penalties and a wider sphere of operations in regard to the taking of undersize crayfish. It will be remembered at the time that the House approved of these harsher penalties in the interests of the industry; but the more unscrupulous fishermen have still taken these undersize crayfish, cooked them, and cut them up. It is impossible for anyone to determine whether the craymeat has been taken from a sized fish or an undersize fish.

I think it is appreciated by the department there is probably legitimate room—or there could be—for the dealing in craymeat; and at first I had hoped that a regulation could be drawn up which would provide for this legitimate field of operations; but in casting about for a satisfactory regulation it was found to be virtually impossible. Too wide a loophole was left, and the trade in undersize crayfish could still have been continued to the detriment of the industry by and large.

So I have taken the decision, after advice from my officers, that a complete embargo be placed on craymeat. No amendment to this Act is required—the matter can be dealt with by regulation. I trust that the regulation will serve its purpose and assist in cutting down the traffic in undersize crays.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

Message: Appropriation

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 5th October.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 5th October, 1961

CONTENTS

CONTENTS—*continued*

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

COMMONWEALTH GRANT

Amounts Credited to Consolidated Revenue

1. Mr. HAWKE asked the Treasurer:

   (1) What amount of Commonwealth grant was credited in August and also in September, to the Consolidated Revenue Account under the new method of taking into that account each month one-twelfth of the annual grant?

   (2) What amount would have been credited for each of those two months had only one-fifteenth of the grant been credited to the account as was formerly the practice?

   Mr. BRAND replied:

   (1) £2,508,166.

   (2) £2,006,533 6s. 8d.

2. *This question was postponed.*

ONSLOW: OLD RECREATION AREA

Septic Effluent Contamination

3. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Health:

   (1) Is it a fact that the old recreation area at Onslow absorbed much of the septic effluent during the flood period, and is still very soggy and water-logged?

   (2) Is it a fact that there is a strong stench emanating from this area; and, if so, what steps are being taken to rectify the matter?

   (3) Is he completely convinced that the conditions referred to will not cause disease of any kind in the area; if not, what steps is he taking to have the matter thoroughly investigated by a competent authority?

   Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

   (1) The old recreation area at Onslow was not contaminated with septic tank effluent during the flood. No reports or complaints have been received about its present water-logged condition.

   (2) No complaints have been received regarding stench and none noted during inspections subsequent to the floods.

   (3) Inspections since the flood have not indicated the presence of a health hazard.

WITTENOOM ASBESTOS MINE

Dust Concentration

4. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

   (1) Has he seen the ventilation officer's report on dust conditions at the Wittenoom asbestos mine for the month of August?

   (2) Is he aware it states that in 60 working places out of 103, the dust count was over 300 particles per c.c. and in some places up to 1,000-plus particles per c.c.?

   (3) Does he consider this is excessive dust concentration?

   (4) If so, what action does he intend to take to have the position rectified?

   Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

   (1) Yes.

   (2) Yes.

   (3) and (4) The State Mining Engineer advises that the dust concentrations above 300 particles per c.c. are excessive.

   A programme to improve the ventilation of the mine is in progress. The main items are further development work to improve the air flow and the installation of a new main fan.

When the work is complete a further ventilation survey will be made.

TOMATO AND FRUIT CASES

Continuity of Supplies

5. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

What precaution was taken by the Government when it disposed of the State Saw Mills and State Building Supplies to see that our tomato and fruit growers would continue to get their case supplies without hold-up of supply, and at the previous cost?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Growers have placed reduced reliance on the State Building Supplies for case requirements during recent years and production facilities installed by this organisation have been only partially employed. Under these circumstances, and with case supplies reasonably easy, it was considered unnecessary to include any special provisions with regard to case supplies in conditions of sale of the State Building Supplies.

GERALDTON SLIPWAYS

Tenders for Leasing

6. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware that the Public Works Department is inviting tenders for the leasing of the No. 1 and No. 2 boat slipways at Geraldton?

(2) If so, will he say at whose request the tenders are being called?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Tenders are being called in accordance with Government policy.

BUILDING SOCIETIES

Allocations under Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement

7. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) What building societies at present receiving moneys under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement were in existence and operating prior to moneys first being made available from that source?

(2) What amount annually was advanced by each of those societies for three years prior to the agreement?

(3) What was the sum advanced from 1956 by those societies each year respectively from—

(a) Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement funds;

(b) otherwise?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Perth Benefit Building Investment and Loan Society, Bunbury Benefit Building Investment and Loan Society, Home Building Society, West Australian Starr Bowkett Investment Benefit Building Society.

(2)	1953/54 £	1954/55 £	1955/56 £
Perth	614,652	305,723	354,045
Bunbury	16,731	18,138	12,071
Home	9,078	27,724	26,398
W.A. Starr Bowkett	316,730	317,398	225,342
	957,191	668,983	617,856

(3) (a)	1956/57 £	1957/58 £	1958/59 £	1959/60 £	1960/61 £
Perth	(a)	258,248	196,467	121,900	(b)
Bunbury	(a)	9,185	26,400	34,125	(b)
Home	(a)	12,500	21,415	33,385	(b)
W.A. Starr Bowkett	(a)	214,327	148,638	117,570	88,311
		494,270	392,920	306,980	88,311

(a) Not segregated on Annual Return.
(b) Returns not yet received.

(3) (b)	1956/57 (a) £	1957/58 £	1958/59 £	1959/60 £	1960/61 £
Perth	725,538	603,048	715,514	604,638	(b)
Bunbury	60,506	52,167	48,816	70,474	(b)
Home	73,257	102,943	190,496	185,330	(b)
W.A. Starr Bowkett	228,408	304,018	282,250	401,275	356,162
	1,087,709	1,062,176	1,237,076	1,261,717	356,162

(a) Includes Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement Funds.
(b) Annual Return not yet received.

Note.—Figures in Nos. (2) and (3) relate to year ended the 17th October next for Perth Building Society; the 31st August next for Bunbury, and the 28th February preceding for W.A. Starr Bowkett.

RABBIT ERADICATION

Myxomatosis: Sale of Antidote

8. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Knowing the damage caused by rabbits in this State and the concern expressed by farmers at the introduction into the State of a serum that is an antidote to myxomatosis (Shope's fibroma) will he take action to have the Australian Agricultural Council prohibit the sale of this serum in Australia?

Mr. NALDER replied:

An approach will be made to the Australian Agricultural Council to agree on the imposition of a ban to prevent the sale of Shope's fibroma throughout Australia.

INTOXICATING LIQUOR

Under-age Drinking

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Is he aware that under-age drinking of intoxicating liquor is taking place in coffee lounges and public places?

(2) If he is aware of under-age drinking in such places, does he contemplate the introduction of legislation, so that such places can be brought under police control?

(3) If he is unaware of such under-age drinking, will he have the mattter investigated, with a view to preventing such happenings?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) to (3) It is not an offence for a person under 21 years to consume intoxicating liquor. The offence is for a licensee to supply it to a person under 21 years of age or for any person to drink it in certain public places specified in the Act. The Licensing Act comes within the Attorney-General's department.

RAILWAYS

Elleker-Nornalup Line: Reopening

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has he given further consideration to reopening the Elleker-Nornalup line; and, if so, what are his conclusions?

Nornalup-Northcliffe Line: Construction

(2) Has the Government any intention of building a line from Nornalup to Northcliffe?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) No.

(2) There is no current intention to build such a line.

ALBANY HIGH SCHOOL

Extensions: Bricks from Great Southern Brickworks

11. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Were bricks purchased from the Great Southern Brickworks, Albany, for high school extensions, required to be as near as possible in colour matching the existing building and archways?

(2) What was the price of bricks supplied on the job by the Great Southern Brickworks?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes. The specification provided:—Bricks for facework shall be specially picked for uniform colour, shape, sharp arrises, etc. and to match the existing brickwork.

(2) This work was carried out by private contract and the department has no knowledge of the prices paid by the contractor for his material.

Technical Annexe: Purchase of Bricks from Narrogin Brickworks

12. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it true that bricks to build the technical annexe at the Albany High School will be purchased from Narrogin brickworks?

(2) If so, what is the price of Narrogin bricks on job site?

(3) Are the bricks to build the technical annexe to be cream colour; and, if so, why?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) No. Albany bricks are specified for all internal and external face brickwork and all other brickwork.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Yes. The technical annexe at the Albany High School is not on the same site—nor is it a logical development of the original school. A modern style of architecture is used and the use of a cream-coloured brick is considered to be desirable in this instance.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Turnover Tax

13. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

In view of the fact that the turnover of the Totalisator Agency Board to the 31st July was shown as £510,058 in the report tabled in Parliament, what is the explanation for the answer given by him on the 23rd August that turnover tax due to the Government was only £10,383 8s.?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The actual amount of tax on the turnover of £510,058 to the 31st July, 1961 was £25,502 18s. This amount was shown in the board's summarised operating and profit and loss statement appearing on page 5 of its report as £25,503.

At the 31st July, 1961 of the amount due, the board had actually paid £15,119 10s., leaving £10,383 8s. to be paid by the end of August, 1961 in relation to the period ended the 31st July, 1961. The words "what amount was due" in the question of the 23rd August were taken to mean—"what amount was due and unpaid at the 31st July, 1961."

PERTH PARKING REGION

Alterations and Extensions

14. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is consideration being given, or is any action in progress, to alter or extend the present parking region of the City of Perth?

(2) If so, what alterations or extensions are contemplated?

(3) If not, will he give consideration to this matter, having regard for the fact that the eastern and western extremities of Hay Street, for example, are remote from the centre of the city as against, say, Beaufort and William Streets and adjacent streets immediately north of the railway?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Yes.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Agencies: Opening for Eastern States Races

15. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Is he aware that suburban branches of the Totalisator Agency Board were closed on Monday last when an important Sydney race meeting was held?

(2) Is this practice not conducive to increased illegal betting taking place?

(3) Will he request the Totalisator Agency Board to open branches and agencies on all future important Eastern States race days?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) The board considers that as adequate facilities are still available the action of closing some agencies on non-public holidays should not lead to illegal betting.

The board will open agencies in accordance with the staff available to handle the business offering. A number of agencies are, however, to be opened on Saturdays and the main State public holidays only.

FRUIT CASES

Action to Meet Shortages

16. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware of past procedure with regard to the supply of fruit cases?

(2) Does he know that when sawmills throughout the south-west have orders for cutting timber of a more payable nature, no fruit cases are produced, and that in such circumstances the State Building Supplies always agreed to cut any shortage of fruit cases?

(3) What is the position likely to be in the event of the Hawker Siddeley Co. refusing to supply fruit cases if a shortage becomes apparent during the coming fruit season?

(4) What action does he propose to take if the situation as described in No. (3) arises?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) In recent years case supplies have been easier and growers have exercised their right to place orders wherever it suited them. While there has been co-operation between major sawmillers and case distributors there has been no plan for allocation and acceptance of orders according to production capacity.

(2) This has not applied for the past four years and the proportion of orders placed with the State Building Supplies has been far less than might have been expected on past service of this organisation to the fruit-growing industry.

(3) and (4) The remedy is in the hands of the growers themselves who can cover the position through their organisations by placing firm forward orders with one or other of the competing sawmillers.

TRAFFIC POLICE

Increase

17. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Has any action been taken to increase by approximately 40 per cent. the strength of the Police Traffic Branch, including 25 men for motor-cycle patrols, as reported in *The West Australian* of the 2nd May, 1961?

(2) If no action has been taken, can he indicate what is proposed in this direction?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) and (2) Finance for extra traffic police is still being investigated and no increase in the number of extra motor-cycle patrol men has yet been made.

CAUSEWAY

Public Conveniences at Eastern End

18. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Works:

Has any area been set aside at the eastern end of the Causeway for the erection of badly-needed public conveniences?

Mr. WILD replied:

No land has been set aside by the Main Roads Department for public conveniences. This is something for the local authority, and it is understood that the Perth City Council has the matter under consideration.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

CHAMBERLAIN INDUSTRIES

Sale

1. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Can he advise the House whether the Government is negotiating for the sale of Chamberlain Industries?

(2) If so, what is the name of the firm with which the Government is negotiating?

Mr. Graham: And (3) Is it to be given away?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) and (2) A similar question was asked earlier in the session, and the position as indicated by the Premier on that occasion is still unchanged. As a result of the announcement made by the Government on the 18th May, 1960, there have been inquiries from various parts of the world regarding Chamberlain Industries; and that is as much as I can inform the House at this stage.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Date of Availability

2. Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:

Can he give any indication as to when the Auditor-General's report on the Public Accounts is likely to be made available to Parliament?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No; as a matter of fact, I cannot. However, I will make inquiries, and submit it as quickly as possible.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Agencies: Opening on Melbourne Cup Day

3. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Am I to understand from his answers to question No. 15 today that some agencies in the metropolitan area will be closed on Tuesday, Melbourne Cup day?

(2) If so, would he ask the board to reconsider that proposition; because, as he well knows, it is probably the principal betting day throughout the year for all small bettors?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

I will have to make specific inquiries on that point; but I would think that all agencies would be open on Melbourne Cup day. However, it would depend, of course, on the expected amount of business.

END OF SESSION

Target Date

4. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

As reports are in circulation that the Government proposes to terminate this session by the middle of November, can he tell the House whether there is any substance in those reports?

Mr. BRAND replied:

Only the substance that is in any rumour that circulates in Parliament House. However, I will give the House an indication later.

FRUIT CASES

Action to Meet Shortages

5. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In regard to his answer to my first question on today's notice paper, is he quite sure that the situation is as stated in that question? The information given me by the Fruit Growers' Association does not add up to his answer; and I would like to make sure.

Mr. NALDER replied:

So far as I am aware, the answer to the honourable member's question is correct. I am unable to supply any further information at this moment.

S.P. BOOKMAKERS

Association with Accountancy Firm: Correction of Statement

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [2.32 p.m.]: I would like to make a personal explanation arising out of a debate held in the House last week in connection with the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill. I mentioned the name of a firm of accountants as being associated with information supplied to the Royal Commissioner (Judge Ligertwood) in connection with starting-price betting; namely, the firm of Hendry, Rae & Court. On checking, I find that this firm was not mentioned. There were several accountancy firms of repute mentioned; and up until Tuesday I was under the impression that the firm to which I have referred was one of them. I find, however, that is not the case. I make this personal explanation in order to keep the record straight.

BILLS (7): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Iron Ore (Tallering Peak) Agreement Bill.
2. Railways (Standard Gauge) Construction Bill.
3. Railway Standardisation Agreement Bill.

   Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Brand (Premier), and read a first time.
4. Public Works Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Wild (Minister for Works), and read a first time.
5. State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Perkins (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.
6. Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.
7. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Perkins (Minister for Police), and read a first time.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) [2.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. TOMS (Maylands) [2.39 p.m.]: When this measure was in Committee I asked the Chief Secretary questions regarding valuators. Since then he has shown me an explanation; and I would ask that the Chief Secretary pass it on to the Minister handling this Bill in another place, so that it may be included in *Hansard*. I feel it would give building societies a better idea of the interpretation of the particular point.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) [2.40 p.m.]: I will do as the honourable member suggests. I regret that I have not got my notes with me at the moment. I did supply an explanation to the honourable member, as he has stated. It would be an excellent thing to have it inserted in *Hansard*, and I promise to give it to the Minister in another place, and he will see that it is recorded.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Bank Holidays Act Amendment Bill.
2. Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd October.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [2.42 p.m.]: This Bill is consequential on the measure to amend the Criminal Code, which was discussed in this Chamber last Tuesday. Murder will not be regarded as a capital crime if Parliament agrees to the Bills which have been introduced; in other words, if another place does not veto those Bills. I do not think there is much chance of that although, when we were in office, another place could and did veto measures which we introduced because we have never had a majoirty in that Chamber. That is why sometimes we feel that another place is not impartial. It is supposed to be a House of review but, as I see it, it is a party House, and it depends on which side has the majority.

Mr. W. Hegney: It has always been a party House.

Mr. Brand: Made so by the Labor Party.

Mr. NULSEN: It has always been a party House; but we have never had a majority there. Under the Bill a person charged with the crime of murder will not be admitted to bail without the order of a judge of the Supreme Court. I have no quarrel with that; and, in fact, I agree with 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.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd October.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [2.46 p.m.]: This is another consequential Bill affecting the verdicts of juries on trials for murder. There are cases where a majority verdict is sufficient; and, unless this Bill is passed, that will apply to murder—that is, if the Criminal Code Amendment Bill is passed. Unless it is agreed to, 10 jurists, but not fewer than 10, could make the decision; but this Bill provides that in murder cases the verdict must be unanimous. Because murder will no longer be a capital crime, it is necessary to have this amending Bill to bring the crime of murder into the category requiring a unanimous verdict, and that is all the Bill does: it provides that the jury must be unanimous before reaching a verdict in murder trials. I agree with the measure.

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.

IRON ORE (SCOTT RIVER) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [2.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to ratify an agreement dated the 9th March, 1961, between the State, Mineral Mining and Exports (W.A.) Pty. Ltd., and Heine Brothers (Australasia) Ltd. Mineral Mining and Exports (W.A.) Pty. Ltd. is the main company to the transaction. Heine Brothers (Australasia) Pty. Ltd. is a party to the agreement as a guarantor, to the extent defined in clause 30 of the agreement; namely, "that the Company shall duly perform all the covenants agreements and conditions on its part contained in the within Agreement to be performed up to the notice date" provided for in the agreement or such earlier date on which all the parties to the agreement are released from their obligations to be performed after the notice date. I place emphasis on the words "notice date" because they have particular significance in the understanding of this agreement.

The agreement is an attempt to exploit limonite deposits in the south-west. These are classed as low-grade iron oré deposits, and the whole project is contingent on—

(a) Proving the deposits.

(b) Perfecting a satisfactory process for the economic treatment of the ore.

(c) Establishing satisfactory markets for the processed ore.

(d) Developing shipping facilities which will permit the economic export of the processed iron ore.

It should be clearly understood by members of this House and the general public that the project is contingent on the foregoing. I mention this because a great deal of publicity was given to this proposal under the name of the Scott River Sponge Iron Project from non-Government circles, and prior to the Government entering into detailed negotiations with the company.

During, and subsequent to, the negotiations and the signing of the agreement, the Government has endeavoured to impress on the general public that the industry cannot be proceeded with until the proving phase has been successfully completed. The object of this was to try to prevent excessive land speculations in and around the Augusta-Flinders Bay Area. There was a suggestion in the local Press circulating in this area that the Government was not doing all it should to further this project. It was suggested that the Government should be proceeding with certain public works that were related to the project.

However, the local authority was informed that under the terms of the agreement there are two phases to it and the Government's commitments—which are not heavy in any case—do not become effective until after the first phase has been completed. Therefore, it would have been quite wrong for the Government to become involved in a major road-building scheme or the bridging of the Blackwood River until the first phase of the agreement had been successfully completed by the company and the required notice given to the Government and approved by it. I think it is now clearly understood in the district that this proving phase is a prerequisite to the success of the industry.

This, however, is not meant to imply that the Government is not wholeheartedly behind the efforts to prove the economic wort hof this low-grade deposit. On the contrary, the Government is anxious to give all the encouragement possible—and has ,in fact, given all the encouragement possible—to the scheme, because it would like to see the successful processing of low-grade ore which would otherwise have little or no prospect of export. Until these low-grade ores are in some processed form, I think it can be accepted that they can be of very little economic worth either locally or for export.

At this stage I wish to pay a tribute to the company for the persistence it has shown with this project. It takes real money and courage to investigate the fields of low-grade ores; and to develop a project of this type, a great deal of finance is required. It is a very speculative field of investment; but, of course, if the company is successful it will get its return. Nevertheless, as members understand, in many of these projects a great deal of work is done and much money is spent, but no progress is made beyond the proving phase. That is peculiar to mining ventures; and, as I have said, this company has been persistent in its efforts and firm in its resolve to prove that this project can be brought to a successful conclusion. Success with this venture would provide—

(a) An industry for an area that has little or no secondary industry.

(b) Good overseas shipping facilities for other products as well as processed iron ore.

(c) Exploitation of a deposit at present of little commercial value.

And, what is more important, it would—

(d) Increase the amenities and services available in the area because of the inevitable influx of population and consequential development that would follow a successful industry.

The main factor expected to help the economics of this project is its close proximity to the coast.

When plans are tabled, members will realise that the townsite is within the proverbial stone's throw of the coast. In fact, the distance from the suggested port to the actual works site could be measured in terms of five, six, or seven miles; and it is not much further to the iron ore deposits themselves. Transport costs are important in mining projects, especially where large tonnages are involved, and therefore the close proximity of the townsite and the works site to the port should be the determining factor in the success of this industry.

It will be appreciated that without an agreement the company could not be expected to spend money in proving the deposits; and, in any case, it would have very little prospect of raising funds and of interesting people with technical know-how if it did not have the support of an agreement to lay down, in clear terms, the company's rights to mineral leases, works sites, harbour facilities, power, and numerous other things on the satisfactory completion of the proving phase.

The objectives under the agreement may be summarised as follows:—

(1) To establish by the 31st December, 1964, at an estimated capital cost of not less than £5,500,000, a factory designed and having a capacity to produce not less than 250,000 tons of processed iron ore a year.

That is not the iron ore content, but the processed iron ore which, of course, could be measured in terms of possibly two tons of the raw ore to one ton of processed ore, according to the degree of processing and the processes that are eventually agreed upon. Continuing with the objectives—

(2) Prior to the 31st December, 1966, to construct and establish on the works site or to extend the then existing factory to give a capacity to produce a total of not less than 500,000 tons of processed iron ore a year at a cost (including the the previous amount of £5,500,000) of not less than £10,000,000.

The notice date, which is so important in the agreement, is provided for in clause 4. It is really the crucial point in the agreement, and in the two phases of the agreement.

Mr. Fletcher: Could that processed iron ore be handled in our existing plant?

Mr. COURT: Yes; the processed iron ore could be blast furnace material anywhere. Whether or not it will be remains to be seen; but the actual processed iron ore, as I will explain later, is part of the world trend in upgrading these raw materials in one degree or another. The significance of the honourable member's question is appreciated and can be answered by my saying that it could be used in Australian blast furnaces if it suited the technical operations of those furnaces. Each furnace must be adjusted to a particular type of process. It is not possible to use any type of ore or processed material. But there is no technical reason why it should not find its way into Australian blast furnaces.

By the 31st December, 1962, or a later date mutually agreed upon, the company is to give notice that—

(1) It has satisfied itself that the iron ore areas contain iron ore of tonnages and grades suitable for the company's purposes under the agreement.

(2) It has satisfied itself on the advice and recommendation of Maunsell & Partners or other

reputable consultants in consultation with the engineer of the Public Works Department as to the best location of the wharf site and the design and methods of construction of the wharf and associated wharf works.

(3) It has decided upon the method of producing processed iron ore from the factory to be provided under the terms of the agreement.

(4) It has arranged for all finance necessary for the discharge of the company's obligations.

(5) It is able and willing to proceed with the discharge of the company's obligations under the agreement.

This notice has to be accompanied with appropriate details in accordance with clause 4. Not only does it have to state these things, but it also must prove all these things in giving notice to the Government. If the company does not give this notice by the prescribed time, the company's rights cease and determine. If the company does give notice in accordance with the agreement then the State has an obligation to examine the notice and, if satisfied, shall give notice accordingly to the company. The date on which the State, not the company, does this becomes the "notice date"—and I quote "notice date"—for purposes of the agreement. In other words it will say to the company that it is satisfied that it has conformed to the first phase of the agreement.

There are provisions in the agreement which prevent the State being unreasonable in its attitude towards giving notice to the company. The State must act with reasonable despatch; and if the company feels the State is not giving due attention and due credit for what it has done, as stated in its notice to the Government, the company can submit the matter to arbitration, and it will be resolved by that method. In other words, the State cannot, in a perfunctory manner, dismiss the notice it receives from the company. The significance of this notice date is that it is a point at which the exploratory and organisational phases of the agreement virtually terminate—successfully or otherwise—and the second phase of the agreement commences to operate if required.

I might mention that in drafting this agreement it was difficult to formulate an agreement which would give companies the necessary encouragement and authority to get on with the proving of this deposit, determining suitable processes, the exploration of suitable markets, sources of finance, etc.; and, if they successfully overcame these difficulties, to provide them with security of tenure and the basic facilities and services to enable them to get on with the project.

Eventually the Crown Law advisers drafted this agreement, which is in two distinct phases. We feel this is a suitable form of agreement, which will be a pattern for a lot of other negotiations which will take place in this State in respect of mineral deposits which must be proved with the necessary finance and processes organised around them before they can proceed to the second phase. It does not commit the Government to any sums of money for capital costs while this phase is going on. That is all done at the expense of the company concerned, and the Government has complete access to all information which the company has obtained, whether it be in respect of the company's deposits, its quantities of ore, the grades of ore, the technical aspects of the ore, or whether it is in respect of the actual processes that are to be used.

Naturally, if the company is unable to prove the deposits to its satisfaction and successfully negotiate all the other requirements in relation to harbour facilities, processes, markets, finance, etc., phase two does not come into operation. This means that we have lost nothing; the company has footed the bill that far.

The definitions are of even more significance in this agreement than they are in some others. I invite the attention of members particularly to definitions of the following:—

Iron ore.
Iron ore areas.
Low grade ore.
Processed iron ore.
Upgraded ore.

While the term "sponge iron" has been used freely in Press comment, particularly during the earlier stages when this potential industry came into prominence, it was found that "sponge iron" did not lend itself to a precise definition for purposes of an agreement. Therefore the use of the expressions "processed iron ore" and "upgraded ore" were resorted to.

As to whether the final product of this industry will be pelletised iron or sponge iron or some other form is yet to be determined. It matters not from the State's point of view, provided we get the industry that processes the low-grade ore to something which is either useful in our Australian blast furnaces or as an exportable commodity. There are many forms in which this iron ore can be processed today; and there are many forms in which it can be used as blast furnace material.

The latter—that is, the term "upgraded ore"—means iron ore that has been upgraded by mechnical means, other than thermal treatment; while the former—that is, "processed iron ore"—means iron ore that has been processed to a further degree beyond the treatment of upgraded ore by thermal treatment. It was hoped that this particular ore, because of the amount of free silica it contains, could be treated by

mechanical means to a stage which would warrant the early export of some of it in substantial quantities, while the more refined processed type of iron ore was being produced—a type of processed iron ore which can be achieved only through thermal treatment. As to whether or not that will be the ultimate result I do not know, and the company cannot say at this stage. Provision has been made to distinguish between upgraded iron ore by mechanical means without thermal treatment, and iron ore upgraded by thermal treatment.

Obviously the plant, equipment, and investment involved in producing processed iron ore is much greater and more complex than that used in processing and producing upgraded ore. Both forms of processed ore would, however, make a major industrial contribution to the area. It is unlikely that anything short of processed iron ore, within the terms of the agreement, would be acceptable for long-term export contracts.

This is consistent with the changing scene whereby steel-producing countries, which cannot operate solely on their own iron ore deposits, are seeking furnace materials, processed to a degree beyond the raw ore subject, of course, to improved economics of transportation and the like, and partly related to their internal plans so far as processing facilities are concerned. There is often a point beyond which, for a variety of reasons, these importing countries do not want to go in their own territories.

There is a significance in this trend; because if countries like Japan are importing huge quantities of raw material it means that they are carting from one country to another very large amounts of uneconomic material. This is virtually waste material. In turn, those countries have to establish tremendous facilities in their various ports to be able to handle quickly and in bulk these huge quantities of raw material they are importing. They have to incur tremendous capital expenditure in establishing blast furnaces and other equipment to process this raw ore. There are signs today that these great industrial countries which are producing steel are seeking material that has been processed to a degree. It might be only to the first, second, or third degree; but they are showing a desire for material to be partly processed in another country, if the economics of transportation make it desirable to buy such partly processed material.

This industry, the subject matter of the Bill, is indicative of a similar trend in other parts of the world. For instance, the other day we read of a sponge iron industry, or some project of that nature, about to be established in Malaya. This is again an attempt to partly process the raw material in Malaya before it is shipped to Japan. By this means only half the shipping tonnage would be involved; and, in turn, this means half the wharf facilities being required, and half of the handling and storage facilities being established at the ports of destination.

Some countries are getting to the stage when their industrial expansion is so tremendous that the physical problem of bringing in raw materials must be catching up with them. We notice the trend today is to purchase partly-processed materials. Of course, the main industry is still being undertaken in the great industrial countries.

Mr. Nulsen: Under this agreement the industry in this State could never reach the status of being an integrated works.

Mr. COURT: No. That is not intended at the moment; but that does not mean to say that somebody in Australia at a later date—if this industry is established successfully—might not use the partly processed ore as furnace material for producing iron and steel.

I would not like to be misunderstood on this point. There is no reason to say that this partly-processed ore will not be used in Australia; and there is no reason why in the future Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. will not want to buy this type of material for use here. After all, it is good blast furnace material; and for that matter it is merely another form of ore, except that it has been upgraded from 35 per cent., 38 per cent., or 42 per cent., as compared with Koolyanobbing iron ore, which is 62 per cent. By the time the low-grade ore had been upgraded it would be the equivalent to ore of 60 to 65 per cent.

Mr. Bickerton: You mentioned the figure which the project would cost, in order to produce processed iron ore in this State.

Mr. COURT: Yes; to produce 250,000 tons of processed iron ore, which would take roughly 500,000 tons of low-grade ore, is expected to cost £5,500,000.

Mr. Bickerton: That is for the foundry.

Mr. COURT: That is for the whole of the works, including the associated works which are allied to a project like this one. That figure does not include the costs to the Government, such as the costs of providing power and making roads, which are fairly small under this agreement. The company undertakes to meet a tremendous proportion of the investment cost, and that makes its proportion sound very high. One has to realise that this investment is expected to be amortised over a great number of years.

There is also this point in respect of costs: If and when the company has got over phase one and has proved the deposits and agreed on the process to be used, it will then be competent for the company to approach the Government and say that, as the result of a better process being discovered, it can establish a plant at a lower cost than £5,500,000. The Government may then approve of a different

design of plant which would cost less than £5,500,000, provided it was satisfied that the right type of project would be established.

Such a course is only a commonsense approach, because the methods of producing this type of material are changing so drastically and this industry is in its infancy. It is logical to assume that in the next three to ten years greatly improved techniques will be discovered to produce this type of processed iron ore.

Mr. Fletcher: Is any provision being made to apportion some of the processed ore to the Wundowie charcoal iron and steel project?

Mr. COURT: No. The processed iron ore under this agreement can be exported. The unprocessed ore cannot be exported, without prior approval of the Government. There is no tag for the ore to be used for this or that particular industry.

The ore is subject to a royalty of 9d. per ton for low-grade ore, and 1s. 6d. a ton for higher-grade ore. This is considered to be very satisfactory, having regard for the fact that the deposit, without such an industry as the one proposed, has little or no commercial value. The whole objective behind this exercise is to obtain a local industry. When one considers the royalty to be paid one must appreciate the fact that this ore, without the establishment of such an industry, would have no commercial value at the present time; and there is no right to export unprocessed iron ore.

Mr. Bickerton: At what point do you differentiate between low-grade and high-grade ore?

Mr. COURT: Within the definitions in the agreement, low-grade ore is that below 50 per cent. Ore of a higher percentage becomes high-grade ore. It is a fairly arbitrary line, but it was the only one which could be suggested by the experts as a sensible dividing line. For technical reasons they were able to explain that it would be most unlikely that that would be anything but a good practical division, because of the technical nature of the ore which exists down there and the physical changes which take place in mechanical upgrading.

Mr. Bickerton: Is there much ore above 50 per cent.?

Mr. COURT: I shall give the figures before I resume my seat. They are not as stupendous as those quoted twelve months or more ago. I repeat: They were not official quotations, but figures used when this project assumed the nature of a somewhat glamour project, before detailed negotiations with the Government took place. But the figures that have been proved, nevertheless, are quite spectacular.

It will be noted that the export of ore from the deposits concerned other than in processed form is not permitted without prior consent of the State. It is hardly likely that these low-grade deposits would lend themselves to export in their original form in any case. I cannot imagine any country wanting to buy these low-grade deposits at this stage in the steel industry's history for transport to any other country, and we can think of no proposition to transport them within Australia. Hence, one can see the importance of having industry based on these deposits to process them in Western Australia so that we can turn something which is at present uneconomic into something which is economic.

The royalty is subject to variation in accordance with royalties payable or agreed to be paid by steel manufacturers in Western Australia, and is also subject to arbitration in the event of dispute. The mining leases, provisions for which are clearly set out in clause 5, naturally form a very important part of the agreement as they are the basis of the industry. The provisions for the registration of mineral claims within the temporary reserves are set out. The right to these leases is tied to the active use of them in accordance with the agreement. The leases just cannot be left unworked by the company.

For instance, clause 5(8) provides that if by the 31st December, 1967, the company has not mined from the iron ore areas and processed at the factory at least 500,000 tons of iron ore in the preceding 12 months, the State may by notice in writing cancel and determine the mineral claims and the rights and interests of the company in respect of the iron ore areas and the wharf site. So the company is not only tied by time-table, but also by a volume of output, if it wants to preserve its rights under the agreement.

Mr. Nulsen: In regard to the wharf site, will that be the responsibility of the company?

Mr. COURT: Yes. There is further provision that if during any three consecutive years after the year ending the 30th June, 1968, the company fails to mine from the iron ore areas and to process at the factory at least an average of 500,000 tons of iron ore a year, the State may give notice in writing to the company of its intention to cancel the agreement, and the rights of the company in respect of the mineral claims, the iron ore areas, and the wharf site are forfeited. The significance of these dates is to allow the company time to build, plan, and get into operation; and from then onward, it has to maintain a consistent tonnage of a high order.

There are, of course, in fairness to the company, conditions laid down where certain specified delays will be taken into

account in determining whether notice should be given by the Government. The appropriate clause is clause 25.

Plan "A", a copy of which is tabled, shows the approximate location of the works site. It is subject to survey, but will comprise approximately 867 acres of land. At the appropriate time—that is, after the Government is satisfied the industry can proceed—the Government undertakes to make this available on a freehold basis free of cost. The Government also undertakes to make available, for other industrial purposes, approximately 50 acres of Crown or other land in reasonably close proximity to Augusta and Flinders Bay. It is expected to be required by the industry for consequential industrial development. Clause 10 covers this particular land. This is a distinct area as compared with the works site. The works site is on the Scott River and close to the deposits, whereas this other 50 acres is an industrial area closer to the settlements of Augusta and Flinders Bay.

Mr. J. Hegney: Will the tourist resort at Augusta be protected?

Mr. COURT: As far as is practicable with an industry of this type; but we must realise that with a major industry of this nature we cannot have all of the old order—we cannot have it both ways. However, the honourable member will find, as I develop my comments here, that we have done our best to separate the works site—assuming the industry eventually proceeds—to five or six miles from the residential town of Augusta. We have already endeavoured to plan that there will not be any heavy traffic of iron ore and processed iron ore through the main townsite. Every effort will be made to keep the wharf site, including the heavy transport, away from the residential area, just as the works site will be several miles away from the townsite.

Mr. Bickerton: Are these deposits deep?

Mr. COURT: No; they are surface deposits, and they are unique. They could be 3 ft.; or they could be up to 12 ft. deep on top of sand. It is as simple as that. They are unique in formation.

Mr. J. Hegney: I was thinking in terms of pollution around Augusta, where there is a fine tourist resort. It would be a pity if it were injured now.

Mr. COURT: It is not expected that this industry will produce much effluent. It is a dusty industry. That is why it has been kept away from Augusta for a distance of five or six miles which, I think, is adequate. The industry is dusty but is thought not to pollute. The effluent does not present any problem—that is, the ordinary effluent one might expect from this type of production.

Mr. Moir: Surely it is not going to become a dusty industry.

Mr. COURT: Not as far as is practicable. The company has already given notice of the methods it proposes for mining. These methods will keep the actual dust within the industry itself down to the absolute minimum so far as the workmen are concerned.

Mr. Moir: I notice it has a high silica content.

Mr. COURT: I do not think people would want to live on the fringe of this industry. Members will see that the works site is ideally located in relation to Augusta and Flinders Bay development. The works site is not too far away, but is sufficiently removed to avoid any nuisance to townsites. It is envisaged that the main work force will live in the vicinity of Augusta.

An important part of the project is the wharf and harbour facilities. It is the company's responsibility to develop at its own cost the wharf approaches and related loading appliances suitable for handling vessels of 20,000 tons or greater on a basis of at least 10,000 tons loading capacity a day for the export of processed iron ore.

Perhaps I could explain briefly: It might be possible for the company to build a harbour with all the associated facilities outside of the Blackwood River for, say, £2,500,000 to give it everything it needs to service the industry; but the Government might prefer a port in a slightly different position so that, instead of just having bulk-handling facilities, it could service or bring cargo in and out, other than the type handled by the company. If we increase the cost to the company by £1,000,000 to serve our purposes of development, it is expected, under the agreement, that the Minister will, in making a final decision, have some regard for the unfair burden imposed on the company.

Mr. May: I do not think you will get away with that.

Mr. COURT: In what way?

Mr. May: Get the company to pay for it.

Mr. COURT: Provision is made for the retention by the company of reputable consultants; and they are named initially as Maunsell & Partners. There is also provision for close consultation with the engineers of the Public Works Department as to location, design, method of construction, etc.

In the event of any dispute as to location, design, or method of construction, the final decision rests with the Minister who, in making that decision, will give due consideration to any unfair burden or added cost or interference with the company's operations that might be imposed on the company by the selection of a location, a design, or a method of construction other than the one recommended by the company's consultants.

In effect, this means that should the Government, for purposes of better servicing the area, require a port to be placed in a location other than that recommended by the company's consultants, or designed or constructed differently, or made larger again to better service the district, then the Minister should have regard for the extra burden on the company, because of a decision by the Government to better service the district as distinct from meeting the company's requirements under the agreement. The provision is that we have to have a suitable type which is to be the result of consultation with the Public Works Department engineers, and it is the responsibility of the company as to how it arranges the finance and so on. The company has to demonstrate, in fact, that it can do it.

Maunsell & Partners have submitted a report under date August, 1961, and copies have been made available to the Government on a "for information" basis—and I stress the "for information" basis—and not as a part of the formal notice under the agreement at this stage. The company has indicated to the Government just what its consultants think about the project and what can be done.

Alternatives have been proposed by Maunsell & Partners. One is for a breakwater-protected berth in Flinders Bay—that is, outside the Blackwood River—estimated to cost £2,150,000. The other is for an inner port situated in the mouth of the Blackwood River and protected at its entrance by breakwaters. This is estimated to cost £2,820,000.

The inner port has advantages in serving the needs of the company as well as the potential needs of the district. At this juncture no decision has to be made on the location or type of wharf.

Mr. May: That would have to be dredged, would it not?

Mr. COURT: Some dredging would be involved but the inner harbour development does lend itself to a first-class port. It is really no different from the development of Fremantle at the mouth of the Swan.

Mr. Moir: That would be pretty expensive.

Mr. COURT: That is if it were on a big scale, but this is on the basis of providing for a ship of 20,000 tons with loading gear capable of loading 10,000 tons a day.

Mr. Moir: You would not want too many No. 10 berths down there.

Mr. Brand: That is very true.

Mr. COURT: No; there would be no need. I do not think they will have any No. 10 berths; not in our lifetime, anyway. Naturally the inner harbour would be less affected by the weather. One of the problems outside the mouth of the Blackwood would be that it would be affected to such an extent on some days that it would not be usable, whereas the inner harbour would be usable most of the time.

Mr. May: Nearly as good as Albany.

Mr. COURT: I am not going to join in argument on Albany versus Bunbury because we will have another argument, if this industry is established, between Flinders Bay and Busselton. Do not anticipate trouble; we have enough as it is!

Naturally no decision has been made at this stage as to the location or type of wharf, because the report has only been made available on a "for information" basis and not as formal notice under the agreement. The wharf would be operated as a private wharf by the company, although it remains the property of the State except in respect of plant, equipment, and removable buildings. The company is responsible for maintaining the wharf site in good repair and condition during the currency of the agreement.

Under the terms of clause 11 the company is left free to make its own choice of means of transport between the works site and the wharf site. Various methods have been proposed such as roads, tramways, and overhead cable. Here again, no decision as yet has been necessary, because a lot of work has to be done before details of transport over the short distance from the works site to the port have to be resolved. If the port is outside the mouth of the Blackwood, naturally a major crossing of the Blackwood River would be involved.

Mr. May: What is the distance between the wharf and the works site?

Mr. COURT: According to the route, it varies between five and seven miles. It is a very short route. As I was saying, if the port is developed outside the river, then a crossing of the Blackwood will be necessary; but if an inner port is developed the crossing of the Blackwood will not arise for purposes of getting materials down to the ships.

There is provision for the road transport of char from Collie to the works site should the company so desire, and should char be the fuel finally decided on. The alternatives for fuel under consideration are char produced from Collie coal and charcoal from forests within a reasonable distance of the works site.

Provision has been made for road transport of char from Collie if need be. It was not thought to be possible to rail-haul it economically or satisfactorily; but the company has been assured, under the agreement, of the right to transport the char by the most economical means from Collie if it decides to use char. The decision naturally rests with the company.

Alternatively, there is provision for the company to be given access to the required supplies of firewood within a radius of 50

miles of the works site for charcoal purposes—up to 1,000,000 tons a year of firewood at a royalty to be agreed, but not exceeding 1s. a ton. This is subject to variation. The company is obligated to draw supplies of firewood from private property to the fullest extent possible. Subclause (4) of clause 11 makes it clear that the company is not entitled to cut or obtain and use any timber of milling quality or which may be utilised for the purpose of poles, piles, paper pulp, or fibre board.

Mr. Bickerton: What is the 1s. a ton for?

Mr. COURT: That is for firewood. The company can only take such wood as is approved by the Forests Department. It cannot use timber which has another commercial value. This has the great advantage from a forester's point of view that it puts to economic use something which at the moment is a complete waste.

Mr. Curran: Who is going to police the carrying of timber in that area?

Mr. COURT: There are foresters around there who have other duties to do, and this would be only one of them. I assume that normal supervision would be exercised.

The agreement provides for the supply of power by the State Electricity Commission to the works site and wharf site both during construction and in the operational phase. The company is entitled to generate its own power for its own use: provided, however, that after the State Electricity Commission has constructed its mains and is ready and willing to supply power, the company will not thereafter generate or use its own power without the consent of the State Electricity Commission.

There are circumstances when it would suit the State Electricity Commission—particularly during the construction phase—for the company to supply its own power. However, as I have just explained, the agreement provides that if the State Electricity Commission does build its mains to the works site and serves notice that it is ready and willing to supply the power, then the company from that time on cannot generate its own power without S.E.C. approval.

Provision is made for roads between the mining claims and the works site and between the works site and the wharf site. The crossing of the Blackwood River to service the wharf site does not arise if the wharf is built inside the mouth of the Blackwood River. However, crossing may be required for other purposes even if the inner harbour project is adopted. But this is a matter that has been negotiated by the company with the Commissioner of Main Roads, and presents no problems when the traffic needs clarify themselves.

The responsibility is on the Main Roads Department not to produce roads regardless, but in accordance with traffic requirements so that they will be economic. Planning is based on trying to by-pass the townsite with heavy road transport from the works if practicable. If we can keep the works site away from Augusta and heavy traffic out of the townsite, a great number of problems will be solved.

The housing requirements of the project at Augusta are provided for in two ways: The State is committed up to 160 houses. Again I repeat that the State has no commitments at all until phase 1 is out of the way and we know the industry will be established for certain. So we are not doing anything on spec. Beyond the 160 houses it is not arbitrary and is entirely at the discretion of the State. It is expected that if the industry were successfully established many more than 160 houses would be needed.

The company accepts the responsibility for housing its senior executives, employees who are not married, and the company's caretakers on the works site.

For the purpose of senior executive housing and single employees, the Government will make available free of charge on a freehold basis not more than 20 blocks of a reasonable area of Crown or other land within or near the townsite of Augusta. Houses provided by the State will be leased to the company on a basis to recoup the State its capital outlay over a period of 30 years, the company being responsible for all rates, maintenance, insurance, etc. Letting will be for a period of not less than 30 years with provision for renewal for periods of not less than five years. The company will be responsible for the management and control of these houses, including the collection of rents.

Notwithstanding the previously stated provisions, the company has agreed that it will use its best endeavours to arrange finance for its own housing scheme. This is naturally preferred by the Government; and as an inducement to the company to arrange its own finances for housing, the Government is prepared to give the company on a freehold basis, free of charge, Crown or other land not exceeding 50 acres for the erection of housing for married employees. To the extent to which the State provides this land, the State is relieved of its obligation for the provision of housing.

There are not expected to be problems in respect of effluent and the provision of water; and so far as the other clauses in the agreement are concerned, I think they conform to the normal requirements in an agreement of this type. There is a clause in respect of no discriminatory charges against the company, which is common in this type of agreement.

There are one or two things regarding progress made to date on which I would like to comment before I conclude. First of all, the company has expended from its cash resources in the course of exploratory work money in excess of £55,000, and this

is increasing progressively as further work is undertaken by the company. The company has been very active and the progress to date may be summarised as follows: Maunsel and Partners' report has been presented and indicates that both inside and outside harbour facilities can be constructed. Under date the 29th September, 1961, the company advised the Government in respect of ore resources as follows:—

> The area within 60 miles radius of the proposed port has been prospected and iron ore occurrences have been tested by scout drilling. An area of approximately 20,000 acres of limonitic iron ore has been selected as suitable for processing at the proposed plant at Scott River.
>
> Eighty costeans have been excavated and sampled covering an area of 2,500 acres adjacent to the proposed plant site.
>
> Four authorities, Yawata Iron & Steel, Nettetsu Mining Co., Consolidated Zinc, and Griffin Coal Mining Co., have undertaken sampling and assessment of the ore reserves in this particular area. The finding of these authorities is that the area contains approximately 35,000,000 tons of ore averaging 35 per cent. of acid soluble iron and it has been established that when the whole area is taken into consideration the total quantity of the ore reserves available for the project are adequate to jutsify the large capital expenditure envisaged.

This information, I might add, has not been given officially as formal notice under the agreement; and no doubt it will be the subject of appraisal by the Mines Department in due course. This is an indication by the company of good faith and of its progress on proving work.

Under the heading of "Development of Processes," the company has advised as follows:—

> Fairly large trial samples of ore have been shipped overseas to consultants in Germany (Lurgi) the U.K. (Huntington Heberlein and Head Wrightson) and Japan (Yawata) for the purpose of determining the optimum process and plant for processing the ore into marketable products.
>
> It will not be known whether the industry can be established on a sound economic basis until the research now being undertaken by these consultants is completed. It is anticipated that their reports will be available before the end of this year.

On the question of markets, the company has advised that it is of the opinion that no difficulty will be experienced in securing long-term contracts for processed iron ore provided a method of producing a high-grade product at a competitive price can be arrived at. The outcome of this awaits the decisions by overseas consultants. Subsequent to that, under date the 2nd October, 1961, the company has further advised as follows:—

> Water Supply:
>
> There is an adequate supply of both salt and fresh water available at the site of the works to provide for the production of all the end products envisaged.
>
> Soil Restoration:
>
> The ore occurs in poor sand country, on which there is very little timber and certainly none of commercial value. It is proposed to back load the gangue after ore beneficiation to backfill the area from which iron ore has been mined. If slag is produced it also will be backloaded and used as backfill.

On the question of health hazards—and this is the point raised by the member for Boulder and the member for Pilbara—the letter says—

> The ore contains a large percentage of silica which will be removed in the upgrading process. However the silica is present in fairly large particles, and as a wet process is contemplated there will be no unusual industrial health hazards.

Further comment on the question of exploration and testing is as follows:—

> (a) Exploration and testing has verified the early estimates of tonnage. The tonnage of ore that can be economically processed will depend on the economics of the research now being undertaken overseas. There is no doubt whatever that the amount of ore available of the required grade is sufficient to maintain an industry to produce at the rate of 500,000 tons per annum of pelletised iron ore, or alternatively a high value end product at the rate of 300,000 tons per annum for a period of 50 years.
>
> (b) Samples of ore representative of 35,000,000 tons averaging 33 per cent. Fe have been shipped to Lurgi, Simon Carves and Yawata. The sample shipped to Head Wrightson is representative of 24,000,000 tons averaging 38 per cent. Fe, and the sample investigated by Australian Mineral Development Laboratories was representative of approximately 2,500,000 tons averaging 48 per cent. Fe.

Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.8 p.m.

Mr. COURT: Before the afternoon tea suspension I had practically completed all the remarks I wanted to make on introducing the Bill to ratify the agreement. An agreement of this nature is of necessity very complicated, and in this particular instance it was even more so because of the unknown factors that have yet to be proved. However, I am quite confident that the

company concerned will use its best endeavours, in conjunction with the guarantor company, to overcome successfully phase one, so that phase two can be proceeded with.

It may be that after a study of the agreement members will have queries that they would like answered when I reply to the second reading debate. If they are of a technical nature I would appreciate advice from them.

Debate adjourned for one week, on motion by Mr. Moir.

Message: Appropriation

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

NATIVES(CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [4.10 p.m.]: Since the Minister introduced this Bill I have made a study of it to see what effect it will have on the principal Act. It provides for a number of amendments to be made to the 1944-1958 principal Act which, if this Bill is passed, will subsequently be known as the Natives (Extension of Rights) Act, 1944-1961.

In the main, the majority of the amendments can be regarded as being machinery amendments which are necessary because of the legislation which has been passed in recent years. For example, in the old Act the mention of citizenship rights is made with reference to road boards and road districts and, as all members know, these have now become municipalities; therefore, provision is made in the Bill to include municipalities in the principal Act.

Further, in the interpretations, where the Commissioner of Native Affairs is now referred to in the Act, the Bill will make an amendment to give him the title of Commissioner of Native Welfare.

There is one major alteration proposed by the Bill which seeks to include some additional provisions in section 6 of the Act. The main provision the Minister wishes to include reads as follows:—

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, a native who is born after the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five, without being required to make an application under this Act,—
>
> (a) has the same rights, privileges and immunities and is subject to the same duties and liabilities as a person who is of the same age as the native, and who is a natural born or naturalised subject of Her Majesty; and
>
> (b) shall be deemed to be a person to whom a certificate of citizenship has been granted under this Act.

Then, in paragraph (3) of the proposed new subsection the following provision appears:—

> Nothing in this section deprives a native, who is a holder,—
>
> (a) of the right to property or benefit accrued prior to the native becoming a holder; or
>
> (b) of any property that would accrue to or devolve on the native if he were not a holder.

I do not think there will be much debate on the minor alterations proposed in the Bill, but speaking for the Opposition I think I can say to the Minister that we are not happy about granting citizenship rights to those native children born after the 1st January 1955. The policy of the Labor Party in this State is that all natives should have citizenship no matter when they are born; that because they are born in Australia they should be granted citizenship rights automatically. In the past, by introducing measures from time to time, we have endeavoured to achieve that objective; and, in 1958, we introduced a Bill, which was amended, to do just that.

The Minister now proposes to grant citizenship rights to all those native children born after the 1st January, 1955, but I fear that that is going to bring about many complications. At the moment we are following what is largely a shandygaff policy in that some members of a native family can be citizens and some cannot; and I think the Minister's proposal will only aggravate a position such as that. So probably the Minister may already have a feeling that we will be attempting to amend the Bill in this regard; and if he has he will be correct because we will be making an attempt to amend this provision so that all natives will have citizenship when they are born.

In the Committee stage, if we fail in our first move, we will make an attempt to amend the Bill so that it will be mandatory for all native families to be granted citizenship rights when half the members of a native family already hold them. If I may elaborate on that a little, what I mean is: If there are seven members of a native family and four are citizens and three are not, we consider that the whole family should be made citizens.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister made mention of the fact that there has been a quickening of interest on the part of the general public in the welfare of natives, especially in recent years, and that he was taking steps along those lines to more or less comply with the desire of the public to have natives made citizens. However, we feel that the steps the Minister proposes to take do not go far enough; we consider they should go much further.

I think we are justified in expecting that they should go further because the natives have come a long way—particularly in the last decade or two—since the original settlement of Western Australia.

Most natives today have a reasonably good State school or independent school education as a consequence of living in districts or near towns where there are State schools, independent schools, or missions, and they are now looking forward to the day when they will be made citizens. I believe the fact that they are not now citizens is holding back their progress.

You will be surprised to hear, Mr. Speaker, that as recently as last Sunday evening I heard two men—both as black as the ace of spades—who hail from Kenya in East Africa, addressing 30 or 40 of our local natives, and those two men told the gathering that they were amazed that our natives did not have citizenship rights. Those men from Kenya said they have citizenship rights in their own country and were staggered to learn that the natives in this State do not possess such rights. I heard that said myself, and I felt that the natives whom those men from Kenya were addressing were entitled to citizenship rights.

Mr. Bickerton: I think the Minister will agree with your amendment.

Mr. BRADY: I do not think the Minister will be as adamant on this point as he has been on others in the past. I feel sure that he will be allowing for certain compromises, and I hope he does.

We have also travelled a long way, in so far as citizenship rights are concerned, in regard to another aspect of our native population. During his second reading speech the Minister said that the Government of the day had had foisted on it the Allawah Grove native settlement. Then I think he said that he was horrified when he went to Allawah Grove to inspect the settlement after he had taken over the portfolio of Minister for Native Welfare.

The Minister, however, did not make plain what he was horrified about. Naturally, being a former Minister for Native Welfare, I was interested in that statement, and I do not know whether he was horrified at the natives in the camp; the buildings in the camp; or the number of natives in the camp who did not have any buildings. He did not make the position clear; and when he replies to the second reading debate I will be pleased to hear what he actually did have in mind.

Mr. Perkins: The conduct in the place.

Mr. BRADY: Of course, that could be so. There are times when some of the natives get out of hand; when some of them unfortunately perhaps have a little too much to drink.

Mr. W. Hegney: So do whites.

Mr. BRADY: But while I am talking about drink I would like to read some of the evidence given before the Federal Royal Commission which was here recently to inquire into voting rights for natives. I would like to quote the remarks of an anthropologist, Mrs. C. M. A. Harrison, who is reported to have said that—

> A slight degree of malnutrition which exists among natives in the south-west was closely associated with alcoholism.

She said further that—

> Once a native suffered from malnutrition he often took to alcohol. Natives should be allowed to drink so that they could learn to handle alcohol properly.

Being a teetotaller myself—I never indulge in drink—I was most interested to read that comment; as I was to read that the person making it was not only a woman but an anthropologist. That was a slant in relation to alcoholism which I had never heard before; and it might be a good thing if the Minister or his department gave some consideration to these suggestions on alcohol put forward by experts.

Mr. Perkins: Would you support the good lady in her belief?

Mr. BRADY: I would now, and I will tell the Minister why. When I was in charge of the department, I took two or three trips to the north-west; and I invariably found, in every hotel, that natives were drinking. I found natives drinking in Carnarvon, and in Port Hedland; I found them drinking in the hotels of Roebourne, Broome, Derby, and Wyndham. This was the case with both the men and the women: they were drinking with the white people, and being accepted by them.

At one time I would not have agreed to this aspect of their social life. But I will be quite frank with the Minister about this; and my views have changed because of what I have seen in this regard. In passing I might say that on one Sunday morning, in Roebourne, I witnessed a fight between two Italians; and the only person who made any attempt to separate them was a full-blooded native. I said to him, "You took a big risk;" and he replied, "Not an unnatural risk." I then went on to say that he appeared to be well educated, and he said that he was. When I asked him where he had been educated he replied that he had received his education at New Norcia, and said that he was working in the Public Works Department. There I found a native who was accepted by the white people; and that was the case in all the ports that I visited.

I would like to quote the opinion expressed to me in a letter from a person who was once a justice of the peace in Guildford. He said, in effect, "Mr. Brady, I would like to point out that I have sat

on the bench at Guildford for many decades, and that I have sentenced natives for drinking and varied offences; but I found that I was doing the wrong thing, and that the natives should have been granted the right to drink, just as this privilege is afforded white people. Had they been permitted to do so they would have handled their drink as do white people." That is the opinion that was included in a letter to me after this gentleman had sat on the bench as a justice of the peace in the Guildford district for many years.

While the Minister might have been horrified at what he found at Allawah Grove as it relates to the actions of some of the residents, I would like to point out to the House that he also found at Allawah Grove such amenities as telephones, a bitumen road, and water laid on in every home. He also found electricity in every house; that two doctors and a sister were available to the people at Allawah Grove; that an infant health centre had been established; that a kindergarten was conducted regularly at the centre; and that the Friends Society was conducting a sewing class. He found a club established which was constituted of natives who met to discuss local community matters; and that there was a man in charge named Toolittle, who was granted £1,000 from the "Save the Children" fund. Indeed, he found a number of amenities at Allawah Grove which were not granted to natives in the metropolitan area prior to 1957.

The only facility provided for natives before that time was a site alongside a sanitary depot—there were no amenities at all. They never enjoyed such things as a road; nor did they have water or electricity laid on; nor any of the other amenities I have mentioned. The natives at that time lived in the bush in their natural state. That was the condition of affairs in the metropolitan area when the Labor Government took over from the Liberal-Country Party Government.

Thanks to the previous Minister for Housing—the member for East Perth (Mr. Graham)—it was possible for us to obtain houses that were vacated by white people who had been transferred. These houses were made available to the natives. That was at least a step in the right direction, even though the houses are completely unsuitable.

At the time they were occupied by the white people I mentioned in this House that they were as hot as hell in the summer, and as cold as charity in the winter. But, as I have said, they were certainly better than the conditions under which the natives were living before they entered those houses; and they are now living in them with a semblance of civilisation. I would like to urge the Minister to take what action he can as quickly as possible to build homes for natives among the white people. I would like to stress this necessity.

Mr. Perkins: You never built too many while your party occupied the Treasury bench.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Has this anything to do with the Bill?

Mr. BRADY: This refers to the question of granting citizenship rights to natives; and I feel the quickest way to achieve that objective is to provide them with decent homes and amenities, preferably among the white people. If the Minister provided facilities in the metropolitan area similar to those that were available at Allawah Grove I am sure he would agree that natives would be assimilated and become citizens a lot quicker than they otherwise would.

I just thought I would like to remind the Minister of what the Labor Party found when it took over the Government. I daresay we could have said we were horrified at the lack of amenities that were provided for those unfortunate people.

The Minister and the department appear to be out of touch with the reactions of the general public to this legislation. After the legislation was introduced, there were at least a dozen letters written to the Press concerning this matter. Perhaps it would be as well if I read some of them to the Minister so that he might have an idea of the public's reaction to this Bill.

Mr. Perkins: Twelve letters are not many from the total population of Western Australia.

Mr. BRADY: The Minister, of course, is trying to get ahead of me. For his information I would point out that some of the people who have written the letters represent many hundreds of people, and speak on behalf of those people. I think the Minister can be assured there are thousands upon thousands of people who are interested in seeing that the natives are granted citizenship as early as possible, rather than that they should have to wait till the date mentioned in the Minister's Bill. They feel that the wait of 15 years, for children—with an additional six years for those born before the 1st January, 1955—is far too long.

The first letter I would like to quote is dated the 17th July. It was written by Margaret Bello and is as follows:—

> The Government's decision to grant full citizenship rights to native children born after January 1, 1955, means that those children will not come into their full rights before 1976, which gives the Government a respite of 15 years from now.
>
> Apart from the fact that this decision is only a half-hearted compromise, it may even cause family dissensions between the educated children and the uneducated parents.

Only a person who has experienced racial discrimination can understand to the full the bitterness which such ostracism evokes in the hearts of those who have to suffer it and which brings in its wake loss of self-respect, indifference and shiftlessness.

The Government should be magnanimous, courageous and unprejudiced by granting the natives full citizenship rights—their birthright—forthwith.

Dealing with the position in Sydney, the following report appeared in *The West Australian* of the 12th September, 1961:—

Experts Clash Over Native Voting Rights.

Mr. A. P. Elkin, a former professor of anthropology at the Sydney University, said that everyone should have the right to vote.

The West Australian of the 8th September published the following leading article:—

The Natives (Citizenship Rights) Bill means, in effect, that by 1976 an increasing number of coloured Australians will automatically assume the same rights and responsibilities as white people. They will be compelled to enrol and vote at Legislative Assembly and Federal elections.

But since the Bill excludes natives born before January 1, 1955, it would give rise to serious anomalies. It does nothing to hasten citizenship rights for many non-primitive adult natives outside the 1,650 already having them or, in fact, for a child born in December, 1954.

The Government is determined to hasten slowly and safely in the belief that, with improved education, native children will be able to accept the duties of white society when they grow up. Its proposal would put the onus on future Governments to ensure that its faith was not misplaced.

Since it is desirable that all Australian Governments should try to keep in step on this question, the Government should have waited to see what the Federal Select Committee on voting rights for aborigines recommended. Even if that committee were unduly cautious the Government would have a duty to try to evolve a more liberal measure of reform than what it has conceded.

Because of the sensitivity of world opinion on backward and subject peoples it is unlikely that we shall be left to solve the native problem in our own leisurely time. It would be foolish at present to try to give the vote to every native in touch with civilisation. But the method of granting citizenship rights should be overhauled and it should be possible to extend citizenship to many more adults with the safeguard that enrolment and voting should not be compulsory. It is unlikely that this would lead to greater liquor abuses than exist at present. On the contrary, it would help to give natives more self-respect.

Doubtless the Government is anxious to legislate before the general election. If, however, it is determined to go ahead it should bring more children within the scope of the Bill and make it possible for more adults in the State's non-primitive native population of 16,000 to become citizens and vote.

That is exactly what the amendments of the Opposition will achieve.

Mr. Perkins: Will you read some of the letters which you wrote to me as the Minister for Police, protesting against the trouble caused by natives to the residents of Guildford?

Mr. BRADY: This is typical of the form shown by the Ministers on the front bench. They try to draw red herrings across the trail. Unfortunately the Minister for Police has not the assistance of the Minister for Industrial Development or the Premier to protect him.

In regard to the statement of the Minister I would like him to quote any of the letters I am supposed to have written to him complaining about the conduct of the natives at Guildford. Let him read such letters from his files when he replies to the debate.

The Minister has complained about alcoholism on the part of natives who reside in my electorate. He is trying to make out that I have been harassing those natives by writing to him. Being a former Minister for Native Welfare I would think twice about taking such a step, even if I wanted to. I have complained only once, and that was about the conduct of natives in Middle Swan. I did write to complain about the conduct of natives who raided poultry yards in South Guildford. If it was a white man who was guilty of such an offence I would also write to the Minister for Police.

I ask the Minister to quote the letters which I am alleged to have written to him, containing complaints.

Mr. Tonkin: I know of the existence of one letter which the Minister will not quote.

Mr. BRADY: There are many such letters.

Mr. Perkins: There are a few from East Perth on the subject.

Mr. BRADY: I need not worry about the affairs of the member for East Perth, because he is able to look after his own electorate. To continue with the reports which have appeared in the newspapers

concerning this question, the following was published in *The West Australian* of the 11th September:—

> The Natives (Citizenship Rights) Act Amendment Bill showed that the Government did not believe the time was right for citizenship to be granted to natives, the Rev. A. Crookes Hull said yesterday.
>
> Mr. Hull, who is State secretary of the Methodist Overseas and Aboriginal Missions, was speaking at the West Leederville Methodist Church.
>
> He said the Bill providing citizenship for natives born on or after January 1, 1955, now before the Legislative Assembly, was grossly undemocratic because it determined citizenship on the basis of age grouping and date of birth.
>
> If it was morally right to grant citizenship to natives born in 1955, it was also right in the case of those born earlier. The Bill excluded a big section of natives from social and cultural development.

I presume the Rev. Crookes Hull represented many thousands of the community of Western Australia when he made that statement.

A letter to the editor from Mrs. Rischbieth appeared in *The West Australian* of the 2nd September, 1961, as follows:—

> The Bill now before Parliament regarding citizenship rights for natives is a most inadequate addition to an already out-of-date measure which governs our native people, and should be replaced.
>
> Premier Brand has been approached from several quarters with the suggestion that the Bill be deferred until the recommendations of the Federal Select Committee are available. I understand, however, that the Government intends to proceed with the measure.
>
> In its restrictions, the amending Bill excludes all natives born before January 1, 1955, which means that children now aged six years, on reaching the age of 21, will assume the same rights as white people. But the most glaring injustice, so it seems, is that the Bill shuts out non-primitive adult educated people, many of whom are known to desire to work for the improved standard and status of their own people but who under this measure are deprived of the means of helping them—namely, the vote and the dignity of citizenship status.
>
> Members of Parliament should give consideration to the likely effect of this Bill if passed and its repercussions at home and overseas.

I understand the Commonwealth Parliamentary Committee inquiring into the native question visited Western Australia and took evidence from people who were connected with the aborigines in this State. The Minister himself gave evidence before that committee. I understand his evidence was along the lines that two discriminations which had any practical effect were the right to vote, and the right to obtain liquor. He said the Government was taking the line of developing as quickly as possible the generation of native children growing up so that they could take their place in the community.

Another witness was Dr. Ronald Murray Berndt, reader in anthropology at our local University. He had an important statement to make concerning citizenship rights for natives. I feel the House should have regard for what Dr. Berndt said, because he frequently, during the holiday periods, goes to the outback of Western Australia and associates with natives for many weeks at a time. He goes into the various camps, and also to Allawah Grove, to meet these people. He said this—

> A vote for the natives would lift their morale and give them a new lease of life. The natives are deeply conscious of their history and are full of bitterness because of their early treatment. They are much more concerned than European people think. If they had a vote they would feel they had a stake in things, a little more expression and choice.

I thought I should mention the viewpoints of those people as published in *The West Australian* and placed before the Commonwealth committee when it was here.

Another reason why the Opposition will endeavour to try to drastically amend the propositions put forward by the Minister is that the natives have some resentment about applying for citizenship rights. I am sorry the Minister has been so evasive in regard to giving myself and other members in the House this information. On the 7th September I asked the Minister the following two questions:—

> (1) What is the approximate number of natives who have applied for, and been granted, citizenship under the Natives (Citizenship Rights) Act, 1944?
>
> (2) What is the approximate number of natives who could apply for citizenship under the Natives (Citizenship Rights) Act?

In answer to the first question the Minister replied as follows:—

> There have been 2,202 applications for citizenship rights certificates, 1,652 having been granted.

So over 600 natives were refused citizenship rights after they had applied. The Minister replied as follows to my second question:—

> Information from the recent census is not yet available, and until this is to hand the number of natives who could apply for citizenship rights cannot be reasonably estimated.

I do not think the Minister was fair when he gave that reply. I asked him only for an approximate number, but the Minister said that the census had not been compiled. He knows the census closed only recently, and it might be six months or twelve months before we obtain the information. However, if the Minister had quoted from the department's returns for 1960, he could have told me the figure, because it is on page 41.

At the 30th June, 1960 there were approximately 19,000 natives in Western Australia. So, out of 19,000 natives in Western Australia, only 1,652 have been granted citizenship rights. That is approximately only one-tenth of the number that could have received them.

Therefore, it would appear that the natives resent having to apply for citizenship rights; and many of them have expressed themselves as being opposed to applying. I have read of natives in the nursing profession and of nursing aides refusing to apply for citizenship rights because they felt that as they were born in Australia they should automatically be citizens. I have also read of school teachers of native blood who have refused to apply for citizenship rights because they were born in Australia and felt they were equal to anybody else born in Australia and should therefore automatically be citizens. I have read of dozens of people of that type throughout Western Australia who have refused to apply.

Another reason why the Opposition will try to drastically amend the Minister's proposition is this: that thousands of natives who were born before the 1st January, 1955, are educated to a standard equal to, and in some cases superior to that of many white people in the State of Western Australia. They have not applied for citizenship rights in the past because they feel they should not have to. Some of these people are double and triple-certificated nurses; and some have their A-grade teaching certificates. These people feel they should not have to be forced to wear what they call a "dog collar" and carry a letter from a magistrate or from the Crown Law Department containing a photograph, thus showing that they have citizenship rights. The Opposition feels the Minister should drastically amend the proposal before the House in order that these people will not be forced into that position.

The other night when I was browsing through some literature I was surprised to find that many years ago, when the natives were in their wild state, they were citizens of this State. There was a book written by a lady named Mary M. Bennett. I believe she lives in Kalgoorlie. This book is called, "Human Rights for Australian Aborigines"; and in it she had this to say—

> *The Oldest Australians*
>
> In the year 1788 when the first white people sailed into Botany Bay, New South Wales, the newcomers saw scores of naked dark-skinned people watching their arrival. This was the first sight of the native Australians by those who had come to claim their land. The new settlers had nothing to fear from the aborigines who made no effort to repel the invaders. Physically they were well endowed, living by hunting, mostly in the coastal areas where water and game were abundant. Under the tribal system separate sections of the land were regarded as hunting preserves for the different tribes. It is estimated that there were at least 300,000 aborigines in Australia in 1788.

Let me say this by way of an aside: I was speaking to Mr. Kim Beasley, M.H.R., who was a member of the Federal committee which sat recently in Western Australia; and he told me that by the end of the current century it was expected there would be approximately 150,000 coloured and full-blood natives in Australia. That is half of what the number was in 1788.

We all know what has gone on in the years between. Anyone who does not know should read the history of the natives written by the late Daisy Bates; and of the activities of others who tried to do something in the early days—such as the Bishop of the Anglican Church who came out in the early part of the century and told the settlers that they were not giving the natives a good enough deal. Representatives of some of the other churches told the settlers the same thing. The important point I want to bring out in this debate is that natives were citizens during the time when we first obtained our popular franchise.

The next heading in this book is "A Trust Betrayed." I quote as follows:—

> In 1887 the natives of Western Australia were citizens of the country with the added right that one per cent. of the gross revenue had to be paid into a fund—beyond the reach of Parliament—for the advancement of the Aborigine people. This condition was laid down by the Imperial Parliament as compensation for taking their land when granting self-government to Western Australia and secured by Clause 70 of the Constitution Act. In

1895 the State Government petitioned the Imperial Parliament asking that this Clause of the Constitution should be cancelled, and Sir John Forrest, Premier, said, "It seems to me that the approval of the Imperial Government to the repeal of the 70th Section of the Constitution Act and the consequent placing of complete trust in the people of this colony to do what is right and just to all Her Majesty's subjects, whether white or black, would be a graceful act, and still further strengthen the bonds of loyalty and affection between the mother country and this portion of Her Majesty's Dominions."

This promise to deal justly with black equally with white settlers has not been honoured.

If members take the trouble to refer to their book of Standing Orders for the Legislative Assembly they will find that there is no section 70 in the Constitution. There is a section 65; there is no section 66 or 67; there is a section 68; but no section 69 or 70. Therefore it would appear that the author of the book from which I have quoted has done a tremendous amount of research and knows that she is correct when she says that the natives were citizens until in 1895 the Imperial Parliament was petitioned by the State of Western Australia to delete that section from the Constitution.

So 60 years have gone by and we find that of the 2,000-odd natives who applied for citizenship rights, 600 were refused; in other words, approximately 25 per cent. Is it any wonder that of the 19,000 natives in Western Australia, 17,000 have not applied?

Mr. W. Hegney: How many did you say were rejected?

Mr. BRADY: Approximately 600. There is a reason for that, and I think it is because the Act is loaded against the natives. At one time magistrates dealt with this matter. Then about 1948 the McLarty-Watts Government altered the Act so that a member of the local municipality or road board had to decide with the magistrate. The most unusual position was that the decision had to be unanimous. If it were not, the native concerned did not gain his citizenship rights. I do not know of many boards in Australia where that provision is made.

When dealing with such an important matter as this we have to recall these things in order to know the situation. The point I am trying to make most is that the interest in natives has so quickened in the minds of people in the last two decades—and particularly in the last decade—and natives are so conscious of the fact that they desire citizenship rights, that the steps the Minister says the Government is taking are too small. They should be larger, quicker steps to give the natives the opportunity to obtain citizenship rights.

As I told the House a few moments ago, I heard two black people talking to a group of our natives. They said they were proud they were black and would not like themselves to be called coloured. Those two men were from Kenya in East Africa. They said they were automatically granted citizenship rights. If it is good enough for other colonies to give citizenship rights to their black folk, we should do so to ours.

I suppose that every one of the local natives who were at that meeting at Allawah Grove could become citizens, but they have no power to do so. They sat in an orderly public meeting and listened attentively. There were no interjections.

Mr. Hawke: The member for South Perth could not have been there.

Mr. BRADY: The whole of the activities overseas were explained to them at that meeting. I have spoken fully on this question because it is an important one. Human beings are being discussed—people who are amassing wealth for the squatters in the north-west, for the pastoralists, for the rural community, and for the business people.

The other night the Minister admitted that today there are dozens of natives who are apprentices. But they will be excluded from becoming citizens unless something is done.

Mr. Rhatigan: What would the Minister know about it? He flew over a couple of missions! That is all the experience he has had!

Mr. BRADY: I think the Minister will be prepared to compromise before this Bill is passed.

Mr. Norton: You are a super optimist!

Mr. BRADY: I feel I have shown that he is out of touch with public opinion. I can speak, as members know, at length on this matter; but I feel I have given sufficient information to demonstrate that there is a necessity for this clause to be altered.

Let me say finally that the State Ministers for Native Welfare held a conference in the Eastern States about 1947. They decided then that all natives should be given citizenship rights; but unfortunately the then Western Australian Minister for Native Welfare (the late Mr. Doney) did not introduce a Bill along those lines when he returned to Western Australia. I do not know why. I have been told that he was informed by the Liberal-Country Party Cabinet that such a Bill would not get support.

If the Ministers in the other States were agreed that citizenship rights should be granted, this fact should be made known because it is vitally significant.

As I said before, the natives in Western Australia at this stage are quite capable of assuming their responsibilities as citizens; and I hope that when the Bill is in Committee the Minister will see his way clear to accept the amendments which the Opposition will propose in order that we might quicken the steps which the young people can take in their desire to obtain citizenship rights at the earliest possible date, and also so that their fathers and mothers, and sisters and brothers will not be forced to live in their present shanties.

I have already indicated that I intend to move for the addition of a subclause to clause 6. I understand that other members propose to move amendments also. I support the Bill in so far as it will help natives to obtain citizenship rights, but I do not support it in its present form.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.0 p.m.]: This Bill contains seven clauses, only two of which to my mind have any great substance. The first short one, in my opinion, is an effort on the part of the Minister and his Government to mislead the community of Western Australia. I might be wrong in my assumption, but I will take some convincing. The first clause to which I desire to refer is that which reads—

> The long title to the principal Act is amended by substituting for the word "full" the word "additional."

The principal Act, passed in 1944, was an Act to provide for the acquisition of full rights of citizenship by aboriginal natives. Why the change? This Bill provides—

> The principal Act as amended by this Act may be cited as the Natives (Extension of Rights) Act, 1944-1961.

Again I ask the Minister: Why the change in the verbiage? The original Act was passed 17 years ago, and it was an Act—although I think it has long been outmoded—to confer upon certain members of this community full rights of citizenship provided they faced up to certain requirements concerning education, health, and so on. An application had to be made, and the magistrate had to be convinced that the person concerned was entitled to be issued with a certificate; and the holder, if he were convicted of two comparatively minor offences, could have his full citizenship rights taken from him.

The time has arrived when every member of this community should be entitled not to additional rights or an extension of rights, but to the same rights that you have, Mr. Speaker; the same rights that the Minister has; the same rights that the Prime Minister of this country has, or any other member of the community. Why this jiggling around with words—an extension of rights, or the conferring of additional rights—when in these enlightened days we should be conferring full citizenship rights on everyone?

I propose to quote a few articles from the Declaration of Human Rights. I think it is quite appropriate, and it might help to convince some members of the Government that the time is over ripe for all these restrictions to be removed from a section of this community. Let us have a look at the preamble to the Declaration of Human Rights that was adopted some 13 years ago. The first paragraph of the preamble is as follows: —

> WHEREAS recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world . . .

The preamble says further—

> WHEREAS the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom . . .

Article 1 says—

> All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2 says—

> Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

That is universal enough. Let us now turn to Article 6, which says—

> Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

These are not my declarations; they are declarations on an international basis adopted 13 years ago. Article 18 says—

> Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 21, which is the final article I will quote, says as follows:—

> Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

I have quoted those articles for the purpose of showing members how far behind we are in this State in the direction of conferring on others the rights and privileges which we enjoy ourselves.

I said that the Natives (Citizenship Rights) Act was passed some 17 years ago. I have my doubts about the efficacy of that Act. Experience has proved that it should be repealed and the restriction imposed on the native community should be removed.

From memory, I asked the Minister how many natives had applied for citizenship since the commencement of the Act. The answer was 2,199. I am not quibbling with the answer given by the Minister to the member for Guildford-Midland, whose question was asked a little later. The figure he was given was 2,202. I asked the question, how many applications have been approved; and the answer was 652. My next question was: How many applications have been rejected? There were 346 rejected; 65 were withdrawn; and 136, according to the answer I received, are in abeyance or the cases have been adjourned. I do not know how long those cases have been in abeyance, but that is beside the point at the moment. There are 346 people in this country who thought they were entitled to full rights of citizenship; who went before a magistrate and the president of a shire council, or the mayor of a municipality in a community, and were told they were not entitled to the rights of citizenship.

Let us put ourselves in Gilligan's place. Suppose it was one of us who did not enjoy the full rights of citizenship, and we considered we were entitled to the same rights and the same status as anybody else; and on going before two of our fellow-countrymen and requesting the conferring of those rights, those two countrymen said, "No, you are not going to enjoy the same rights that we have," and our application was rejected. I know there are quite a number of people who are regarded as natives before the law, but whose pride and spirit will not allow them to apply for citizenship under this outmoded Act. When I was the member for Pilbara I knew quite a number of men who were natives before the law. They did not have the trade training that the Minister kept harping on the other night; but they were good, honest labourers, and quite a number of them were working on public works: on the wharves, on main roads, and on stations; and they were just as good citizens as any of us are.

Those men were full financial members of the Australian Workers' Union; they enjoyed the privileges of the award; they got the union rates of pay; they enjoyed the same conditions; they camped with the white men, and were members of the same organisation; they paid the same rate of tax. They paid the same amount of tax, if their circumstances were similar to those who enjoyed the full rights of citizenship.

We now have, at this late hour of the day, the Minister, on behalf of his Government, bringing in a Bill of this description, indicating that those boys and girls who are now six years and 10 months of age will, in 1976, be entitled to full citizenship rights; but if they are now seven years of age, or eight years of age, they will have to apply for citizenship under this Act. The thing is too preposterous; it is too ridiculous altogether!

The member for Canning is a schoolteacher. The Chief Secretary was a schoolteacher. If they had taught in the north-west or the back country, they would know of quite a number of boys and girls, who were natives before the law, who went up to the primary stage. Those boys and girls are now 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 years of age. Will they be entitled to the rights and privileges of citizenship? No; not unless they pass the test of a magistrate, the president of a shire council, or the mayor of a municipality. There are other people who have reached the junior standard; and, as the member for Guildford-Midland said, there are some who are nurses; and there is at least one who is a schoolteacher in the Education Department. I do not know whether he is still there, but he refuses to apply for citizenship rights. A man can be a Bachelor of Arts, or a university professor, but, if he is a native, by law he has to apply for citizenship under this Act; and, as I said before, if he commits a couple of minor offences he could have the rights of citizenship taken away from him.

I have taken the trouble to read the Minister's second reading speech a couple of times, although I admit it was pretty hard to do. He kept harping on the fact that what is being done now will ensure trade training, education, and housing for the native community, and that by the time 1976 is reached these people will be able, automatically, to become citizens of this country. Incidentally, he gave the missions of this country, which have been doing such a magnificent job for the native boys and girls, over a long period of years —I do not think he really intended it as such—a back-hander. He indicated by his speech that their efforts have been in vain. But the missionaries have, over many years, made great sacrifices and given their lives in the interests of this under-privileged community. Yet the Minister, by his remarks, indicated that their efforts have been in vain.

I think most members of this Chamber know that as a result of the missionaries' efforts there are many men and women who have as much right to be regarded as citizens as we have. They have had a good basic training and they are entitled not to have any restrictions placed on them by an Act of Parliament. On the contrary they should be received into the community.

The Minister made reference to three aspects of native welfare—housing, education, and trade training. There are plenty of white people who engage in unskilled occupations. Thousands of them today are

only labourers because they have had no trade training. Just in passing—and I referred to this aspect during my speech on the Address-in-Reply—I might mention that in every State of Australia, and in the Commonwealth as well, Governments have had to introduce legislation to make it compulsory for the people of this country to vote at elections. Why did they have to do that? It appeared that there was apathy and indifference among members of the public, and it was thought fit by the legislatures that there should be compulsory enrolment and voting. Yet we have some people who say that the natives would not know what they were doing, and that they would not take the trouble to vote even if they were given the right to vote.

But they should be given the opportunity; and the restrictions, so far as the Electoral Act is concerned, should be removed. Where there is a will there is a way, and at least we could have a period where enrolment was voluntary; and, if these people wanted to be enrolled, they could take the necessary action. Yet the Minister tried to make out that this Bill was doing something for the native population, and that the Government was being magnanimous in extending the rights of citizenship. It is extending the rights to this extent: a number of boys and girls who are now regarded as natives, and who are under seven years of age, will be entitled to citizenship; but, apart from them, any man or woman, or boy or girl, no matter what his or her educational qualifications may be, will still have to apply for citizenship in 1976, if this legislation is passed.

Members can see the ambiguity of it. A number of boys and girls will be entitled to automatic citizenship while their brothers and sisters will have to apply for the rights of citizenship. Some will automatically be regarded as citizens while others will still be regarded as natives.

Mr. Hawke: Crazy.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Members can see how divided a family could become on that basis. These people have souls, the same as we have. They have consciences, and they have reasoning propensities, just as we have.

Mr. Graham: You cannot say that about the Government.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: We should have some human feeling about this. I ask members to put themselves in Gilligan's place. How would they feel if their families were divided, and some of their children were regarded as natives while others were regarded as citizens of this country? Some would have restrictions imposed upon them while the others would be free of those restrictions.

Mr. Perkins: Your Government only gave lip-service to this.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am not going to be sidetracked by the Minister. Suffice it to say that when I was Minister for Native Welfare we introduced a Bill to provide for citizenship for natives.

Mr. Hawke: And the Minister voted against it.

Mr. Perkins: What about housing?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am not going to enter into a controversy with the Minister. I am speaking now on behalf of an underprivileged section of this community, and I am trying to show how misleading this legislation is. I was going to say that it is innocuous, but it is not that. It is going to be most harmful to a number of people in this community.

Let us follow the position a little further and visualise what will happen in 1976: I have been making a rapid calculation in regard to this. The member for Guildford-Midland quoted from a book written by Mrs. Bennett. He mentioned the year 1788, when the first settlers landed at Port Phillip. How long ago was that? It was nearly 200 years ago. How long is it since Fremantle, Perth, and Guildford were founded? The colony of Western Australia was founded in 1829—132 years ago. Yet despite all our progress in Government, and understanding of human relationships, the Government introduces this sort of legislation.

I am not standing for it. I presume we will have to pass it, unless the Minister is prepared to accept amendments. However, let us get back to dealing with 1976, and let us visualise what is going to happen then, unless there is some major reform in regard to the native community before that time. I hope there will be; but if this legislation is passed, and nothing is done in the meantime, a number of people will have attained full citizenship automatically by virtue of their age. They will have dark skins—I am not saying that in any derogatory sense—but they will have had to apply to no-one; they will automatically become citizens; but their sisters and brothers, who are a little older, will have to apply for citizenship.

But even if the sisters or brothers have applied for citizenship, and can produce their certificates, look at the doubts that will be thrown on those who have automatic citizenship, and who are the same colour as their brothers and sisters who have certificates. If these people want to go somewhere where restrictions are placed on natives, they will have to produce their birth certificates. How preposterous can some people get!

I do not know whether members of Cabinet gave this legislation much consideration, but I certainly do not think it fills the bill. On the contrary I am firmly of the opinion that it is an attempt to shelve the issue; and the Minister thinks that, if he gets away with

this there will be no more problems in regard to our attitude towards the native community of Western Australia between now and 1976. He probably thinks that a lot of things can happen in that time, and that the Government's responsibility to the native people will have been shelved.

I was going to quote a few extracts from the Minister's speech, but the member for Guildford-Midland has covered the ground extensively. In conclusion, let me say I hope—and I do so with all the sincerity at my command—that there will be some members on the Government side who will not stand for this, and that they will ensure that the date will go back to 1905, or 1895; or alternatively that the date will be removed altogether, and also that, in due course, this native citizenship rights legislation will be repealed and that there will be introduced reasonable and just legislation to cope with any particular aspect relating to the native community—but not with a view to imposing further restrictions, or to continue these existing unjust restrictions. I want every person in this country, if he believes in democracy, whether he be brown, black, or white, to have the same rights and privileges that I have enjoyed in this country for the past 50 or more years.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [5.21 p.m.]: I am a little disappointed with the provisions contained in the Bill. Although they are as forecast, and as we anticipated, I had hoped that I would be a member of a Parliament that had moved with the times and had granted full citizenship rights to all natives. The provisions of the Declaration of Human Rights have already been quoted by the previous speaker; and I find it something of a paradox that natives, although citizens of this country, are, by an Act of Parliament, deprived of citizenship rights.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister himself said—as recorded on page 744 of *Hansard*, dated Tuesday, the 5th September, 1961—

> I agree that all Australians, white or coloured, do have citizenship by right, but so far as natives are concerned there are a few limitations.

As I said before, I find that to be something of a paradox when citizenship rights are something we take away from them.

In 1957, I was at the I.L.O. Conference at Geneva and, for three weeks, sat among representatives of all Governments and countries who were attending the conference and dealing with protection and integration of indigenous and other tribal and semi-tribal populations in independent countries. That conference had been proceeding for three years in Geneva and it concluded with a recommendation being made that covered all types of tribal populations.

At Geneva a great deal of surprise was expressed when it was found that Australian aborigines did not have citizenship rights throughout the length and breadth of the country; and when this text was being discussed, the provisions of the legislation that applied in this country were referred to time and time again.

Article 1 of this convention was merely a preamble, but Article 2 stated—

> Governments shall have the primary responsibility for developing co-ordinated and systematic action for the protection of indigenous peoples and their progressive integration into the life of their respective countries.
>
> Such action shall include measures for—
>
> > enabling indigenous peoples to benefit on an equal footing from the rights and opportunities which national laws or regulations grant to the other elements of the population.

That was the background of the whole discussion; namely, that indigenous populations shall have equal and full citizenship rights with all elements of the country. The provisions of that text were framed with the co-operation of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, and the World Health Organisation.

I think that is a fair indication that modern thinking is along the lines of granting complete citizenship rights to all populations. I just do not know why we should take citizenship rights from the natives. I have looked for the answer. I have wondered whether it is because they are considered as being inferior as a race; but then, if they are considered as being inferior as a race, surely we would never grant them citizenship rights at any time, and there would be no need for this Bill!

So the reason cannot be that we consider them inferior as a race, but possibly it is on account of their social status, especially when we take exception to the aborigines. If it is because of social status, this can only be based on an unreasonable approach. It does not seem reasonable or fair that because a person is coloured or black he should be treated as something that is objectionable. However, this seems to be the attitude that has been cultivated over the years.

To give the natives social status, the first thing we must do is grant them full citizenship rights. There is no doubt that citizenship rights carry a certain dignity, and we cannot expect aborigines to act as citizens or with any dignity if they have no official standing behind them.

There have been many articles written, of course, on the question of citizenship rights, and I could probably compile quite a good speech by taking extracts from all

of them. Rather than do that, however, I have found in my reading that there are two particularly good articles; and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some quotations to the House from both of them.

The first appears in *The Western Sun*, dated Friday, the 14th July, 1961. This article was written by a person well experienced in native affairs. It discusses the Minister's proposal as it was anticipated it would be brought down and as it has since been brought down, and it reads as follows:—

> Mr. Perkins' plan is not very progressive.
>
> It involves an arbitrary date, which means, moreover, that no effect will be felt for 15 years, until the first of the new class of children turn 21 and get the right to vote and drink.
>
> Even after 15 years, it would only be the beginning for many adults who still have not their Rights.
>
> It will be at least the year 2025 before all aborigines in Western Australia have full citizenship rights.

I should imagine that that figure is based on the average life span of three score years and ten. The article continues—

> Arguments used to oppose the granting of citizenship Rights are identical with those used in England against adult suffrage and votes for women.
>
> Some people have suggested that giving aborigines the vote would be like giving a razor to a child.
>
> The similarity between a razor and the vote is difficult to see, apart from the fact that a few political heads might fall when the new voters realise they have something in their own future.
>
> The Kennedy administration in the United States is well aware of the power of the negro vote.
>
> Similarly, to consider aborigines as children, or as having "primitive tribal instincts" is incorrect.
>
> Most of them in W.A. are in contact with the European way of life—and they are not considered too childlike or primitive to pay taxes.
>
> Shelving the problem now will not improve matters. Both full-blood aborigines and people with mixed blood are increasing.
>
> The Romans said they did not want slaves from Britain, as they were inherently too lazy and stupid a race, and incapable of advancement.
>
> It seems equally preposterous to speak of aborigines as having "tribal instincts" which preclude their being able to take responsibility.
>
> The only way to become an effective member of a democracy is by participation.
>
> People have to have freedom not only to make correct decisions, but also to make mistakes.
>
> With liquor, just as prohibition in America made the problem worse, present W.A. legislation has aggravated rather than controlled the situation.
>
> The ordinary laws of the land are adequate to deal with drunkenness and lawlessness among black or white.

That is correct, of course. Whatever laws apply to drunken white people must apply with equal force to drunken black people. Continuing—

> Mr. Perkins has recently shelved certain aboriginal housing projects because he says that he has to listen to the wishes of the people in a democracy.

I believe some of those housing problems related to projects in Busselton and Kalgoorlie. The article continues—

> This presumably refers to the wishes of white voters and not those of aborigines. To oppose a move because of a few abuses is like throwing the baby out with the bathwater.
>
> Unfortunately the present legislation is building a false class of aborigine. Those few who have rights almost invariably oppose the granting of similar rights to others using the same arguments as whites.

There is no doubt of course that does happen. But those views are not entirely peculiar to this side of the House.

There are, of course, a number of other articles and reports which emanate from people of all shades of political thought, on this very important question of native rights; and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote an article, published by the University Liberal Club, on the native problem. It deals with full citizenship rights, and places major emphasis on the right to vote. It is not a widely circulated paper—perhaps it is more widely circulated in the University than anywhere else; possibly because it has been put together by the University Liberal Club.

I do not know what standing the University Liberal Club has with the Liberal Party, but I do believe it has the right to send representatives to various Liberal conferences. I understand that is how the club operates. The article I am about to read was prepared by Mr. P. H. Steele. I quote—

> This report is the culmination of our views after 18 months of reasonably concentrated enquiry into the aboriginal problem in Western Australia.
>
> The overall and very definite conclusion at which we have arrived is that the native should be conceded full citizenship status, i.e. the restrictive legislation imposed upon him by

this State should be unconditionally repealed. This view is one held not only by the majority of students in Political Parties within the University, but by a great number of the general public with whom we have come into contact through our interest in this problem.

That is quite definite; there are no half measures. The result of their 18 months of investigation has shown that restrictions of all kinds should be removed from natives.

Mr. Graham: It suggests that the young Liberals should join the Labor Party.

Mr. Roberts: Are you canvassing for new members?

Mr. DAVIES: What I am about to read has been written by a native welfare worker who, unfortunately, must remain anonymous. His name, however, is well known to me and to other members. I quote—

> Citizenship is a legal term defining a certain status in the eyes of the law. Citizenship is not synonymous with community acceptance. This being so, a person's behaviour, mode of living, conduct, morals or any other peculiarities of personality or characteristics of race, or for that matter whether or not a person can hold his liquor, therefore has nothing whatever to do with the question of citizenship.
>
> Most people argue against citizenship as they would argue against the granting of social acceptance and the claim that natives are not yet ready for citizenship is no exception.

I think that is very true. To continue—

> It seems that we are inclined to confuse citizenship with community acceptance and vice versa.
>
> The distinction between citizenship and community acceptance is that one is a purely abstract issue concerning legal status, while the other is conferred by society on conforming to an accepted way of life.
>
> Contrary to popular belief, natives, do in fact possess the status of being a citizen of Australia and in fact, of each State.

This is precisely what the Minister indicated the other night. The article continues—

> It so happens, however, that some States have seen fit to suspend some of the rights which natives are entitled to exercise. They have done so and the deprivation of some of the constitutional rights of natives is still in force in this State today.
>
> You will note that there is a distinction between "status" and "rights." The former is preserved intact whilst the latter or a portion of the latter can be suspended. Status, however, without the equivalent equal rights of a citizen, is empty and meaningless. This being so, it would not be correct to say that natives should be given or granted citizenship, the correct way of putting it is that the State Government should concede recognition of the fact that they are citizens.

There are two or three other comments but they are really not important. To continue—

> It has been said that this State makes provision for those natives who are socially advanced to acquire citizenship. The Government apparently recognizes that there are two major obstacles in the way of deserving natives—the franchise and access to liquor. But it does not wish to remove these obstacles so it does what it considers to be the next best thing, it has created a device known as the Native (Citizenship Rights) Act, this Act is designed to enable the holder of a Certificate issued under this Act, to overcome these restrictions. In other words, it enables the holder to fly over the obstacles. But having arrived at this stage, the native finds himself in a very peculiar position. His legal status is still that of a native within the Act for the purposes of the beneficial provisions of the Native Welfare Act. For instance, in practice where a white person may apply to the relief section of the Child Welfare Department and be granted monetary relief, the citizenship rights holder is referred to the Department of Native Welfare where he can be granted only rations. An order form enabling him to obtain meat and groceries from a store. The actual effect of a Certificate of Citizenship Rights is to jack a native up a peg or two in the social scale by enabling him to overcome all restrictions. Whilst possession of the Certificate of Citizenship Rights does, in fact put a native into a privileged position among his own people, it also strips him of human dignity by imposing on him the obligation to show his Certificate on demand to publicans, barmaids, police officers, and others who may wish to determine his status for some purpose or other.
>
> The result effected by this degrading obligation is quite obvious—it causes the cruel and very definite effect of perpetuating an acceptance of an inferior status and generally establishing an inferiority complex.
>
> In my opinion, natives are *not unduly concerned* about acquiring the right to vote for the purpose of exercising that right. I do not believe that they have this end in view. Rather, to them it is a means to an end. In

their view, they see in acquisition of that right a form of insurance. A kind of preventative against being kicked around from pillar to post. Possession of this right will ensure that they will no longer be treated as of no account. For the first time in their life, their political views will matter. They will be wooed for their votes. As a section of voters in electorates our legislators will be anxious not to offend them. In my opinion, the natives will not be too anxious to use this new-found right, until they get the feel of it. At the moment, they are anxious only to acquire possession of it, nothing more.

I think that sums up fairly well the reactions of the natives themselves when viewing the question of citizenship rights. There is one other important aspect which deals with some of the arguments used by retentionists in favour of the present legislation; and here I would like to quote an article written by F. M. Chaney, junior, which reads as follows:—

> Whenever voting rights for aboriginals are discussed two arguments are always used to counter suggestions that the native should be subject to the same laws in this regard as any other Australian. Firstly, that many natives are not yet ready for the vote and secondly, that it would be impossible to make voting for the aboriginals compulsory because of the nomadic life some of them lead.
>
> The first is specious, the second more obviously false. We claim to believe in democracy and give all people over 21 years of age the vote. We do not ask for qualifications. Political awareness, general education, literacy, all may be absent in the white man yet we do not consider withdrawing the franchise, in fact we go so far as to make voting compulsory even for such an individual. Surely this attitude is fundamentally correct and democratic. Why does it cease when the question of the aborigine voting comes to be considered?
>
> We have no right to have special standards applied to people on the basis that they are racially different.
>
> It is also obvious that as the State Electoral Act now stands it would be practically possible to remove the portion of Section 18 which exempts natives from its provisions.
>
> If this were done natives would be obliged to register as voters and obliged to vote. What however would be the practical effect?
>
> Those natives who are absorbed into the general life of the community would constitute no problem at all, it would be no more difficult to apply the Act to them, or for them to accept the obligations entailed, than it is for the white community.
>
> Problems begin with the large number of itinerant natives who drift through wide areas, of the State, through the cities and towns and rural regions. They are not however an insurmountable difficulty. The Electoral Department seems to handle itinerant white workers without panic or disorder.
>
> S.17 lays down that in order to qualify as a voter you must have lived in a district or sub-district for a continuous period of three months prior to enrolment. However subsection (2) provides that occasional absences from such district or sub-district do not prevent you from qualifying. Thus itinerant workers can register as voters in what may be termed their base of operations. When an election comes around there are adequate provisions for postal and absent voting to ensure that they can exercise their franchise.
>
> The same principles could be applied to the itinerant aborigine. He would register in his home town and his wandering life could in no way detract from his right to vote. You do not have to be in the country for very long to find that a native now in Gnowangerup might well be known to be a Mt. Barker resident, and so as for every other itinerant it becomes a question of fact as to where the native does reside.
>
> Then comes the question of enforcement. Once again the problems are the same as those already faced by the Department with respect to itinerant whites. We are not concerned if aboriginal franchise did add to the problems. Rights cannot be curtailed because some expense would otherwise be involved. But it is worth remembering that there would be practical limitations on the keeping track of aboriginals until they do become more stable in their habits—limitations which we must accept and which in fact solve the problem of the third group of nomads.
>
> This group is usually set up as the final argument against the granting of a compulsory vote. In fact they are an irrevelant consideration. If you wish to be legalistic they would not qualify as residents of a district if genuinely nomadic. More important they just would not come within the sphere of the Electoral departments activities. Only as they gradually drift into civilization will they become the departments concern. The department will not be sending out officers into the Warburtons for example. That is not the way it operates.

> It should be realized that a compulsory vote for natives is not impractical. It will be difficult, and wise administration of the Act by the Chief Electoral Officer will be required. For example S. 156 (12) of the Act put it in his discretion as to whether or not there was a reasonable excuse for not voting, such discretion could no doubt be used.
>
> The important thing is that we should not be afraid to put obligations on the aboriginal. Probably he needs obligations even more than he needs privileges. The Constitution of Australia makes the aborigine a citizen, he should therefore have all the rights and duties of citizenship possible.

Those are some of the views on the problem as expressed by the opposing forces. I recommend the views expressed by the University Liberal Club, as contained in the report I have just read; apparently a great deal of research has gone into its preparation. All this adds up to the fact that the present system of the granting of citizenship rights is degrading in the extreme.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Committee inquiring into this matter heard evidence in Western Australia from more than one native who, although eligible for citizenship, would not apply because he considered he would be degraded by so doing.

Mr. Perkins: How many people in this State would take that view?

Mr. DAVIES: I am only quoting those who gave evidence before that committee. I have not made a study of the position myself. I am only going on the facts published in the newspapers, and the facts were that a number of natives applied for citizenship; but from the information given by a previous speaker in this debate, not all of those eligible have applied. I feel that most reasonable people will agree that is the proper thing to do. It was only the ultra conservation element—which apparently has control in the granting of citizenship rights to all natives—which was not prepared to move with the times and do what should have been done years ago—and which it is only just and fair should be done—to provide all natives with citizenship rights. The granting of full citizenship is working well in all States in Australia, with the exception of Queensland, the Northern Territory, and Western Australia.

Mr. Perkins: It is not working in the Northern Territory. There the authorities give the aborigines citizenship rights on one hand, and take those rights away on the other.

Mr. DAVIES: I said it worked in all States except Queensland, the Northern Territory, and Western Australia. I thought that citizenship rights were granted automatically in New South Wales, but there appears to be some restrictions on the obtaining of liquor. I listened to an address by a person who recently travelled throughout Australia and studied the position in each State, and he said that the restriction on the obtaining of liquor was generally overlooked in most parts of New South Wales; and that, in effect, there were no restrictions in respect of liquor.

Mr. Perkins: Would you prosecute natives who did not enrol or vote, if they were given citizenship rights?

Mr. DAVIES: In this State there is provision for the Chief Electoral Officer to exercise his discretion under section 156 (12) of the Act. The discretion which the Chief Electoral Officer can exercise in respect of the white population, could also be exercised in respect of the coloured population. I see no difference between white and native citizens. The laws which are passed to apply to the white population should also be made to apply to the native population.

Mr. Perkins: Are you not introducing a new type of discrimination? You are advocating that the law which applies to one class of citizens should be applied to another.

Mr. DAVIES: I am suggesting that the same laws be applied to both classes. To take the example of the right to vote, the Chief Electoral Officer can apply his discretion in respect of the white population, so surely he should be able to apply it to the coloured population.

Mr. Perkins: He does not apply the discretion, except in the case of a person who is exempt from voting for some good reason.

Mr. DAVIES: The discretion can be applied. Surely only the circumstances need to be looked at. I am not here to suggest what excuse should constitute a reasonable ground for applying the discretion. The law provides that the Chief Electoral Officer may exercise his discretion; therefore he should exercise it in respect of all classes of the population.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister cannot even take a trick against the newest member in this House.

Mr. Perkins: I am not trying to take any tricks; I am trying to elucidate the facts.

Mr. DAVIES: The facts quoted by speakers in this debate today and the examples given by them point to the need for this Government to do the proper and

decent thing; that is, to accept the amendments on the notice paper which will ensure that full citizenship rights are granted to all natives.

The arguments being used by the Government are the same as those which, in the past, were used to oppose the granting of the right to vote to women, and the granting of adult franchise. Surely no great tragedy has befallen us by the granting to women of the right to vote, and the granting of adult franchise.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Norton.

PUBLIC MONEYS INVESTMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [5.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is designed to enable the State to increase its earnings from moneys held in the Public Account. The total cash holdings of the Government are kept in an account at the Reserve Bank of Australia. Into this bank account are paid all revenues, loan proceeds, and other moneys comprising the Public Account, and from it all types of Government expenditure are made. The bank balance fluctuates daily and varies from some hundreds of thousands of pounds to as high as eight million pounds.

The legislation which governs the Public Account is the Audit Act of 1904, which prescribes that public funds shall be kept in a bank. No power is given to the Treasurer to invest these funds in any way, and consequently the earnings on these moneys are limited to 1 per cent. per annum which is the rate paid by the bank on balances held on our behalf.

These earnings fall far short of the return which can be obtained from investment in the short-term money market. This market was created in Australia with official backing and is the principal reason for the introduction of this Bill.

So that members will know the nature of the official short-term money market, I shall explain its constitution and operation. The official short-term money market was established by the Commonwealth in February, 1959. The term "short-term money market" is an expression used to describe specialised operations relating to the investment of funds lent on a very short-term basis. It offers facilities for the investment of temporary surplus funds, and in return pays interest for the period involved. The security for the investment is Commonwealth Government securities with a maturity date not exceeding three years.

The market is operated by dealer companies licensed by the Reserve Bank, which guarantees the dealer's ability to repay by accepting the position of "lender of last resort." This means that in the event of the dealer being short of ready funds to meet his obligation to a depositor, the bank will advance the money to him for this purpose.

When funds are deposited with a dealer company it is required to have Commonwealth securities of equivalent market value deposited with the Reserve Bank which issues a safe custody receipt to the lender. Thus the Reserve Bank acts not only as custodian of the securities but also in terms of the license which the bank issues to the dealer, as lender of last resort.

So although the investment is with a short-term money market operator, in fact there is both the trustee or custody protection of the Reserve Bank and its role of lender of last resort. These safeguards ensure that there is no possible way that a lender can fail to recover the amount of his deposits with any of the short-term money market dealers.

Dealings on this market are subject to a minimum deposit of £25,000. No brokerage is charged by the dealers or the bank. Money may be deposited at call or for specified periods. The rate of interest payable varies not only with the period but with market demand for funds. This market is now firmly established. The statistical bulletins of the Reserve Bank show that interest rates varying from 2¾ per cent. per annum up to 4¼ per cent. per annum have been paid. In this respect I would point out that 2¾ per cent., the minimum quoted, is almost three times higher than our current earnings from moneys held in our bank account. The method of operation on this market is as follows:

The lender contacts an authorised dealer and obtains a quote of the rate of interest the dealer is prepared to pay. The lender may seek alternative quotes to take advantage of the best rate offering. He then pays to the dealer the amount to be invested and receives in exchange a safe custody receipt covering Commonwealth securities lodged at the Reserve Bank for the amount invested. At the end of the term, or when the funds invested are required by the lender, he is repaid the money, together with interest in exchange for the safe custody receipt.

Funds may also be invested by what is described as the buy-back method. Under this arrangement the dealer sells Commonwealth securities to the lender and agrees to buy back the securities at the end of a specified period at the same price, together with an amount covering the agreed interest earnings.

As will be obvious from this type of dealing, time is the essence of the contract, particularly if the funds are invested at call; and consequently provision is made in the Bill for the Treasurer to be empowered to directly use this market for investment purposes without further authority.

In addition to the creation of the official short-term money market, the Commonwealth is also currently issuing short-term securities in the form of seasonal Treasury notes. These notes have a tenure of three months and provide a yield of approximately 4 per cent. per annum. Provision is also made in this Bill for the Treasurer to take advantage of this type of investment when circumstances are appropriate for its use.

This measure will also enable the Treasurer to invest funds for longer terms in Commonwealth securities or on deposit with a bank. There are occasions when certain sums are set aside for specific purposes and are not required for some time. These funds may well be employed in earning a higher rate of interest than the 1 per cent. currently available through the bank account.

Members will note that provision is made for the Treasurer to obtain the approval of the Governor for longer-term investments. In the case of short-term investments such a course, because of the timing of the operation, is not practicable. However, provision for the Governor to generally give directions to the Treasurer on investments is included.

In summary, this measure provides for a number of important principles which are—

Authority for the Treasurer to make use of otherwise idle funds by investment for short terms in sound securities;

provision to invest for longer terms, subject to the Governor's approval;

to ensure that public funds produce the maximum income for the State, consistent with the safeguards required for the investment of such funds.

The Bill now before members will permit the use of the investment facilities which I have described and will enable the best possible use of available cash in order to obtain as much as we can in interest earnings for the State.

That briefly explains the Bill. I commend it to the House, because I understand that other States have followed this line and it has proved most beneficial. I also understand from the Under-Treasurer that something in the vicinity of £80,000 might be won from this medium. I think it is quite a sound decision, provided we have the authority of Parliament, to invest those funds which, from time to time, lie idle in such amounts.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hawke (Leader of the Opposition).

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [6.2 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The passing of this Bill is necessary in the event of the Bill which I have just introduced becoming law. Its purpose is to remove transactions on the short-term money market from the incidence of stamp duties.

When introducing the Bill for the Public Moneys Investment Act, I explained the reasons for the creation of an official short-term money market and the way in which it was operated. Members will realise that the income of the approved dealers operating in this market is derived primarily from the interest paid on the Commonwealth securities held by them. Mainly from this source the administration costs and interest paid on deposits must be met. As it is a competitive market, the interest rates paid are to some extent limited by the expenses, and the operating margins are very fine.

In the larger States, the approved dealers have established offices at which the transactions are carried out; but in this State that has not been possible. One of the main reasons is that each operation attracts stamp duty in some form under the Western Australian Stamp Act.

For example, receipt duty at 3d. per £100 would be levied on deposits and repayments, and in some transactions mortgage duty at 2s. 6d. per £100 would be payable. An investment of £500,000 for one week would attract two payments of receipt duty which would total £125. Obviously payments of this order, or even higher, would force the dealer into loss on many of the transactions.

In consequence I understand that such dealings as are arranged in Perth are actually transacted in other capital cities to avoid the imposition of this tax. In those States no stamp duty is payable on short-term money market transactions.

The present arrangements in Western Australia, as well as being inconvenient for the dealer, are also unsatisfactory from the lender's point of view, as difficulty and some delays are inevitable. As the State does not receive duty under existing conditions, and therefore would be no worse off by exempting these transactions, this measure has been introduced to facilitate the operation of the market in Western Australia.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hawke (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 6.4 p.m.