Members who were here when a similar measure was debated some years ago will recall that one of the objectives was to make sure that the Royal Commissioner, the advocates, the counsel, and the witnesses were not placed in a worse position by appearing before, or with, the commission than they would be if they were before the Supreme Court, where protection is given to judge advocates, counsel, witnesses, and so on.

This protection has been requested by the Royal Commissioner in respect of the Wool Exporters Royal Commission; and it is felt we should have provisions which are comparable with those that prevail in other parts of Australia. I cannot say for certain whether this applies in all of the other States of Australia, but my understanding is that protection is given in most.

When Royal Commissions are appointed, it is only fair and proper that those who act in official positions as commissioners, advocates, counsel, and witnesses, should have the protection to which they would be entitled if they were appearing before the Supreme Court.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Davies.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [12.5 a.m.]: As I remarked to the Premier, this Bill should only take a few minutes of our time. It contains two simple amendments to the Hairdressers Registration Act, which was originally an Act of 1946 and amended in 1953 to provide for fees for examinations and for the wearing of badges. In 1955 there was another small amendment dealing with section 14 of the Act.

It is now proposed to amend two sections of the Act. One amendment deals with fees; and this is to ensure that people who are registered as hairdressers pay the fees even though they may not be practicing. The other amendment is to ensure that the section which refers to a person being suspended for fraud, or for any other reason, will apply to such a person only in so far as appeals are concerned.

As I see the position, if a hairdresser is supended because of fraud or for having done something in contravention of section 16, then he has a right of appeal. The words "pursuant to this section make this quite clear.

In regard to the amendment to section 14 it seems that if a person is suspended for not paying fees, he is automatically deregistered and therefore does not have to pay fees to the organisation. Therefore they either pay and be registered, or they do not pay and be struck off the books.

I support the amendments because the Hairdressers Registration Board has been advised by its solicitors that something along these lines should be attempted. The amendments will clear up the position that now exists and I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. O'Neil (Minister for Labour), and transmitted to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [12.10 a.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

I would like, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to remind the House that, with the prospect of concluding the first period of this session next Friday, we will sit as usual on Tuesday at 4.30 p.m., because of party meetings and the like; at 2.15 p.m. on Wednesday; and at 11 a.m. on Thursday. We may sit a little earlier on Friday, and when we do meet we will sit on.

Although we will meet again early in 1969 for the second period of the present session, it is necessary for all the money Bills to be passed, as well as all other important legislation, before we conclude the first period. It is, of course, up to us all whether we finish reasonably early on Friday or whether we talk all night. Nevertheless, we do not want manoeuvring of any kind for any special purpose, because we must continue sitting until such time as we get the legislation through.

I would like to thank the House for its co-operation tonight.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.11 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 29th October, 1968

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

BILLS (6): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Nickel Refinery (Western Mining Corporation Limited) Agreement Bill.
2. Railways Discontinuance and Land Revestment Bill.

3. Police Act Amendment Bill.
4. Nurses Bill.
5. Art Gallery Act Amendment Bill.
6. Child Welfare Act Amendment Bill.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

CLOSE OF SESSION: FIRST PERIOD

Target Date

1. The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Mines:

   As we are now in a very late stage of the first period of the session, could the Minister inform us when he contemplates that this period will end?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

   The Government hopes and plans to end the first period of this session on Friday, the 1st November.

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION: FIRST PERIOD

Sittings of the House

2. The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Mines:

   What are his ideas with regard to sitting hours for the rest of this week?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

   The Legislative Assembly will, after today, sit tomorrow at 2.15 p.m.; on Thursday at 11 a.m.; and probably at the same time on Friday. That is the Premier's intention. Looking at our notice paper and that of the Legislative Assembly, I would say it is fairly obvious we might well be waiting for some legislation, and I would be grateful if members would keep in mind the times the Legislative Assembly intends to sit. I will adjourn the House from day to day according to the volume of legislation which comes down from the Legislative Assembly.

   The two Houses, of course, must finish at approximately the same time in order that they might exchange messages; but the Assembly has more Bills to send to us than we have to send to the Assembly.

   That is the best answer I can give the honourable member. However, bearing the Assembly times in mind I propose we use our best endeavours to finish the session on Friday.

Legislation: Examination and Debate

3. The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

   Since he has stated it is anticipated the first period of this session will conclude this week, and we know several taxing measures and two appropriation Bills, in addition to many others, are yet to come to us, may this House be assured that sufficient time will be made available for a thorough examination of those important Bills and adequate time also for the debate appropriate to them?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

   I can only say that the Ministers will give as much time as possible for debate on all the Bills we are to receive. I am unable at this particular moment to indicate when the appropriation Bills or Loan Bill will reach the Legislative Council. In the years I have been here—when sitting on this side of the House and in other places—I have known those two Bills to land here between the hours of 7 p.m. and midnight, and be passed on the same night. However, I am sure we are anxious to give as much time as we possibly can for debate on the appropriation Bills, the Loan Bill, and any taxing Bills which may be introduced.

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

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning), and read a first time.

QUESTIONS (10) : ON NOTICE

LAND AT MANDOGALUP

Excavation and Drainage

1. The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY asked the Minister for Mines:

   In view of the proposed acquisition of the area of land facing and extending westwards from Johnson Road, Mandogalup, known as the "Specs," for storage of sludge from the refinery of Western Aluminium NL—

   (a) will this area be excavated for a dam site, and will it be pugged with clay;

   (b) are the principals concerned with the use of this land aware that a portion of the "Specs" is reputed to contain an area of quicksand;

   (c) has an investigation been undertaken by any authority as to the holding capacity of the portion referred to in (b):

   (d) is there any danger of the poisonous sediments from the alumina refinery finding their way into the vast underground water supply which is used

extensively for human consumption in the Mandogalup and Wellard districts; and

(e) what proposals are planned to replace the main drainage course southwards through the "Specs" from north and east of Hope Road, and north of Anketell Road and White Road?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) This area will not be excavated for a dam site. However, as the hollow areas are progressively filled up with sludge, there will be a slight building up of surface material around the perimeter to contain the sludge within the dam-site area. The area will be pugged with clay as and when required.

(b) No. They contend that there is swamp land in the area, but not quicksand.

(c) No. The company intends to carry out comprehensive tests to determine the holding capacity of the whole area once it has been acquired.

(d) There could be some pollution, but the company intends to seal the area with clay against any very dilute caustic soda solution contained in the sludge polluting any underground water supply.

(e) Proposals to replace the main drainage course southwards through the "Specs" are under consideration by engineers from the Public Works Department.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Extension to Remote Areas

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

As the net profit of the State Electricity Commission for 1967-68 exceeded $3,800,000 after absorbing losses of more than $500,000 incurred in the southern areas of the State, will the Government give further consideration to extending the commission's activities to the remote areas of the State, and provide current at the rates it charges in the southern areas?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The whole of the commission's profits are essential to extend operations at the present rate.

There are not sufficient funds available to extend the commission's activities in the north-west towns on the basis suggested.

FORESHORE ROAD

Albany

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

In connection with the proposed foreshore road at Albany, referred to as the western access road—

(1) (a) Has the Main Roads Department made a survey of possible routes; and

(b) if so, what work has been carried out to date?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of the proposed project?

(3) What is the estimated construction cost?

(4) How many traffic lanes are proposed?

(5) In view of the extreme discomfort and inconvenience suffered by residents of Festing Street as a result of heavy haulage traffic, could the Public Works Department review its harbour development works' programme with a view to expediting the construction of an access road other than Festing Street?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) (a) Approximately 10 years ago a preliminary investigation was made to study the feasibility of a foreshore road.

(b) No work has been carried out.

(2) There is no proposed project, but a sum of $440,000 as an estimated cost of the foreshore road was quoted by the Albany Town Council several years ago.

(3) Answered by (2).

(4) Consideration has not been given to details of road design.

(5) As all available Albany Port Authority funds are committed for the next three financial years to the completion of No. 3 berth, a review as suggested is not considered warranted.

TEACHERS

Graduations and Resignations

4. The Hon. R. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) How many teachers have graduated from the Claremont and Graylands training colleges in each of the years 1966 and 1967?

(2) How many are expected to graduate in 1968?

(3) How many teachers resigned from the Education Department between December, 1966, and December, 1967?

(4) How many teachers have resigned from the department in each month of this year to date?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) 1966—	Claremont	413	+ 21	private
	Graylands	144		
	Total	557	+ 21	private
1967—	Claremont	288	+ 28	private
	Graylands	218	+ 1	private
	Secondary	136	+ 5	private
	Total	642	+ 34	private
(2) Estimate 1968—	Claremont	337	+ 29	private
	Graylands	185		
	Secondary	175		
	Total	697	+ 29	private

(3) Resignations from permanent staff—December, 1966 to December, 1967—

Other work	93
Marriage	183
Ill-health	8
Miscellaneous reasons	265
Retirements—	
(i) age	31
(ii) ill-health	3
Deaths	6
Termination	1
	590

NOTE: (a) Many of the 183 teachers who resigned for marriage were re-employed as temporary teachers.

(b) Actual figures of recruitment from other sources, on a basis comparable with the above statistics, are not available for the period prior to January, 1968. However, the number of teachers re-entering the service or recruited from other sources has enabled the Education Department to maintain staffing ratios.

(4) Monthly resignations during 1968 of permanent teachers—

	Jan.-Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Total
Marriage	.	11	20	19	5	2	22	4	83
Interstate	1	2	1	3	3	. .	1	1	12
Overseas	1	2	2	13	10	7	16	2	53
Miscellaneous reasons	.	7	1	4	6	1	9	1	29
Ill-health	. .	.	. .	. .	. .	2	1	1	4
Domestic	.		2	2	2	1	1	1	9
Other work	.	16	6	7	5	5	7	5	51
Age retirement	1	.	.	2	1	....	1	1	6
Voluntary retirement	1	1	1	1	....	....	. .	....	4
Retirement due to ill-health	. .	....	....	..	..	.	.	2	2
Total	4	39	33	51	32	18	58	18	253

BLOOD ALCOHOL CONTENT

Assessment

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

(1) In view of the fact that some men are much bigger and heavier than others, and consequently their bodies contain much more blood, how is the scientific figure of .08 per cent. blood alcohol content assessed?

(2) Will the blood alcohol content for females be the same as for males?

(3) Will he inform the House the formula used in the calculation, and relate each of the progressive stages of the calculation?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) The percentage of alcohol in the blood means the number of grams of alcohol contained in 100 millilitres of blood.

Medical evidence demonstrates that any quantity of alcohol in the blood causes a degree of mental and physical impairment. The standard of .08 has been adopted as a result of clinical observations in Australia and overseas as the degree of mental and physical impairment resulting in a marked deterioration of drivinig ability and accident involvement.

(2) No; in fact any two or more persons, of either sex, consuming an equal quantity of alcoholic liquor could show different concentrations of alcohol in the blood.

(3) The Blood Sampling and Analysis Regulations, 1966, regulation 11, provides—

> The analytical method by which blood samples shall be analysed for alcohol by an analyst is—
>
> (a) by ascertaining the change in concentration of the dichromate; or
>
> (b) by gas chromatography.

It would not be practicable to relate the progressive stages of analysis in this answer, but the honourable member is welcome to contact the Director of the Government Chemical Laboratories for more information if he so wishes.

WELSHPOOL ROAD

Widening

6. The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Mines:

Can the Minister advise if the road-widening now being undertaken at the Welshpool Road railway crossing is to be continued in an easterly direction to include the remaining narrow section of Welshpool Road?

The Hon A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Work at present being carried out on the Welshpool railway crossing will be extended eastwards to Tomlinson Road, and when finished will provide a pavement width of 44 feet to match the widened section of Welshpool Road.

At this point in time the Main Roads Department has no plans for the further widening of Welshpool Road.

CITRUS FRUITS AND BANANAS

Imports and Exports

7. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister explain in detail the laws and regulations relating to—

(a) imports of citrus fruits from the Eastern States to Western Australia;

(b) exports of citrus fruits from Western Australia to the Eastern States;

(c) imports of bananas from the Eastern States to Western Australia; and

(d) exports of bananas from Western Australia to the Eastern States?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) Under the Plant Diseases Act, citrus fruits imported from the Eastern States are subject to inspection on arrival, and they shall be packed in new prescribed containers. If diseased they may be destroyed, disinfected, or quarantined.

(b) Exports of citrus fruits to the Eastern States are subject to the statutory provisions of each individual State and details of the provisions would be contained in their respective regulations.

In general, however, their provisions are designed to safeguard against the entry of fruit fly. Fruit is not permitted entry into South Australia unless certified from a fruit-fly free area of a 50-mile radius.

Victoria has a similar provision but permits an alternative to the above certification in the form of low temperature treatment for a period of 14 days.

New South Wales requires cold storage treatment as above, or ethylene dibromide fumigation.

The cold storage treatment is deleterious to citrus fruits.

(c) Under the Plant Diseases Act, bananas imported from the Eastern States are subject to inspection on arrival, and they shall be packed in new prescribed containers. If diseased they may be destroyed, disinfected, or quarantined.

The bananas shall be green in colour, or certified to have been green when inspected in South Australia or Victoria.

Such bananas shall have been treated with or dipped in a fungicide containing salicylanilide to control "Squirter" disease.

The bananas must be fumigated on arrival with ethylene dibromide at prescribed dosage as a safeguard against the introduction of Queensland fruit fly.

Experimental consignments which have been certified to have been treated with lebaycid dip before despatch

from Queensland have been permitted entry without fumigation for a trial period.

(d) As for (b).

UREA

Price Increase

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

As the price of urea affects the cost of production in primary industries, will the Minister explain the rise per ton from $48 in 1967 to $73.50 in 1968?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

All urea used as fertiliser in Western Australia has been imported and this will probably apply for most of the 1968-69 season.

Prices overseas have varied considerably in the past five years, with variations in world supply and demand.

A year ago the W.A. price was quoted at $67.20, but early in 1968, fertiliser companies were able to offer urea at $53.20, and some supplies imported for direct delivery at wharves were priced at $48 or $49 per ton. Late in the delivery season the price rose again to $68.40.

After considering the overseas situation for the coming season, urea suppliers in W.A. have quoted a price of $73.50 cash less $3 per ton for payment before the 10th January, 1969. This price applies at all ports and distributing centres, whereas previously there were extra charges of up to $6 per ton for transport to outlying centres from which deliveries to farmers were made.

There is no regular standard overseas price for urea. The price in other Australian States is usually higher than in Western Australia.

DRAINAGE

Cockburn

9. The Hon. R. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department made a survey and prepared plans for the partial drainage of North Bibra, Yangebup, Kogolup, and Thompson Lakes, to retain them at normal levels?

(2) If so, when will work begin on this drainage scheme?

(3) If the answer to (1) is "No," is the department aware that these lakes have risen greatly in the past three years due mainly to land development, and that Yangebup Lake has flooded over Yangebup Road, necessitating this roadway to be reconstructed at a higher level?

(4) As a proposal to drain Yangebup Lake into Thompson Lake has been proved to be not feasible, when will the department be in a position to effect this overall drainage problem?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) The Metropolitan Water Board has carried out preliminary investigations for control of the water levels in North Bibra, Yangebup, Kogolup, and Thompson Lakes by regulated discharge to the ocean.

(2) No date has been set for this work to be carried out.

(3) Answered by (1).

(4) The feasibility of draining Yangebup Lake into Thompson Lake has not yet been finally determined; however, implementation of any overall scheme will depend on the availability of finance and the priority of this work relative to other drainage projects. Therefore, no firm date can be given.

NATIVES

Federal Pastoral Award

10. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Can the Department of Native Welfare advise what number of station hands will receive the benefits of the Federal pastoral award which takes effect on the 1st December next?

(2) Is implementation of the award likely to cause a reduction of native communities which have grown on pastoral properties?

(3) If pastoralists do remove natives from their leases, what action has the department in mind concerning such an event?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not known but this is possible.

(3) They would be assisted to obtain other employment or, if this were not available, to apply for unemployment benefit under the Federal Social Services Act and for such other relief which they might need and be entitled to under the State Native Welfare Act.

NEW BUSINESS: TIME LIMIT

Suspension of Standing Order No. 62.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

> That Standing Order No. 62 (Limit of time for commencing new business) be suspended during the remainder of this first period of the current session.

I should like briefly to say that this motion is connected to a degree with the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to times of sitting. As members know, Standing Order 62 limits the time for the introduction of new business to 11 p.m. If the House agrees to the suspension of this Standing Order, it will be possible to introduce legislation later than 11 p.m.

It would be the intention of Ministers not to overdo this—if I may use that expression. However, bearing in mind the other question asked by Mr. Wise, I would like to say that in order to facilitate matters it may be necessary to sit later this week than we have done up to date.

I think it will be agreed that we have had a fairly good session. We certainly have not sat after midnight on any occasion and, in fact, I do not think we have been here any night much after 11 p.m.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The latest night was 10.52 p.m.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Logan says the latest sitting was 10.52 p.m., but I have an idea we were here one evening until 11.5 p.m. However, that does not matter to any extent.

In the event of the House agreeing to the motion, Ministers will exercise discretion with regard to the freedom given to them to introduce new legislation. So far as legislation in this House is concerned, I think the Minister for Local Government gave notice this afternoon of the last Bill to be introduced. I had better save myself, I suppose, by saying that at this point of time I will have no further legislation. In fact, I certainly would not look forward to introducing further legislation. To my knowledge, Mr. MacKinnon has no new legislation, either.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), read a first time.

2. Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment Bill.

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

MEDICAL TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. J. G. Hislop, and transmitted to the Assembly.

KWINANA LOOP RAILWAY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [5.2 p.m.]: The fact that the introductory notes for this Bill did not cover many pages, and that the Bill itself has only three clauses and a schedule, would indicate that it deals with only a small matter. However, it is a matter of great importance, and because of the Minister's remarks when introducing the Bill I spent 3½ hours this morning and this afternoon in the area concerned. I made a great deal of research into the plans and the proposals and discussed the matter with the Rockingham Shire and also with half a dozen residents whom I know in the old townsite of Kwinana.

The proposal is to build a new loop of railway in the Kwinana area to handle wheat which will be delivered to the new Co-operative Bulk Handling works to be established there in the years to come.

I can remember that from 1926 until he retired, The Hon. J. B. Sleeman, who was a speaker of the Legislative Assembly, advocated year after year during debates on Supply Bills and the Address-in-Reply, the establishment in and the moving of big industries to the area along Cockburn Sound. I support the Bill and in doing so I support what Mr. Sleeman put forward on so many occasions and tried so hard to convince the powers that be about. At one time a Select Committee was appointed to deal with this matter and it produced two rather voluminous documents of evidence and recommendations.

With the commencement of the BP project in 1951 the area has developed beyond anyone's wildest dreams until now there is a huge industrial complex in the Kwinana district. Also, I want to repeat something I said when discussing the Nickel Refinery (Western Mining Corporation Limited) Agreement Bill a few nights ago. I said on that occasion that every day will bring more industrial development to the Kwinana area and there will be so much industry there that, as surely as night follows day, the people who now live in the district will have to do something about establishing themselves elsewhere.

Some time ago I asked for plans of the industrial development of this area to be laid on the Table of the House, and the Department of Industrial Development was good enough to spend some time and effort on preparing the plans and making the details available. However, in the plans

there were no details regarding the railway which is covered by the Bill before us. I took the plans with me this morning—or at least I had with me those plans which dealt with the important points I wanted to consider.

At this stage I would like to read a letter from the Director-General of Transport (Mr. Knox) to put this Bill in its proper perspective. The letter was not read by the Minister in this House, or the Minister in the other place, when introducing this legislation, but I think it is appropriate to have the letter recorded. It reads as follows:—

> THE HON. MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT AND RAILWAYS
>
> SUB: Proposed Construction of Kwinana Loop Railway
>
> To meet the needs of the agricultural industry of this State in the next ten years Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is proposing to further develop its bulk grain facilities in the Fremantle zone.
>
> Apart from increasing its existing port storage at North Fremantle, the Company intends to establish additional horizontal storage—initially to hold approximately 10 million bushels of grain—at Kwinana. Ultimately this storage may be expanded to 30 million bushels depending upon the increased rate of grain production throughout the State which in the next ten years is expected to reach 200 million bushels.

This year we are expecting a harvest of about 110,000,000 bushels. The letter continues—

> A factor that has influenced the Company to acquire a site at Kwinana is the adjacent deep water, which is considered to be essential with the world-wide trend toward larger bulk ships demanding draughts of 45 feet and more. The Company proposes, at a later stage, to install bulk grain shipping facilities and will export direct from its Kwinana site. Until these facilities are available the Company will bring grain into Kwinana direct from country bins, store it and then transfer the grain to the present North Fremantle terminal for shipment.
>
> I have examined the transport task involved in this movement from country bins to Kwinana storage and from Kwinana storage to North Fremantle. Co-operative Bulk Handling's whole operation is geared to rail transportation and the Company has considerable investment associated with this mode. The proposal therefore is to extend the Kwinana rail network by about 5 miles 23 chains to provide access to the new bulk grain storage site and to provide a loop onto the existing Mundijong-Kwinana railway as shown in W.A.G.R. plan No. 60598 attached. The estimated cost of the work, including land resumption but excluding sidings considered to be the responsibility of the Company, is $875,000. The actual construction of the railway is expected to commence in January 1969.
>
> I am satisfied that the transport task, because of the overall pattern of grain movement in this State from grower to port and the considerable quantities that will have to be moved in shuttle service between Kwinana and North Fremantle, can best be performed by rail.
>
> In accordance with Section 21(1) (8) of the State Transport Co-ordination Act 1966 I recommend that this new line, which will be operated as an open railway, be constructed.

I thought that that letter was of sufficient importance to have it recorded because it indicates that at this point the Director-General of Transport has given consideration to something which will be of great benefit not only to the Kwinana area but also to the rest of the State in the future.

However, there is one question I would ask: Has the Director-General of Transport given consideration to the transport of passengers by rail from Rockingham to Perth and *vice versa?* I was asked this question myself on five different occasions today. The shire council asked me that question; a school master asked me the same question, as did a road worker and two of the local residents with whom I spoke. It would seem to me that when the railway is established in that district it would be possible for the Director-General of Transport to suggest and have the Railways Department run a diesel train for the rail transport of passengers from Rockingham to the city.

In his introductory speech the Minister said—

> The plan for the connecting railway line has been drawn in such a way as to permit the provision in a bulk handling site of a 7,000-foot siding, which will accommodate up to 70 wagons, with two locomotives and a van. With a total length of 3,400 feet, a haulage of this size would discharge over a central receiving point as part of a continuous forward movement without shunting.
>
> Wheat trains, which would use the proposed area, are envisaged to consist of rakes of up to 70 wagons, each 46 feet long, also with two locomotives and a van, comprising a haulage in excess of 3,400 feet in length. In such a case, a minimum standing length of 3,500 feet was adopted for the purpose of the design. To enable a train of this length to pull forward in a straight line over the discharge

point, and to give the driver an uninterrupted view, a straight line of 7,000 feet in length would be required, plus a length of 600 feet at the central discharge point, thus making 7,600 feet in all.

Today I was fortunate enough to have a gentleman who lives in the area conduct me over the route of the proposed railway, but I want to repeat what I have said before: Residents in this area, where there is a vast industrial complex, are being squeezed tighter and tighter—they are like the meat in a sandwich. For instance, the plan proposes that one section shall run along Third Avenue and what was previously set aside as a four-depth planning system—from the ocean inland—will now be squeezed into a two-street system, which will mean that over 100 people will be further squeezed by industrial development.

I make a plea on behalf of the people there that these pockets should be taken over by industry and the people given reasonable compensation at a reasonable time to enable them to be accommodated elsewhere at no loss to themselves. In other words, the Government should do everything it can to help them; it should do as it did when it acted on behalf of the nickel refinery—offer to acquire the property of the people concerned at the present rate of valuation for that area and establish the people in some other locality. Of course, if some of the people do not want to shift but want to remain where they are there is nothing I can do about that.

There are some people who would like to get out, but who cannot afford to do so unless they are given reasonable compensation. Another point to which I wish to refer is the lack of co-operation shown by the department to the local shire councils.

I was able to give to the Kwinana Shire Council a copy of a question I had asked here concerning the production of the plan by the Department of Industrial Development. The shire council was delighted to have these questions and answers because it was the first knowledge it had of the existence of the plan.

The shire council also paid tribute to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority for the co-operation it received from that body; and the plan the council showed me when I was in the office today indicates all the sitings of the new roads. I believe this is the plan that should have been tabled.

I do not blame the Minister for Local Government for this omission, because this is a railway Bill with which we are dealing and the Minister for Local Government merely had the privilege of introducing it, though I cannot understand why we did not receive a similarly good plan from the Railways Department. I feel that we should have been provided with a better plan than the one we have, which consists mainly of a red line drawn through an area.

The plan shows that when the railway leaves the Mundijong and alumina marshalling yards it will turn direct to the west, and when it almost reaches Victoria Street in Rockingham it will turn north and run parallel with Stirling Street until it reaches the junction of the line at Beach Street and the Western Mining nickel refinery.

It will be seen from the plan that there are several residential blocks in the area; and when I took the matter up with the Rockingham Shire Council this morning, it was pointed out to me that, although this area was subdivided but not developed, the shire was able to co-operate with the department in replanning the area east of Stirling Street and north of Victoria Street —that is, on plan 60597.

This area has been replanned for industrial uses and, at the moment, negotiations are taking place for the granting of a piece of land to the Kwinana Shire Council—I am not sure from whom, though it is probably from the Railways Department or the town planning people —providing the Kwinana Shire Council with sufficient land to establish a large and modern caravan park. This is to act as a buffer between the industry which has moved so far south and the townsite of Kwinana itself.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Are you talking about Rockingham or Kwinana?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am talking about Rockingham, and I apologise if I said Kwinana. If this piece of land is made available to the Rockingham Shire Council, the council intends to develop it immediately, and it is seeking co-operation for this purpose.

The area I inspected this morning is a large one; it is one which would be used for industry. Once the railway is sited there, I daresay a lighter type of industry will be established and a further development will take place.

On behalf of the Rockingham Shire Council I did want to draw attention to what is taking place, and on behalf of the Kwinana Shire Council I would like to say that there is an area north of Office Road comprising a group of people living in the old Kwinana townsite who are now being crushed into a very small area. I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [5.21 p.m.]: I reluctantly support the Bill. I say that, because the legislation means, in effect, that from Clarence Rocks in Naval Base—sometimes called Coogee—down to Rockingham proper, we have one very small beach which is an "A"-class reserve. Early this year I

attended the opening of the CSBP jetty, which was constructed by the Fremantle Port Authority. I was accompanied by councillors from the Kwinana Shire Council, and they were alarmed when the Minister for Works, while performing the official opening of the jetty, said that to the south of the Kwinana wreck reserve, as it is commonly called, an area had been set aside for port authority purposes.

It is possible that we were not notified of this, because it is just outside the shire limit, Office Road being the boundary; incidentally, it is also the boundary of the South Metropolitan Province.

I know that some members of this Chamber accompanied the Premier and certain Town Planning Department and Department of Industrial Development officers on a tour of this area about six years ago. The tour was initially arranged by the then member for Cockburn (Mr. Harry Curran). It was a long time before the Government took sufficient interest to have a look at the area, but after much pressure was applied by the Kwinana Shire Council over a number of years, the Kwinana wreck site was made a reserve.

Without getting a rule on this map, and without being absolutely sure, I would point out that it seems as though the public is to be denied access to approximately 15 to 16 miles of coastline, apart from the small strip of land at the Kwinana wreck site.

As we all know, industry has taken over some of the best beaches we have. It is possible that we made the initial mistake of granting such a large area of beach-front land to the BP refinery, but it is of some consequence, however, to know that when Co-operative Bulk Handling moves into the area it will only be necessary to erect a gantry over the beach front; the beach will not be fenced in, and that is very good. The problem, however, will be: How does one get to the beach?

As Mr. Lavery has just said, the remaining houses in the townsite will have to go. I know the Department of Industrial Development purchased quite a number of these houses from some of the people who wanted to sell. But those people who are anchored in the area want a fair replacement value for their homes and properties, to enable them to obtain similar homes elsewhere. They cannot afford to sell and move out.

I daresay the members for the area can feel a certain degree of relief in the knowledge that this will virtually be the last lot of resumptions on the southern extremity of our province, though possibly there will be some in a north-easterly direction from time to time.

My reluctance in supporting the Bill is not to prevent industry coming to Cockburn, but to endeavour to prevent, as far as possible, the loss of so much of our beach areas. With the housing development that will take place, the Minister for Local Government would in all justice to the people concerned, be doing something positive to retrieve the position—and this should be the No. 1 priority—if he had the northern extremity of Clarence Rocks declared an "A"-class reserve.

This area north of the Clarence Rocks reserve was the subject of an argument in this Chamber in 1961, when an attempt was made to take it over for industrial purposes; though fortunately it was not agreed to by this House.

I know preliminary discussions have taken place in connection with the Woodman Point area—and some of this is Commonwealth land—but the area should be reserved now, so that when the facilities at Woodman Point and the magazine are no longer necessary, the shire council will be able to prepare plans for development.

I have said before that if this area were properly developed, it would leave Surfer's Paradise for dead. The people in the Fremantle area, and those south of that area, should have a guarantee that they will have some access to the remaining portion of Cockburn Sound; and this will be the last remaining portion of Cockburn Sound to which people will have physical access, and which could be developed and not be disrupted by future industrial development.

Perhaps I had better resume my seat now after having given the Bill my limited support.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [5.29 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill, though I do not intend to say very much about the establishment of the railway. There is one matter, however, which comes to my notice and which pleases me very much, and that is the co-operation the respective shire councils are receiving from Government departments.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You mean not receiving.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: No, I mean the co-operation they are receiving. My mind goes back to the time when I was a member of a local authority and when we found it extremely difficult to obtain any co-operation at all from Government departments. So it is very pleasing indeed to know that this co-operation does exist between shire councils and Government departments.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What co-operation are they getting?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I support the Bill.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (West) [5.30 p.m.]: I have listened to this debate with considerable interest, particularly the contribution of Mr. Lavery. He seems to have extended his boundary somewhat.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I was handling the Bill before the House. I do not want the honourable member to think I wanted to refer to his district.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: This measure is one which for some time we have hoped to see. For several years I have felt that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. would have to move into this area at an early date. More is the pity that it did not move in sooner, because we would have seen a much better set-up had the whole of the extensions been at Kwinana and not at Fremantle.

Mr. Berry made a brief reference to the co-operation the shire councils received from the Government. From experience I can support this. Mr. Ron Thompson and Mr. Lavery feel there is something lacking, but I do not think their understanding of the problem has been very great. The Shire of Rockingham, in particular, has been in the past, and I am sure it is now, very appreciative of the great consultation that has taken place with it in matters of planning. Mr. Logan, and the Government generally, have gone to great lengths to co-operate and to achieve something that will fit in with the ideas of this shire council.

On many occasions I have had reasons to examine the proposals; and the co-operation from the M.R.P.A. has been extremely good. This has been a major exercise for the Rockingham Shire Council. It is one that will cause a great deal of disruption, which is inevitable. In the areas of Kwinana and Rockingham, it is inevitable that industry will continue to be disrupted for a long time. This is a price we have to pay; but the pronouncements by the Premier on behalf of the Government, by the Minister for Local Government (Mr. Logan), and other Ministers have made it publicly known on many occasions that the public is going to receive full consideration and that there will be as little disturbance of the beaches as is possible.

I do not share the fear of other members who have spoken in the vein that the public will be excluded. There will be difficulties; but difficulties are made to be overcome. I hope we will finish up with an area solely with industries within its boundaries. This would certainly overcome a great deal of the human problems associated with this expansion of industry.

The question of transport for the larger centres around Kwinana to the beaches is a matter for the transport authorities. Those who do not own their own motorcars—and there are not many today—should be provided with good public transport to enable them to enjoy the facilities of the sound. I would hate to think—as would all members of this Chamber, and, in fact, all people within the State—that we are going to gradually lose large areas of beaches. I do not believe this will take place and I am certain the Government will not allow anything to happen that will be to the detriment of the people in Western Australia.

I support the measure as it is one that will enable Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. to deal adequately with the expected expansion of grain growing in Western Australia. The position is perhaps going to be better than expected. We have a mighty organisation in Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.—it has dealt very effectively with farmers' grain handling problems—and this measure will provide for expansion in the foreseeable future.

I am extremely pleased we have this measure before us, because it gives due warning to those people within the area of what is going to happen in the future; and it would be good if future planning for the area could be firmly settled. We know it is difficult for the planning authorities to set forward a plan that will not have to be changed, but we can reach a stage where it will definitely be known where the roads, railways, and the port, are going to extend finally so that the people concerned will be able to settle down and enjoy the still large areas left in the district. I am sure that will be a very happy situation and I support the Bill.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.37 p.m.]: This will, of necessity, be a brief speech. I asked Mr. Lavery to undertake this Bill on my behalf because he has considerable interest in the area and a great knowledge of it. It ill-behoves any member to castigate a man who does his best on an occasion such as this. If members are to speak within their own areas, I would remind Mr. Abbey that he does not live very close to the area mentioned in the Bill, yet he seeks to make a snide remark immediately he gets on his feet. I was not able to take this Bill myself.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: I did not make a snide remark.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: It is typical of the honourable member. I think Mr. Lavery and his associate, Mr. Ron Thompson, know far more about the material in this Bill than the honourable member who has just spoken.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [5.38 p.m.]: I am sorry this unseeming bitterness has arisen becuase it was absolutely unnecessary. If the honourable member had listened to what Mr. Abbey was talking about—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Don't you have a crack; concentrate on your job!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am concentrating on what is before this House and am replying to the debate. Mr. Abbey was not referring to the boundaries that are affected by the Bill; he was referring to provinces.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: He poked his nose in.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Read his speech and see what he said.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will please address the Chair.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Despite Mr. Ron Thompson's reluctance to support the Bill, I am pleased that he has because we have gone to a fair amount of trouble over the years to endeavour to retain as much of this beach as possible. I think it should have been realised in 1951, when BP commenced operations in the area, that industry would go on from that point. This area must, of necessity, become devoted to industry. I think notice was given in 1951 that this would happen. Therefore I do not think we need make any excuses for the industry that has since gone there.

For the benefit of Mr. Ron Thompson, I think we have stated that the Woodman Point area will, as far as possible, be the playground of the West.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Not under this Bill.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No; but Mr. Ron Thompson raised the matter and talked about beaches. We made sure, when the Hope Valley Road was closed, that Alcoa provided an alternative access to the beach. The plan in front of Mr. Lavery shows that there is a corridor through the industrial area to the beach. The Kwinana wreck area is an "A"-class reserve and from there to Palm Beach is regional open space. When one takes into consideration all that has been done, one realises a good job has been effected as far as the control of beaches is concerned.

Mr. Abbey spoke of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. moving to Kwinana. He was of the opinion that the move should have been made earlier. I think that was one of the decisions which I, with others, was called upon to make in 1959 when the old hospital bins of Co-operative Bulk Handling at North Fremantle were outdated—it had to be decided, whether the new silos would go in their present position or at Kwinana. I am convinced we made the right decision because, at that time, neither C.B.H. nor the Government was ready, particularly in regard to where C.B.H. would be settled.

I am sure if we continue to obtain record harvests in the future, both silos will be required, particularly if there is a shortage of overseas orders and storage is required. Therefore it will be essential to have both the areas in use for the storage of wheat and the handling of wheat. I think I can say that those people who are affected will receive as much consideration as all others have in the area concerned.

Mr. Lavery mentioned a point in regard to passenger transport. I think the honourable member would realise that this was under very serious consideration when we were dealing with the other railway Bill concerning Rockingham. The Railways Department and everybody concerned gave consideration to putting the proposals into effect if the Fremantle Port Authority should go ahead with its plans for that area.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The map in my possession from your department is a splendid one and should be tabled.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is a railway map. I would remind members that Cabinet held a special meeting at Rockingham with the Rockingham Shire and the Fremantle Port Authority in regard to road access into Rockingham. I think this was the co-operation the shire asked for and received because, at that time, it was preparing a town planning scheme and paying a fair amount of money for it. This scheme could not be held up for long, and the shire had to find out what was going on. We endeavoured to keep the alignment of the road and railway as near as possible for two reasons: One was in regard to the town planning scheme; and the other was in regard to the development of Bungaree Precinct No. 1.

I am satisfied that Rockingham Shire Council is more than happy with the co-operation it has received in this matter. It was as a result of the co-operation between the shire, the State, and C.B.H. that it was suggested the area alongside the Rockingham Shire be a caravan park. This would create a barrier between C.B.H. and the residential area. I think the only point outstanding is the transfer of the land.

We were fortunate in being able to get 7,000 feet of railway land in a straight line to enable the trains to operate efficiently. Wheat trains are rather long and it is essential, from an efficient working point of view, that they have a straight track on which to operate. We were fortunate in that most of the land in this area was either undeveloped or was Crown land.

I am satisfied that in the long run this proposal will be of great advantage to the wheatgrowers of Western Australia. One of the reasons why this area was selected was because of the deep water that is available close in to the shore. One would need only a gantry with a short jib because the ships could tie up close to the shore. With the advent of larger ships it is essential that provision be made for ships up to 100,000 tons; and there is deep water in this section of Cockburn Sound.

All in all, I think the planners—the Kwinana Development Committee—have done an excellent job in selecting this site. Had the committee tried to obtain the area in 1959 it might not have been available and it is possible we would not have been in the satisfactory position that we find ourselves in today. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

MANGLES BAY RAILWAY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [5.48 p.m.]: This Bill, of course, follows on the previous Bill which we have just disposed of. The Bill refers to the extension of the railway southwards, from the Kwinana loop to a point near the convent school in Point Peron Road. The line crosses through the club house of the golf course, and also cuts across Lake Richmond. As the Minister has already said, it is an extension of the line we have previously discussed.

Some consideration has been given to the selection of the site to the satisfaction of most of the people concerned.

It is not often that I get up and criticise another member in this House. I will keep to the Standing Orders, Mr. President. I have been a member of this House since May, 1952, and I have represented the area concerned, right down to Boundary Road near Lake Richmond. I was a representative of this district before the new shire buildings were built in Rockingham. Mr. Abbey has been a member for this area for a very short number of years, and I would remind the honourable member that when we are elected members of Parliament, and we swear allegiance to the Queen and take our seats in this House, we represent every elector in the State, and every province in the State, as far as our deliberations are concerned.

I feel sure that new members in this chamber feel that although they have been elected to represent certain provinces, they would be failing in their duty if they did not, in fact, consider each Bill as they saw fit on behalf of the people of Western Australia. I would remind Mr. Abbey that since I have been a member of Parliament I have supported the farming industry on many occasions when he has not even had the fortitude to stand up and support his own community.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am getting to the point of exploding. I think Ministers sitting opposite approve of my attitude in this House when I handle Bills on behalf of my party. What Mr. Willesee said is correct; when I am the first speaker on behalf of my party it is my duty to carry out some research to find out all I can about the Bill, and I think all the Ministers would give me credit for doing that; and they would acknowledge that when I support a Bill, on an occasion such as this, I do it to the best of my ability and with the most gentlemanly instincts inherited from my mother and father.

I resent very much the suggestion that I have moved into another member's field. I would draw attention to the fact that the member for Cockburn in another place (Mr. Taylor) was also castigated when he replied to this Bill.

I point out that Office Road is our boundary, and the Bill we have just disposed of deals with the railway which crosses Office Road. The present Bill deals with a railway to be constructed which will be joined to the Kwinana Loop Railway slightly north-east of Victoria Street. It will then extend in a south-westerly direction, and then in a north-westerly direction to Third Avenue at the back of the townsite of Kwinana.

The line proposed in the Bill may not be required for some considerable time. The Minister referred to a report submitted by the Director-General of Transport, and I would like to read that report. It is as follows:—

> Proposed construction of Mangles Bay Railway
>
> The proposal to build the Mangles Bay railway, at some time in the future, stems from recommendations made by the Committee for the Development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana.
>
> The purpose of this railway is to meet future transportation needs arising out of the probable pattern of industrial development in the area. Although the actual construction of the line may not take place for some time, authority to construct is sought in order to save future resumption costs and to facilitate the region's land use planning.
>
> The Mangles Bay line will form part of the rail complex to serve Cockburn and Kwinana and in accord with Section 21 (1) (8) of the State Transport Co-ordination Act I recommend

that planning for its construction proceed subject to the proposal being reevaluated prior to the actual work of laying the lines taking place.

That report was signed by Mr. Knox, the Director-General of Transport, and was addressed to the Minister for Transport. The report shows clear thinking and it is something for which the people of the area have been looking for a long time: A decision in plenty of time to allow the local shire and the local residents to plan for the future.

In supporting the Bill I want to draw attention to one point. As I said when speaking to the previous measure, the map I obtained from the Department of Industrial Development shows the necessity for planning this railway now. The Commonwealth Government is about to reach a decision with regard to Point Peron, and considerable replanning will take place. Unfortunately, the resumptions will include the area occupied by that great group of people—the National Fitness Council.

Mr. Knox has said that this redevelopment may not be required for some considerable time. However, I believe the redevelopment will take place very much sooner than expected—sooner than the 12 or 15 years that is thought by some people. I advise people, as publicly as I can, to take note of the proposed route of this railway so that they can plan for the future.

I again compliment the Town Planning Department for its farsightedness in planning the area. The map which I have seen today shows decisive action. In the future, part of the area will be taken over by industry, and part of the area will be playground, whereas the whole of the Point Peron area was originally a playground for the people.

Reference was made to the co-operation of the Government with the local shires. I wonder how it can be called co-operation when, as late as the 16th January—or February—both the Kwinana Shire and the Rockingham Shire received the first intimation that two days later the Nickel Refinery agreement was to be signed. There was not much co-operation there.

It is 15 years since the plans were first mooted and, as the Minister for Local Government has said, it was proposed that the area would be industrialised when the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act, 1952, was passed. It has taken 15 years for something like a plan to be evolved so that almost any person going to the area will be able to decide where to seek residential land.

The Minister, on many occasions, has referred to Cabinet meeting the people in that area. I can tell the Minister that when the Labor Government was in office in 1955—when the late Gilbert Fraser was alive—we also had conferences over the planning of the same area.

This is a simple Bill, and includes the usual red line on a map. Although some people will be upset by the movement of the trains, there is no doubt that the development of the area can be proceeded with because of the plan. I feel it will need to be a pretty strong Government that tries to take away any further portion of the beach that is left.

I agree with Mr. Ron Thompson, despite what Mr. Abbey said, that when one comes from Point Clarence down to the proposed area in Mangles Bay, one finds there is little beach front remaining out of the distance of 18 miles. There is a portion of beach at Naval Base and at the Kwinana townsite, but that is about all that is left. I think it was as a result of Mr. Curran, the ex-member for Cockburn, taking the Premier down to look at this area, that the Premier, himself, finally made the decision to save the area. It is a small area and it will not cater for a great number of people at any one time.

I remember that at that conference the then manager of BP said he would never know why they needed all that fence line on the ocean south of BP's actual tankage area. I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [6.2 p.m.]: I would like to pass a few remarks in connection with this proposed railway. There is one feature about the proposed extended spur line which is to run to Mangles Bay which I think must have quite a large bearing upon decisions that may be made in connection with the area. It will be remembered that when this area was planned a sewage plant was to be installed. This was in connection with the proposed joining of Garden Island with Point Peron for further development, and there was quite an outcry against it.

I suppose those who criticised and protested about the proposed development would have had good reason to do so, but my opinion is that this railway is going to traverse a large area of unratable land —land which is already owned by the Government. Reclamation work will not cost a great deal. I have looked this area over very carefully to see what will be done about sewerage for these works, and I cannot see a more suitable spot—I am not saying there is not a more suitable spot, but I cannot see one.

There is an enormous number of houses being constructed at the moment behind Rockingham. I think Landalls are involved in a scheme to build some 400 to 500 houses, and there has to be some disposal of sewage because the water table is only six or seven feet below ground level in normal times. When there is a very wet and prolonged winter this is quite a

problem and surface water has to be disposed of by canal. This canal drains the water away and takes it into Lake Richmond and then on to Mangles Bay. This system is working successfully and is doing a good job.

Having regard to the tremendous increase in housing, the proposed route for the Mangles Bay railway is, in my opinion, the only feasible route. It is the least expensive. It will upset some people, but not a large number. I support the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.5 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (West) [7.32 p.m.]: As has been said by previous speakers, the Mangles Bay Railway Bill is complementary to and a continuation of the measure discussed shortly before the tea suspension. This Bill will do much to clarify a situation for many people. Like other members I have been acquainted with the situation with which people will be likely to be confronted, and therefore it is a sound policy that those people are to be given prior notice of the route this railway will follow.

To those people who had retired to Rockingham and who had hoped to spend the rest of their lives there, the situation that now exists in Rockingham has been disturbing. The residents of that area had hoped to enjoy the climate and the situation in their retirement years, but now they find themselves disturbed much more than they could have anticipated 10 years ago. A good indication of this is that, not so many years ago, some classrooms of the Safety Bay school were removed, but now a great many classrooms have been added. This, in itself, is a pointer to the increased prosperity in the area and is a factor that should be taken well into account.

Although there are always some disturbing features when the planning of roads, railways, and so on, is mooted, many benefits follow such planning, but very little has been said in regard to the benefits that will be enjoyed by the community in the district. Those people who have already been disturbed, and those who will be disturbed in the future, will find that the enhanced value of their properties will be adequate compensation for the inconvenience they have suffered.

I know of some people who, realising that the writing was on the wall, sold their properties at enhanced values, and this trend, of course, goes hand in hand with industrial development. It is not the development envisaged by the people of Rockingham and Kwinana when they retired to those parts—because many of the people there are retired—but I think the majority of them are adjusting themselves to the new environment by taking up residence south of the area affected, and they are finding that the disturbance to which they have been subjected is not as great as they anticipated.

Therefore, I support the Bill, because I think it is a move that will certainly clarify the position for many people residing in that area. Unfortunately, Mr. Lavery, when speaking to the Kwinana Loop Railway Bill, misunderstood my intention, and I am sorry he did so. Obviously, at the end of every session nerves tend to become a little frayed, but when one has a go at someone else in a friendly way, one usually has a smile on one's face, and I had a smile on my face when I spoke about Mr. Lavery. Therefore, the comment I made was not meant to be unfriendly. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [7.36 p.m.]: In regard to the Bill now before the House, I could possibly say, "I told you so," because in 1960 and 1961, when speaking of this area, I can recall stating that the Minister for Town Planning should inform the people of Rockingham as to what development would be likely to occur in their area in the future. As a result of some information I had gleaned I envisaged what was intended to be done in the area in a few years to come, but at that time I was told I was talking nonsense.

At a seminar several years later, an officer of the Town Planning Department beat the gun, as it were, by making the statement that Garden Island would eventually be used for shipbuilding, and possibly by other industries. In making this statement, therefore, he was well ahead of the official release of what was intended to be done with this area. That officer was chided by the Minister in the Press and it was said then that the officer was speaking as an individual and not as an employee of the Town Planning Department. However, the things that were envisaged by this officer, and what I also anticipated would happen, have come to pass. I will admit that when the officer of the Town Planning Department did make the statement, the matters in question were, perhaps, hypothetical. I now say that the Bill before us is purely hypothetical, and that statement is confirmed in a letter read out by Mr. Lavery, which letter was attributed to the Director-General of Transport. In that letter he said that the area would be revaluated in possibly 15 years.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That was not the director's statement; that was the Minister's statement.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, that is correct. I apologise; it was mentioned in the Minister's notes that the area would have to be revalued in the future, and this is something that will have to be done. If we have a look at what has transpired in the Rockingham district which I represented for many years, we need only cast our minds back three

years when the Lands Department conducted an auction of some land in the district. If one studies the map of the area, one will see that Stoner Street was the first affected, and it was in regard to this street that I had the first inquiry.

Although this land was auctioned by the Lands Department and it was bought by people in the belief that they could build homes on the blocks that were sold, a fortnight later they discovered that a large portion of the land was to be reserved for the railway. Fortunately I was successful in exchanging several of the blocks affected for other blocks that would not be used for the railway. Therefore it can be seen that the co-operation Mr. Berry talks about was non-existent. Such co-operation might have existed some 10 or 15 years ago, when Mr. Berry was engaged in local government matters, but there has been a change since then and such co-operation is now non-existent between departments. If there had been any co-operation, the Lands Department and the Railways Department should have known that the railway would pass through these properties, and the land would not have been sold in the first place.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you are only encouraging Mr. Berry to make another speech.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is quite true, and as I proceed I will go on to prove that there is no co-operation between Government departments. In principle I agree with this legislation. It is similar to what was done in regard to the freeways, which is very sound, because people can find out readily that land is to be reserved for the construction of a freeway and if they construct a home on that land they know what to expect in the future.

As I have said, I regard this as hypothetical legislation which will not be proclaimed for many years, and possibly before it is proclaimed the legislation will be repealed and re-enacted to suit the actual date when the railway will become necessary. When the route of this railway was first surveyed 2½ years ago, the cost of compensation was estimated at $2,000,000. That was to be the cost of compensation alone. I can definitely say that at that time the Railways Department scrapped the whole idea of extending the railway to Point Peron, because it could not stand the financial burden that would accrue by making the necessary resumptions. As a result, the railway will now terminate at the Sacred Heart Convent, situated at Point Peron.

I would say the circumstances surrounding the Sacred Heart Convent at Point Peron is an example of the co-operation one gets from Government departments. Earlier this year it was decided that for the purpose of developing Rockingham Park, a drainage scheme would be built extending from Rockingham Park to Lake Richmond. Within a short period, Lake Richmond had reached its capacity. Then it was decided to service Rockingham Park and, for no apparent reason, that an open drain would be cut from Lake Richmond to Mangles Bay. As a result, the surveyors were sent into the field to plan the work, but no consultation was made with the sisters and the mother provincial of the Sacred Heart Convent at Point Peron, which accommodates at least 100 children, and which is also a training centre for young teachers in the Sacred Heart Catholic order. The surveyors pegged portion of the convent property, and the open drain was to run very close to the convent building itself.

However, after some negotiation, it was decided that the drain would not be built there and it was moved back on to the boundary of another property known as Marchants.

Earlier this session I had something to say about the property of Mrs. Marchant, a widow. A slipway and facilities for crayfishermen have been established on that property. When I raised that matter earlier in the session the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, the shire council, the Fremantle Port Authority and others concerned refused the fishermen the use of the Palm Beach jetty. After I had raised the matter the Minister was kind enough to send me a letter to inform me there was no chance of this jetty being made available for the use of fishermen; and that the fishermen would have to travel 17 miles by sea to use the excellent facilities at the Fremantle Fishing Boat Harbour. Fortunately the position has changed since that time, but the credit for the change cannot be given to this Government. The change was brought about by an Australian fisheries council.

An open drain has been constructed alongside Marchant's property, with the result that the slipway and the other facilities are silting up. Within a short space of time, when the drain is used to its fullest capacity, the livelihood of Mrs. Marchant will be taken away. For some unknown reason the development is being carried out on private property, and the owners of those properties will suffer considerably because the value of their properties must fall.

From the plan of the proposed railway it will be seen that a portion of Lake Richmond is to be reclaimed. When that is done a greater volume of water will pass along that open drain, and a greater degree of silting will be occasioned.

I said that this Bill was hypothetical legislation. I qualify that statement by saying that it will be implemented by the occurrence of three things. The first is the establishment of a naval base at Garden Island, to bring about the development of the railway; the second is that B.H.P., or

Australian Iron and Steel, is carrying out extensive drilling tests for limestone, and when limestone of the required quality to suit its blast furnaces is available there will be a need for the legislation; the third is the establishment of major shipbuilding works in Western Australia. Those are the three possibilities which would bring about a need for the legislation before us; otherwise it would be placed in a pigeonhole and be forgotten.

It is interesting to delve into the origin of the name "Mangles Bay." This is quite an historic name in Western Australia. A Miss Ellen Mangles married the first Governor of the State, Governor Stirling; and I think it was also a Mangles who chopped down the first tree in Barrack Street to found the City of Perth.

At the present time owners of private property are being inconvenienced, because after a decision was made to move the drain away from the locality of the Sacred Heart Convent the Government surveyors placed pegs in virtually the same position as the drain to run the railway line through that property. In view of the large amount of vacant land available in this area it is not right or fair to enter the land of the Sacred Heart Convent. The proposed route is within 20 yards of the entrance to the school.

With modern techniques it would be possible to establish a route to follow the sandbank across to the point at Garden Island. That would give a good foundation for the line. Very little is impossible of achievement with the use of modern machinery; and a couple of D9 bulldozers could build an artificial sandbank in the shallow waters, and within three months that bank would be sufficiently consolidated to enable construction of the line to proceed.

We find that in the proposed route of the line the eighteenth and the nineteenth holes of the Rockingham Golf Club course will be separated. I do not think the people of Rockingham will appreciate that. I think that when the chips are down there will be a rerouting of the railway line. I cannot see that the Rockingham Golf Club will remain silent on this issue; if I were its political representative I would not give in lightly.

The proposed route of the line could take a wider circuit around Rockingham. If this is done the line will not interfere with the built-up area of Rockingham; that is, by establishing it 500 or 600 yards to the east. This route would bypass the development that is taking place in Rockingham. When we examine the route we find that further south it misses the loop. I know that in the past eight years three propositions have been put forward for the development of this area, and one in particular was mentioned in the Fremantle supplement of the *Daily News*. The Government had given a developer permission to move in, but each time that one of the three plans was put forward it was scrapped, because the Town Planning Department did not know what the Railways Department was doing, and *vice versa*.

When the Government intends to carry out development in an area it should tell the people a little more about its proposals. In respect of this Bill the Sacred Heart Convent is entitled to know a little more about the proposals, because the development is to be established on freehold land. I think that Mrs. Marchant is entitled to know a little more; as is Mr. Van Giels, a boatbuilder.

Going a step further, what will happen with the construction of a causeway between Garden Island and Point Peron? Unless extensive stretches of open water are retained, and pylons are built, this bay will become polluted in very quick time. Under the CSBP legislation which was passed three years ago the company is permitted to pump 600 tons of gypsum into these waters each day. If no open stretch of water is retained and a causeway is constructed, it will not take very long for the bay to be silted up. Gypsum has a neutralising effect on salt; if the water in this bay is stagnant—which will be the result if the causeway is constructed—then the gypsum will have a neutralising effect, and within a short time no fish will be found in that area.

This confirms the solid views I expressed when I spoke on the previous measure. The beach front in that locality is finished; and if it is not finished by lack of access then it will be finished by pollution and siltage. That is a reasonable assumption. One has only to take into account the tonnages that will be processed by CSBP over the next few years to realise that the discharge of gypsum into the bay will reach the maximum permitted level.

This legislation cannot be regarded as final. At this stage it does not mean a thing to us, because it is only a line on a map. The Government departments concerned should send their representatives out to call on the people who own the freehold land involved in this development, particularly to the Sacred Heart Convent, Mrs. Marchant, and the others, with a view to preserving their equity. Some marvellous offers have been made, and one of $40,000 was made for a particular site. If this Bill is passed that land will not be worth $400 on the open market. At this stage the Government is not prepared to resume the land. This legislation is merely a pie in the sky; it might never be implemented.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [7.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [7.58 p.m.]: I draw attention to one particular point; that is, the proposed railway line will traverse an area in which people live. As the Duke of Edinburgh said, the people do count. I hope that proper provision will be made for the construction of overways and underways on this line, and that no more level crossings will be established.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [7.59 p.m.]: I am certain that aspect of the matter will be investigated when the railway line is built. I did not reply to the second reading debate because I did not think there was any need; but I should point out that the engineers and surveyors have spent a lot of time and done a great deal of work to determine the best route to be taken. I am satisfied that when the line is built the route as now proposed will not be altered very much, even if it is built in 15 years' time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TAXI-CARS (CO-ORDINATION AND CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

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

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Builders' Registration Board and the Master Builders Association have expressed serious concern of late regarding some current practices and developments affecting the operation of the Act and, indeed, some apparent inadequacies in the Act itself have come under criticism.

The objects of this Bill are amendment of the Act along certain lines to enable the board to better achieve the objectives of the parent Act and to establish more effective administration procedures.

An amendment is proposed to section 2 of the Act to exclude farm buildings specifically from the definition of a building. The operation of the Act is extending outwards to rural areas on account of the expanding metropolitan boundaries, as defined in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act.

Farming, of its nature, renders it imperative that farmers have the facility to erect their own buildings in off-season periods. The "Owner/Builder" limitations under section 4(a) of the Act restrict this, however, to houses required for their own use. But it must be readily acknowledged that farm buildings are not necessarily required, in all cases, to be of a standard complying with the board's standards.

Section 2 is also to be amended to include a definition of "Building License" and some subsequent amendments then alter the word "permit" to "license".

Section 4A refers to a permit under section 374 of the Local Government Act, whereas the license to build is issued under the Uniform General Building By-laws in force under the Act.

It has been shown by experience that owner-builders can, without difficulty, avoid the obligations of the Act, so the proposed amendment to section 4A seeks to prohibit the sale of a property within 18 months of the issue of the building license, unless the consent of the board is first obtained. It will, however, be a defence against the charging of the offence of unlawfully selling such a house, for the defendant to plead before a court of petty sessions that the board withheld its consent unreasonably.

The Act does not specify a term of appointment for the members of the board. Section 5 is to be amended to provide for a term of three years. The Act also makes it mandatory that the architect appointed by the Governor shall be chairman of the board. The Bill seeks to remove this provision.

A new section 5A is a machinery provision which deals with vacancies on the board, in which respect the Act is deficient.

Under section 10, applicants, on the basis of experience as a builder or supervisor outside Western Australia, can be entitled to registration. It is inequitable, therefore, that local residents who have been supervisors, must undertake a six-year course of study and pass their builders' registration examinations to qualify for registration; whereas those who have been supervisors of building work overseas or in the Eastern States can immediately gain registration. The Bill restricts the right of the latter category of persons to registration only if they satisfy the board that they have been builders outside the State, are competent to carry out building work to the satisfaction of the board, and were not resident in the State in 1961.

Provision is also made to enable persons who have had experience as builders within the State, but outside the area to which the Act applies, and who, in 1961, were not

resident in the area, to which the Act applies, to make application for registration. This will allow genuine well substantiated builders operating in the country prior to 1961 to become registered. Many of these did not avail themselves of the registration rights accorded by the 1961 amendment Act, as the area governed by the Act embraced the metropolitan area only and, accordingly, they could well have reasoned that there was no point in applying for registration.

Amendments to section 10 (2), 10B, and 10C, seek to provide more effective control over the building work carried out by partnerships and companies.

It is clearly the intention of the Act that there be one registered builder responsible for all building activities and yet this is not so in many partnerships and companies. The Act, at present, allows registration of a partnership or company merely by nominating an employee as a registered builder. The nominated builder cannot be acted against for the negligence or incompetence of his employer as the nominated builder, being an employee, is not a party to the contract. From recent Press publicity, it is evident that this has resulted in the development of a situation where some unethical builders have made their "tickets" available for hire to firms engaged in the building industry, but have taken little or no part in the actual work of management and supervision of the firm's building work.

It is proposed to amend the Act so as to permit the board to proceed against the registration of the "nominated builder" if it cancels or suspends the registration of a partnership or company.

To ensure that the board will be able to identify the particular registered person who was supposed to manage and supervise the building work for the partnership or company, the Act is to be amended to require the partnership or company to name the partner, director, or employee, whose duty it is to manage and supervise particular building work.

The rights of the nominated builder are protected in the amendments inasmuch as his registration cannot be cancelled unless the board has given him the chance to attend the hearing against the partnership or company and has afforded him the opportunity of giving an explanation personally at the inquiry or in writing.

Clause 13, subclauses (c) and (d), provide for suspension of a builder who has been guilty of offences in connection with the performance of any contract. Considerable work is done by builders, especially in the housing field on a speculative basis and such work is therefore not within the jurisdiction of the Act. The amendments to these subclauses seek to rectify this position.

The final amendment is to section 24, subsection (1) and is a machinery clause to enable the board to obtain information regarding the issue of building licenses from local authorities. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West —Minister for Local Government) [8.8 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill contains two minor amendments to the Hairdressers Registration Act which have been requested by the Hairdressers Registration Board.

The board's solicitor advises that a registered hairdresser who has ceased practising as a hairdresser may remain on the register without payment of fees, under the existing provisions of the Act.

All registered hairdressers, whether practising or not, should be required to pay the appropriate fee. The fees are: principal $6.25 per annum, employee $1.75 per annum, and this Bill provides accordingly.

The board may suspend or cancel the registration of a hairdresser, where the registration has been obtained by fraud, or where a registered hairdresser has been convicted for an offence under the Act or regulations. In this event, the board must advise the hairdresser concerned, by registered mail, of the complaint against him and hold a full inquiry enabling the hairdresser concerned to state his case, and there is a right of appeal against the decision of the board.

The Act also provides for suspension for non-payment of fees. There is some concern, however, that suspension of registration for non-payment of fees could be subject to the procedures required when a hairdresser has committed an offence. This was never intended and it is desired to confine the inquiry mentioned previously to those cases involving offences, leaving the suspension for non-payment of fees a matter for simple notification of the fact. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan.

IRON ORE (HAMERSLEY RANGE) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [8.10 p.m.]: This Bill is one which must be dealt with in conjunction with the Bill to

amend the Iron Ore (Hanwright) Agreement Act so I hope I will be permitted during my remarks to make reference to both Bills, as they are complementary.

It is good to learn that further expansion of industry is taking place in the Pilbara district, particularly in this new area which has been established by Hamersley Iron, and which previously was purely and simply used for grazing of cattle and sheep. I understand that the population of the new township of Dampier has reached about 3,000, while there are about another 800 or 900 people at Tom Price.

The business of mining and exporting iron ore has had a great effect upon the immediate area and has, indeed, been very profitable for the companies concerned. The principal companies of course are Conzinc Riotinto of Australia, which is a subsidiary of Riotinto of the United Kingdom, which has 60 per cent. of the shares, and Kaiser Steel has 40 per cent. Kaiser Steel is a wholly-owned American company so that largely, and very largely indeed, the iron ore establishment at this centre is owned by overseas capital. The establishment of Hamersley Holdings as a company enabled a number of shares to be placed with Australian shareholders. Therefore something like 15 per cent. or 16 per cent. of Australian capital directly and indirectly through the shares in Conzinc Riotino of Australia is participating in the venture. Overall, from Australia's point of view, it is a very small participation.

I always thought, and my thought has been strengthened recently, that although we may require overseas investment to enable us to develop our natural resources, we may be, perhaps, extending our generosity a little too far. Quite recently the Federal Treasurer found it necessary to go overseas to raise a very substantial loan in order that the country might be in a position to meet its overseas financial responsibilities.

While the quarrying and export of iron ore makes quite an impact by bringing a few thousand people to previously unoccupied areas, it has, in my opinion, a very serious effect on the eventual overseas balances. What it earns for Australia, of course, is substantial, but the dividends from the profits which must be repatriated from Australia create a two-way traffic. Unlike the profits from primary production, the profits from this type of venture do not remain in Australia.

In the main, wheatgrowers, woolgrowers, and other primary producers, find that income from their industry is distributed over a much wider field, and remains in the country. So while it is good to see an expansion of industry in these remote areas, I think it is time some notice was taken of the overall effect upon the Commonwealth's financial position. It is said that the iron ore companies pay tax; that employees of the companies, through their wages, also pay tax, and from those sources the Commonwealth is doing fairly well and that the State, of course, gets something back through reimbursements.

It is also said that the royalties being paid by the companies have proved to be very substantial and a blessing to the Western Australian Treasury. However, in my opinion, the royalties are not sufficient to meet the requirements and there should be a far greater Australian share participation in companies such as these. The Hanwright Bill before us is, of course, a subsidiary to the Hamersley Bill and, in fact, is really complementary to it, but I am rather surprised the Government did not take some action to induce the companies concerned—that is, the principal companies in Hamersley Holdings—to make available a much larger Australian shareholding.

While the Government, like everybody else in Western Australia, is keen and anxious to foster industry, create employment, and advertise the State—which all Governments should do—I feel that in this instance it could have made a better bargain than it has made. The Bill we are now discussing is not creating a new industry; it simply provides for an established industry possibly to buy—we do not know about that because we have not been told—the iron ore which is under reservation to another company, that other company being the Hanwright company. Yet it is only about 12 months ago that we ratified an agreement between the Government and the Hanwright company, and at that time we all hoped, as did the company, that it might be able to raise the finance necessary to start another quarry and export industry, using ore from the Paraburdoo lease and the Mt. Lockyer lease, both of which were owned by the Hanwright company and which are now being transferred, by the two Bills before us, to Hamersley Iron.

Apparently the Hanwright company failed in its attempt to raise sufficient capital to exploit the reserves and ship the ore overseas in the same way as other big companies operating in the north are doing. I have already said that we do not know whether or not the ore is being sold under an agreement between the two companies, or whether large bodies of ore are being transferred from one company to the other. Under the original arrangement with Hamersley Iron, when the Australian participation was referred to, there was mention that the prospectors, Hancock and Wright, were to receive a 2½ per cent. royalty on the f.o.b. value of all ore shipped from Mt. Tom Price through Hamersley. There is no mention of what those people will be getting out of this arrangement.

However, in my view, as Hamersley Iron will not be required to meet the tremendous expenditure necessary to utilise the Hanwright reserves, as it had to do in its original proposal, if anything is to be paid to the prospectors it should be a very small sum and the Government should get any other benefit which may result from the proposal. The Government should get that because of the mere fact that the exporting company, under this proposal, will not be involved in the same capital expenditure as it was under its original agreement.

In his introductory speech the Minister referred to a sum of $300,000,000 having to be spent from now on. But that will be a long way from now on; it will not cost the company another $300,000,000 to take ore from these new ore bodies into Dampier and blend it, treat it, or do whatever the company wants to do with it, as would be the case with a new field being opened up, with the necessity to build a port, railway, and so on. From what I have read, Hamersley's expenditure so far has been somewhere about $130,000,000 or $140,000,000.

A new town has to be built at Parabardoo so that these reserves can be mined, but I should imagine that that town will not be any bigger—if indeed it is as big—as Tom Price. Also, only 40 or 50 miles of railway have to be constructed and that appears to be about the only expenditure involved. If, however, the company changes over to the production of agglomerates and concentrates it is getting a big discount.

On previous occasions when Bills containing agreements were being passed through Parliament, and members criticised the royalties provided for, they were told that those royalties had to be reasonable because of the tremendous expenditure the companies had to meet to develop the deposits, build ports and towns, construct railways, and so on. But that is not a recurring cost and for that reason I believe the Government should have received if not a larger royalty then something in another direction by way of housing or something else which would have made up for the lesser expenditure in which the companies are involved.

I realise it would be difficult to alter the standard royalty, and what applies to one company applies to all of them, of course. However, our complaint has been that the royalties are fixed and what will they be worth, in money value, in 25 years' time, or in 100 years' time? Because of the enormous quantities of ore available in the Pilbara area the iron ore companies will be going for a long time. I was rather interested to read in *The West Australian* of the 24th of this month some comments of Mr. R. T. Madigan, who is the manager of Hamersley Iron. He was speaking at a symposium and the newspaper cutting on this matter reads as follows:—

> The known reserves of Pilbara iron ore—frequently given as 20,000 million tons—are misleading because the figure only refers to high-grade ore, according to the managing director of Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd.
>
> Mr. R. T. Madigan said that the total tonnages available could be as much as 100,000,000 million.

That is enormous.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is a lot of ore.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Sufficient to meet the world's needs for about 140,000 years.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The article continues—

> In an article in a Sydney newspaper yesterday, Mr. Madigan said that the Pilbara had enough iron ore to meet the world's needs for about 140,000 years.

As I said, that is an enormous amount of ore.

Are we committed—and it seems we are—through these agreements to the royalty which is set out? The royalty today is very low indeed but it will still prevail, apparently, in 140,000 years' time; because the agreements have been drawn up with a sort of one-way traffic. The original Hamersley agreement in clause 3, subclause (2), paragraph (c) of the schedule stated—

> No future Act of the said State will operate to increase the company's liabilities—

and I emphasise the word "increase"—

> —or obligations hereunder with respect to rents or royalties.

The Government has not increased the royalties under the proposal before us; in fact, it has actually decreased them in one respect. I refer to page 23 of the Hanwright Bill, clause 15, subparagraph (iv) which states—

> . . . on locally used ore (not being iron ore used for producing iron ore concentrates) and on iron ore concentrates produced from locally used ore and shipped or sold or used in plant for the production of steel or in an integrated iron and steel industry or in plant for the production of metallised agglomerates (other than iron ore concentrates shipped solely for testing purposes) at the rate of fifteen cents (15c) per ton;

Here we have a situation where, normally, 15c per ton is the minimum paid for any type of ore by all companies, including B.H.P. Here we find that 15c will be charged on the ore locally used, and there

will be a charge of 15c a ton on iron ore concentrates produced from locally used ore.

By way of illustration I would point out that it would possibly take about 15 tons of ore to make 10 tons of concentrates. I do not know the exact quantity but that is just an example.

The Hon. E. C. House: Would not that come under price control?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: No; this is the price for locally used ore.

The Hon. E. C. House: Does not this relate to price fixing?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is a royalty charge made by the Government, and we are not getting enough; it was not properly controlled.

If it takes 15 tons of iron ore to produce 10 tons of concentrates the company pays 15c a ton on 10 tons of concentrates, not on the 15 tons of ore used. So the figure is reduced. I often wonder what the position would have been had Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, not voluntarily increased its rate some years ago from 5c to 15c a ton. This was done on ore that was taken anywhere, whether it be in South Australia or Western Australia.

It is reasonable to believe that the Government would not dare to give the Hamersley people or the Mount Newman people anything under 15c for ore to be taken and used in the manufacture of industrial commodities in Australia. As I understand the position, the Government is getting less than 15c a ton for the ore under this agreement. If I interpret the position correctly, it means that the foreign companies are able to partially upgrade the ore and pay a lower royalty than does B.H.P., which is an Australian company, for the ore used in its production of steel in Australia. Surely that is unfair.

That is what the position seems to be. Comments have been made about the Australian company not paying enough. We recognise that with the loss of value in money it actually increased its royalty by 200 per cent. But the critics lose sight of the fact that B.H.P., through its subsidiary, now called Dampier Mining, finds it is just as far to transport ore from Yampi Sound around to Port Kembla or Newcastle as it is to transport iron ore from Hamersley or Dampier to Japan. There is not a great deal of difference.

So one company will be using its ore in Australia and paying 15c a ton while another company producing ore fines pays 15c a ton, and if it produces concentrates it will also pay 15c a ton on concentrates only. But the Australian company will have to pay 15c a ton on the ore. The concentrates will go out cheaper.

When B.H.P. exports ore from Newcastle or Yampi, or anywhere else, it pays the export price—7½ per cent. f.o.b., 60c for lump ore and 15c a ton for fine ore. I have said before that the Government has missed out badly in regard to royalties; and because this is more or less uniform in all agreements, I think the Government should have received much more from the company covered by the Bill in relation to housing.

Housing requirements must be made available at the new township to be established at Paraburdoo. There is some talk, however, of establishing a town of some 30,000 people which is to be called Karratha, which is eight or nine miles inland from the present township of Dampier.

There is nothing in the Bill which asks the Hamersley Iron people to share in the construction of that town so, presumably, its construction is to be done at the Government's expense. There is provision in the Bill that Hamersely Iron will build a water scheme at Millstream and pipe the water to Dampier. I do not think that will take a great deal of money. Millstream is 2,000 feet above sea level; it is a big open pool, several miles in length, and flows at the rate of 3,000,000 gallons a day. So it will not be a big job to take the water out of that pool and pipe it 100 odd miles. After it is completed the company will make a present of the scheme to the Government, and the Government will then operate and manage the scheme and sell the water to Hamersley at cost. I know that if a pipe is put in fairly deep in that area the water will run downhill, so it is not a great achievement.

In my opinion the Government has not done very well in relation to the aspect of housing. Without exception, the iron ore companies in the north have provided for their key personnel only—for their staff, tradesmen, and the specialists operating machines. The unskilled labourer must necessarily be a single man. It will be no good at all a married labourer asking for a job in that area because he will naturally want to take his family there and no accommodation will be available for them. He will have no hope whatever of getting a job. Single accommodation is built for the unskilled labourer.

The point I am making is that the labour turnover of these companies is so high that I think the Government could quite easily have asked them to do a little more towards housing, thus boosting the resident population in that area. It is not good enough that they should only build houses for their key personnel and staff. They seem to have forgotten about the married, unskilled labourer who wants to work in the area and save money; because he has no hope of doing so in the city.

Mention is made in the Bill to Cape Lambert. Talk about this started a good while back when the Cleveland Cliffs company was originally proposing to establish at Cape Preston. The company investigated Cape Lambert but nothing came of it. It is four years since the Cleveland Cliffs agreement was ratified, but the company does not seem to have made any headway at all and, as I read the agreement, it does not have to make much headway.

Being a foreign company with interests of its own in the United States and Canada I daresay it feels it can afford to wait and sit on its Australian deposits and not work them at all. I would point out, however, that the people around Roebourne and Point Samson are getting a bit fed up about the kite flying in regard to Cape Lambert.

It is about time the Government did something about the Cleveland Cliffs agreement or, if it cannot do anything about it, it should bring the agreement back to Parliament so that we can speed the matter up a bit, and give the people in the area an idea as to what their future is likely to be.

Everybody had great hopes that the Hanwright agreement would prove beneficial to the district, but, if it has, the Government is not telling us anything about it. Another point that interests me is that the Minister in his speech referred to the possibility of the State providing power to Hamersley Iron and to Hanwright if they established at Cape Lambert. The Minister said that if it is possible for the State to provide power before 1977 at the rate of 5c or 6c per kwh the commitment will be brought forward. But the agreement does not say that at all; it is different altogether. The agreement says that—

> . . . if before the 1st January 1977 the State gives to the company notice that it is willing to supply the company at all times from the commencement of the first day of January 1986 and thereafter during the continuance in operation of this agreement with all the company's requirements for electrical power anywhere within a radius of 30 miles from the post office at Dampier the company will forthwith enter into an agreement to purchase the power.

The price written into the Bill is a total cost of .5c to the company. The Minister mistakenly said 5c, but it is .5c per unit. That is good news for the people in Roebourne who are paying 14c and 15c per unit! How could the Government be sure that it can produce power at that rate by 1986—18 years hence? It is a little bit too fantastic. In 18 years the Government hopes to be able to supply this power.

We have read observations about nuclear power and different firms coming here to examine the position and explore the feasibility of establishing a nuclear plant in the area; and I hope they can. But I feel the Government should not have written into the agreement a price such as it has until it was absolutely sure it could produce nuclear power at that price and not lose money by doing so.

Of course, the Government knows its own business best and it might have all the answers. So I hope the Minister can tell us something about it. However, it is fantastic to think that such a figure could be provided for and the provision signed now—18 years before it is likely to eventuate. If there is a variation in the price—whatever it might be—there can be no variation so far as the agreement and the Bill are concerned. We are only able to accept or reject this Bill. It is a Government Bill and there is not the slightest doubt that it will be accepted, but I must say it is with regret I should be placed in the position—I can give examples—of saying that the Government of Western Australia is not receiving what it should for the natural resources being mined and exported overseas.

I would like to make one reference to a statement in connection with the profitability of Hamersley Iron. On the 15th October the directors made an announcement in *The West Australian*—and we must take notice of them. They are reported to have said—

> The directors have announced that group net profit for the quarter was $5,100,000.
>
> This brought profit for the nine months to September 30 to $11,673,000.
>
> Profit for the latest three months represents an annual profit rate of $20.4 million, compared with profit for the full year to December 31, of $9,364,000.

So it almost doubled this year. Continuing—

> The quarterly result followed a profit of $3,768,000 for the June quarter.
>
> Profit for the nine months remained after providing depreciation of $8,806,000 and future tax of $6,359,000.
>
> Outstanding loans from the North American banks were reduced from $110.08 million to $105.42 million during the quarter.

We can see there are tremendous profits to be made out of mining and the shipping of iron ore and pellets. The company is years ahead of its previous agreement; and all credit to it, because of the manner in which it has established itself.

On the other hand, I must repeat that I do not think this State is receiving its fair share by way of royalties. I would ask the Minister to discuss this with his

colleagues should any future agreements be negotiated—and possibly they will be. I refer to the fact that if the Government is afraid to obtain an imbalance in royalties, it should at least see they are brought up for review after a period of years.

It was said in another place that after 15 years there would be a charge of 25c written into the agreement, in addition to payable fees. I would be pleased if the Minister could tell me which clause refers to that increase. I think royalties should be brought up for review. This could be done, because there is a variation clause in the agreement; and, if the company is prepared to agree, anything can be changed, but that is not the position if the company says, "No." I think the Government should demand that more houses be built in the bigger towns to provide for the married unskilled worker—the man who is not a specialist at his job, or a member of the staff.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [8.52 p.m.]: I am grateful to Mr. Strickland for what I think could be referred to as his qualified support for this Bill, and the agreement which it contains. I am a little perplexed about some of the comment he has made in relation to the activities of this and other companies operating in the north-west. There is nothing in this Bill about Cleveland Cliffs, but I think it is appropriate I should make some remarks about this company. The honourable member has the idea that the Government is doing nothing about Cleveland Cliffs. However, from time to time—perhaps Mr. Strickland has not seen these—there have been accounts in the Press of the progress or lack of progress made in respect of Cleveland Cliffs. However, recent reports in the Press have indicated that Cleveland Cliffs is closer to making arrangements with the Japanese than ever before.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It has been four years on the job.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right; but while on that point, the north has been there a lot longer than four years. I am simply amazed to hear Mr. Strickland say that the companies should provide more houses. I would pose the question to him: Who built the houses at Dampier? Who built the houses at Tom Price? Who built the houses at Goldsworthy? Who built the houses at Mt. Newman?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I know the companies built the houses, but I was referring to houses for unskilled men.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The companies have provided everything that has gone into these projects.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Who live in the houses?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The people who work for the company.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Not unskilled men.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I fail to understand what the honourable member means. At a period some time last year I think he told us he landed at Dampier on one occasion when it was hard rock—there was nothing there at all.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are misquoting me.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, I am not; I am simply making my own comments and endeavouring to reply to what the honourable member said.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You must have misheard.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not mishear the honourable member. He said the company should build more houses. The answer is that the companies have built the houses.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You know what I said.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The companies have built the projects, railways, ports, and every mortal thing. We called tenders for the Mt. Goldsworthy deposit.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are a defender of the faith.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am a defender of the truth; and I do not think we should have it said that the companies are not doing enough.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said for the unskilled worker.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Everybody working on this project is being housed, and the honourable member knows that if they were not, they would not be there.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Would it not be fair to say that the honourable member referred to unskilled married workers?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All I am saying is that the people who work on the projects are being supplied with houses by the company.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Good houses, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All of us who have been to Dampier know this. We called tenders for Mt. Goldsworthy; and members will recall that when the Commonwealth first took the embargo off the export of iron ore it was conditional that half the deposit—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: We remember Sir Arthur Fadden coming over.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member remembers this gentleman coming over because he has made a number of speeches about it, from time to time.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: He negotiated it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is not true. To use the honourable member's expression, I am not the defender of the faith, but Sir Arthur Fadden had no negotiations whatsoever with the Government.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Press was wrong.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He had no negotiations whatsoever with the Government, but he came to see me—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —with some letter of accreditation. I said, "You will be able to use this with advantage when you put in a tender for the Mt. Goldsworthy deposit." I deny that Sir Arthur had any negotiations with me or with the Government.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Minister please address the Chair?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; and perhaps I may be able to speak with more effect. I repeat: We called tenders for the Mr. Goldsworthy deposits and the royalty for iron ore at that point was set on the basis of an f.o.b. price; and the best price we could get in those days was of the order of 6s. a ton. We decided to set it at the f.o.b. percentage so we would get the benefit of any lift in prices that occurred. We knew also that we would have to take any decrease. We knew this would naturally apply.

I look back to when the people who obtained the tender for Mt. Goldsworthy —the Mount Goldsworthy company—were not going to Port Hedland, but to Depuch Island. Members in this House have firm convictions about this; and I can well remember the disappointment of the people at Port Hedland and the change from disappointment to pleasure when the decision was made to go to Port Hedland.

The iron ore development in the north has turned Port Hedland into a centre we never thought possible. We never thought it would be as great as it is today, and in a few years it will be greater still.

I think Mr. Strickland answered a lot of his own questions. He told us—after having queried the royalty rates and the conditions applying to them—just what benefits were being derived from the agreements. He told us of the 42 per cent. Commonwealth tax paid by the companies, and he told us of the income tax levied on the salaries and wages of the people employed in the various projects. He also said that the iron ore projects had created many employment opportunities, and all these things are only too true. The north has been transformed in a wonderful way and I think we are all happy and proud of the fact that this has been done.

Millions of dollars have been poured into the development of these projects. It is not a matter—using the honourable member's expression—of the agreements being drawn up "with one-way traffic." That is not true; it is not fair to say that. The agreements are drawn up on the basis of a partnership between the Government and the companies, the Government giving the companies the opportunity to explore, mine, and sell, so as to create income. Measured in geological terms, these deposits have been there for millions of years but it is only in the last 10 years that we have been able to do something effective with them.

As far as the royalties are concerned, we make no secret of the fact that where the minerals of the State are being used in secondary processing in Western Australia, for the benefit of Western Australians—and for the whole of the nation —then the royalty payable will be less than that which will apply if the ore is shipped out of the country in the form of direct shipping ore. Surely that is a laudable approach to these agreements.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Bill says the company can sell the concentrates overseas.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course the agreement states that the company can sell the concentrates overseas. The other agreements which have been signed had the same provision. Concentrates are not taken out of the ground. Ore is not mined one day, and concentrates the next day. The ore is mined and direct shipping ore is produced after it has been crushed. Then, there are the residues and the fines. The minimum amounts payable are meticulously set out in the agreement. Included is the price for processed ore and, of course, concentrates is a form of secondary processing. The ore has to be treated in order to get concentrates. Every one of these agreements has the same sort of provision.

One of the important provisions in relation to these two agreements, with which we are dealing, is that Western Australia will be brought closer to a form of secondary processing, which we all look forward to. We are brought closer to the manufacture, in Western Australia, of metallised agglomerates and, ultimately, to the establishment of another steel mill. If competition is good—and I believe it is good—then the establishment of a second steel mill will be good for that very fine company, B.H.P. An important part of this agreement is that steel will be produced in greater quantities, and in a competitive manner with another steel-producing company.

Mr. Strickland pointed out that I quoted the figures of 5c and 6c, and mentioned that perhaps the figures should have been .5c and .6c. I think my notes may have been at fault and there may have been

a typographical error. The notes with which I was supplied show the figures of 5c and 6c, but, as I have said, this could be an error, and I will most certainly check the figures when I get an opportunity.

I would only be labouring the question if I went any further. In conclusion, I would like to say that one of the great countries of the world—America—was developed with English capital. Australia is being developed with English capital, and some American capital, in combination forms, and I do not know how else we could raise the sums of money which are necessary to put into operation agreements such as these. I do not know how we could match the obligations which are placed on the companies in relation to the deposits and the undertakings. We simply could not raise the money on the local market, and Mr. Strickland knows that fact.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I do not know it at all.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Then, of course, I think I must tell the honourable member that we would have extreme difficulty in raising on the Australian market the sort of money needed for this type of operation. The Hamersley people fulfilled an undertaking by making available a certain percentage of shares to the Australian people. The company was really under no obligation, as I understand it, but nevertheless it fulfilled a promise by making some of the shares available to the Australian people, and those shares were taken up by Australians.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Which portion of the agreement—the original agreement—sets out the royalties to be charged?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not contained in this agreement; it is in the Goldsworthy agreement. There is a clause —it does not express the form of royalties —setting out an overriding amount of 26c on each ton of ore shipped after a certain period.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is only in the Goldsworthy agreement?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, and to the best of my knowledge the same principle applied to the Hamersley agreement. Later on I will look at that agreement to see if I can find the specific clause, and I will point it out to the honourable member. I thank him for his comments and his support of the Bill.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Thank you.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

IRON ORE (HANWRIGHT) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 23rd October.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

STATE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [9.14 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to make three amendments to the principal Act. Section 60A of the principal Act is amended by increasing the amount of money made available, under certain circumstances, for a second mortgage. The amount will be increased by $2,000. With the increasing cost of building, it is difficult to maintain a static mean figure on which the commission can base loans for housing. Therefore it is to be expected that the limits must be raised from time to time. One question arises from such a rise in values; namely, is there a tendency to limit the number of people who can be helped? If a given quantum of money is available for a specific purpose, and the maximum loan is $8,000, if that maximum is lifted to $10,000 it would follow that fewer people could be helped because of the additional money being made available in each case. I assume with the legislation which is now before us that the need for the extra quantum of money has been appreciated and it will be made available with the result that there will be no retrogression in the very serious position which now applies to State Housing Commission allocations.

The increase of the allowance for dependent children, both from the point of view of the increase in the allowance and the lifting of the eligibility from 16 years to 21 years, is a beneficial step, I believe, for the applicants. People who were previously just outside the scope will now be comfortably within the scope. All those people who were previously borderline

cases will, at least, be applicants for the cheaper type of home and will not have to go onto the open market to borrow money at a fairly expensive rate of interest when compared with the rate at which the State Housing Commission makes money available.

Perhaps there is one anomaly in the qualification that a dependent child is no longer dependent when he reaches 21 years of age; there could be cases where invalid children are not only dependent as children but are equally dependent in their adult life. If parents see fit to look after such men or women in later life, then I believe that that dependency should entitle the individual to qualify for the allowance.

To comment on the Bill itself, I appreciate that the extension has some material value as does the fact that the figure has been lifted by 100 per cent., from $50 to $100. The same applies in the lifting of the loan figure from $6,000 to $8,000, which represents a rise of $2,000 and is in keeping with the previous increase which I have mentioned. Again, my only comment is that I presume additional finances will be available to absorb the rise and there will be no diminution in the number of people who will be able to be helped under this legislation as against the number who can be helped under the existing Act.

An important step contemplated in the legislation is the abolition of the scheme known as the McNess Housing Trust, which will now come within the scope of the State Housing Commission. In his introductory remarks the Minister made it quite clear that the members of the existing trust had themselves made the suggestion that the assets and all the functions of the trust should be taken over by the commission. The Minister actually said—

> With the passing of the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Acts, the housing of pensioners and other social Service recipients is adequately provided for, and the need for provision such as in the McNess Housing Trust Act has declined to the extent that it is now not necessary.

I consider one could be misled by the term, "adequately provided for"; because I know of very many pensioners who are not within the scope of the State Housing Commission's orbit at the moment and who very much desire that they could be housed by the commission. As I see the position, and judging from conversations I have had with commission officers, this is not likely in the near future at any rate. Many applicants are listed and the turnover is very slow. The position of housing this type of person has reached a state of emergency. I certainly would not say that they are adequately housed or provided for. However, I do think there is adequate machinery within the Act to look after these people, but the actual provision of this type of housing has still a very long way to go in order to reach equilibrium.

I was surprised to find the very large net profit which the State Housing Commission is reported to have made to the 30th June, 1968. In round figures, the amount is some $7,000,000. In 1967 it was $1,900,000-odd. To my mind this is a tremendously large sum of money to be taken as profit by what is an administrative body, the essential purpose of which is to look after the interests of the scheme. I wonder why such a large amount of profit was taken in one year.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is it $7,000,000 in one year?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: That was the figure quoted in reply to a question. If that is the case it seems too much is being charged to a section of the community which is really considered to be in the lower income bracket. However, a breakdown of the high net profit may reveal a very different situation from my cold analysis at this present time. It does appear to be an extraordinary amount and I wonder if, perhaps, rents are too high.

It is true the Minister for Housing uses the argument that if he can make money by this method, he creates more housing for other people. Within reason, that is a legitimate argument, but I question its legitimacy when we reach such a high figure as this. Should it not be considered that the very basis of the scheme is the use of Commonwealth finance, with the scheme being administered by the State and the money returned to the Commonwealth in the ultimate?

So far as the Bill is concerned, of course the Opposition would support it as only benefit will be derived from the passing of the legislation. The premises I have used are more cautionary than anything else and I hope that the points I have raised were, in fact, thought of and looked into prior to the introduction of the measure.

THE HON. C. E. GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [9.24 p.m.]: The purpose of the Bill is to amend the State Housing Act and we are told it will do several things. Firstly, it will increase the allowance for each dependent child from $50 to $100. Secondly, it will extend the age from 16 years to 21 years for children who are dependent on their parents. Thirdly, it will increase the maximum allowance for advance from $6,000 to $8,000. Fourthly, it will increase the permissible cost or value of the house, excluding land on which a second mortgage advance may be made, from $8,000 to $10,000. Finally, it will empower the State Housing Commission to absorb the assets and the liabilities of the McNess Housing Trust.

I agree with all these features of the Bill and I certainly intend to support it. One point which concerns me a little, to say the least, is that when the allowance for each dependent child is increased from $50 to $100, as has already been suggested, this will make more people eligible for assistance from the State Housing Commission. I am not opposed to that, either.

What I am opposed to is the type of accommodation which the State Housing Commission will have to offer these people. I am more than a little concerned at the trend which the State Housing Commission has suggested it will follow in the future. I refer to the diabolical scheme—for want of a better adjective to describe it—of high density accommodation. Will the State Housing Commission insist that people who have no alternative but to seek rental accommodation with the State Housing Commission, shall live in these dwellings? The legislation before us will force more people to live under conditions similar to those which the State Housing Commission is presently endeavouring to force onto people.

I have mentioned once or twice previously that the trend in the future will be to build higher density accommodation for State rental purposes. All sorts of fantastic reasons have been presented as to why this situation has come about and why it is necessary for the State Housing Commission to have to stoop to building this type of housing in order to accommodate people. I am opposed to it because I do not believe it is the way the ordinary Australian person wishes to live, if he has a choice.

I had occasion to send to England for some information on this subject. I have gathered a fair amount of it, but I will not read it all. However, I would like to read one or two extracts. A full page appears in the *Observer Review*, which is a London Sunday paper, dated the 18th February, 1968. It carries the block heading "High Society" and the whole of the page is devoted to condemning the activities of housing authorities which place people in something other than ordinary detached accommodation. I am more than a little concerned, because the measure before us will mean that more people will be housed in this manner.

I should like to read one or two extracts from this newspaper in order to give members the opportunity to hear what some other authorities in the world—in London in particular—think of this type of housing.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member will have every opportunity to make a speech of this nature at a later stage. The Bill hardly lends itself to quoting lengthy articles from a newspaper, because it is, in the main, dealing with the financial aspect of housing.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Thank you Mr. President, for reminding me of that and for suggesting that I will have an opportunity at a later stage to refer to the reports published in this newspaper. For the time being I will refrain from making any quotations.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You will have plenty of opportunity to refer to them during the debate on the appropriation Bills.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am aware of that.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Don't forget that we want to finish on Friday.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I consider the Bill will increase the number of people who will have no alternative but to live in the type of housing which is the subject of this Bill. I will not pursue my line of argument, but will simply state I support the amendments contained in the Bill because they are all worth while.

When speaking to this measure Mr. Willesee stated that the State Housing Commission had made $7,000,000 profit, and perhaps there is some reason for this. I am not altogether against the idea of the Housing Commission making a profit, but whilst moving around my province, one point that forcibly comes to my attention is that many people living in State Housing Commission homes were in fact on the low scale of income to which Mr. Willesee has referred when the houses were first allocated to them. In other words, the husband was earning only a small weekly wage and could only afford to pay the low rental that had been fixed at that time. However, many of these people are now engaged in more lucrative occupations and probably earn many thousands of dollars a year, but they still continue to reside in State Housing Commission homes paying rentals nowhere near comparable with the rentals that are paid by other people occupying homes built by private builders.

I do not believe the State Housing Commission or any other instrumentality should provide houses at a cheap rental to people for the rest of their lives simply because at one stage of their working life they were eligible to be allocated a State Housing Commission home. There are many people in such a position and it is difficult to suggest that the State Housing Commission should sort them out and say to them, "You are now earning $5,000 a year and therefore you are no longer eligible to remain a tenant in one of our houses. You must seek other rental accommodation or make arrangements to buy the house." I do not suggest that, but it is not unreasonable to suggest that the tenants of rental homes should pay a rental which is more in keeping with that paid by other people occupying houses owned by private landlords.

I would be the last person to suggest that anyone in adverse circumstances should be approached in this manner by an officer of the State Housing Commission. In fact, I have such a person in my electorate and I will fight tooth and nail in making representations to the State Housing Commission to have his rental reduced In acting on behalf of such a tenant in the past I have had no trouble whatsoever with the Housing Commission in applying to have the rent reduced. On the other hand, I think it is desirable that where people are able to pay an economic rental and the Housing Commission can make a profit from the renting of houses which will enable it to build more houses for people in need of accommodation, I think such a policy is not only desirable but also essential. I support the Bill and, as you suggested earlier, Mr. President, I will take the opportunity at a later stage to acquaint members with a few details and some of the information I have collected relating to this subject.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [9.36 p.m.]: I wish to question only that part of the Bill which seeks to increase, by $2,000, the allowable amounts for housing. Obviously this is intended to be a solution to a problem that exists, but this solution may only bring other problems in its wake. In a way, the sum for which State homes are purchased is a control in itself over the cost of some homes built by private builders. If the State Housing Commission intends to allow up to $8,000 or $10,000 for a home I think we will find that those houses which at present are within the range of $8,000 and which are built by private builders in future will be available at the maximum cost of $10,000 which is the amount proposed by the Bill.

I would suggest that the remedy lies not so much in increasing the amounts allowable to cover the increase in the cost of homes. I do not have to prove to members that there is an inflationary trend at present, but this inflationary trend has a greater impact on the cost of land than on homes, and it is in this regard that the Government has not made much impression, even though it has been well aware of the inflationary trend in land values for a long time.

My point is, then, that increasing the cost of homes and the allowable amount of loan for second mortgages may solve the problem for those people who can afford homes to the value of up to $10,000, but this, in its train, will bring great problems for those people who must, of necessity, buy homes at a lower price.

Mention has also been made of the profits that are made by the State Housing Commission which we assume have been derived from rentals. Other suggestions have been made that the profit has been derived from the sale of land. I do not know how the profits are proportioned, but if this tendency continues some thought should be given to the effect on the economy as a whole. Obviously, if we are to take more money from people on low incomes for rentals on State Housing Commission homes, they will have less to spend on bread and butter items. In other words we will reduce their marginal income and they will have to reduce their expenditure on items other than daily necessities. Therefore, this must have some reflection on the general economy.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [9.39 p.m.]: Could the Minister supply me with some—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am having great difficulty in hearing you.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am having difficulty in hearing myself, because there is so much noise going on around the Chamber. When the Minister replies to the debate could he tell me if the State Housing Commission has changed its policy on the allocation of purchase homes? It seems to me that over the last four or five years the system has been changed. In previous years when a person applied for a purchase home, within 15 or 16 months at the most, he could go ahead with the building of his home. Today, however, it would seem that a person applying for a purchase home has to wait as long as an applicant for a rental home, because I know some applicants for purchase homes who have been waiting for over three years to have one allocated.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [9.41 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the Bill. There are probably only two or three points on which I should comment. Firstly, I wish to speak on the question of the profits which are made by the State Housing Commission. Contrary to the belief that Mr. Claughton appears to hold, these profits are not entirely derived from rents. Generally speaking, the profits are made by the State Housing Commission as a business undertaking, whether they are derived from rentals, the purchase of land, the resale of land, the reallocation of land, or any other factor.

Personally, I think it is a most desirable state of affairs that the State Housing Commission should be able to regard itself as an organisation which is run efficiently and is able to make some profits. Of course the profits it makes go back into the building of more homes for the very people we are discussing. It must not be overlooked that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement contains a formula upon which the rental shall be assessed.

I am inclined to agree with the statement made by Mr. Griffiths in regard to the State Housing Commission making

houses available at a reasonable rental for people in the low income bracket. Whatever the rent may be eventually it is less than the rent charged by those in a private building sector. Some time ago a number of houses were built by the State Housing Commission and the rent charged was something less than $3.50 a week. They were brick houses and the people occupying them were on a much lower weekly income than they are now. As Mr. Griffiths has stated, the lot of the average individual has improved over the last few years, and his income has increased substantially. Until recently some people were continuing to occupy the type of house I have mentioned for a rental as low as $3.50 a week. This does not seem to be reasonable, and I think the State Housing Commission has some responsibility to do something about increasing the rental to a more reasonable figure.

When I was Minister for Housing we used to take advantage of a tenant vacating a State Housing Commission home to adjust the rental to a more economic figure than that charged to the previous tenant when the house was first occupied by him. It seemed to be perfectly reasonable to take such action. I cannot agree with the suggestion that because the State Housing Commission has amassed some profits that they ought to be disseminated among only those people occupying State houses.

If there was a reduction in the rent the commission would not be able to use its energy to building houses to the extent that it is able to at the present time. No-one really forces a person to live in a State house, except for circumstances.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They are pretty forcible ones.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I said, "Except for circumstances." When we look at the real purpose of the Act, and have regard for the agreements made between the States and the Commonwealth under the Act, we will find that the purpose is to give assistance to people in need of houses—the people in receipt of a certain income. Whether or not the circumstances are forced upon them, this is the group to which such assistance is given.

As Mr. Clive Griffiths pointed out, under the Bill more people will become eligible for housing assistance, because it is proposed to lift the permissible income of applicants by making an allowance for each child in the family, up to 21 years of age. The point made by Mr. Claughton in regard to the increase in the amount of the advance I cannot understand, because a person is not forced to take advantage of these advances. The Bill will enable a person to take advantage of them if he wants to.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The Bill brings in a greater number of blue collar workers.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If a person manages his income properly—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The Minister missed the point I made.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is not beyond the realms of possibility. The fact remains that if a person is able to borrow up to that amount, and wants to borrow it, he can do so; but this Bill will not necessarily reflect in more expensive homes being provided, because such homes are already available to the people in the community, and they can be purchased.

The only other comment I make is in relation to the point raised by Mr. Willesee concerning the McNess homes. I did say that with the passing of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement Acts the housing of pensioners and the recipients of other types of social service benefits will be adequately catered for, and the need for the McNess Housing Trust will be removed.

It is only fair to agree to the point made by Mr. Willesee, but it is also fair to say that the point I made that these people will be adequately provided for under the existing legislation, rather than under the McNess Housing Trust, is a good one. We should bear in mind that the McNess Trust is running out of endowment funds, and it has been relying on the support of the Government and the Lotteries Commission. When it ran out of its income funds last year the Lotteries Commission did not continue to support it. It would therefore be logical to suggest that the trust should be disbanded, bearing in mind that Mr. McLaren (the chairman), Mr. Hyam, and Mr. Cole—members of the trust—put this forward as a recommendation to the Minister. This Bill is another move in the right direction towards giving greater assistance to a section of the community, and it will enable more people to become eligible under the Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 9th October.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [9.54 p.m.]: This Bill which was introduced by Mr. Jack Thomson is quite a small measure consisting of only two clauses. The

amendment is a further proposal to assist ex-servicemen in obtaining Crown land for agricultural development. Provision for concessions to ex-servicemen in respect of the purchase of land allocated to them has existed in the Land Act for many years. Furthermore, the amendment to the Act in 1967 gave merchant seamen who had served in the 1939-45 war the same concessions as those applying to ex-service personnel.

The existing legislation and the provision in the Bill will make preference to ex-servicemen a statutory requirement; that is, by providing an obligation to that effect. The present policy of the land board is that ex-servicemen's claims are given full consideration. In one instance the Bill seeks to change the purpose of the land board from a board of adjudication to a classification board, in all cases where a discharged member of the forces is an applicant.

There would be no point in convening a land board and interviewing applicants in the normal way unless the board was satisfied that the discharged member or members of the forces did not have the potential to develop the land applied for. If the board did hear all the applicants, and then decided that a discharged member of the forces had the potential to develop the land, the evidence of all the other applicants could not be considered.

In the attempts of Mr. Jack Thomson to assist ex-servicemen we should bear in mind the resultant disabilities that may be caused with the passage of the Bill. Further, his amendment would remove the existing discretion of the board to recommend that none of the applicants be approved; at the present time the board has this discretion. This amendment, if adopted, would make it mandatory for the board to allot the land, provided that at least one qualified discharged member of the forces was an applicant.

The situation in Western Australia is somewhat different from that in the other States. The method of allocation of land differs, and moreover there is not the volume of land to be released for selection in the other States. As we know, over a considerable period of time the Government has made available for selection a vast quantity of land in Western Australia. The amending Bill would apply to all ex-servicemen, and it would virtually direct the land board to give them preference. The result could be that in instances where there are single ex-service applicants—and this occurs quite regularly—the local applicants would appear to be at a disadvantage. When I say they would appear to be at a disadvantage I mean they most certainly could be placed at a disadvantage.

It is agreed that preference should be given to ex-servicemen where the circumstances are reasonably equal, but this amendment provides for absolute preference. While I say this, I am aware of the fact that on the notice paper Mr. Jack Thomson has placed an amendment to clause 2. I would like members to realise that I am conscious of that amendment, but for the moment I am speaking to the Bill.

If members are satisfied that these conditions should apply then they should of course, support the Bill. However, it is to be remembered that it would be no good complaining later—as the parliamentary representatives of country districts invariably do if they have cause—where a local applicant was not successful, and somebody else, by reason of the mandatory provision in this Bill, was successful. In such circumstances we would need to have regard for the fact that we supported a Bill which put those members in that situation.

I think it goes without saying that every time the land board sits and deliberates, there is some form of criticism as to why this man obtained a block and that man did not, and why this man should have obtained a block and this one should not have. It is difficult, indeed, for this board to satisfy everyone, and of course it cannot because of the greater interest in this type of land in more recent years than there was in the past.

The main emphasis in this field is preference to ex-servicemen, and this is a commendable objective when the conditions are reasonably equal; but the Bill is one which virtually gives absolute preference to returned ex-servicemen when single blocks are involved. I am not at the moment taking the amendment into consideration. This preference to ex-servicemen will not be confined to returned Western Australian applicants, as discharged servicemen from all States will receive absolute preference if they possess the potential to develop the land.

We could find a situation where the local people in an area where land is being made available may apply for the land and no local ex-serviceman will apply, but some ex-serviceman from Australia could be an applicant. I believe the Bill would give preference to such a person over the local people in the district where the land is being made available; and if we are conscious of this, and if this is what we want to do, I think we must appreciate that this is what we will do if we pass the Bill.

In considering this Bill members must decide for themselves whether absolute preference is to be given to ex-servicemen or whether the present practice of the land board in giving all reasonable preference to returned soldiers should be retained.

I believe it would greatly assist members in giving consideration to the need for this piece of legislation if Mr. Jack Thomson

would give some details of specific cases in which he considers the board has been remiss in any way; particularly where Mr. Thomson might think that the board has acted to the detriment of returned soldiers. We would, of course, desire information about more than, perhaps, one, two, or three cases, if we were to be convinced of the necessity for this legislation. It is not good to legislate for the individual, and I think we might find that experience would have it in the future that not only would it be not good to legislate for individuals, but it might have some deleterious reaction in certain cases.

I wonder whether Mr. Jack Thomson could see his way clear to clarify the reasons which prompted the introduction of this Bill; because if so we would all be in a better position, in all reasonableness, to consider whether or not the proposition is sound. I would also like to have the benefit of hearing from people with experience in the matter—from country members who are far better equipped than I to explain what they think of a proposition of this nature, the manner in which they think it would operate, and whether or not they think it would be a good thing.

So I am going to content myself with that at the moment. I am, of course, conscious of the fact that an amendment is on the notice paper, which intends to substitute the following paragraph in proposed new Subsection (2a):—

> (b) if the Board is satisfied that the ability and capacity of the applicant to develop the land for which he has applied is such as would enable him to properly develop the land, .

I do not think there is very much difference between that paragraph and the paragraph already in the Bill. When the honourable member replies to the debate, perhaps he will tell us what difference there is.

I think the Minister for Lands hoped that the honourable member would make further alterations to the Bill to allow some preference to be given in a more limited way to ex-servicemen rather than the preference which is contained in the Bill. However, having said that, I withhold my further intentions in respect of the Bill until I have heard what other members have to say.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [10.6 p.m.]: Although I have a good deal of sympathy for the thought behind this Bill to give more than preference to returned servicemen, in looking at the overall effect, I must say at the outset that I do not like the measure. It goes further than to give preference, because it is mandatory on the land board, if a returned serviceman applies for the land and can satisfy the board he has the potentiality to develop it, to grant the land to him.

In many cases I think the land board does a very good job. I know that at times it makes mistakes, and, in allocating 1,000,000 acres a year, which it has been called upon to do over the past eight or nine years, it is only to be expected it will sometimes make mistakes.

I know of some instances where I believe mistakes have been made, but even then, I have to confess I am not always right. I can well recall that on one occasion I took up the cudgels on an applicant's behalf and when I had gone into the matter I found the land board had in its possession some information I did not have, with the result that I had to confess the land board had not made a mistake; although, I repeat that it does at times make mistakes.

On many occasions when land is being considered by the land board—and this applies more when large areas of land are involved—if members watch carefully the allocations made they will realise it is quite apparent that preferential consideration is given to local farmers and the sons of local farmers in the area where that land is available. I think this is reasonable because it would be correct to believe that local farmers and their sons would have more knowledge of the type of farming and development necessary in their local area.

If this Bill were passed in its present form, absolute preference would have to be given in any allocations of land, whether they be large or small in area, to a discharged serviceman, no matter from what part of Australia he comes. For that matter, he could come even from New Guinea. The discretion is taken out of the hands of the board and it is compelled under this Bill to allocate the land to the discharged serviceman.

I cannot agree with that principle, although I have every sympathy for preferential consideration to be given by the land board to discharged servicemen and I think that, in many cases, if not always, this is given now. However, to make it mandatory for the board to grant this land to the returned serviceman against every other applicant is, I think, wrong. I think it would be far wiser to leave some discretion to the land board.

The Minister referred to the amendment on the notice paper. Like the Minister, I cannot see that it alters the Bill in any significant way.

Another important point I feel we should consider at this stage is that although, as I have said previously, for the past eight or nine years the land board has been allocating land to the tune of 1,000,000 acres a year, I do not think this is going to be the picture in the future. From now on these areas are going to become smaller and smaller and this means there will be less land available for allocation.

Therefore, the effect of this Bill will be far greater in the overall picture than it would have been in the past.

If this Bill was confined to returned servicemen from Western Australia—but it cannot be—I might find myself a little happier with it; but as the Bill stands at the moment I cannot bring myself to agree with it. I think the Minister's suggestion, that Mr. Jack Thomson give consideration to further amendments, may possibly meet with my approval; but I do not know, because I have not seen them and at this stage I certainly would not commit myself to supporting this Bill outright without its being considerably amended. Even then, I still do not like the principle of compelling the land board to make this allocation and leaving it no discretion in the matter. This is exactly what the Bill does, and I do not like the principle.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [10.12 p.m.]: I have listened with interest to the Minister's remarks and to Mr. Willmott when they expounded the fact that this Bill leaves it wide open for blocks to be allocated to ex-servicemen in preference to civilians. I do not agree with what either the Minister or Mr. Willmott said in this respect.

Let us consider what the Bill really does. It provides that some preference shall be shown to discharged members of the forces. We have, of course, the discharged members of the regular defence forces, and the discharged members who have had their names put in the ballot, had their marbles drawn out, and been sent to Vietnam. In some cases their parents have had to sell their farms because of this. When the son returns, he has to take his chance on the open market with the land board in respect of getting allocated to him land for which he has applied.

In the past the War Service Land Settlement Scheme Act provided preference for returned servicemen, and more than preference, because most of those concerned were put on developed properties, financed by the Commonwealth and the State; and they were assisted to a great degree.

The servicemen who return from Vietnam have no opportunity like this. They have very little indeed. Therefore I believe very sincerely that some provision should be made in our legislation to give them some preference over the civilian applicant.

This Bill is not as broad as one might think when one looks at it, because under paragraph (b) of proposed new subsection (2a) the applicant must satisfy the board that he has the potentiality. In other words, he has to satisfy the board he has the finance, the ability, and the knowledge to develop the block. That puts him on even terms with other applicants, but what does the board do if it has a number of allocations to make? Say, for instance, there are 200 applicants for 20 blocks. Among this total of 200 there must be at least 40 whose cases are equal. How does the board make its decision? Does it draw a marble out of the hat in the same way as a decision is made to send a conscript to Vietnam, or does it use its discretionary power in making an allocation? Of course it uses its discretionary power in making such an allocation, because it has to make sure that the applicant it selects will make a success of the property and it must be satisfied that the applicant has the potential to make a profit.

If he has ability equal to that of other applicants, this Bill will allow some preference to be given to him. What is the difference? There could be 200 applicants, 180 of whom are civilians and 20 ex-servicemen, and one could say that among the 20 ex-servicemen there are five who have the potentiality, at the discretion of the board, to develop the properties that may be allocated to them. If there are five ex-servicemen among the 200 applicants, should they not get some preference in being allocated a property, particularly after serving overseas, and more particularly serving in conditions that prevail in the current struggle in Vietnam?

I cannot see anything wrong with the Bill or in the fact that preference will be given to ex-servicemen over and above civilian applicants. One has only to consider this matter in its proper perspective, and think of the properties that have been previously allocated but which have been forfeited because the settler has run into financial difficulties. In other cases those who have been allocated properties have had to be assisted. I know that this problem has had to be considered in the past four or five years, because a special fund has been set up in the Rural and Industries Bank to help some of these settlers. These were men who were allocated properties but who, after two or three years, exhausted their capital, and, as a result, this fund was established by the Rural and Industries Bank to make financial advances to those who have not had sufficient finance to continue with the development of the properties.

I know of one or two returned ex-servicemen from Vietnam who have applied for properties, but who have not been allocated a block. In fact, I have not heard of any ex-serviceman being allocated a property, but I know of some who have been unsuccessful. That is the picture today. So I believe there is nothing wrong with the Bill because the discretion still lies with the board to allocate a property if it is satisfied the applicant has the potential to develop it. If an ex-serviceman

has all the necessary attributes for developing a block he should be given some preference over any other applicant on equal terms with him.

THE HON. E. C. HOUSE (South) [10.19 p.m.]: The Minister asked if we could cite any cases in giving reasons for bringing this Bill forward. The very reason why we are not happy is that the ex-servicemen who have gone before the land board have been treated very badly. Over a period of 18 months several ex-servicemen have appeared before these boards and without mentioning any names I could cite one case in particular. This applicant had attended the Muresk Agricultural College and had passed through it with honours. After leaving the college he worked on a farm as a farm hand, following which he went share farming. He then went to Vietnam. His father had a farm and he applied three times to the land board for a property to be allocated to him, but was unsuccessful. Despite this, I know that the last board to which he made application allocated a block to a person in an area he had selected and in which the father had a C.P. property, but he did not have sufficient finance to develop it. Despite this situation that man's son was allocated another block.

The father of the applicant who was refused was prepared to suppply machinery and extra capital to his son to develop the property. In addition, of course, the applicant would have received $7,000, to which he was entitled. In my opinion there is no reason why that applicant should have had to apply three times to the land board without being given any consideration.

Eventually the father of this applicant said he was prepared to lease or sell his farm if this would assist the board to make up its mind in allocating a block to his son. This offer was also refused. I know this family well. It has a long history of farming development in this State although it does not have a great deal of money.

There is also a case at Esperance that came to my notice. We could not understand why other allocations of property had been made when three returned servicemen had been denied an opportunity to be allocated a block in that district. One of these men rejoined the Army and returned to Vietnam because his only desire was to engage in farming as this was the only work he knew. Also, he did not have the capital to buy a farm outright and his only chance was to be allocated a property through the land board.

Therefore for these reasons we are not happy with the attitude adopted by the land board in dealing with applications submitted by ex-servicemen, and that is why this Bill has been introduced. Every year there are approximately 4,000 applicants for C.P. blocks. I will admit that many of these applications are duplicated, but the total is approximately 4,000. This figure is not exact. It is an estimated figure by the land board. Among those 4,000 applicants there were approximately 40 returned ex-servicemen, and it is estimated that about 10 of that 40 could have been allocated blocks.

If the argument is put forward that there will be a deluge of applications from ex-servicemen if preference is given to these 40 applicants over and above those who are also applying for properties, the condition would still remain that the ex-serviceman would have to measure up to the qualifications expected by the land board. The only difference would be that the ex-serviceman would be given some preference, all things being equal.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They have to measure up now.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes, but they are not being allocated many properties. I do not know whether this is because the land board does not like to be accused of giving preference to ex-servicemen, but this could well be. On the other hand, perhaps the land board wants this provision in the Bill so that it can act in the way it wishes to act. I do not know; it could be one way or the other.

We have had a great deal of experience of these ex-servicemen who have applied for properties, and we would not have brought this Bill forward if we had not felt it was justified.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Have you asked the land board why it did not allocate properties to ex-servicemen?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I did not ask for a specific reason.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is always prepared to give reasons.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I do not know about that. Perhaps I should have asked for a reason but, then again, perhaps it is not my prerogative to do so. I think there is some provision in the Act that politicians should not interfere with an application made to the land board for a property.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Very often, if a politician does interfere it prejudices the chances of the applicant.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: You could probably get the reasons why a property was not allocated after other allocations had been made.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: What if a man applies again? That may be a small point, although I do not think it is very important. I think we should review our record of what we have done for ex-servicemen. We have the best reputation in the world for making concessions to ex-servicemen,

and the ex-servicemen are extremely grateful for these concessions. There is no doubt that they appreciate what has been done for them by the Governments of the day. Perhaps the Curtin-Chifley Government did more than any other in granting concessions to ex-servicemen, and those men will never forget what was done for them by that Government. That Government showed a systematic approach to the problem which is to its credit. I have always given praise for what that Government did for ex-servicemen, and I always will.

We have this extra condition of conscription in the service of men overseas now. I have never been in favour of conscription. I have said so through statements published in the Press and in other places. I have not changed my mind about conscription and I never will. Therefore I think that those men who have been conscripted for service overseas in Vietnam and Malaya should be given special consideration in a matter such as this. It is all very well for us to sit here in a State that is expanding in development and economy and in the knowledge that young people are enjoying good times. A few then draw a marble which decides that they shall be conscripted for service overseas. They are forced to leave their families, and their way of life is disrupted. We often hear it said that it does a young man good to serve in the forces, and that the experience of serving overseas is beneficial. I will admit that the training does a young man good, but I do not want to get involved in arguments for or against the Vietnam war or any part of it.

I am merely saying that these men have to leave their families at an early stage of their lives and when they return I think we should give them some consideration. In practically every field of employment preference is given to ex-servicemen. If one cares to study the pamphlet titled *Re-establishment Benefits For National Servicemen* issued by the Commonwealth of Australia, one will find the following:—

> POST-DISCHARGE VOCATIONAL TRAINING.
>
> Post-discharge vocational training is available for national servicemen where this is necessary or desirable for their effective re-settlement.
>
> Training may be by means of full-time, part-time or correspondence courses provided by technical colleges, agricultural colleges, universities and other approved training institutions. Full-time training will ordinarily be limited to a period of twelve months and part-time or correspondence training to a period of two years from the date of commencement of the first available course after approval for training has been given.
>
> All compulsory fees, examination fees, etc., will be paid and financial assistance towards the cost of fares and all essential text books, equipment, apparatus and tools will be provided.
>
> Those undergoing a course of full-time training will receive a living allowance equivalent to the Six Capital Cities Basic Wage, and in addition those obliged to live away from home will receive a living-away-from-home allowance for specified periods.

It also goes on to list the re-establishment loans amounting to $3,000 which can be advanced except for agricultural purposes, in which case the limit that will be advanced is $6,000 and the rate of interest will be 4½ per cent., with the first $400 being interest free. Therefore, in granting such a loan the Commonwealth Government recognises that ex-servicemen wishing to enter the agricultural industry should be given some special assistance. As I have already said, in practically every other sphere of employment training and assistance for ex-servicemen is available. Such assistance and financial help was also available after the last war.

Some criticism has been made of the war service land settlement scheme, but members should not forget that assistance was also given to doctors, lawyers, and engineers and extended to any other profession in which an ex-serviceman wished to rehabilitate himself. Many of those men went on to make a great deal of money in their various professions; professions they would not have been able to enter if the Commonwealth Government had not provided the rehabilitation courses and financial assistance for them. I know that many of those men, especially doctors, have repaid this assistance in full by giving a lot of their time free in various fields.

They have appreciated what was done for them. The amount of land we still have available for conditional purchase selection is quite considerable, and I think there is enough even if we had to make more available to give these people preference. With the land that is available and the support these people can get from their families, I think they ought to be given some preference. A number of them have been accustomed to living an open air life and they cannot bear to work in an office. This is another reason for giving them preference, because they themselves prefer to go farming.

I think I have covered the Bill adequately. No doubt Mr. Jack Thompson, when he is replying will mention other cases and reasons for thinking preference should be given to these discharged ex-servicemen.

When we consider the capabilities of these people, we must not lose sight of the fact that they have passed the strictest

possible medical examination before entering the Army, and they have probably matured as a result of their Army training, and as a result they will probably make very suitable applicants for land selection.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [10.33 p.m.]: As the debate has ensued it has caused me a little disquiet, because while the Bill seeks to provide that preferential treatment should be given to discharged members of the forces, there has been the implication that what is at present obtaining is, in fact, virtually the reverse: in other words, there has been some discrimination against these discharged members.

The Hon. E. C. House: I made this charge.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: This is somewhat serious, and I think the debate might have taken rather a bad turn which is perhaps not altogether desirable.

I am not sure whether Mr. Baxter said he knew of ex-servicemen from Vietnam being allocated blocks, but I think he did say that there were some who were not allocated blocks. I wonder whether these people who did not receive blocks—and this would refer to those mentioned by Mr. House—were in fact assessed and judged as being not of equal potential with those who were allocated blocks; whether those who were allocated blocks were discharged servicemen or not?

I think this is the point to which the debate has developed, and I think the matter should be clarified as to whether or not this is the situation. We all know the land board has considerable powers of discretion in the allocation of blocks, and I find it considerably difficult to believe that there is actually discrimination, on the grounds that have been suggested, against discharged servicemen, possibly from Vietnam.

Mr. House made mention that he would like to see some preference given to discharged servicemen. So would I; I am sure we all would. I would be in the forefront of those asking for preference to be given. I do not think it can be said in the course of discussion—as Mr. House again said—that there has been any neglect in this quarter in the past. We have a proud record in regard to preference for discharged servicemen. I am sure this is continuing, and that it will further continue.

I am endeavouring to speak objectively but, in my view, it does not mean that we should bring into the Land Act a mandatory requirement which, in the words of the Bill, says that the board shall do something. I think this is somewhat dangerous. If I recall correctly, Mr. House used the words that the board should have the power to do this.

There was the suggestion that the board should be in the position to make allocations to discharged ex-servicemen, and there may already be power in the Act for this to be done. But the Bill does not say this; the Bill says, "The board shall." I want to look at the matter from another point of view. If there is a requirement on the land board to make an allocation, and it shall make a determination in favour of an ex-serviceman on the grounds of his potential to develop the land, here again the board might be wrong in its assessment, as apparently it can be, and has been wrong in so many other cases —and I now refer to various land boards. Simply because a man is a discharged serviceman we may find he has been allocated a block under this mandatory requirement and then he fails. Would we be doing a service to such a discharged serviceman by allocating him land on the basis of his being an ex-serviceman and not on his potential to develop that land? I do not think we would be doing the greatest justice to these people by allocating land in this way.

I am a firm believer in the recognition of this service. I feel appropriate steps should be taken not only to compensate but to reward people for their overseas service, and more particularly those who volunteer. By that I do not intend to cast a slur on those who are not required to volunteer.

But the giving of this reward should be done in some other form of legislation; legislation which specifies assistance and rewards for such a service. It should not necessarily be incorporated in the Land Act. The wording in Mr. Jack Thomson's Bill says the board shall determine that the application be granted.

These are the doubts I have, and while I have every sympathy with those referred to in the Bill, I find it difficult to believe that its provisions will always act to the ultimate benefit of the actual discharged serviceman whom it is designed to help.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [10.39 p.m.]: I was very interested to read the Bill introduced by Mr. Jack Thomson, and to listen to his second reading speech. I want to say at the outset that I agree, as do all members who have spoken to the debate, that preference is most desirable and should be given to ex-servicemen in nearly every circumstance.

For this reason, when I first read the Bill, I felt that perhaps it was not going far enough. By the introduction of the Bill Mr. Thomson has endeavoured to write into the existing Land Act what I believe to be fairly firm provisions. As indicated by the honourable member one of the provisions is that ex-servicemen shall be given very definite advantages.

As I said before, I have every sympathy for ex-servicemen and believe they should be given advantages in the right perspective but, as I mentioned a little earlier, I feel the provisions in the Bill do not go far enough. Its provisions are confined to applicants who are discharged members of the forces, as defined in the Act.

I could envisage a situation where serving members of the armed forces could, in certain circumstances be eligible applicants for conditional purchase land. With this thought in mind, I carried out some research and engaged the aid of one or two people, perhaps a little more able than myself, to assist me, with a view to looking into the situation in which serving members may apply for conditional purchase land, providing they have evidence of discharge from the services within a reasonable time.

For the purpose of my exercise, I felt a period of six months would be a reasonable time for a member to apply, should he be likely to be discharged during the period. I adopted this line, with the thought that if a member is serving and has an indication that he will be discharged at a certain date, and he is desirous of taking up land as a means of livelihood or vocation, he should have the opportunity to apply and possibly be granted land to which to return.

However, as I endeavoured to set out these thoughts in the form of a possible amendment to the Bill before the House, I realised that there were certain very grave weaknesses in the situation. I could instance one: That the land board in hearing an application would desire, I feel, to have a certificate as evidence that a serving member at the time of his application would in fact be honourably discharged at a certain date.

I feel it would be impracticable for an applicant to obtain such evidence to the satisfaction of the land board. With my knowledge of service organisations, I feel they would be unwilling to grant written evidence to the effect that a serving member would be granted an honourable discharge say, within three or six months, as the case may be.

There are too many factors and imponderables in this exercise. As a result of this, and because of one or two problems that arose in the projection of this idea, I decided this line of thought could not be pursued. I did this, not because I did not like the implications of the Bill as introduced by Mr. Jack Thomson, but because I felt that if we are to give ex-servicemen an advantage we should perhaps also see whether we can give serving men an advantage.

I find to my satisfaction, or dissatisfaction—whichever way one likes to look at it—that it is impracticable. This brings me to the Bill. I believe the Land Act in its present form already gives concessions to ex-servicemen, and whether we should write specific guide lines into this Act in respect of ex-servicemen obtaining advantages before the land board is something about which I have yet to be convinced.

I feel the phraseology leaves a little to be desired and before giving my support to this measure I would be very interested indeed to hear of any further amendments that may be foreshadowed by Mr. Jack Thomson. I think it is possibly a dangerous precedent to write this type of amendment into the Land Act. I have taken the view that this is a very definite direction to the land board; and, from my understanding of the operations of this board, it is a body constituted to make allocations of land as it sees fit in all of the circumstances placed before it.

If we start directing the board in one way and then another, we will, in the long term, defeat the objectives of the land board. I am very conscious there are many applicants for land today in Western Australia. I am very conscious, indeed, of the number of requests I get from the south-west corner of this State, portion of which I have the honour to represent. In the south-west of this State there are many existing rural properties of restricted acreages and there are literally hundreds of landholders who are only too willing to obtain more land to make their properties more economic units. If we make the Land Act a little wider by opening it up to ex-servicemen from anywhere in the Commonwealth, I feel we would be working against the best interests of Western Australians.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are they not the blokes defending the Commonwealth?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I agree.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are denying them a right.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am not. I appreciate their efforts on behalf of the Commonwealth, but feel there are other applicants in this field of endeavour who are just as worthy of consideration, because these people—the existing landholders; existing farmers—are indeed endeavouring to obtain their livelihood by this means and they must be considered.

In some respects they are just as important to Australia as a nation as any other member of the community. Quite a number of ex-servicemen who apply for land would not have the necessary qualifications as measured against some other applicants. I do not say this in a derogatory manner—I am being practical. There are many sons of farmers in Western Australia in every district; and this has been instanced by Mr. House in his remarks. I grant that he was referring to an ex-serviceman. There are sons of farmers who are experienced and who have the benefit of their fathers' backing but the

existing holding is not big enough to support them and they desire further land. I put these fellows in a similar category to anybody else.

I personally know the land board has, on quite a few occasions, granted land to ex-servicemen who have returned from Vietnam. From my observation I realise the board takes this into consideration and I appreciate this. Only a few months ago, one such applicant was granted a block in the south-west. I can well remember another person who, last year, upon his return from Vietnam, was almost immediately successful. He was fortunate that applications were called for a number of blocks in a certain area and he was granted a block against many other applicants, so, to my satisfaction, the land board is, to a point, giving consideration to ex-servicemen.

In passing, I would like to refer to a comment Mr. House made in regard to the land board making allocations to what may be termed "unsuitable applicants"—applicants who, with the passing of time, may be proved to be lacking. They may not have the ability or the financial resources.

The Hon. E. C. House: I did not say, "unsuitable."

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Perhaps, in our estimation, they may be below the standard required for success as against another applicant. If we grant preference to ex-servicemen, in some way or other it does not mean the land board will eliminate the man who may be substandard, if I may use this expression. By granting land to ex-servicemen a worthy applicant may be eliminated.

In the case referred to by Mr. House, the applicant was apparently an ex-serviceman and his parents were on the land. I do not know what the full circumstances of this case were, but from my own experience in investigating the reasons why some applicants have not been successful and others have, I have come to realise that the land board, in allocating land, does so with a view to seeing the land is granted to those applicants who are considered to be worthy. That may seem a funny remark to make, but the land board apparently takes the view that land should be granted to applicants who have not the capacity to purchase land from their own resources.

To instance this, I could suggest as a possibility that the board may have considered that the applicant quoted by Mr. House had sufficient resources of his own to purchase a property.

The Hon. E. C. House: I said he did not.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am sorry if I have misinterpreted what the honourable member said.

The Hon. E. C. House: I do not think you are in a position to judge the case, because you do not know.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I can only go on the remarks made by the honourable member, but I am stating my own personal experience in these matters. The land board does take into consideration the full resources of the applicants and if it considers they can purchase a property in their own right it allocates the land to men with lesser resources, but men who may be more worthy.

The Hon. E. C. House: Not in the case quoted.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: That is all right; I have no argument with the honourable member. From experience in the past, I have stated what I think the land board does. If an applicant is not considered worthy, or does not have financial resources, experience, and the backing of machinery from perhaps his brothers, father, or some other person, he is not granted the land. I believe the land board—I could be wrong—does allocate land to applicants on a sliding scale, because of some applicants who are granted land it is obvious that they have not large resources behind them. However, they are young, vigorous, and potentially successful farmers. It seems that the land board allocates a certain number of blocks to young applicants to give them a chance.

Coming back to the Bill, I have reservations in supporting it as it is. I feel the land board does take into consideration all the circumstances of ex-servicemen. As we know, this is not written into the Land Act; and I would hesitate to do so. With the land board constituted as it is, it may be preferable for it to have full discretionary powers vested in it. I know there are many disappointed applicants for land and, because this will always be so, it is a problem we cannot overcome as long as there are more applicants than blocks available.

At this stage I will conclude by hoping that the foreshadowed amendments that may be presented to us during the course of this Bill will clear up some of the apprehensive thoughts I have. At the moment I would hesitate to support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Heitman.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [10.58 p.m.]: I move—

> That the House at its rising adjourn until 3 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.