

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 8th October, 1958.

CONTENTS.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	Page
Linear accelerator, details of establishment and use in Western Australia	1317
Libraries, cost to local authorities, total income, etc.	1318
Hospitals—	
Payment for advice to medical benefits societies	1320
New buildings and maintenance, at Port Hedland	1320
Port Hedland building blocks, availability to public and method of disposal	1320
Point Samson building blocks, new subdivision	1320
Native welfare, new mission at Roebourne	1320
Yampi Sound iron deposits, tabling of Mines Department file	1321
Overseas trade mission, tabling of Press and other statements	1321
Diesel locomotives, rectification of X and XA class faults	1321
Cave House, loss for 1957-58, and decision as to lease	1321
Turkey Point, Bunbury, work on "The Cut"	1321
Shipping, direct service between South American and Australian ports	1321
Public Trustee Act, amending legislation	1322
Government buses, reasons for decline in passengers carried	1322
Japanese businessmen, visits to Western Australia	1322
United States Gypsum Co., interest in Western Australia	1322
Criminal Code, progress with revision	1322
New industries—	
Inducements to establish in Western Australia	1323
Land required and financial commitments	1323
Government concessions for establishment in Western Australia	1323
Cheyne Bay mineral sands, lessees, market value, etc.	1323
Standard gauge, tabling of papers regarding Kalgoorlie-Perth line	1323
Albany Regional Hospital, details of work, cost, etc.	1324
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Sittings of the House, Thursday nights	1324
Auditor-General's report, availability	1324
Railways Royal Commissioner, criticism of sleeper tenderers	1324
Australian Consul-General in America, tabling of letter	1325
Housing, dwellings completed from 1947 to 1958	1326

CONTENTS—continued.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—continued.	Page
Building industry, employees engaged from 1947 to 1958	1326
Onslow breakwater wall, priority for construction	1326
LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1326
MOTIONS :	
Legal Practitioners Act, amendment of Barristers Board Rule 30	1326
Civilian land settlement, implementation of a comprehensive policy	1328
Metropolitan beach trust, introduction of legislation	1347
BILLS :	
Long Service Leave, 3r.	1326
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), 3r.	1326
Tuberculosis (Commonwealth and State Arrangement), 3r.	1326
Bush Fires Act Amendment, returned	1326
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 2r.	1351
Licensing Act Amendment, 2r.	1353
Local Courts Act Amendment, 2r.	1354
Electoral Act Amendment, 2r.	1355

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

LINEAR ACCELERATOR.

Details of Establishment and Use in Western Australia.

1. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) How far from the chest hospital will the building to house the linear accelerator be situated?

(2) Was any overseas or interstate expert advice obtained by the Government as to the wisdom of divorcing treatment by the linear accelerator from the deep and superficial therapy machines at the Royal Perth Hospital and of disrupting the integration of treatment by these several means?

(3) If so, from whom and what in general was the tenor of their advice?

(4) What staff will be required to use and maintain the linear accelerator and to direct and supervise the treatment of patients, from where is such staff to be obtained and what will be the estimated annual cost of employment of this staff?

(5) Will beds for patients be built in association with the building to house the linear accelerator?

(6) If not, how will bedridden patients be transported to the linear accelerator for treatment?

(7) Is it intended to duplicate the existing radio-therapeutic equipment already available at the Royal Perth Hospital in the proposed building at Hollywood?

(8) If not, what provision is there for alternative radiation therapy in this building in the event of breakdown or other failure?

(9) Is he aware that in South Australia the linear accelerator is housed in the grounds of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and is run by the Cancer Council and the Royal Adelaide Hospital in conjunction?

(10) Is it intended that this new building shall become a centre for aspects of radiation treatment?

(11) If so, what provision will be made for treatment by radioactive isotopes and by radium as is at present available at the Royal Perth Hospital?

(12) Is it the Government's intention to establish a general hospital nearby, open to receive patients within the next ten years?

(13) If not, what advantages are to be gained by establishing the linear accelerator at Hollywood and duplicating costs by having certain treatments effected in two centres, particularly as it is possible that the linear accelerator will be outmoded before ten years has elapsed?

(14) Is it appreciated that a cancer institute is uneconomic for a population of less than 2,000,000 people?

(15) Is the Government aware that a full-scale cancer institute to serve 2,000,000 people with associated laboratories and other facilities, unless closely connected with a general hospital, will cost approximately £2,000,000 to establish and approximately £300,000 a year to maintain?

(16) Of the amount donated by the public to the cancer appeal how much is it envisaged will be available for research and other activities after the purchase and housing of the linear accelerator?

(17) If none is available, how are the projects listed in the appeal to be carried out?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1) 280 yards.

(2) and (3) No. The advice was given by the Anti-Cancer Council, which has a more intimate knowledge of local conditions and future development.

(4) The staff position is still under consideration.

(5) and (6) Yes.

(7) No duplication of equipment that is adequately meeting requirements is envisaged, but additional equipment may, from time to time, have to be added.

(8) Every precaution will be taken to prevent breakdowns. As funds become available to the cancer council, it will obtain further modern equipment which will minimise the effect of any breakdown.

(9) Yes.

(10) The institute will develop according to the need and the funds available, the objective being to provide treatment by all modern methods of radiation.

(11) When and if necessary, provision will be made.

(12) and (13) Yes. Acting on the advice of the State Health Council and the University Hospital Advisory Committee, and in conformity with Professor Stephenson's plan, the building of a general hospital in the immediate vicinity of the proposed cancer institute will commence in 1962. Draft requirements are now in course of preparation for submission to the Principal Architect.

(14) and (15) Not if developed as the need arises and funds become available. The Government's primary concern is to assist in providing the best possible treatment for cancer and honour the obligation put upon it by the magnificent contribution made by the people to the cancer fund.

(16) and (17) The projects listed in the appeal were—

- (a) Purchase a linear accelerator.
- (b) House the linear accelerator.
- (c) Establish a cancer institute.

All the funds so far collected will be expended on these projects. In addition to providing treatment, the linear accelerator is, in itself, excellent material for presenting scope for research. Further work in this connection will depend on public contributions, supported by the Government.

LIBRARIES.

Cost to Local Authorities, Total Income, etc.

2. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Education:

(1) What local authorities have established libraries since the coming into operation of the Library Board of Western Australia Act?

(2) What was the approximate cost to each local authority to establish such libraries and what is the estimated annual cost of operating each of them?

(3) What was the total income for all purposes for each local authority concerned for the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

(4) What local authorities propose to open libraries before the 30th June, 1959?

(5) What will be their income for all purposes for the year ending the 30th June, 1959?

(6) What is the estimated establishment and annual operating cost for each proposed library?

(7) In how many instances have libraries been established or will be established with the assistance of voluntary donations from ratepayers?

(8) How much did the Government grant the Library Board for the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

(9) What is the grant for this financial year?

Mr. KELLY (for Mr. W. Hegney) replied:

(1) See Schedule A.

(2) The cost to local authorities of establishing each library is not known and could not be ascertained with any degree of reliability. The estimated annual maintenance cost is shown on Schedule A.

(3) The total income of the local authorities for the year ended the 30th June, 1958, is not known either by the board or the Local Government Department. The income for the last year for which statistics have been published (ended the 30th June, 1956, in the case of road boards and the 31st October, 1956, in the case of municipalities) is shown on Schedule A.

(4) See Schedule B. There are, in addition, 33 local authorities which have applied for service, but which cannot be dealt with before the 30th June, 1959. Some, such as the City of Perth and Perth Road Board, will require more than one library.

(5) The income of the local authorities in Schedule B for the year ending the 30th June, 1959, is not known.

(6) The estimated establishment cost is not known; the annual operating cost is given in Schedule B. The total annual expenditure by local authorities is estimated to increase before the 30th June, 1959, by £12,505. The income of the board has not correspondingly increased.

(7) In at least two cases voluntary donations are known to have been received by the local authorities concerned from ratepayers, and in others "working bees" and similar efforts have been organised locally.

(8) £100,000, which includes the cost of the State Library and of administration.

(9) See No. (8).

SCHEDULE A.

DISTRICTS IN WHICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES OPERATE IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE LIBRARY BOARD OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

	Annual Mainten- ance Cost	Total Revenue 1955-56
Metropolitan—	£	£
Armada-Kelmscott	700	43,236
Claremont	3,200	59,778
Fremantle (a)	5,000	241,500
Kwinana	880	50,308
Barling Range	750	58,391

South-West—		
Augusta-Margaret River	446	43,009
Balingup	110	13,270
Drakesbrook	127	24,235
Preston	330	23,370

Great Southern—		
Kojonup	403	38,801
Lake Grace	156	26,982
Narrogin (b)	473	58,994
Nyabing-Pingrup	105	21,172
Plantagenet	360	40,556
West Arthur	90	19,839

Central Wheatbelt—		
Bruce Rock	350	66,742
Goornalling	228	25,809
Narembeen	173	32,390
Quairading	195	38,050
Tammin	87	18,937
York (c)	370	35,859

Northern Wheatbelt—		
Carnamah	125	30,320
Irwin	89	16,335
Mingenew	108	24,256
Moora	225	51,876
Three Springs	130	22,490
Wongan-Ballidu	97	39,319

Murchison—		
Cue	100	14,956
Yalgoo	105	11,829

Other—		
Esperance	165	25,430
Gascoyne (d)	600	54,114

(a) City of Fremantle, East Fremantle Municipality and Cockburn Road Board.

(b) Narrogin Municipality, Narrogin Road Board and Cuballing Road Board.

(c) York Municipality and York Road Board.

(d) Carnarvon Municipality, Gascoyne-Min-
hija and Upper Gascoyne Road Boards.

SCHEDULE B.

DISTRICTS IN WHICH IT IS EXPECTED THAT NEW SERVICES WILL BE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN 8th OCTOBER, 1958, AND 30th JUNE, 1959.

Perth Road Board—	£
Scarborough Ward	5,500
Toodyay	205
Kojonup—	
Boys' and Girls' Section	(a) 100
Merredin	(b) 750
Fremantle—	
Boys' and Girls' Section	2,000
Boyup Brook	400
Moora—	
Boys' and Girls' Sections	(a) 150
Margaret River—	
Boys' and Girls' Section	(a) 400
Melville—	
Applecross and Mt. Pleasant Wards	3,000
	£12,505

(a) Additional to present expenditure.

(b) Merredin and Westonia Road Boards.

HOSPITALS.*Payment for Advice to Medical Benefits Societies.*

3. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it considered necessary for all hospitals to charge a fee to hospital and medical benefit societies and funds for any information or advice that is sought by those bodies?

(2) In view of the fact that these bodies are non-profit making and are working in close conjunction with hospital administration generally, will he give consideration to requesting hospitals to waive charges in this regard?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1) and (2) This is a matter for the decision of the hospitals concerned.

PORT HEDLAND BUILDING BLOCKS.*Availability to Public and Method of Disposal.*

4. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Can he advise when building blocks under the new subdivision at Port Hedland will be available to the public?

(2) What is the intended method of disposal, and what arrangements, if any, have been made to ensure that parcels of blocks are not acquired by individuals or syndicates with the object of resale at a later date at extortionate prices?

Mr. KELLY replied:

(1) Eight building lots will be available for purchase by the public at 11 a.m., at the court-house, Port Hedland, on Wednesday, the 26th November next.

(2) The lots will be sold at auction with special conditions to ensure that a residential building to the satisfaction of the road board will be erected on each lot within three years, and that no one buyer may purchase more than one lot.

POINT SAMSON BUILDING BLOCKS.*New Subdivision.*

5. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has he considered a new subdivision for building blocks at Point Samson?

(2) If not, will he have this matter investigated with a view to implementation?

Mr. KELLY replied:

(1) Yes. A new subdivision to provide building blocks at Point Samson is under consideration.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

NATIVE WELFARE.*New Mission at Roebourne.*

6. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) Will he advise whether negotiations are taking place for the establishment of a native mission at Roebourne; and if so, what stage the negotiations have reached?

(2) Has the old townsite of Cossack been considered as a site for the mission; and if so, what decision has been reached?

(3) What other sites have been considered?

Mr. BRADY replied:

(1) A site has been selected near the racecourse, and application made to the Lands Department for the area, approximately 100 acres, to be set aside as a native reserve.

(2) Yes. It was rejected because tests proved the water supply to be unsuitable owing to salt impregnation.

(3) A site selected some years ago was abandoned last year because of the objections raised by the Roebourne Road Board. Another site on the Onslow-rd. was considered but rejected in favour of the racecourse site.

HOSPITALS.*New Buildings and Maintenance at Port Hedland.*

7. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Can he advise whether new hospital buildings are envisaged in the near future for Port Hedland?

(2) Is it intended that necessary repairs and painting to the present hospital will be carried out? If so, when?

(3) As painting of some portions of the native hospital is necessary, is he aware of this; and if so, can he advise when it will take place?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1) A new hospital is envisaged on a new site which has been set aside for the purpose. Preliminary plans are being prepared with a view to construction being commenced in 1959-60.

(2) The question of necessary repairs and painting is being investigated in the light of the recent decision not to effect major improvements to the existing hospital.

(3) Yes. An additional supervisor has been appointed to the staff of the North-West Department for the purpose of implementing comprehensive repair and renovation contracts at North-West hospitals generally, and the Port Hedland Native Hospital will receive attention as early as practicable.

YAMPI SOUND IRON DEPOSITS.*Tabling of Mines Department File.*

8. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Will he table Mines Department file No. 850/41, regarding the investigation of the Yampi Sound iron deposits by the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. MOIR replied:
Yes.

OVERSEAS TRADE MISSION.*Tabling of Press and Other Statements.*

9. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

Will he table copies of all Press and other statements released by him or the trade mission which—

- (a) were signed by all members of the mission and
- (b) approved by all members of the mission even though not signed?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

Yes. Copies will be made of the statements, and they will be tabled as early as possible.

DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES.*Rectification of X and XA Class Faults*

10. Mr. HEARMAN asked the Premier:

(1) What is the present position with regard to the unsatisfactory features of the X and XA class diesel locomotives so far as negotiations with Metropolitan Vickers and Crossley Bros. are concerned?

(2) Have payments for these locomotives been finalised? If so, was any reduction in price agreed to?

(3) Are any further negotiations contemplated, or current, with Messrs. Crossley Bros., Metropolitan Vickers or any other firm so far as the replacement of unsatisfactory components of these locomotives is concerned?

(4) What success was achieved by the Deputy Premier during his recent trip to England so far as negotiations with Metropolitan Vickers and Crossley Bros. were concerned?

(5) What was the Deputy Premier able to achieve that could not have been achieved by the Agent-General?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

(1) The contractors have presented a proposal for the rectification of faults; this is being examined by the Railways Commission prior to consideration by Cabinet.

(2) Payments were made in full.

(3) Answered by No. (1).

(4) and (5) The present arrangements are consequent upon the visit to England by the Deputy Premier.

CAVE HOUSE.*Loss for 1957-58, and Decision as to Lease.*

11. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

In view of the answer given to a question asked by me on the 19th November, 1957—

- (1) Has the Government reached a decision on the leasing of Cave House, Yallingup?
- (2) On the 19th November, 1957, the estimated loss for 1957-58 was £265. What was the actual profit or loss on Cave House as at the 30th June, 1958?

Mr. MOIR replied:

(1) Consideration is now being given to the form of the lease as to the basis for the calling of tenders.

(2) Loss, £1,945.

TURKEY POINT, BUNBURY.*Work on "The Cut."*

12. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has consideration been given to carrying out certain works on or near "The Cut," north of Turkey Point, Bunbury, during this financial year?

(2) If so, what is to be the nature of such proposed works?

(3) If not, why not?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) "The Cut" is kept under observation continually, and from time to time consideration is given to the change in conditions and the necessity or otherwise to undertake further work. When it is considered necessary to carry out work on "The Cut," funds will be sought to enable it to be done.

(2) and (3) Answered by No. (1).

No. 13. *This question was postponed.*

SHIPPING.*Direct Service Between South American and Australian Ports.*

14. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

(1) Has the Government made any approaches either to shipping services or to the Commonwealth Government to obtain more particulars regarding the Commonwealth's negotiations with shipping companies for a direct shipping service between Australia and South American ports?

(2) Has the Government examined the possibility of trade between Western Australia and South American ports and what commodities are considered potential sources of trade?

(3) Has the Government discussed the matter with representatives of industry and commerce in Western Australia?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

(1) and (2) No.

(3) Appropriate members of the Government would be willing to discuss the matter with representatives of industry and commerce.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT.

Amending Legislation.

15. Mr. COURT asked the Treasurer:

With reference to my question on the 13th November, 1957, regarding the Auditor-General's comment on the Public Trust Office accounts, page 118 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended the 30th June, 1957, is the legislation to amend the Public Trustee Act which was foreshadowed in the answer given, going to be introduced this session?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

It is not proposed to introduce any amendments to the legislation this session.

GOVERNMENT BUSES.

Reasons for Decline in Passengers Carried.

16. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is the report in the "Sunday Times" of the 5th October 1958, correct that fewer people are being carried by Government buses since parking meters were installed in Perth; and that in August, the first month with meters, Government buses carried 202,000 fewer passengers than in the same month last year?

(2) Has the Government made an assessment of the reasons bringing about this reduction?

(3) Does it represent a decreased number of persons shopping in the city area, or

(a) are more people coming to the city by cars, or

(b) are more people remaining in the suburban areas for their shopping?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The reduction is a continuation of the gradual decline in passengers during the post-war years.

(3) (a) Not known.

(b) Yes.

JAPANESE BUSINESSMEN.

Visits to Western Australia.

17. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) What visits to this State of Japanese trade, business or other representatives have taken place during recent months?

(2) When have such visits, if any, taken place; what have been their main objectives; and what areas have been visited?

(3) What was or what is their likely outcome?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

(1) Some representatives of Japanese trade interests visited this State in recent months.

(2) The visits have been made on various dates. The main objective of such visits has been associated with an anxiety to purchase iron ore and some other minerals. The main areas visited have been Perth, Wundowie and Koolyanobbing.

(3) This will depend largely on whether the Commonwealth Government grants a licence to Western Australia to export 1,000,000 tons of iron ore to Japan.

UNITED STATES GYPSUM CO.

Interest in Western Australia.

18. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Was the interest in Western Australia of United States Gypsum Co., of Chicago, known to the trade mission before or during its travels abroad?

(2) Did the mission contact this company when in U.S.A.?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) and (2) No.

CRIMINAL CODE.

Progress with Revision.

19. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Justice:

What progress has been made in the revision of the Criminal Code to bring it more into line with modern thought and practice?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

The question of the revision of the Criminal Code has been under consideration; but, in the opinion of those who are closely associated with its operation, no substantial revision is warranted. It is recognised that some of the provisions may be regarded as being archaic, and the maximum penalties prescribed in some cases may appear to be harsh and out of date. Nevertheless, judges have discretion as to the quantum of sentence, and they exercise that discretion according to the circumstances of the case and the offender's record. They do not, as a rule, impose either maximum sentences or harsh sentences. On the other hand, the possibility of a long sentence of imprisonment can have a strong deterrent effect on potential criminals.

The Criminal Code has been amended on a number of occasions in recent years, and was reprinted with amendments in 1955.

NEW INDUSTRIES.*Inducements to Establish in Western Australia.*

20. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has the trade mission or the Government offered to any specific industry inducements to establish in Western Australia in addition to the inducements announced in the Press as follows:—

Cash grants in certain conditions of up to 20 per cent. of establishment costs.

Interest-free loans up to 10 years and guaranteed additional loans if required.

Free factory sites.

Essential road, railway, water and power services to factories.

Guaranteed housing for workers?

(2) If so, what are these inducements?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) and (2) The possibility that additional assistance might be given in specific instances was mentioned, but no firm offers of such assistance were made.

Land Required and Financial Commitments.

21. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) With reference to inducements offered to overseas industry to establish in Western Australia, are these inducements now on offer to a defined number of prospective industries or are they still on offer in a general way to all industry where the trade mission visited?

(2) Has the Government assessed the potential land area and financial commitments likely to arise?

(3) If so, what are the estimates?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) The inducements are still on offer in a general way to industry wherever situated.

(2) and (3) It was not possible to estimate what amount of land was likely to be required for new industries, and the possible financial commitments. The Government is, however, satisfied that it will be able to meet the requirements as they arise.

CHEYNE BAY MINERAL SANDS.*Lessees, Market Value, etc.*

22. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Who has the lease of mineral sands at Cheyne Bay, Albany?

(2) When does such lease expire?

(3) What percentage of rutile, ilmenite and zircon are contained in mineral sands from Cheyne Bay, Albany?

(4) What is the market value of such sands at present?

(5) Can he advise if efforts have been made to form a company on an Australian-wide basis to be named Albany Titanium Ltd.?

Mr. MOIR replied:

(1) Phillip Robert Jackson, Frank Albert Moore, Hancock Prospecting Pty. Ltd.—in equal shares.

(2) Dredging claims have no term—they continue so long as the regulations and conditions are complied with.

(3) Percentages vary according to ocean conditions. One investigation on one claim revealed an average of 2.6% rutile, 36.2% ilmenite and 12.5% zircon in a mineral sands concentrate.

(4) No firm market value—price is at present a matter for negotiation between producer and consumer.

(5) I have no knowledge of any efforts to form the company named. Efforts have been made from time to time by the holders to interest outside capital.

STANDARD GAUGE.*Tabling of Papers Regarding Kalgoorlie-Perth Line.*

23. Mr. WATTS asked the Premier:

Will he lay on the Table of the House all papers dealing with negotiations and discussions between the State and Federal Governments in connection with the proposed 4 ft. 8½ in. railway from Kalgoorlie to Perth, covering the period from the 1st July, 1948, to the present time?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

Yes, on next Tuesday for one week.

NEW INDUSTRIES.*Government Concessions for Establishment in Western Australia.*

24. Mr. MAY asked the Premier:

What concession would the Government provide, by way of rail, power, water, land, etc., should inquiries be received relating to the establishment of secondary industries at Collie?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

The following are the incentives being offered by the Government in connection with the establishment of secondary industries in Western Australia, including Collie:—

Cash grants in certain conditions of up to 20 per cent. of establishment costs.

Interest-free loans up to ten years, and guaranteed loans if required.

Free factory sites.

Essential road, railway, water and power services to factories.

Guaranteed housing for workers.

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL.*Details of Work, Cost, etc.*

25. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) (a) Will he give the House details of the work that has already been done on the Albany Regional Hospital?
- (b) What has been the cost of this work to date?
- (c) What is the exact nature and purpose of each of the structures either erected or in the process of erection on the site, including galvanised iron buildings?
- (2) Which of these buildings are permanent structures and which are intended to be removed on completion of the hospital?
- (3) What labour force has been engaged on the site to date and how many of this labour force are normal local residents of Albany?
- (4) What is the time table for each phase of the job?
- (5) What labour force is proposed at different stages during the construction of the job and what is the prospective proportion of normal residents of Albany at each stage?
- (6) Is the job proceeding within the financial estimates for the job?
- (7) What materials of local origin of the area in and near Albany are being used, such as bricks and timber?
- (8) What proportion of local bricks as against bricks from other sources will be used?
- (9) Will all the bricks not of local manufacture be drawn from State Building Supplies?
- (10) What has been the proportion of condemnation of bricks coming from State Building Supplies?
- (11) What has been the cost of temporary structures referred to in No. (2), and what will be the residual value after allowing costs of demolition?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) Access road to site—complete.
Site clearing—complete.
Earthworks—75% done.
Concrete foundations—complete.
Bricks—530,000 laid.
Floor framing, 75% done.
Doors and window frames—25% delivered.
- (b) £86,335.
- (c) Brick administration block, which includes offices, outpatient area; laboratories; casualty; blood bank; delivery, surgical; x-ray and central sterilising.
Brick hospital block, which includes general wards, children's wards, maternity wards

and nurseries, workrooms, pantries and ablutions, and staff dining and change rooms.

Service block, which includes kitchen, stores, laundry, boiler house, workshops, mortuary and garbage disposal.

Staff quarters.

Galvanised iron buildings provide sleeping quarters, messing, showers, laundries and latrines for men living on site, change rooms for men living off site; also office, stores and workshop.

(2) All brick buildings are permanent structures. Galvanised iron buildings will be removed on completion of the work.

(3) Total men on site 133, of whom 90 are Albany residents.

(4) All buildings completed in 1961.

(5) Number of men employed will be governed by available funds. Suitable local men will have preference.

(6) Yes.

(7) Sand, crushed stone, bricks, timber scantling and joinery.

(8) 80%. Local bricks will be used to the full extent of available supplies during the bricklaying period.

(9) Yes.

(10) None. These bricks are being used in internal walls.

(11) £19,690—these buildings are demountable and will be almost wholly reusable.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.**SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.***Thursday Nights.*

1. Mr. BRAND asked the Premier:

When is it proposed that we will sit on Thursday nights?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

The question of sitting on Thursday nights will be decided in accordance with the progress the House makes in the next week or so.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.*Availability.*

2. Mr. BRAND asked the Premier:

When will the Auditor-General's report be available?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

The Auditor-General's report will be placed upon the Table of the House as soon as copies become available.

RAILWAYS ROYAL COMMISSIONER.*Criticism of Sleeper Tenderers.*

3. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

What is the Government's attitude to the preamble by the Royal Commissioner in the interim report No. 6 on the W.A.

Government Railways, laid on the Table of the House on the 7th October, 1958, and reading on page 2 under the heading "The History of the Sleeper Supply to the W.A.G.R."—

Any comments I make on this aspect of my Report are based entirely on files and correspondence and any inferences drawn are based on facts obtained from such sources, and later—

I have not called evidence from members of the Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants of W.A. or from millers and timber cutters outside the Association. Any evidence called from within the W.A.G.R. has only been directed towards helping me with the history of the sleeper position and has certainly not been directed to the merits of the case.

Mr. HAWKE replied:

I have to thank the hon. member for Nedlands for making a copy of this question available to me, 60 seconds before the House met. The attitude of the Government is that the Royal Commissioner is absolutely free to decide his own procedures. The Government would not presume to criticise the procedures which he thinks are appropriate to be adopted. The facts in the report are abundantly clear, and no amount of evidence taken from any amount of people would alter the facts which are set out therein.

4. Mr. COURT: Arising from the answer given to my previous question, concerning the interim report of the Railways Royal Commissioner, is it usual to assume that the evidence from people criticised in any particular case would not affect the decision arrived at; because the Premier has implied, through his answer, that no matter what evidence was put up by the people criticised, it would not affect the decision or the opinions of the Royal Commissioner?

Mr. HAWKE: Clearly, the facts of the situation are set out in the official papers.

Mr. COURT: Not necessarily.

Mr. HAWKE: Those papers contain the tendered prices as submitted on official documents by the timber companies concerned; and therefore there cannot be any argument as to whether the tendered prices were correct. They were the prices submitted on official tender forms by the individual companies, and the prices which the companies within the combine tendered were exactly the same in each instance.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Including the State Saw Mills?

5. Mr. COURT: I would point out, with respect, that the Premier has not answered my question. If we followed his line of argument to its logical conclusion, there

would be no use in trying a man for murder if the court had a letter to say that he murdered a man. Would the Premier please deal with the specific point? Is it usual to accept the proposition that evidence from people criticised will not influence the opinion and the decision of a Royal Commissioner?

Mr. HAWKE: The Royal Commissioner has set out the facts in his report, and those facts have been taken from the official tender forms submitted by the companies concerned.

Mr. COURT: But he has gone further than that.

Mr. HAWKE: The information was supplied by those firms, and I think it would be a waste of time to ask them whether they did in fact tender those prices—

Mr. COURT: I would hate to be tried for murder under this system.

Mr. HAWKE:—when the documents have been signed by them. Obviously they tendered those prices, and obviously they conferred together and all put in the same prices. As a matter of fact, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows, better than most of us, what goes on in this regard.

Mr. COURT: I do nothing of the sort.

Mr. HAWKE: Last year he was a member of a Royal Commission which investigated unfair trading practices, and one of the recommendations which he signed his name to in approval was to bring down into this Parliament legislation to make collusive tendering a breach of the law, and to provide penalties for the punishment of such offences.

Mr. COURT: That was not directed at this particular case. I'd still not like to be tried for murder under this system.

AUSTRALIAN CONSUL-GENERAL IN AMERICA.

Tabling of Letter.

6. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

In view of the reference to the Trade Commissioner in America, and the letter he received from an interested party in respect to establishing industry in Australia, or in Western Australia, would he lay a copy of that photostat letter on the Table of the House; because I am sure this gentleman will be the subject of some inquiry by the Federal authorities?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

Firstly, I wish to make a correction of an inadvertence; it was not a letter from the Trade Commissioner, but from the Australian Consul-General. I think it is undesirable that the letter should be tabled, but I am prepared to let the Leader of the Opposition see it if he calls at my office.

HOUSING.

Dwellings Completed from 1947 to 1958.

7. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many houses were completed in each of the years from the 30th June, 1947 to the 30th June 1958?

(2) How many houses have been commenced since the 30th June 1958?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

Being psychic, I have knowledge of the questions, and I have here the answers, which are as follows:—

Information compiled from Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics' Building Operations Statistics.

(1) Houses completed excluding flats, hotels, guest houses, and shops.

The 30th June	No.
1947	1792
1948	2771
1949	3244
1950	3509
1951	5160
1952	6577
1953	7965
1954	7627
1955	8792
1956	7760
1957	5030
1958	6196

(2) Information not yet available.

BUILDING INDUSTRY.

Employees Engaged from 1947 to 1958.

8. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

How many employees were engaged in the building industry in each of the years from 1947 to 1958?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The 30th June	No. of Employees
1947	5242
1948	5591
1949	6220
1950	6908
1951	7985
1952	8654
1953	8820
1954	9245
1955	10437
1956	9080
1957	9439
1958	8924

Employment in Building Trade (W.A.) including Government and Private Employees. Information compiled from Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics' Building Operations Statistics.

ONSLOW BREAKWATER WALL.

Priority for Construction.

9. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Works:

Can the Minister advise when a start will be made on the breakwater wall at Onslow? In view of the fact that only a few months will elapse before the commencement of the cyclone period, will the Minister give priority to this work in an endeavour to avoid a recurrence of the drastic damage occasioned to Onslow by cyclones last season?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me prior notice of this question, and my reply is as follows:—

Tenders will be advertised on the 12th October, 1958, closing on the 4th November, 1958. A maximum period for completion is specified as 24 weeks, and shift work can be ordered if practicable. Every effort will be made to expedite the work, which is of considerable magnitude.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Mann (Avon Valley) on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Long Service Leave.
 - 2, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2).
 - 3, Tuberculosis (Commonwealth and State Arrangement).
- Transmitted to the Council.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT.

Amendment to Barristers' Board Rule 30.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [4.57]: I move—

That new Rule 30 of the Barristers' Board, made under the Legal Practitioners Act, 1893-1950, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 28th May, 1954, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 22nd June, 1954, be amended as follows:—

Add a new paragraph to the rule:—

(v) Rules 28 and 29 shall not apply to any articulated clerk whose principal's main office is situated fifty or more miles from the General Post Office, Perth.

I am able to move this motion under the powers vested in Parliament by an amendment recently made to the Interpretation Act, such amendment having been introduced by the hon. member for Mt. Lawley. I am pleased at the opportunity provided. The purpose of my proposed amendment is to break what I claim is an unnecessary extension of the trend towards centralisation. Rules 28 and 29 of the Barristers' Board, made under the Legal Practitioners Act, and as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 28th May, 1954, read as follows:—

Subject to Rule 30 every articulated clerk shall, while articulated, attend at the University of Western Australia, the lectures provided in the LL.B. degree course in the following subjects and pass examinations therein as follows:—

and then follows a whole host of individual subjects, which I have no intention of reading out to hon. members. Rule 29 is something similar, and there also follows a list of subjects as set for the final examination.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What is the proviso in Rule 30?

Mr. EVANS: Rule 30 provides—

The board may, for good cause shown, excuse an articulated clerk from attendance at any lecture, or lectures, but, subject thereto, an articulated clerk shall not be deemed to have attended the lectures provided in any subject, unless he shall have attended at least 80 per cent. of the lectures provided in that subject in any one year.

I repeat that an articulated clerk shall not be deemed to have complied with the rules unless he shall have attended 80 per cent. of the lectures provided in any one year. The outcome of this is that an articulated clerk is completely debarred from carrying out his articles in any country centre. For example, an articulated clerk could not be articulated to a practitioner in Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, or any other centre where practitioners have their offices open to the public, because it would be impossible for an articulated clerk to serve under a practitioner in a country town and still attend 80 per cent. of the lectures provided at the University.

I know that the trend is one which has been extended throughout Australia for these courses in highly skilled and technical professions today. The trend is that those aspiring to these professions shall attend at universities. With that I have no quarrel. But I feel that we in this State should endeavour to bring our practice into line with that operating in other States of Australia. We should particularly try to do something along those lines, because a similar rule has operated very successfully in New Zealand for many years.

Speaking on another Bill, I mentioned certain statistics which proved beyond doubt that in Western Australia we are not attracting to the legal profession the number we should be attracting on a population basis, compared with those being drawn to the profession per head of population in the Eastern States. I would like to read the provision in the New Zealand Law Practitioners Act, which touches on this very subject. I quote—

8 (2). The Senate of the University shall prescribe the nature and conditions of the examination and the educational and practical qualifications of those candidates who are required to pass any such examinations, and may also prescribe such courses of study and practical training and experience for those candidates as it thinks fit, provided that it shall not be competent for the Senate to require that any course of study or practical training shall be taken at a University College at New Zealand by any candidate who, for the time being, is resident more than 10 miles from that college or who, being engaged in a qualified profession, or earning a livelihood, is thereby prevented from attending lectures.

I realise that provision is an old one, and that today a distance from a college in New Zealand of 10 miles is probably a little outmoded. But the provision is still there, and no attempt has been made by the Legislature of New Zealand to amend it. It says that an articulated clerk in that country shall not be required to attend a university if his place of residence is more than 10 miles from the place of learning.

Recently, by way of a question, I asked how many articulated clerks there are in this State doing the five-year course, or, as it is called, the Supreme Court course. I was told that there were two articulated clerks doing such a course; and that at least 12 ex-University graduates were doing articles. Those figures are paltry, and are a signal of the dangers that lie ahead of the profession and, of course, ultimately of the community at large.

I also asked how many articulated clerks were serving country practitioners this year. I was not surprised when I was told that there were none. Is it a good sign that all our legal practitioners will completely carry out their training in a city environment, when some of them at least will have to go to the country, where they will find that their dealings with the law are perhaps different in practice from those that obtain in the city?

This dangerous trend towards unnecessary centralisation must be stopped. I am sure no great harm will result from my amendment, which merely says that Rules 28 and 29 will not apply to any articulated clerk whose principal's main office is situated 50 or more miles from Perth. I selected 50 miles because I felt that the nearest

large town to the city was Northam, and that distance would exempt Northam from this provision. However I would not stand hard and fast on the figure 50.

I do feel, however, that the distance of 10 miles set out in the New Zealand Act is very small under today's conditions. The essence of my amendment is that an articulated clerk living beyond that area should not be required to attend the University, but pass an examination set by the Barristers' Board, as was set for those doing the Supreme Court course, before this rule was brought into force and printed on the 28th May, 1954.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Is there any evidence that country legal practitioners would like to employ articulated clerks?

Mr. EVANS: I know of one in Bunbury who would. Though I did not see the practitioner himself, I had inquiries made, and was informed he would be desirous of employing an articulated clerk. I know that there are two practitioners in Kalgoorlie who would like to employ them if they were available. In Queensland the practice is that articulated clerks are exempted from attending the University if their place of residence is a certain distance away. I believe that operates in other States as well. It was only in 1954 that this provision was brought into operation in Western Australia, and I think the provisions that apply in the Eastern States were overlooked. This should apply now to the rules of the Barristers' Board.

On motion by the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke (Premier), debate adjourned.

CIVILIAN LAND SETTLEMENT.

Implementation of a Comprehensive Policy.

Debate resumed from the 17th September on the following motion by Mr. Bovell:—

That in view of the vital importance to this State's economy of progressively increasing primary production, this House calls on the Government to implement a comprehensive policy for civilian land settlement through—

- (1) availability of farms to approved applicants similar to war service land settlement scheme;
- (2) attraction of capital investment from outside the State for individual land development in Western Australia;
- (3) encouragement of settlers from within Western Australia with own capital;
- (4) financial assistance to approved applicants with limited capital for development of virgin land;

(5) financial assistance to existing farmers with limited capital and under-developed farms;

(6) greater activity in survey classification and subdivision of areas of Crown land,

to which the Minister for Lands had moved an amendment to delete all words after the word "House," with a view to inserting the following in lieu:—

supports the policy of the Government in the stepping up of the tempo of land development by—

- (1) approaching the Commonwealth for financial assistance to establish a land settlement project between Jerramungup and Ravenshorpe;
- (2) the survey, classification and subdivision of new areas of virgin Crown land for individual settlement;
- (3) continuing the practice of widely publicising in the Eastern States of Australia, as well as in Western Australia, land offered for general selection, in order to attract capital investment for land settlement.

Point of Order.

Mr. Bovell: I rise on a point of order. In speaking to it, I desire to say that the amendment of the Minister is irrelevant. My motion is as follows:—

That in view of the vital importance to this State's economy of progressively increasing primary production, this House calls on the Government to implement a comprehensive policy for civilian land settlement through—

Then the items are enumerated. The Minister for Lands has moved to delete all the words after the word "House" and to insert the following in lieu:—

supports the policy of the Government in the stepping up of the tempo of land development by—

and so on. I submit that the amendment is the subject of another motion, and I shall quote some instances to substantiate my contention. I refer to May's "Parliamentary Practice" on pages 400 and 401 relating to rules with respect to form and contents of amendments. It says—

Amendments to be relevant.—The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

Stated generally, no matter ought to be raised in debate on a question which would be irrelevant, if moved as an amendment, and an amendment cannot be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question.

When the former Speaker (the late Mr. Rodoreda) gave a ruling somewhat on the lines of my point of order, he stated, as reported on page 1521 of 1954 Hansard, as follows:—

I think I should inform the House that I have already notified the Leader of the Opposition that I am not prepared to accept the amendment which he proposes to insert. The amendment is irrelevant to the motion moved. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition has made up his mind or not as to what he desires. If he has not, we will have to wait upon his pleasure.

I would also advise the House at this stage that I have informed the Premier that the words he desires to insert in the next motion are, in my opinion, entirely irrelevant and that he will have to adopt some other means to obtain his desire.

That ruling had to do with a motion relating to the basic wage. I now quote from the Orders of the Day of the Legislative Assembly, Vol. 35, of the 8th September, 1954. It states—

Adjourned debate (Sir Ross McLarty) on the amendment moved by the Premier to delete all words after the word "that" in line 2 of the following motion moved by Sir Ross McLarty:—

That this House resolves that pursuant to the provisions of Section 12 of the Electoral Districts Act, 1947, and in view of the fact that no less than 15 electoral districts fall short of . . .

That was the amendment which the then Leader of the Opposition moved to the motion, and the Speaker at that time ruled it was not in order.

I now quote from the same volume of the Orders of the Day of the Legislative Assembly, page 3, which states—

The Premier to move the following to add after the word "that" in line 2, the words "in order to provide a more equitable basis of Parliamentary representation, the quotas provided in the Electoral Districts Act, 1947, should be altered . . .

In view of the Speaker's ruling on that occasion I would quote from Vol. 38 of the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly for the 14th September, 1954, relating to the Electoral Districts Act, the Bill to which I have been referring. The Premier asked leave of the

House to withdraw the amendment; and he went on to move—and this, I think, is the course which the Minister for Lands should adopt on the present occasion—to add after the motion a proviso as follows:—

In order to provide a more equitable basis of Parliamentary representation, the quotas provided for in the Electoral Districts Act, 1947, should first be altered to give less voting strength per electorate . . .

That was, in effect, the original amendment of the Premier. In view of the ruling of the then Speaker, the Premier decided to add his former amendment to the motion, and not amend the motion.

I submit that the present amendment of the Minister for Lands, if not a direct negative, has no direct bearing on the motion, because the motion definitely calls on the Government to do something. The amendment asks the House to support the Government in what it is allegedly doing. For that reason I say they are two separate motions; and if the Minister for Lands wants his amendment to be accepted, it should be submitted as a separate motion. I have raised the point of order, and I would appreciate your ruling on it, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I have listened carefully to what the hon. member has stated and I thank him for having advised me of the position before the House sat this afternoon. He said that he was going to raise this matter and would ask for my ruling on whether the amendment was relevant. The point hinges on the question of relevance; that is the whole point.

At the bottom of page 400 of May's "Parliamentary Practice," which has been quoted by the hon. member, the following is stated:—

Amendments to be relevant:—The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question (see p. 430) necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

Stated generally, no matter ought to be raised in debate on a question which would be irrelevant, if moved as an amendment, and an amendment cannot be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question.

I think all hon. members will understand that so far as debate is concerned, the context of an amendment must be strictly relevant to the motion. Having read the motion moved by the hon. member for Vasse, and the amendment proposed by the Minister, I do not think it could be argued that the amendment is not relevant, because they both deal with the subject of land development. The hon. member's motion calls on the Government to implement a comprehensive policy

for civilian land settlement, and the amendment urges that certain words be struck out with a view to inserting these words—

supports the policy of the Government in the stepping up of the tempo of land development by—

and so on. The amendment deals with land development; therefore I would say that it is relevant to the motion.

But I might go a bit further than that, for the benefit of the hon. member for Vasse. Following the quotation I made, there is a relevant ruling in "May" on page 390 which, in paragraph (3), deals with amendments. It reads—

The general practice in regard to amendments is explained on pp. 397-405; and here such amendments only will be mentioned as are intended to evade an expression of opinion upon the main question by entirely altering its meaning and object. This is effected by moving the omission of all the words of the question after the word "that" at the beginning and by the substitution of an alternative proposition (which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question).

The kernel of the whole thing is its relevancy. "May" continues—

In the case of amendments of this type the proposal of the question "that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question" places before the House two alternative propositions, contained in the motion and in the amendment respectively, between which the House has to make a preliminary choice before deciding finally to agree to either of them.

So I would rule that the amendment is relevant to the subject matter of the motion and as is stated in this proposition of "May", the position is now that there are two alternatives before the House and in ruling that the amendment is relevant, I would say that my ruling would be strictly in accordance with the quotation I have submitted. Therefore I rule accordingly.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.

Mr. Bovell: I am reluctantly forced to move to disagree with your ruling, Sir.

Mr. Hawke: Who is forcing you?

The Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Vasse will address the Chair.

Mr. Bovell: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have quoted the rulings of your immediate predecessor and have given the text of his decisions in this matter. I feel, Sir, that while you have quoted from page 390 of "May", the ruling given by your predecessor is the one which is more consistent in relation to the actual facts of the question under discussion.

My point of order is this, Sir: That I am calling upon the Government to do something. The amendment asks the House to support something which the Minister says is being done. Therefore I believe that it is completely foreign in principle to the motion which calls upon the Government to implement a land settlement scheme; and several items are enumerated there for the Government's consideration.

The amendment provides that all words after "House" in my motion shall be deleted, which virtually leaves nothing at all—and a passage is to be inserted seeking support for the policy of the Government in stepping up the tempo of land settlement. Therefore I feel, Mr. Speaker, that whilst you have no doubt conscientiously studied the position before giving a decision in this matter, it is completely opposite to that which was given by your predecessor in similar circumstances, because the phraseology in the motion and in the amendment are not related. I therefore, reluctantly move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

Motion put and negatived.

Debate Resumed.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—on amendment) [5.28]: Speaking to the amendment moved by the Minister for Agriculture in connection with this matter, I want to say that I moved the motion in regard to the civilian land settlement scheme with a view to encouraging the development of our rural industries in Western Australia. The motion was purposely phrased so that it only asked the Government to do something. It was not phrased in any way as to be a vote of censure on the Government.

As a matter of fact, during my speech there were several interjections; and one came from the Premier, to which I retorted by saying that I was endeavouring to woo the Government into this matter and not abuse it into it. I think the Premier will recall that interjection. I endeavoured to present a case, with admittedly a number of aspects, for land settlement in Western Australia; and I concluded my address, which was very lengthy, by saying that perhaps the Government would consider some—if not all—of the proposals that I had submitted.

I was most disappointed when the Minister adopted such a defensive attitude in regard to my submissions. He said that I did not show the present Government up in a true light in regard to its achievements in war service land settlement and the development of our rural industries. I did not in any way criticise the Government for not taking part in the development of our rural industries, but was anxious that the motion should be dealt with on a completely non-party basis. With the cessation of the war service land settlement

scheme in this State in sight, I was anxious to see that some scheme was submitted for consideration to the Government of the day; and it was with that intention that I moved my motion. The propositions contained in the motion were very comprehensive, and I repeat that I am disappointed that the Minister should have adopted a defensive attitude in regard to it.

I will now explain the position in relation to the development of a scheme on lines similar to those of the war service land settlement scheme. Here I qualified my remarks in regard to the proposal for a civilian land settlement scheme, because I believe that we must have a scheme which will sway the Commonwealth Government to supply us with funds; and it was for that purpose I mentioned a scheme similar to the war service land settlement scheme, and no other. I know of no other land settlement scheme that has been sponsored with direct Commonwealth financial aid, in this State, apart from the war service land settlement scheme—

Mr. Kelly: You made no mention of the Commonwealth Government in your motion.

Mr. BOVELL: No; but I referred to it in my speech, and stated that that was the reason why I included mention of the war service land settlement scheme. I criticised the expenditure in connection with the war service land settlement scheme, but did not criticise either the Commonwealth Government or the State Government. As I say, I was endeavouring to keep the motion completely divorced from party politics, and my reason for mentioning the war service land settlement scheme was that, to the best of my knowledge, it is the only land settlement scheme in this State that has been directly assisted financially by the Commonwealth Government.

The Minister may be able to correct me there, but I traced the history of land settlement in this State from its early beginnings, and I quoted the Eastern wheatbelt, the Kellerberrin area and the country to the north of it, as well as the Bruce Rock district, where the late Sir James Mitchell attracted many people—some of them from the wharf at Fremantle—to engage in farming pursuits. I also mentioned the group settlement scheme, which was promoted by the late Sir James Mitchell, and which was later carried on by the late Phillip Collier, to whom I gave credit of having assisted materially in that scheme.

These land settlement schemes were entirely State projects and were financed by the State, no finance having been made available to them, to the best of my knowledge, from any Commonwealth source. I know that the late Sir James Mitchell, when Premier of this State, went to Great Britain in 1920 and there raised considerable capital at a low rate of interest, in

order that the group settlement scheme might be developed; and he saw to it that people from the United Kingdom were incorporated in that scheme. It is my belief that, with the exception of the recent war service land settlement scheme, all our past land settlement projects have been the responsibility of the State Government; and that was my main object in including in my remarks reference to a scheme similar to the war service land settlement scheme.

I did mention some conditions which I considered were advisable in connection with the development of a civilian land settlement scheme and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat them. I said that the proposal must include the selection of land that firstly, with further development, will produce commodities for which there is some current and foreseeable demand.

Unfortunately, since I gave notice of this motion, some two months ago, the wool market has deteriorated to such an extent that at the moment it is difficult to see wool production as a profitable primary industry, although we hope that the current low wool prices are only a temporary phase and that they will increase considerably in the very near future.

I mentioned also the selection of land which would produce the greatest economic return for the least capital expenditure, and the necessity to keep the final capital cost as low as possible; and said that the settlers should be assisted to carry out as much of the development as possible, thus avoiding the setting up of large and extravagant Government land development departments. Whether by saying that I offended the Minister for Agriculture, I do not know.

Mr. Kelly: He is not as thin-skinned as that.

Mr. BOVELL: I am pleased to have that assurance. I did not think he was so thin-skinned; because, having known the Minister for many years, I know that he is reasonable in his approach—

Mr. Kelly: Not too much of that wooing business, now!

Mr. BOVELL: I said further that the areas of land for development should be selected, whenever possible, in districts already served by public utilities and amenities such as roads, railways, schools, and so on, as the additional cost for those could be enormous. I did not say on whom the cost would fall; but of course it would fall on the State Government, and I wanted to obviate that. Obviously the provision of such amenities and services, if necessary, would be a charge on the State.

I mentioned that the land to be selected should be as close as possible to existing services. I said further, that the applicants should be carefully selected in regard

to their ability and aptitude. I also said—I feel that the Government must agree with this, because it believes in everyone being given equal opportunity—that lack of finance should not be a deterrent to eligibility, and that the land should be made available on a freehold basis. Those are some of the points that I made regarding the question of implementing a civilian land settlement scheme, on a basis similar to that of the war service land settlement scheme. I repeat that we must have a scheme of this kind if we are to attract capital from the Commonwealth Government.

Let us now examine the amendment moved by the Minister; and, firstly, the suggestion of approaching the Commonwealth for financial assistance to establish a land settlement project between Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe. It was not until after notice of my motion had been given that any publicity appeared in the Press regarding the Government's intention to proceed with a land settlement scheme in that area.

Mr. Kelly: You were present at the R.S.L. conference—

Mr. BOVELL: I was not.

Mr. Kelly: You questioned me in regard to it.

Mr. BOVELL: I am coming to that. I quoted from "The Listening Post". I was not a delegate at the conference; but, being a member of the R.S.L., I received a copy of its official publication and read what it said in relation to the statements attributed to the Minister. I have here that copy of "The Listening Post" and will deal with it later on.

Mr. Kelly: A statement, covering those details, appeared in "The West Australian".

Mr. BOVELL: I did not notice that. My first intimation of the plan at Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe—whether or not it appeared in the Press, and whether or not the Minister made statements about it—was from the "Sunday Times" of the 17th August, 1958, where there appeared a map of the area of the proposed scheme, showing the proposed roads. Under the heading "Government's Big Farm Plan" it states—

The State Government may establish up to 120 big farms for civilians west of Ravensthorpe. This big new land settlement project is behind plans at the Lands Department to develop 500,000 acres of mixed farming land between Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe.

Further down it raises the question of Federal aid and states, under the heading of "Federal Aid"—

Emphasising this yesterday the Premier, Mr. Hawke, said that if the State Government decided to develop the area as a land settlement project

it was possible, but not certain, that an approach would be made to the Commonwealth for financial assistance.

That was not brought to my notice, and it must have been news for the "Sunday Times" to publish it on the 17th August. The paper would not have devoted a front page and rather big headlines to it, had it not considered it was news to the people of Western Australia; and that was some two weeks after I had given notice in this House of my motion with regard to the need for developing a civilian land settlement scheme.

The second item in the amendment is for the survey, classification and subdivision of new areas of virgin crown land for individual settlement. I dealt with this matter; and I was very disappointed to hear the Minister say, during his speech, that I had criticised the department—they were not his words, but that is the import of them—for its lack of activity. On the contrary, I made a special point of paying a tribute to the work that had been done. But, owing to the fact that for a long time there had been a shortage of surveyors—in my experience there are still some surveys awaiting completion even in my own district—I encouraged the employment of more surveyors so that the work could be carried out expeditiously. I am sorry that the Minister should have taken offence at my words, which appear in Hansard for all to note; and I think his attitude is ill-founded.

The third matter referred to in the amendment moved by the Minister relates to the continuance of the practice of widely publicising in the Eastern States, as well as in Western Australia, land offered for general selection, in order to attract capital investment for land settlement. If this amendment is agreed to, it will merely be another way of "wiping off" my motion, because it would appear that the Minister considered I was censuring the Government; whereas I was seeking its co-operation.

In my submissions in the first instance, I referred to the need—I may have framed it in different language—to advertise in the Eastern States' newspapers to attract people with capital to invest it in Western Australia. I was concerned with the Minister's statement on land settlement and the development of our primary industries in Western Australia, which he made in his reply to the motion that I moved. I will quote the remarks of the Minister appearing at page 889 of Hansard No. 7 of this year. This is what he said—

The hon. member made some play on the vital need, as he put it, for immediate action to encourage further settlement. We cannot settle people any faster than we are doing now. People are now being settled faster than at any other period in the State's

history. We just cannot subdivide a lot of land and throw it open for selection.

This is the part that concerns me most—

There is not that much of it left, and we just cannot subdivide it and do nothing about it.

I hope the Minister was not trying to convey the impression that the limit had been reached in regard to land settlement in Western Australia.

Mr. Kelly: I think if you read a little further on, or perhaps a little before that, you will find that I said that the availability of first-class Crown land was very limited.

Mr. BOVELL: That may be so in regard to first-class land; but during the last few years the emphasis, in regard to land settlement, has been on light land. For example, the Esperance plains venture is on light land.

Mr. Kelly: The war service land settlement scheme was not established on light land, and that is what you are hoping to implement and replace.

Mr. BOVELL: I have told the House and the Minister several times that the matter of establishing a civilian land settlement scheme is based on applying to the Commonwealth Government for assistance. Surely I do not have to repeat that this is the first civilian land settlement venture in Western Australia that I know of in connection with which we have obtained Commonwealth assistance. That is the basis of my contention in regard to civilian land settlement.

The Minister referred to the R.S.L. conference and the statement that he made at it. Also, I referred to the report which appears in the "Listening Post" of March, 1958. In that article the Minister is reported as having said that representations had been made by the State Government for three years to obtain finance from the Commonwealth for a civilian land settlement scheme. I asked the Minister, when making his speech, to give some details of the proposals submitted to the Commonwealth Government during the period of three years that he had mentioned.

However, the Minister in criticising me rather severely for the attitude he claimed I took against his own Government—but which I did not—was on wrong grounds; because if hon. members will read my speech in Hansard, they will realise that my remarks constituted only a very mild request for co-operation by the Government to ensure that our land settlement schemes are continued—in view of the fact that the war service land settlement scheme is close to being terminated, and therefore capital should be attracted from the Eastern States from private investors—and that money should be made available, if possible, for this purpose.

To support my argument, I quoted the activities of the Industries Assistance Board in the past. I pointed out that this board had contributed a great deal to the development of the Great Southern, the eastern, and the north-eastern wheatbelts. In those times a similar system of advancing money was followed. Work was done on a property; and when its value was assessed, an advance was made to the farmer which enabled him to carry out more work and perhaps obtain a further advance to improve his property. That is how the wheat and sheep areas in the Great Southern, the eastern, and the north-eastern wheatbelts progressed to the state they are in today. I would point out to hon. members that those areas are now regarded as being among the State's best economic assets.

However, the Minister did not make a proper reply to my request. In addressing the House, I said that I did not want to have this file tabled, but I thought the Minister might give us some information concerning the Government's proposals. I think the Minister was over-sensitive, despite the fact that he previously assured me—to use his own words—that he is not thin-skinned. In his reply, the Minister quoted the achievement of his Government, and he said that the information contained in my motion was not soundly based.

He did not say that my figures were incorrect, because he was unable to do so, in view of the fact that they were taken from the Pocket Year Book which is issued, under the authority of the State Government, by the Commonwealth Statistician. Also, a great deal of the information which I tendered during my speech was supplied to me directly by various Ministers of the Government when I was preparing my case for the implementation of a civilian land settlement scheme.

Therefore, I consider that I should reply to the Minister's remarks in that regard. The figures that I gave were authentic and correctly presented. I outlined the whole position in order to lead up to a point where I considered that further activity was necessary. Shortly after I moved my motion the Minister explained what the Government had done. Also, the Premier made certain statements in the Press on the land settlement scheme, and so I feel that the motion at least galvanised the Government into some action in advising the public what it is doing in this regard.

In effect, I think the amendment that has been moved by the Minister is unfair because it will completely negative my motion; and the words contained in his amendment will, in effect, become the motion. I cannot agree to that proposal. I consider that if the Minister wanted us to support the policy of the Government to step up the tempo of land settlement by adopting the three items mentioned in his

amendment, he could have moved a separate motion. That was the reason why I raised a point of order earlier.

There is one point I desire to clarify now. When I was introducing the motion, the hon. member for Katanning made an interjection in regard to butter production in Western Australia. In the course of my remarks I stated that the production of butter was 54,000 boxes below the State's consumption. I was practically sure of the figure I had quoted, but the interjection threw some doubt on it.

However, I have since checked that figure, and I can say again that last year Western Australia did not produce enough butter for its own consumption. It was 54,000 boxes short of its needs. The production during the flush period was put into cold storage for use in the off period; but this surplus was not sufficient to provide the needs of Western Australia, and it was necessary to import an additional 54,000 boxes of butter in excess of our own production.

Mr. Nalder: None of the butter produced in the flush season was exported.

Mr. BOVELL: I am assured that all the butter produced in Western Australia was kept in cold storage and eventually consumed in this State. Therefore, no butter was exported from Western Australia for the year to the 30th June, 1958. I wanted to clear that matter up, because there was some doubt about the position. However, I verified it; and what I have said now is correct.

This brings me to the point that any State should be self-sufficient; and despite the fact that butter producers today are having a difficult time in regard to prices and other circumstances, it is my personal belief that if we are to be a self-sufficient State we should produce enough for home consumption. I will advocate that as long as I am a member of Parliament. If we have an industry, that industry should be capable of producing at least enough commodities, whether primary or secondary, for the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Lawrence: It won't be long now.

Mr. BOVELL: The amendment, as I have already said, is another subject; and I thank you, Mr. Speaker for allowing me such a great amount of latitude. I appreciate the fact that I will possibly be stopped from speaking again.

Mr. Norton: Did you say latitude?

Mr. BOVELL: The proposal is to delete certain words; but I know that if the Minister is adamant that his amendment be proceeded with, as the Government has a large majority my motion will be defeated, and I will not have an opportunity of addressing the House on it.

Mr. Brand: You are in order. They are only attempting to delete these words, and there is no need for you to apologise.

Mr. BOVELL: I am not apologising; I am thanking the Speaker for his indulgence. I would ask the House to reject the Minister's amendment because I think it is appropriate that the motion in my name should be carried. Its contents embrace all forms of land settlement. I repeat that I set out to seek the co-operation and assistance of the Government and not to criticise it. I did this because I believe it is necessary for us to develop our primary industries. If we do not progress, stagnation will cause an economic position in Western Australia which would be a disadvantage to all phases of industry and life here. Western Australia still depends and must do so for a long time on its primary industries.

Mr. Lawrence: It always will.

Mr. BOVELL: I think it behoves the Government to show a realistic outlook.

Mr. Potter: It has done so by amending the motion.

Mr. BOVELL: I ask the House to reject the amendment moved by the Minister to delete all words after the word "House". In conclusion, I am going to repeat those words. The motion reads—

That in view of the vital importance to this State's economy of progressively increasing primary production this House . . .

That is the beginning of the motion, and this is what will be deleted under the amendment moved by the Minister for Lands and Agriculture—

calls on the Government to implement a comprehensive policy for civilian land settlement through—

- (1) availability of farms to approved applicants similar to war service land settlement scheme;
- (2) attraction of capital investment from outside the State for individual land development in Western Australia;
- (3) encouragement of settlers from within Western Australia with own capital;
- (4) financial assistance to approved applicants with limited capital for development of virgin land;
- (5) financial assistance to existing farmers with limited capital and under-developed farms;
- (6) greater activity in survey, classification and subdivision of areas of Crown land.

If these words are deleted, I take it that the Government does not want any of the matters dealt with and is not interested in them. Therefore, I certainly oppose the amendment.

MR. HALL (Albany—on amendment) [6.7]: I rise to support this amendment.

Mr. Brand: Why?

Mr. HALL: I do not feel the Minister will require my support and will win his amendment. The hon. member for Vasse told us that he thought this was the first time an attempt had been made to have a civilian land settlement scheme implemented. I have a photostat copy here which was taken at the request of the Bruce-Page Government in 1929. There were some 5,000,000 acres in the proposed survey. That brings us back to the reference by the Minister to surveys and an approach to the Commonwealth for financial assistance.

In regard to the 5,000,000 acres I mentioned previously, if we made a survey today, we would find that very little of that land was left. That brings us down along the coastline to the areas stipulated by the Minister—Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe. I think the Minister has approached the subject wisely, because he realises there is a suitable rainfall in those areas. They will be attractive to settlers from the Eastern States who will no doubt come here after aerial surveys and photographs are presented in the Eastern States. Perhaps we will also have settlers in Western Australia who will want to go there.

It is no secret that the biggest job this State has to tackle is land settlement and development; and it is obvious that many farmers in the Eastern States are attracted to the areas I have mentioned, particularly because of the light nature of the clearing and, I repeat, its suitable rainfall.

I believe a suitable area of 500,000 acres has been set aside for the purpose of establishing such a project between Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe; and if the Government does not go on with the proposed civilian land settlement scheme, the land should be thrown open for selection to farmers with sufficient capital.

Mr. Brand: If that area is developed, it will merely be an extension of the scheme initiated by the McLarty-Watts Government.

Mr. Kelly: That's a new one!

Mr. HALL: Although we will bring in farmers with capital, certain hazards will be faced. It is impossible to say that everyone will be a successful farmer. We are having worrying times today, because the wool market has fallen. However, if we look at the land that the Minister has in mind, we will find that the growth of wool can be supplemented by the introduction of the right types of breeds. Farmers could go in more for crossbreeds in the near coastal lands which will produce a better carcase for export and a better class of crossbred wools which might provide a better floor display.

Mr. Nalder: Do you mean fat lambs?

Mr. HALL: Close to the coastline we get wetted down wools, and they are unattractive on the sale floor. Therefore, we get a repercussion from the buyer. Wool from these close coastal areas with heavy rainfalls will not compete with the better types of Merino. We must encourage the right type of settler, who understands breeds. From crossbreeds they would get better wool and would readily dispose of carcasses to overseas markets through Borthwicks.

Mr. Nalder: Fat lambs?

Mr. HALL: Yes, and crossbreeds.

Mr. Brand: Are there many Merinos being raised at Many Peaks?

Mr. HALL: I understand some have been, but I do not think they were very successful. There have been some at other places and also around Albany. Unless one has the better-class Merino, one must lose on that line. I have not much more to say on that subject.

However, it is obvious that the Eastern States farmers have become very interested in this area. They are also interested in Albany, which is obvious from a Press article which I propose to read. It is as follows:—

A New South Welshman, F. B. Giles, and his wife hope to sell their 1,100-acre property in that State and begin farming on an 800-acre site near Albany.

The Albany land is one of several lots thrown open for selection in the district, together with other properties near Esperance.

Giles and his wife pictured yesterday examining a map of the area made a rush plane trip from their home in Parkes to inspect the Albany land.

More applications were received for land at Moates Lagoon than there was land available for selection. I have previously spoken of hazards of land development and propose to read this article.

Mr. Brand: Not before tea!

Mr. HALL: It is as follows:—

Speaking at the joint farmers and scientists' conference held at the University—organised by farmers through the Farmers' Union and by the W.A. Branch of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science—Mr. E. F. Smart, of Mingenew, said there were at least 2,000,000 acres of cheap light land running north and south of Mingenew available for selection.

However, there were many hazards in land development and he felt it was a waste of time and money for lads without adequate capital and experience to touch any virgin country.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HALL: The hon. member for Vasse touched on a point which I would say, without fear of contradiction, would be the most controversial one that he mentioned; and it concerns markets. It is obvious we have to go further afield to look for markets. It might be as well for the Government, or the Department of Agriculture, to plan a mission, similar to the trade mission which we sent overseas, to see whether we can place our agricultural commodities on the overseas markets.

An article headed, "McEwen says: Trade with Red China" recently appeared in the Press, and it bears out what I have been saying. This article does not leave much doubt because the powers that be in the Federal sphere, who claim to know a lot more of world happenings, have defined their policy in this regard. It is rather significant that we must follow that policy if we are to place the agricultural commodities that we plan to produce from our civilian land settlement.

Also, we have to look to see what is ahead for wool. I draw the attention of hon. members to one or two factors that affect the price of wool. One that stands out is the percentage of synthetics introduced into the worsted manufacture of the woollen trade. This is done for many reasons. It is not simply to displace wool as a fabric, but because the demand is there. The public wants the character of wool cloths to be altered to suit modern requirements. As hon. members know, the trend today, even in men's fashions, is to have glints added to the material; and synthetic fibres included to permit of lighter weight, and greater durability and warmth. This is one matter which affects the price of wool.

Mr. Brand: I suppose this is related to the motion.

Mr. HALL: It is, because the motion deals with agricultural development, and I am referring to the hazards that arise in the selling of the produce.

Mr. Brady: Don't let the Leader of the Opposition put you off.

Mr. HALL: Another channel into which a large percentage of our revenue goes is hire purchase. It is definitely going into the solids, such as motorcars, refrigerators, etc.

The world consumption of raw wool increased in 1956 by almost 9 per cent. to a record of 2,844,000,000 lb., clean basis. All the main producers of textiles, except the United States, used more wool in the first nine months of 1957 than in the corresponding period of 1956. The largest proportionate increase was in Italy, followed by Japan and France. In the United States, consumption was 11 per cent. less, mostly in apparel wool.

Mr. Nalder: Have you any details of the quantities of the wool?

Mr. HALL: We can touch on that later. It is estimated that consumption in 1957 may have reached 2,930,000,000 lb. clean, about 3 per cent. more than in 1956.

Mr. Brand: Would some of these hire-purchase companies be big purchasers of cloth from the Albany Woollen Mill?

Mr. HALL: They would be in, possibly, wearing apparel and blankets; but those purchases would not offset the great amount of money that goes into hire-purchase companies in order to buy solids—machinery, motorcars, and refrigerators. As I was saying, the amount of wool I just mentioned is about 3 per cent. more than in 1956, and about 50,000,000 lb. more than wool production in 1956-57. This was made possible by a reduction of stocks in consuming countries. That deals with the consumption side of wool.

World commercial stocks of raw wool at the 1st January, 1957, are estimated as approximately unchanged from a year earlier, and represented about 3½ months mill supply. They are expected to be about 5 per cent. less in January, 1958. At the opening of the 1956-57 selling season, the United Kingdom stocks were 7 per cent. less than a year earlier. In the United States, although stocks were slightly greater in April, 1957, than a year previously, this was more than offset by the decrease in commodity credit corporation holdings. Total apparel wool stocks were 31,000,000 lb. scoured basis below their level at the 1st April, 1956, and were less than in any year since 1941. Raw wool stocks in Japan and France at the 30th June, however, were significantly greater than at the same date in 1956. This gives us an idea of what is happening.

Prices throughout the 1956-57 selling season in Australia, rose steadily, although fluctuations were greater than in recent seasons. The margins between cross-bred and merino wools narrowed substantially, in contrast to the widening movement in 1955-56. The increase in wool prices was much greater than the rise in the general level of commodity prices. At the beginning of the 1957-58 season, prices were about 5 per cent. less than the closing rates of 1956-57. They have, in general, continued to fall since then, so that at the last sales in December, average 64's were 22 per cent., and good 56's 20 per cent. cheaper than at the beginning of the season.

Mr. Brand: What are you quoting from?

Mr. HALL: From extracts that are readily available to anyone. They are from the statistical returns. Spending had been transferred, as I mentioned earlier, to hire-purchase goods, thus affecting our wool sales. Spending had been transferred from textiles to durable goods. The general improvement in general economic conditions, and some restriction

on hire-purchase sales of durables, led to a renewed interest in textiles, resulting in record wool consumption in 1956, and probably more in 1957.

The rise was common to many countries, but was much greater in Japan than in any other. The fall in wool prices, which began in the final weeks of 1956-57, coincided with a general fall in the price of raw materials. Anti-inflationary measures, in some countries, have had an important influence, especially the rise in the United Kingdom bank rate, which has restrained British buyers who, traditionally, provide the strongest force at Australian auctions.

I do not say that I know the answer to this question, because better brains than mine are trying to solve it; but I sometimes feel that if our wools were well displayed with, perhaps, a reserve price marked on them, they would sell better. This type of selling applies to most shops. If an article is displayed, but is not glamorised in cellophane wrapping, there is not much chance of selling it. This all adds up to the development of the civilian land settlement scheme, and it is urgent that we look before we leap. It is no use producing a commodity that we cannot sell; and I must agree with the hon. member for Vasse on this point. I also say that I have to agree with the Minister, because I feel he is on the right track.

Mr. Brand: You do not have to.

Mr. HALL: We have to avoid any pitfalls in our attempt to extend a civilian land settlement scheme. I commend the hon. member for introducing the motion.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood—on amendment [7.42]: I oppose the amendment on the ground that it shows the barrenness of the Government's policy in connection with land settlement. The first thing the Minister asked us to do was to approach the Commonwealth Government for money in connection with two specific schemes in relation to a particular district. This, apparently, is the only area in the State that he is interested in developing. But land settlement can take place all over our agricultural areas. Any Government that seeks to have its policy confined to two specific areas is, I feel, not only unrealistic, but is not acting in the best interests of the State.

Surely we should be anxious to encourage anyone who wants to take up land, wherever land can be found in the State, and not confine people to a particular type of farming. The whole of the Minister's speech, in reply to the motion, indicates that the emphasis has been on cereal and wool production. Well, there are plenty of other commodities that are worth producing in the State. For instance, the orchard industry has an export income which is

considerable; and the orchardists, generally, have made very few demands on the Government over a great many years. They have run their own show satisfactorily, and there are still many thousands of acres of land which are suitable for orcharding. An area of 10 acres of the right land is sufficient for a commercial orchard.

Mr. Potter: Don't you think our farming should be more diversified?

Mr. HEARMAN: That is what I am suggesting; that we should not put all our eggs in one basket. I am glad the hon. member for Subiaco is on my side. Apparently we are making an impression on at least one Government member.

Mr. Brand: Not on one, but on the whole lot.

Mr. HEARMAN: It is not a matter of just wool alone. I am suggesting that fruit is an export commodity for which we have to find satisfactory overseas markets. The production of fruit could be increased without any great area of land being involved. It appears that the Government, by this amendment, is not in any way interested in developing the orchard industry, despite the fact that there is possibly no industry that has made fewer demands on the Government over the years.

The Minister talks about the survey, classification and subdivision of new areas of virgin Crown land for individual settlement. The original motion mentioned a greater activity in the survey, classification, and subdivision of areas of Crown land; and it seems to me to be the same girl with a different frock. I do not think there is any point in the Minister's amendment in that regard, because that matter is already included in the original motion. He also talks about continuing the practice of widely publicising in the Eastern States of Australia, as well as in Western Australia, land offered for general selection, in order to attract capital investment for land settlement.

Nobody would object to that; but there appears to be no indication, in any of the paragraphs of the Minister's amendment, of the need to provide some sort of assistance for the small man who wants to start out and develop a farm where no farm existed before. I think the history of land settlement in this State has demonstrated, time and time again, that it is the individual who wants to take up a particular piece of land and develop it who ultimately wins through and makes a success of the venture. There are many instances of that in this State. Many of the wealthy farmers today were only in a small way when they started out; but subsequently they made a substantial contribution to the wealth of this State.

Surely people such as that—sons of farmers who want to take up land somewhere in the vicinity of the old home farm so that they can get assistance from their

parents in regard to machinery and stock, and things of that nature—should be given every assistance. Those people do not want to be brought under any scheme, and surely Government policy should endeavour to embrace such people. There should be some recognition of the need to help them.

After all, literally hundreds, and even thousands, of people of that type have been helped in the past by successive Governments. Those farmers have made a worthwhile contribution by the development of their properties. Even if the Government did lose some money in the process, the State has been paid back a hundredfold since then. Any land settlement policy, if it is to be realistic and comprehensive, must include some consideration of such people.

I have with me a letter dated the 29th September. It was written by the Assistant Under Secretary of the Land Settlement Board to a man who, some five or six years ago, took up a block of land that was purchased originally by the Government for the War Service Land Settlement scheme. Subsequently it was not required for that purpose and so became available for disposal. The man concerned is not a war service land settler, although he served in the Navy for six years, commencing duty in 1939. It was unfortunate that he was unable to qualify because originally he was a Victorian, and there appeared to be some doubt as to his health—that has since proved to be groundless. He came to Western Australia because he heard that land was cheaper here. Perhaps he was one of those who was influenced by the advertising carried out in the Eastern States.

He found that by comparison with Victoria land prices were cheap, and he took up 400 acres for a price in the vicinity of £7 an acre. Originally he was given six years to pay back the money because he had no capital when he started. I am quite certain that everybody on the Land Settlement Board, and in the Lands Department must have realised that for a man to take on what might be termed a dry dairy farm, with no capital, and to talk about paying back the money borrowed in six years, was fantastic. Yet that is the period of the contract that was originally signed by the department with this man.

Subsequently, as the result of representations made, very much better terms were offered to him and he was given 15 years in which to pay back the money borrowed. Even that, when one takes into account the terms that are given to war service land settlers, was a very short term considering that he was getting no assistance from the Government.

The only other assistance he received was a grant of rabbit netting for fencing. This man has worked very hard on that

property. He realises now, of course, that the original proposition he undertook was completely hopeless. He has been working at a timber mill as well as on his property in order to earn some extra money. He has maintained his wife and family in that manner for years, and the actual work that he has put into the property has amazed everybody who has any knowledge of it, so much so that when he finally ran into a deadlock an orchardist in the town—a man of some affluence—decided to advance him money privately to purchase a milking herd.

It is because of such cases that one questions the land settlement policy of the Government, particularly as regards the agency section of the R. and I. Bank. It has no money to help these people, despite the fact that that section exists for the specific purpose of helping such cases. The bank was able to assist this man with money to build a cow shed; but he is still living in a Nissen hut and there is no house on the property. Originally he could not get any money to stock his property and he had one season when he had marvellous pastures—I saw them myself—and no stock, because he did not have the money to purchase. Under the present Government policy the bank is not able to help him; but, as I have already said, he was assisted privately in the purchase of a milking herd. This was done because the orchardist in question saw what the settler had been able to do with his property.

But it is a disgraceful thing that a man who can command such respect should not be able to receive further assistance from the Government. In January he was asked to pay back the sum of £200 13s. 8d., and in February he saw me and said that he could not possibly find the money. I suggested that he make a proposition to the department that he pay so much a month. He did that and agreed to pay back £20 a month; and he kept up his payments until last August when, because of the additional work that has been imposed on his wife—as a result of his having to work away from the farm and milk 20 cows night and morning, feed the calves and pigs, and do other work on the farm—she had a breakdown in health and spent three months in hospital.

Now he cannot meet his commitments, and he received the letter from the department, the final paragraph of which reads:—

Therefore in the circumstances unless the balance required to pay the stated £200 13s. 8d., that is the revised instalment which would be due under the 15 years term as at the 1st January, 1958, is received within 21 days from date, consideration must be given to the question of cancellation of the contract.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how much encouragement is that to a man to continue the uphill fight and establish a small dairy farm in the South-West which, as has been demonstrated over the years, is a very difficult task? Surely a Government with a worth-while land settlement policy would not allow a state of affairs such as that to continue! After all, if he did not pay back one penny of the money borrowed the State would still be better off, because he is still producing butterfat and is receiving something like £60 a month in the form of a cream cheque. Surely the department does not expect any of that money! After all, if the Government did not provide him with the money to buy the herd it has no moral claim to the proceeds, and so it cannot expect to have the first grab at those monthly cheques.

Nevertheless, this man is working on a mill and is getting approximately £10 a week. Because of his circumstances, he cannot work full time at the mill. He does not start until nine in the morning, and he finishes at four in the afternoon to enable him to get home, do the milking and the other necessary jobs about the farm. He is still prepared to continue to pay £20 a month to the department; but when he has considerable hospital expenses he cannot meet that payment.

I have discussed this matter briefly with the Minister, and I think that probably we will find some way out of the impasse. I think it would be a shame—or, as the hon. member for Collie says, a crying shame—if this man were to be put off his property because he failed to meet his commitments of £20 a month from August last. Yet that is the proposition contained in the letter. It is a clear-cut indication of just how the Government's land settlement policy is actually working.

It is all right to talk about these people who have thousands of pounds behind them—the Minister mentioned something like £155,000—and say that we can get them to settle in this State. Of course we can; and I do not want to stop them. But they are not the people who need so much attention from the Government as the smaller man who is willing to work and who needs some Government assistance.

The history of land development in this State over the years has shown that the State has been amply repaid for the money that has been expended on land development. Frankly, I cannot see any necessity to amend the motion in the manner envisaged by the Minister, because the original motion gives some recognition to the problems that I have mentioned, one of which is highlighted by the letter I quoted.

In his motion, the hon. member for Vasse mentioned five points, including financial assistance to existing farmers with limited capital and under-developed farms. There was no mention of that in

the Minister's amendment; in fact, there is no suggestion that such a problem exists. To ask this House to support a policy which does not even recognise that essential feature of land settlement, and which is inevitably associated with development, particularly of the heavily timbered areas, is completely wrong. Such a principle is recognised everywhere in the world where agricultural development is taking place, and obviously it is not reasonable to ask us to support such a policy. The very fact that the amendment omits this point condemns the Minister and the Government.

Reading the Minister's amendment, one would think that apart from the need to approach the Commonwealth Government to get money to develop the Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe projects, there is not much else to worry about—we can leave the rest of the land to anybody who wants it. That is a delightful thought, but it is not the right way to go about land settlement in this State. Surely it should not be dependent on the implementation of some scheme! Surely with land settlement in a country such as this, which still has most of its development in front of it—despite the fact that the Minister says we are running short of land, which many of us will dispute—there is a need for continuous settlement such as was envisaged by the establishment of the agency section of the R. & I. Bank.

When that section was set up there was a recognition that assistance should be given to people who wanted to develop new properties, and not necessarily people who were prepared and willing to be thrust into some scheme that had been blueprinted for some years.

Mr. Potter: That is a bit of a socialistic move, isn't it?

Mr. HEARMAN: No. I think it is a socialistic move to say that a person has to be a member of a scheme or the Government is not interested in him. There are plenty of farmers' sons, and people like that, who should be helped. I know of people who have worked on farms in my electorate for years. They know farming in that area, and they would be willing to take up and are capable of taking up and developing areas in their own way. But they would have no part of any Government scheme under which they would be told what they had to do; under which they would be given the choice of two or three different types of house, or cowsheds. A number of these young fellows do not want to put a house on the place at all for a start. They are more anxious to put their money into development, and establishment of pastures, the erection of fences and the provision of water and that sort of thing. They are more interested in spending money on avenues that will bring them

an immediate return than in spending it on building a house; because either the young fellows are not married, or are in a position to live on their parents' farm.

So there is need for a continuous settlement policy which does not necessarily incorporate any particular scheme at all. I feel the Government's responsibility—possibly at the risk of over-simplifying the matter—could be first to make land available for settlement. We cannot have land settlement without land, and it is the Government which can make it available. In some cases it is possible that a private individual can make land available, but that is not the sort of thing that we as a Parliament, or the Government, can insist on, even though it does happen occasionally.

Secondly, I think the Government must realise the financial difficulties associated with the initial stages of land development. The objective should be not to hamstring the settlers with dunning letters demanding payment within a certain time; it should be the promotion of land development and helping the man to keep going and do just that. Let him go for five years or more and get something back; let him produce something the State can sell rather than hamstring him, and insist on payment, so that he cannot even buy super and that sort of thing. We must have a realistic approach to this question of finance. There is nothing in the Minister's amendment that gives any indication of that.

Mr. Kelly: You have been very helpful in the matter of finance!

Mr. HEARMAN: I have suggested that there are many ways in which the Government can save money. But the Government will not listen to me. I have pointed out where money can be saved in connection with the railways. Last night I showed that money could be saved in Government building. I also indicated the waste of Government money and cited the instance of a bridge that was being built. But the Minister does not appear to be very receptive to my suggestions.

Mr. Kelly: Nor are many other people.

Mr. HEARMAN: That may be so, but it ill becomes the Minister to criticise me on these lines when he takes no notice, and gives me no credit for attempting to demonstrate how the Government can save money. If the Government could save money it would have money to spend on other projects.

Mr. Kelly: Governments get thousands of wild-cat schemes like yours.

Mr. HEARMAN: It is a wild-cat scheme, is it, to try to save money on Government buildings? It is a wild-cat scheme, is it, for the Government to charge 45s. a chain for clearing land when a private contractor quotes 26s. a chain? These figures are in the records of the Upper Blackwood Road Board and can be made

available at any time. Those are wild-cat schemes, are they? It is not as much a wild-cat scheme as some of the projects the Government undertakes.

If the Government has money to dish out to overseas firms to help them establish themselves here—and I do not for one moment wish to stop them coming here—it should have sufficient money to give to the man who is trying to develop a farm; the Government should not tell him that he must find £200, or part thereof, within 21 days or else he will have his contract cancelled.

Mr. Bovell: The Government's first responsibility should be the primary industries.

Mr. HEARMAN: Much talk has been made about the assistance the Government is going to provide companies in establishing themselves here. I do not object to that at all; I think it is a good thing. But then for the Government to turn round and say, "We cannot do anything for this man" because I have not assisted the Government to get any money, is just too stupid. How silly can the Government get?

Mr. W. Hegney: You should know.

Mr. HEARMAN: If the Government is going to talk in that fashion, there will be no limit to its stupidity. The Minister does not seem to be concerned at all about economies. The third responsibility, which I think the Government can say it has measured up to, is the question of technical assistance. Generally speaking, I think that the Department of Agriculture can claim to have done a reasonable job, and there is no qualification or reservation about that remark. The department has done a good job in endeavouring to overcome the technical difficulties of pasture establishment, etc. in new areas. I would also point out there are many farms that could be established, within my own electorate, for instance, where none of these technical problems exist, in so far as new farms are concerned.

Development has taken place in those areas over many years, and most of the practical problems have been well and truly surmounted. Yet we found, in response to questions asked earlier, that in my electorate eight blocks of land have been made available very recently. In fact it is significant they were advertised shortly after the questions were asked. So, if anyone wants to take advantage of available land, they can have a go at these eight blocks.

Mr. Kelly: You flatter the Lands Department if you think they can get the land ready that quick.

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister has started something, and I will tell the House the whole story. These blocks were surveyed in 1954. There is a letter on record

which shows that the Conservator of Forests wrote to the Lands Department quoting the block numbers and saying that three of them were for immediate selection and that the timber could be removed off the other blocks—there was a total of 16 or 17—within a matter of 18 months or two years.

I asked questions in the House and I got the file tabled. The file indicated that there was a certain amount of desultory correspondence between the two departments; and finally, in April this year, I saw the Under Secretary for Lands; and, after I politely laid down the law a little, he said, "If the Forests Department would do something about it we could release these blocks." He said I should see the Conservator of Forests and ask him about this matter.

I saw the Conservator, and he was very huffy about it and said, "If somebody will tell me from which blocks they want the timber removed we will remove it." He asked me if I could give him the block numbers. Accordingly I went back to the Under Secretary for Lands, and from the file I took out the conservator's own reference number contained on his letter—I think it was September, 1954—in which he himself had quoted the block numbers.

So I quoted him his own reference numbers; and, in due course, he sent somebody down from the fourth floor to the basement and the letter was finally produced, in which the conservator himself had quoted the block numbers and in which he had said that within 18 months or two years he could get the timber removed. I asked him what all this was about—not knowing the block numbers and so on. He said, "It is not a very good show." He agreed with me. I think that was the first point of agreement, but we did agree. He said that he would do something about this.

That is why blocks became available; and that is why I started asking questions as soon as Parliament met, to make sure I had taken the trouble to get the reference numbers on the Conservator's own letter; but had I not done so nothing would have been achieved, because the file shows that in April he had written saying he did not know what was happening, and that he would call for a report. By September no report had been received and no-one knew what was going on. At that time I went to see him.

Mr. Brand: Were you flattering the Lands Department?

Mr. HEARMAN: If the Lands Department writes a letter about once a year to the conservator, it feels it has done a pretty good job. In reply to the Minister's query as to whether I was flattering the Lands Department, I would point out that I had no intention of doing so. I hope I have made my meaning quite clear. The

Lands Department could surely do better than take four years to make blocks available.

Mr. Kelly: What progress was made between 1954 and 1957?

Mr. Brand: The Minister is apologising now. He is only about eight years out. You should make it quite clear as to who was the Government in those days.

Mr. HEARMAN: I think it should be clearly known that the present Hawke Government was in office during that period, and it is some indication how that Government works in connection with land development. I know the Minister took great credit for the fact that the Chase Syndicate, and other people, had applied for land. But, of course, that is a debatable point, and I do not want to enter into it at this juncture.

However, there are literally hundreds of people looking for land. They have their eye on a certain spot; and for the life of me I cannot see any reason why that land should not be made available to them, particularly when the Minister has chided me, as he has tonight, on the subject of finance; because a great many of these people—particularly those who would take up small areas for orcharding, etc.—are not in need of Government finance. So if the Government is short of finance and cannot make it available, then it would seem to me that, as a matter of Government policy, it should be encouraging settlement in these areas I have mentioned, of which Tone River is a case in point, where I know there are a number of people prepared to take up that land without asking for Government finance.

Mr. Potter: That would not come within the terms of this motion.

Mr. HEARMAN: It refers to land settlement. If the Minister wants to say we are asking for too much money, then let him be consistent. If that is his problem, he should get to work, and make land available, even if it is only in small individual areas, to these people who are prepared to develop it without requiring Government assistance. The Minister cannot have it both ways. He cannot say we are asking for Government finance, and at the same time say that the Government has not any money, but is still interested in land settlement. Let us take the case of my own electorate.

There are eight blocks of a commercial farm size available. There are two other blocks which are said to be available; one, not being in my electorate, of 144 acres; and the other, of 200 acres, in my electorate. They would be useful only as adjoining properties to existing farms.

It is a poor state of affairs, and an indication of Government land settlement policy, when a member of Parliament is approached by a young man who wants to start farming and has to say to him, "The

nearest land available is around Tone River. It is a sheep proposition. I know that you know nothing about sheep and that you are an orchardist, but if you want to be somewhere close to your existing home, that is the closest land available, unless you buy private land."

I do not know whether hon. members sitting behind the Government are satisfied with such an unsatisfactory state of affairs in an electorate like mine, located in the centre of the South-West, with an assured rainfall, and which has produced a very considerable amount of wealth for the State in the form of export income. I do not know if we are being asked to regard that area as being fully developed. The people in it do not regard it as such.

Surely they know more about that land than others! Surely it should be possible to enable people who at present have small acreages, and who have children growing up and willing to carry the burden of the parents, as it were, to expand to the point when two incomes can be derived from the property instead of one! Surely any land settlement policy which is worth while would make provision for such people!

But there is nothing in the amendment before us which indicates the least awareness on the part of the Government of the necessity to assist those people. I consider them to be worthy of being assisted—every bit as much as the Chase Syndicate and others. Ultimately those people will become the best farmers in the district.

I would suggest to the Minister that he inspect the Newlands area in my electorate, where many small farmers have started off on five or six acres. They have received no assistance. All they had to start off with was the land, and they had to pay for it. Had the land been given to them by the Government, how much better off would the State be with their increase and continuity of production, thus bringing in money from overseas.

Surely the Government must realise the value of those people to the State, and surely the Minister should give some recognition to that aspect of land settlement in the amendment he has moved! Surely he does not expect the House to agree without any protest whatever to his amendment, in view of the obvious omissions of the Government! For reasons which I have made fairly clear, I oppose the amendment.

THE HON. D. BRAND (Greenough—on amendment) [8.20]: Mr. Speaker—

THE SPEAKER: I notice the Minister for Lands was on his feet. I might point out for his benefit that he has no right of reply. He has spoken to the motion and

has moved an amendment. The standing Orders do not permit him to have a further say on the matter.

Mr. BRAND: I do not wish to say much more than what has already been said in opposition to the amendment of the Minister, which seeks to delete the subject matter of the motion moved by the hon. member for Vasse, with a view to inserting other words. I cannot understand why the Minister has not decided to deal with the motion on its merits. There is nothing wrong with the suggestion put forward in it. It merely calls on the Government to implement a land settlement scheme which, at present, does not exist; that is, a civilian land settlement scheme.

It would appear that the Government has no policy in respect to this matter. It is not until a motion of this nature is moved that the Minister brings forward the point that the House should, firstly, support the Government in its approach to the Commonwealth Government; secondly, support the efforts of the Government in making surveys and a reclassification of certain areas of Crown land; and thirdly, support the practice of advertising our land in the Eastern States.

Those are three points which every Western Australian takes for granted. In the course of his ordinary administration, any Minister for Lands would do this. The fact that that was all that the Government had done was the reason why the hon. member for Vasse and others on this side of the House stressed the point that there is not in existence a worth-while civilian land settlement policy in the State.

Mr. Kelly: All of them have hopped on the band waggon.

Mr. BRAND: Not at all. The Minister said that because a motion had been moved in respect of a land settlement scheme, or the need to settle and develop land, hon. members were hopping on the band waggon. The motion before us is no more related to an attempt to hop on the band waggon than was the motion moved by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches in relation to the proposed beach trust. In fact, it is no more related in that manner than some of the motions which the Minister for Lands moved when he was on this side of the House. Time and time again motions have been moved which were related to some topic before the people of this State or the Commonwealth. To call that hopping on band waggons, is a poor way for the Minister to describe such action.

The topic before us is one in which we are all interested. Land settlement seems to be relegated to the background, with all the tumult and shouting that is going on at present about attracting secondary industries here. However, it is still a fundamental need in respect of the development of the State.

Mr. Kelly: Would you double the output of wool at the present?

Mr. BRAND: If it is at all possible, I feel sure that every sensible producer will endeavour to increase the production per sheep, or to carry more sheep on the land already developed.

Mr. Bovell: Of course the producer would!

Mr. BRAND: In doing that, the producer will be helping to reduce the cost of production, which is so high at present. The Minister cannot deny that. Surely he does not think that hon. members in this House believe there is no need to maintain a steady increase in the production of primary industries—of wool, butter, wheat, or other commodities.

I do not know whether the Minister realises this, but Sir Douglas Copland has pointed out, in the "Australian Insurance Journal", that the population of Australia is increasing by $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. annually. He went on to say that, if this increase continues, Australia will double its population in 30 years; therefore there is an urgent need to grow more wheat and to produce more wool, even if it is only to meet our local needs, apart from the fact that the world's population is increasing rapidly.

The United Nations Demographic Year Book for 1957 states that the population of the world in 1957 approximated 2,700,000,000 people. It points out that in 1950, or seven years previously, the figure was 2,400,000,000; therefore it increased 300,000,000 over seven years, or an annual increase of approximately 1.6 per cent.

It is therefore of real interest to this new country of Australia—and in particular to Western Australia, as it is so close to the vast Asian countries across the ocean—to produce more and more food, if the population of the world is to increase at that rate in the future. Indeed the standard of living of those countries will increase at the same time, and that will no doubt bring about a greater demand for more and better food. Why should not Western Australia—which has vast areas—get in on the ground floor and be prepared to take this market by continuing with a steady progressive land settlement scheme?

In this motion we are not advocating that such a policy should be a tight land settlement scheme controlled by the Government. We advocated, in the several points put forward, that the Government should do all in its power to help the people who, in the first place, are already established on the land—particularly those who have established themselves through their own means and initiative in the last few years.

I might point out to this House that in the great call for land settlement between 1929 and 1933, when the motto was, "Go on the land young man!"—with dire consequences to a number of them—a great deal

of work was done on the land. I can think of areas which I know so well around Northampton, Mullewa, and along the Wongan line, where the life work of farmers was put into the development of their farms.

Because they had insufficient finance to carry on, these experienced farmers had to walk off their properties and leave their all behind. In many cases other persons took over the properties later on, and the Government of the day was prepared to write down the debt due to the Agricultural Bank and to other Government institutions which had loaned the money for development. So the newcomer had the benefit of the work that had already been done. However, the newcomer established himself and he progressed because finance became available.

We do not want to see original settlers walking off again. The young people who are going out to the land west of the Midland line, around Esperance, Boyup Brook, and other parts of the State—whether they be dairy farmers, wheat producers, wool producers or others—should be assisted. It is the responsibility of the Government to put forward a policy of rendering financial assistance, in order that those who are prepared to work and put everything into the development of their land may be given assistance to maintain a steady increase in production, and finally to become independent, worth-while settlers.

Those are the points I want to bring before the House. I feel very disappointed when the Minister, by virtue of the Government majority in numbers in this House, says in effect that this motion is too embarrassing for him and that he will skid around it by deleting words and putting others in their place. Any worth-while policy or alternative suggestion would be readily accepted. It is a very weak approach for the Government to put forward, as a worth-while point for land settlement, that we advertise our land in the Eastern States. That is a really worth-while gesture!

While on that subject I believe, along with other hon. members who have spoken—not only tonight, but previously—that the Government should concentrate on survey and subdivision of first-class and second-class land which is available; on the survey of roads; and on the expenditure on roads, of some of the funds which are being so freely spent in the metropolitan area. This should be done so that the settlers can establish communication and have adequate transport facilities in their pioneering of the settlement areas.

After that the Government can advertise anywhere it likes, and it will find an upsurge of interest. We should satisfy every worthwhile applicant who has the means to develop the land; until then, we should

be surveying and pressing on with this aspect which has been suggested in the motion before us.

I do not intend to speak any longer. I just wished to add those few words, and when I sit down, no doubt the hon. member for Subiaco will make a very worthy contribution. I hope I have made the House realise that we are not putting up any wildcat scheme but a worth-while one which, if implemented, would ensure the progress of the development of the land of Western Australia which, in the first place, must be developed and settled before secondary industries, which are very important to our economy, can be established to the extent that we would wish them to be.

Mr. Kelly: You are speaking without any knowledge at all of what is happening in the State when you say that.

Mr. BRAND: I am speaking as one of the hon. members who represent a very large area of the agricultural land.

Mr. Kelly: A settled area!

Mr. BRAND: What about the land west of the Midland line?

Mr. Kelly: They have settled down there too!

Mr. BRAND: At the end of 1952 and the beginning of 1953 there were about 22 to 24 blocks west of Coorow which were surveyed by the previous Government. They were taken up by various people who have made some progress there; but because of the problems associated with the development of light lands, quite a number of them have had to suspend their operations and others have been forced to walk off the land because of the lack of finance.

There are some still battling on, and some whose cases I have taken to various financial institutions—and, indeed, to the Rural and Industries Bank. Whilst the Rural and Industries Bank has been sympathetic and helped to some extent, these men are being hamstrung in their operations because of lack of finance, and if the Minister suggests that I do not know what I am talking about, I would put him in the picture with a great deal of gusto if I thought he would do anything about it.

Mr. Bovell: The Government's amendment does nothing for these people.

Mr. BRAND: It just whistles around the corner of the problem and makes a wee noise whereas the Government should get cracking on what is a serious problem. The hon. member for Albany laughs. He has nothing to laugh about.

As a matter of fact, he has problems in his own area, and he should be very seriously considering the future of the farmers there. They will face many difficulties,

as he pointed out to us tonight. The price of wool has fallen, so that the future is not so bright for them, and he should not be hopping on the band waggon so much with the Minister for Lands, because he has been told to, but should get cracking on the Government and point out that we need finance to help these men on the land so that they will increase primary production in Western Australia.

MR. POTTER (Subiaco—on amendment) [8.34]: I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is clairvoyant or whether he has just put up a challenge to me; but I am not going to speak on land settlement generally, because if I did I would be entertaining hon. members for half the evening. I am going to speak on the terms of the motion.

Mr. Brand: That would not be land settlement generally at all.

Mr. POTTER: It is, as a matter of fact, precisely so. The Leader of the Opposition has, of course, chided the Minister for Lands on one or two points in relation to his motion, but I think the terms of that motion are fairly wide. He speaks about the need for advertising in the Eastern States, as does the hon. member for Vasse in his motion, and I must congratulate—or rather commend—the hon. member for Vasse for having brought that motion to the House. It does at least show he is very interested in the subject; but I believe the submission of the motion was a glorious attempt to climb on the band waggon after a statement had been made by the Minister for Lands at a recent congress of soldier land settlers. In order to climb on that band waggon and to more or less ingratiate himself and his party with the primary producers in the country, he came forward with this particular motion.

I suggest that the Government is doing all that is practicable, taking into consideration all the factors, and the finance that is available. We do not, as the hon. member for Blackwood has pointed out, put all our eggs in one basket. The reason for this is that we must not devote all our money and efforts to any particular type of land settlement, because we might find that in many aspects it was not sufficiently diverse in character.

For instance, there are the tinned fruit industry, fruit growing and—in the district of the member for Albany—possibilities in regard to growing vegetables for canning. All these industries could be developed and the products shipped overseas. In addition, there are many seasonal crops in our northern areas which are marketable here and overseas.

Consequently, I consider that land settlement requires a much more comprehensive study than is suggested in the terms of the motion moved by the hon. member for Vasse. I reiterate that this is only an attempt to climb on the band

waggon and capitalise a statement made by the Minister for Lands at a meeting of the returned servicemen; and, also, certain whispers that have been circulated in regard to civilian land settlement. I suggest that although the Leader of the Opposition was not here, he should have been very much more enlightened on this particular motion before speaking. I support the amendment.

Amendment (to delete words) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—22

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Hall	Mr. Potter
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Toms
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Andrew

(Teller.)

Noes—14

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hearman	Mr. I. Manning

(Teller.)

Majority for—8.

Amendment thus passed.

THE HON. L. F. KELLY (Minister for Lands—Merredin-Yilgarn) [8.44]: I move—

That the following words be inserted in lieu of the words deleted:—

supports the policy of the Government in the stepping up of the tempo of land development by—

- (1) approaching the Commonwealth for financial assistance to establish a land settlement project between Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe;
- (2) the survey, classification and subdivision of new areas of virgin Crown land for individual settlement;
- (3) continuing the practice of widely publicising in the Eastern States of Australia, as well as in Western Australia, land offered for general selection, in order to attract capital investment for land settlement.

Point of Order.

Mr. Hearman: I would like some guidance from you, Mr. Speaker. If the amendment is agreed to, will I then be able to move a further amendment?

The Speaker: If the amendment is agreed to, the question before the House will be whether the motion, as amended,

should be agreed to. At that stage the hon. member could, if he wished, move a further amendment to the motion as amended.

Debate Resumed.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood) [8.47]: I move—

That the motion, as amended, be amended by adding after the word "settlement" the words "but regrets the lack of recognition on the part of the Government of the problems of—

- (1) settlers already endeavouring to establish farms outside any Government settlement scheme;
- (2) persons with knowledge of farming but lacking capital to start new farms;
- (3) the districts other than Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe requiring additional land settlement;
- (4) the need for a continuous policy of land settlement throughout the agricultural areas of Western Australia.

My reasons for taking this course should, I think, be obvious to the House after my previous remarks; because the motion, as amended, simply means that the House supports the policy of the Government regarding settlement in the Jerramungup and Ravensthorpe areas, but does not make any mention of settlement outside of those areas or of the need for financial assistance. It refers to the survey and classification of new areas—and we have no quarrel with that—and it talks about advertising in the Eastern States; but seems to me to give very little recognition to the problems that I outlined only a few minutes ago, in connection with the difficulties that confront people who wish to start new farms in areas other than those mentioned in the motion as amended.

I think it would be wrong for us to agree to a motion which virtually confines our interest in land settlement to specified areas, and takes no account whatever of the problems envisaged when the agency section of the R. & I. Bank was established. Surely, with the passing of a few years, we have not completely lost sight of the need to help people who require financial and other assistance to establish themselves! Surely the Government does not think it has solved its settlement problems in broad terms by means of a motion as narrow as this one! Surely it has a wider conception of the requirements of land settlement than the motion envisages! Surely, if we are to make a successful approach to the Commonwealth for money, we will have to show a wider recognition of the problems involved—and a readiness to grapple with them—than the motion, as amended, envisages!

Mr. Graham: If you were dinkum you would introduce a closer settlement Bill, and that would make plenty of land available.

Mr. HEARMAN: Perhaps, if the Government were dinkum, it would introduce such a measure!

Mr. Graham: You have a very short memory as to what your Government did when we, as an Opposition, tried to introduce such legislation.

Mr. HEARMAN: I think that if the Minister and his Government were dinkum they would bring down a Bill of that kind.

Mr. Bovell: How would we get a Message from the Governor to provide funds for it?

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister and members sitting behind him know that what I say is right. If the Minister is reduced to this sort of thing in an effort to defend his Government for its unrealistic approach to the matter, we have apparently plumbed the depths. If the Minister for Lands had not made the position bad enough, the Minister for Transport certainly has, by his interjection to the effect that if I were dinkum I would introduce a closer settlement Bill.

Mr. Graham: But you are the one who is making all the noise and all the complaints.

Mr. HEARMAN: I have some complaints, and I mentioned some of them earlier, in connection with the Forests Department. The Minister knows perfectly well that they were justified.

Mr. Graham: They were not.

Mr. Kelly: That is only your idea.

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister cannot refute the story I told. I do not know what the Government intends to do, but it would seem from the tenor of its interjections, that it will oppose the amendment and does not believe that the small man should be given a go at all.

Mr. Graham: We haven't even read the amendment yet! You haven't had the courtesy to supply the Minister with a copy of it.

Mr. Roberts: The Minister has a copy of it.

Mr. Graham: Yes; he received it ten seconds ago, and the motion has been on the notice paper for weeks.

Mr. HEARMAN: We did not know that the amendment moved by the Minister was to become the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEARMAN: It is certainly necessary to maintain some order. I do not think the Minister can claim to be taken by surprise, because the tenor of my remarks earlier this evening must have indicated my line of thought, and surely the

Minister had ample time, if necessary, to adjourn the debate or rephrase his amendment to embrace the suggestions I have put forward! If the Government decides to use its numbers to defeat this amendment, it will go on record as showing that it has no interest in assisting the small man to go on the land at all.

Mr. Graham: I think you are suffering from a bit of Country Party opposition.

Mr. HEARMAN: What a nice remark for the Minister to make! He can always get personal, as we know. We know it is an old trick of the Esplanade orator that when one is beaten in argument one can become personal in an endeavour to intimidate one's opponent. I might inform the Minister that people far more formidable than he have in the past endeavoured to intimidate me, but I am still here. The Minister can try to do it, if he wishes, and he can judge for himself how much success he is achieving. This question of descending to personalities is always the mark of one who has lost an argument.

The purpose of my amendment is to give some recognition to the difficulties that confront the battler—the little man. Is the Government interested in the little man? If it is not, it will defeat my amendment; but, if it is interested in him, it will agree to the amendment.

I do not propose to reiterate the arguments I put forward only a few minutes ago, as the Minister is quite clear as to what my thoughts on the matter are.

I quoted to the House a letter which indicates the treatment the battlers are receiving, and I believe we could expect better treatment for them from the Government if it is prepared to give them more assistance than is envisaged by the Minister's amendment.

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

Ayes—14

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hearman	Mr. I. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes—22

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Brady	Mr. Molr
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Hall	Mr. Potter
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Toms
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Evans

(Teller.)

Majority against—8.

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion, as previously amended, put and passed.

METROPOLITAN BEACH TRUST.*Introduction of Legislation.*

Debate resumed from the 3rd September on the following motion by Mr. Marshall:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early steps to introduce legislation to establish a metropolitan beach trust. To which the Minister for Lands had moved the following amendment:—

Delete the word "introduce," with a view to inserting the word "consider" in lieu.

MR. O'BRIEN (Murchison—on amendment) [9.1]: I support the amendment which the Minister has moved to the motion submitted by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches whom I commend for bringing it before the House. Over the years we have seen these beaches left in a poor state despite the fact that a great deal of money has been spent on their maintenance by the local authorities concerned. On occasions, especially following the winter months, one feels very sad to see the sand that has been carried away from the foreshore by the effects of the wind and the water. It would cost a great deal to implement the scheme outlined in the motion, but I think that if the scheme outlined in the amendment moved by the Minister is implemented it will prove to be a step in the right direction, because many of our beaches could be greatly improved.

The proposed scheme, if agreed to, will encounter many difficulties. Only recently I visited City Beach and saw there a front-end loader pushing back the sand that had been blown on the roadway during the winter months. One is often asked why the ocean is so near the shore. Well, the wild waves get wilder and they break on the beaches. They not only break on our metropolitan beaches but also on the beach at Broome, but by placing them under the control of a State instrumentality—

Mr. Cornell: You will not be creating a beach trust for Lake Perkolilli, will you?

Mr. O'BRIEN: No; and I do not intend to make an inland port of Lake Austin, either. However, if the House agrees to the amendment moved by the Minister, I am sure that the scheme outlined will prove to be successful. The motion now reads—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early steps to introduce legislation to establish a metropolitan beach trust.

The Minister has moved an amendment to strike out the word "introduce" and insert in lieu the word "consider." It is the amendment that I propose to support, but once again I commend the hon. member

for Wembley Beaches in bringing this motion before the House. The hon. member for Cottesloe and the hon. member for Bunbury have wonderful beaches in their electorates, but we hear nothing about them from those hon. members. However, we have a very reliable man in the hon. member for Wembley Beaches and we have a very reliable Government, which I support.

Amendment put and passed.

THE HON. H. E. GRAHAM (East Perth) [9.6]: On behalf of the Minister for Lands, I move an amendment—

That the word "consider" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. CROMMELIN (Claremont) [9.7]: I move an amendment—

That after the word "consider" the following words be inserted:—

ways and means whereby financial and technical co-operation between the Government and local authorities for the adequate preservation and development of beaches may be achieved without the creation of a further Government authority in the form of a beach trust and without reducing the powers, responsibilities and initiative of Local Government.

The object of inserting those words after the word "consider"—

Point of Order.

Mr. Graham: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I seek your guidance in this matter. The motion seeks the appointment of a trust—although there is a difference of opinion as to whether it should be a metropolitan trust or a State trust—but the amendment moved by the hon. member for Claremont expressly states that there shall not be a trust. It occurs to me that this constitutes a negative to the proposition that is already before us. Therefore, before the debate ensues on the amendment, I think we should have some clarification of that point. Accordingly, I ask for your ruling.

The Speaker: The motion before the House, as moved by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches, is as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early steps to introduce legislation to establish a metropolitan beach trust.

To this the Minister for Lands moved an amendment to delete the word "introduce" and insert in lieu the word "consider". I rule that the hon. member for Claremont is quite in order in introducing an amendment at this stage.

Debate resumed.

Mr. CROMMELIN: As I was about to say the intention of my amendment is to ensure that another statutory body is not formed. In other words, it seeks to ensure that the control and maintenance of our beaches is left in the hands of the local authorities concerned. The formation of a trust—whether it is constituted to cover the beaches in the metropolitan area or those spread right along our coastline—will mean, to a large extent, depriving the local authorities of the powers they now enjoy.

If my amendment is carried it will still give all local authorities—such as those suggested by the hon. member for Murchison—the right to request to have allocated to them funds and technical advice to establish and improve the beaches that come within their control. I cannot see why there should be any need for a Government instrumentality to be placed in control of the beaches. For some time most local authorities have had to face up to the fact that they are short of funds to improve their beaches. However, I feel certain that hon. members will appreciate that all local authorities are suffering from lack of finance.

It is not so very long ago that I was advocating in this House an easement in the allocation of traffic fees to local authorities. If that were done, it would prove to be of great assistance and relief to the various municipalities by making money available to them which could be spent on the improvement of the beaches that come under their control. All being well, it can be assumed that in about 18 months' time all local authorities will be free of having to contribute their share of the cost of conducting the spraying campaign against argentine ants. Once they are free of that commitment, the money that they are now contributing would help towards providing sufficient funds to improve and control the beaches.

In the various local authorities, different amounts are raised for contribution towards the argentine ant fund; and, in most cases, the rating is from 1*d.* to 2*d.* in the £. This brings in a substantial amount of revenue; and when this legislation is repealed, the money that is now raised can be diverted to the improvement of our beaches.

The fact is that, whether the Government establishes a trust or not, someone will have to assist the local authorities so that they may raise the standard and the quality of the beaches that come within their boundaries. It could be argued that these local governing bodies could obtain additional revenue by creating more parking areas, erecting changing rooms, and charging fees for their use, etc.; but there again, money is required to construct these facilities. I think everyone would prefer the Government to permit the local authorities to raise the money required in the

manner I have mentioned, because many local authorities have already shown what they can do to improve the metropolitan beaches.

I cite as an example the Nedlands municipality in particular, which is spending a large amount of money to improve the beaches under its control. That local authority is fortunate in being able to auction blocks of land from time to time, and the proceeds are being used for the improvement of its beaches. The same applies to the City of Perth which only last week conducted a sale of several blocks of land, and it is common knowledge that it intends to make great improvements to City Beach and other similar areas.

Mr. Heal: I hope you are right!

Mr. CROMMELIN: That is the information I have been given, and I think those improvements will be effected. Only a few days ago I read in the Press that the tourist trade in this State should be encouraged and fostered, and this evening I heard the Deputy Premier saying in the corridors what a wonderful opportunity there was in this State to establish and improve beauty spots to attract tourists. He has been overseas recently and seen the places that he has mentioned; and he said that if one were not an Australian, one would readily realise that there are no better beauty spots than exist in this State.

If funds were made available to the local authorities, it would be a wise move if they could co-operate with the Tourist Bureau to conduct a campaign to attract more tourists to this State, and also to improve the appearance of our beaches and, in general, help to improve the aspect of our tourist resorts and make them more attractive. More than ever I feel that the proposal put before the House is an attempt to some minor degree to suggest that the local authorities are not capable of improving their beaches. They are capable of effecting improvements provided they have the funds available; and they are anxious to do so.

I move this amendment with the hope that it will be carried; because if the Government is sincere, I feel it will render a lot of financial help to the different local authorities to give them an opportunity to show they are capable of carrying out the work which needs to be done.

MR. MARSHALL (Wembley Beaches—on amendment) [9.17]: I desire to oppose this amendment, because it appears to me that the hon. member for Claremont is completely out of touch with the opinion of the local authorities concerned.

Mr. Brand: Quote them.

MR. MARSHALL: It appears to me that he must have his tongue in his cheek when he proposes to amend the motion in this

manner. Had he stopped at the word "achieved" in the fifth line, I might possibly have agreed to his proposition; but he goes on to say that local authorities do quite a lot in regard to the maintenance of beaches. I have gone to a considerable amount of trouble and have evidence that most of the local authorities concerned, particularly in the beach areas, want this trust.

Mr. Roberts: Is that from local authorities in the metropolitan area or throughout the State?

Mr. MARSHALL: It is evidence from responsible officers of local authorities, such as mayors and councillors.

Mr. Brand: Can you name them?

Mr. Roberts: Are they in the metropolitan area or State-wide?

Mr. MARSHALL: The motion is to establish a metropolitan beach trust.

Mr. Roberts: I am asking you a question.

Mr. Johnson: You are asking a silly question.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am referring to the metropolitan area.

Mr. Crommelin: Which local authorities?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Claremont should listen for a while. This is what the Mayor of Claremont had to say on the 26th February—

Mayor A. W. Crooks supported the scheme in principle. He said a Government authority was long overdue.

In view of the damage and neglect over the years it was unfair to ask an individual authority to bear the heavy expense alone.

The beaches were used by people from all over the State and it was a matter for strong Government backing. The suburbs with beach frontages would derive the greatest benefit and should therefore donate bigger amounts than those without.

Mr. Crommelin: That is only the opinion of the mayor. Who was he?

Mr. Heal: A mayor.

Mr. MARSHALL: This is the opinion of Mr. Gadsden, the mayor of Cottesloe—

Will be pleased to be represented at any meeting on the establishment of a trust.

This is the opinion from Fremantle—

Had agreed in principle to a trust. Beach repair should be a State responsibility.

Then we have the opinion of Mr. J. A. Smallman, secretary of the Mosman Park Road Board—

Strongly in favour of a beach trust. Secretary J. A. Smallman said that the board had no sea beach but was willing to contribute.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They are not now. Mr. Brand: Quote Gifford.

Mr. MARSHALL: This is the opinion of the Peppermint Grove Road Board—

Supported a beach trust proposal submitted to it recently by the L.G.A. Secretary Tom Wardley believed that it would also support the Marshall scheme if it included river beaches.

The board was involved in considerable expense of maintaining its river picnic beach which was used largely by people from other suburbs.

The Wanneroo Road Board also fully supports the proposition. So it is no good the hon. member for Claremont saying that no opinions have been expressed.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What about the City of Perth?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Claremont can look at letters on file from individuals. This is what Councillor Harvey had to say—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What about the Perth City Council?

Mr. MARSHALL: Councillor Harvey said—

... Cr. C. L. Harvey told the Cottesloe Municipal Council last night ... a levy of 1d. in the £1 on all municipal council and road board rates should be made throughout the State. This rate should be sufficient to maintain all ocean and river beaches in W.A.

He said that Cottesloe, with a beach front of two and a half miles and 3,000 ratepayers, could not find the money to provide the bathing facilities and other amenities necessary for city people and country holidaymakers.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He is right in part.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have given the opinions of many people associated with local government in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What about the Perth City Council?

Mr. MARSHALL: I will come to that presently.

Mr. Nalder: How much money does he anticipate getting?

Mr. MARSHALL: No figures have been shown to me.

Mr. Nalder: It is only guesswork.

Mr. MARSHALL: That might be so.

Mr. Brand: It is as sound as the whole proposition!

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Katanning has raised an interesting point. The hon. member for Claremont indicated that the money from the sale of land at City Beach was going to be used to improve the beach. I would like him to hear a few comments of the City Beach ratepayers in regard to what has been done there over the years. I will not read the lot, but just a few extracts. If hon. members want to read them all later on, they can do so. The comments are as follows:—

People in City Beach live here because it has aspects pleasing to them—they have bought land in this area and built homes on it to live and rear families, not as a speculation—and most of those who have built homes are still living in them.

It is considered that much greater development could go forward in the district as a whole. To those who would quote older parts of the council's provinces, such as Victoria Park, which subscribe a far greater proportion of the total rate revenue by reason of which they should receive pro rata greater improvements, it is pointed out that this and other suburbs are well established and take for granted amenities which City Beach can only expect (at the present observed rate of progress) in the distant future.

Roads in the City Beach residential section are narrow and poorly maintained. Many are breaking away at the edges and are gradually being washed away. Some roads have bumps in their surfaces, one even has a dip so deep that a whole car can disappear from the normal level to reappear again on an intersection, providing an ever-present danger to children playing in the area. Almost all the roads require proper kerbing of timber or concrete. As the roads are so narrow an accelerated foot-path construction programme is essential.

For years, residents, through the progress association, have asked for re-surfacing and straightening of the boulevard between the golf links and the beach. That the section out to the links was re-surfaced for the benefit of golfers, and no doubt the Drive-in theatre, leaving the worst section which directly serves residents of the north end of City Beach, served as a clear indication of the council's disinterest in City Beach as a residential area. The City Beach Progress Association have been assured

for a number of years that this work is "to be placed on the coming year's estimates."

A common practice of some councillors when turning aside direct queries is to state that thirty, forty or fifty thousand pounds has been spent on City Beach. This introduces a subject which many felt has been overdue for consideration. That is the divorce of the beach from the residential area.

Estimates for City Beach include the beach maintenance, construction and maintenance of roads to and from the beach, lighting, ranger services and possibly many other items. These are not primarily for the convenience of City Beach residents, but for the convenience of every ratepayer in the metropolitan area and indeed Western Australia, and should be so considered by the Council. Amenities for the beach are not and never have been amenities for the residents of City Beach.

That is what the people of City Beach think about Mr. Green's remarks.

Mr. Crommelin: Read about the Nedlands Municipality.

Mr. MARSHALL: We have the report published in "The West Australian" of the referendum submitted by Town Clerk Green to a council meeting. These are not my ideas. He informed me that the Perth City Council accepted its full responsibilities for the development of beaches under its control. I have seen the development of City Beach over a period of 35 or 36 years, particularly the area between the Perth Road Board area and the Swanbourne rifle range, and I am sure nobody could tell me of any developments of significance during that period.

When I had a discussion with Mr. Green as to how City Beach development would be financed, I asked him some pertinent questions. I think now is the time to answer, because at that time negotiations were going on in regard to the Empire Games. It is pertinent to make reference to what Mr. Green had to say in the Press on the 5th of April this year, when the City of Perth was being asked questions by ratepayers as to how the games would be financed. Mr. Green had this to say—

If the 1962 Empire Games were held in Perth, the cost to Perth City Council ratepayers would be 0.45d. in the £. for every £100,000 the council raised in loans, Town Clerk Green said yesterday.

The State Government had already assured the council of a grant of £150,000 and it was not expected that the Commonwealth Government would offer less than that.

Consequently if the council spent £ for £ with the two Governments, the Council loan rate would require an additional 1½d. in the £.

It appears to me that if the residents in the Perth city area have to finance the Empire Games it is very remarkable that we get any objection to the financing of a beach trust. Mr. Green voiced his objection when he said that a beach trust could not be financed. Yet he will charge the ratepayers who come within the jurisdiction of the City of Perth 1½d. in the £ to finance the Empire Games. His objection falls to the ground.

I strongly object to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Claremont on the grounds I have mentioned, and I am sure he is not speaking for the local authorities concerned in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Crommelin: You have not told me about the Nedlands municipality.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—on amendment) [9.30]: I think the proposition contained in the amendment is a much better and more logical one, and is more conducive to getting quick results than is the proposition contained in the motion put forward by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches. As I see the position, both propositions seek the same end. Each of us is desirous that some start should be made in connection with tackling the problems associated with the preservation and conservation of our beaches. It is the means of achieving that end-result which is in dispute.

The hon. member for Wembley Beaches pointed out that the best means would be to establish some form of Government trust that would operate in the interests of controlling, maintaining and developing the beaches. The hon. member for Claremont puts forward the proposition that ways and means to achieve this preservation should be found whereby financial and technical co-operation, between the Government and the local authorities, would be achieved without the creation of a trust and without destroying any of the powers and initiative of local government itself. I feel sure it would be far cheaper to adopt the proposal contained in the amendment.

One of the principal objections which a great number of the local authorities have to the formation of a trust is that it would mean the formation of a body which would increasingly grow; and the expense of the trust would impose a great financial strain on the general funds raised in the taxation form that has been outlined. In short, it would appear that a great part of the funds raised would go down the administrative drain without one penny being spent on beach maintenance, improvement, or local authorities.

Mr. Marshall: It would all go back to the local authorities.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is pointed out that it would be far better to try to fall in line with local government by giving technical advice and making some small financial arrangement with the local authorities whereby they could assist themselves. During this debate, we have been told that the Nedlands Municipal Council has actually begun a worth-while scheme for the development of the beach area under its control.

Mr. Marshall: It had that plan 30 years ago.

Mr. Crommelin: It did not have the plan 30 years ago.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The hon. member for Wembley Beaches could well pay regard to the vociferous interjection made by the hon. member for Claremont. The plan has actually been commenced. The Perth City Council also has a proposal, and it has already begun to develop the beaches under its control.

Is it not much more logical and sensible to help local government to do this sort of thing without imposing upon the Government a trust, and the financial responsibility of looking after this matter? We all know, whether we happen to be on this side of the House or the other, that once a Government instrumentality is set up, it inevitably seems to fatten upon itself and grow at purely administrative expense.

The question we have to deal with is the best way of achieving the end of properly developing our beaches; and the best means of achieving this lies in the proposition outlined by the hon. member for Claremont. So I support the amendment.

On motion by the Hon. H. E. Graham (Minister for Transport), debate adjourned.

STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [9.36] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is divided into three sections, and its meaning is clear to all hon. members. I wish, however, to explain the points that are included in it. The first amendment deals with the appointment of a member representing rural interests. The second one is for the purpose of having an inspector or officer of the board wear a distinguishing band on his hat so that he may be easily recognised as an officer of the board. The third amendment is to clarify the position as to the rights of a producer to carry goods in his own vehicle from one property owned by him to another property owned by him. Section 5 of the Act states—

The board shall consist of three members, one of whom shall be a Government official, one representing rural

industries, and one city interests, but none of whom shall be financially interested in any form of transport service or contract.

My amendment deals with the person representing rural industries. I feel that the Farmers' Union represents probably most of the rural dwellers. The amendment suggests that the representative of the rural industries should be appointed from a panel of three names submitted to the Minister by the Farmers' Union. The Minister would choose from that panel the person whom he feels would be able to represent the country dweller.

This is quite a good suggestion, and it will have the support of most country people. The Farmers' Union is represented practically throughout the whole of the State because it has branches in all country districts. If the representative of the rural industries were chosen from such a panel as I have suggested, there would be a better understanding in the country areas because any points raised in different country communities, could be submitted directly to their representative who could bring those points before the board. This is a desirable amendment, and I hope the Minister and the House will agree to it.

The second amendment deals with the question of the inspector or the officer of the board wearing a distinguishing hat band. At the moment, on many of the main roads leading from the city to the country it is an ordinary occurrence to see an officer of the board sitting in his car. Even in the last few weeks I have, from the number plate on the car, recognised one of the board's officers. He sits in his car, just off the road, and time and time again I have seen him pull up trucks and question the drivers. Not every farmer recognises the transport officer. He has no distinguishing badge, except, I understand, that at the moment he produces a badge from under the lapel of his coat. An officer of the board should have a distinguishing badge that could be readily seen by the person that he wishes to question.

Mr. Graham: Would you suggest the same thing with regard to potato board inspectors and vermin board inspectors?

Mr. NALDER: I would have no objection. I feel that an officer of any department should have a distinguishing badge so that when he questions a person that person will know who is questioning him.

Mr. Graham: Would that apply to a fruit-fly inspector?

Mr. NALDER: Yes.

Mr. Bovell: What happens now?

Mr. NALDER: Section 49, Subsection (2) of the Act provides—

If such person fails to produce any such document within 24 hours, or refuses to state his name and address,

or states a false name or address, or refuses to permit an inspection to be made of the public vehicle, or of the load carried thereon, or refuses to give information in respect to the load carried, or gives false information, he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Mr. Graham: What difference does a hat-band make to that?

Mr. NALDER: The hat-band would have on it the words, "authorised by the Transport Board." If the Minister has a look at the Bill he will see that it says—

A hatband bearing in large and conspicuous capital letters "Authorised by the Transport Board".

Mr. Graham: What colours do you suggest he should have? The East Perth colours?

Mr. NALDER: I would be quite happy about that; the Minister's suggestion has my full support.

Mr. W. Hegney: Do you think the hat-band should have the full words or only the initials?

Mr. NALDER: The Minister is starting to split straws, and he is renowned for that. If he wants to abbreviate the words, I am quite happy about it, so long as the officer concerned, whether he be a Milk Board inspector, a fruit-fly inspector, or any other inspector, can identify himself when he stops a person on the road. I am not suggesting that the Minister for Education should have a distinguishing hat-band, although sometimes I think it would be advisable.

Mr. Jamieson: Wouldn't it be better if the man had some sort of official cap rather than a hat-band?

Mr. NALDER: It looks to me as if some of the hon. members who have been interjecting agree with the principle contained in the Bill; therefore it will not be necessary for me to weary the House any further on this matter.

Mr. Graham: You may be deluding yourself into believing that it will be accepted.

Mr. NALDER: It seems, from the interjections that have come from hon. members on the Government side, that they agree with the amendment in principle.

Mr. Graham: You might believe that from my interjections, but you could be wrong.

Mr. Roberts: The private hon. members sitting behind the Government will probably change their minds when the Minister gets on to them.

Mr. NALDER: The next amendment is an important one. It is an amendment to the First Schedule, and its aim is to clarify the position of primary producers. Only

recently I was approached by a farmer who owns a property in my electorate, and also another property not far from Perth. From time to time he finds it necessary to transport various articles and requirements from one farm to the other, and in the past he has been in the habit of going to the Transport Board and getting a permit.

From my interpretation of the Act there is no need for him to do that; but to be on the safe side, he has been asking for a permit for the past 18 months, and he has been getting it. But about a fortnight ago he approached the board for a permit and was refused. No reason was given; but, because he did not want to break the law, or run the gauntlet, he sent the items that he wanted—just a small quantity—by rail.

What a ridiculous situation that is! Surely we should make the matter very clear so that there will be no doubt that if a farmer wants to convey any of his requirements from one farm to the other he should not have to come to the city to get a permit to do so!

Mr. Graham: Who said he had to do that?

Mr. NALDER: What?

Mr. Graham: Come to the city to get a permit.

Mr. NALDER: He has been doing that rather than run the risk of being held up and asked to give an explanation. He has been going to the Transport Board for 18 months, and on each occasion has been given a permit.

Mr. Graham: Because it suited his convenience to come to Perth.

Mr. NALDER: On this occasion, because he saw a different officer, he was refused a permit. The amendment in the Bill is aimed at making the position clear for all time. There is no alteration to the Act; it simply clarifies the position. Where a farmer owns a farm in one part of the State, and he wants to carry farming implements, machinery or requisites from that property to another property he owns in some other part of the State, in his own vehicle—not a hired vehicle—he should be permitted to do so without breaking the law. I hope the Minister will give consideration to these amendments, and I have much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. H. E. Graham (Minister for Transport), debate adjourned.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [9.52] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill which seeks to make a change—and not a very big one—in the

licensing arrangements at the Perth Airport. It goes almost without saying that any Bill which becomes an Act, or is incorporated into an Act, subsequently requires some amendment; and so it is with the recent licensing legislation having to do with the Perth Airport. It appears that after approximately 12 months' operation of the amendments to the Licensing Act under which a licence was granted to the Perth Airport, the officers of the Department of Civil Aviation, whose responsibility it is to administer and supervise this portion of the Act, say that it is desirable that the Act be amended to permit the catering and bar concessions to be let independently.

At present the words "on the licensed premises" in the Act mean that the bar and catering concessions must be held by the one person, and that is the licensee. Reference to the parent Act reveals that an airport licence authorises the licensee to sell liquor on the licensed premises to passengers and their friends, officials, and to any person being served with a meal on the licensed premises in a room set aside for that purpose. Those words "on the licensed premises" mean that the two concessions must be let together and held by the one person. The amendment in the Bill, which I think is a desirable one, will permit the two concessions to be let independently.

The Bill provides that in lieu of the words "on the licensed premises" the words "at the airport" be substituted. Actually it could be construed that there is no necessity for the insertion of the words "at the airport"; but one does not know what will happen in the future in regard to building at the airport, and subsequent building may make a further change necessary unless those words are incorporated. The draftsman, and the officers at the airport responsible for looking after this section of the Act feel that the words are necessary, and they have been included.

That amendment is the first and principal one in the Bill. The second amendment is a minor one and actually only tidies up a proviso to the section to which I have just referred. It will make the hours during which liquor can be served during meals conform much more closely to the hours set aside in the parent Act. At present the section which in my opinion requires amending reads that liquor may be served to a person in a room set aside for the purpose at the airport if the liquor is drunk or consumed with the meal and—then follow the words that need amending—

- (ii) the meal is served during the hours prescribed by the Licensing Court as those during which meals shall be obtainable on the premises.

It has been found in practice that the Licensing Court has been somewhat at a loss to set aside hours when meals should

be served. Hon. members will readily appreciate that aircraft movements at times cannot be confined to certain set hours, and meal times frequently have to be altered. As a result we find the anomalous position that, with permission for liquor to be consumed with meals at the airport having been granted, and the Licensing Court having set certain hours, passengers who arrive after the hours set down are precluded from getting liquor with their meals.

My amendment would tidy that matter up and make the section read that liquor can be served with a meal during the hours specified in a previous portion of the parent Act—hours that have already been agreed to.

As regards the first and more important amendment, I have summed up the position in five reasons why I consider the change is a desirable one. The first reason is that experience has shown those responsible for the letting of concessions feel that management and control problems would be bettered, and much simplified by the splitting of the catering and bar concessions. The Bill will go a long way towards getting better management and control.

The second reason is that it is felt the licensee should be required to give greater personal attention to the operation of the bar at busy times, in order to ensure its proper conduct, its strict control and full supervision. At present the licensee's attentions are unavoidably confined to the dining room during the busy hour. The splitting of the concessions would enable greater personal attention to be given to the bar at busy times.

The third reason is that circumstances may occur—indeed, they have occurred—where one person is found to be unsuitable for the operation of both concessions. It could easily happen that one person would be unsuitable to operate both the bar concession and the catering concession. Past history has already proved that to be so.

If that does prove to be a fact, it is impossible to discharge a man from one concession, because he controls both; and it is not desirable. If a man is satisfactory on the catering side, it is in the best interests of all concerned to try to retain him on the catering side. But if he does not prove to be suitable on the other side, then those responsible for administering the licence find they cannot discharge him from the one without discharging him from the other. The Bill will enable discrimination to be made between those two concessions.

The fourth reason is that the Department of Civil Aviation desires a separate concession in order, as it says, to enable better control and more efficient and businesslike management; it will help it to realise a better financial interest for the department than has been the case up to

this point. That is an admirable proposition, as far as we are concerned. It is excellent that a Government department should endeavour to run its affairs in a more businesslike and economic way. The last reason is one that may take a little explanation.

Up to the present time, Qantas Airline has practically operated the dining room at the Perth Airport; but, in the very near future, the Department of Civil Aviation is to take over all the assets of the dining-room from Qantas Airlines. In this way the current agreement that exists between Qantas and the dining room concessionaire will lapse. It will lapse when the Department of Civil Aviation takes over. When this change-over takes place tenders will be called, on an Australia-wide basis, for the dining room and bar concessions. If the Act remains as it is, it seems probable that a very large hotel combine from the Eastern States may be able to tender so low as to be granted the concession for the dining room and bar.

This hotel combine, I am told, is very much attracted to the proposition of tendering for these concessions because it desires to contact passengers, immediately on their arrival in Australia, and channel them to its chain of hotels in the Eastern States. If this Bill is passed and these concessions are let separately, they become small concessions—ones which can be tendered for in the most competitive fashion by individuals who seek to make a living wage, with a reasonable margin over and above that wage.

So my fifth reason is one that speaks for local products rather than in favour of the hotel combine from the Eastern States taking over the catering concessions at the Perth Airport. I would emphasise that the change-over will take place; that the Department of Civil Aviation is taking over from Qantas and the dining room concessionaire in a comparatively short space of time. Those are the five reasons which, when summed up, will show the necessity for this change at the present time. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke (Premier), debate adjourned.

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

MR. MARSHALL (Wembley Beaches) [10.8] in moving the second reading said: This Bill seeks to amend Section 126 of the Local Courts Act. Section 126 makes provision for the exemption of a certain amount of wearing apparel, furniture and other items, from seizure under an award of execution. Since the Act was introduced in 1904 there has been only one amendment to this section; that took place

in 1938. The present proviso in Section 126 provides that the following goods shall be protected from seizure:—

Wearing apparel of such person to the value of £5; of his wife to the value of £5; of his family to the value of £2 for each member thereof dependent on him; bedding to the value of £10; household furniture to the value of £10; implements of trade to the value of £15; and family photographs and portraits.

The Bill seeks to give greater protection than is provided at present by substituting for the above list of exemptions the amendment contained in the measure. As I have mentioned, there has been no amendment to this section since 1938, which is approximately 20 years ago. If one considers the change in money values that has taken place in this period, it will be obvious that the section needs some drastic overhaul.

However, quite apart from this aspect, I put it to the House that the time has arrived for a more humane attitude to be adopted in this matter of protecting families' household effects. Over 100 years ago or so, if a man got into debt he was put in prison and kept there until his debt was paid. Over the years, however, a more humane attitude has been adopted towards debtors, the majority of whom get into debt through misfortune, unemployment or ill-health.

But once a court has given a person a judgment against another the plaintiff can enforce his judgment by various means as follows:—

(a) Judgment summons, whereby the debtor is examined as to his affairs and ordered to pay so much per week in accordance with his means.

(b) Warrant of execution, whereby his goods or land can be seized or sold.

(c) Garnishee proceedings, whereby his bank account, or money owing to him can be attached and paid to the plaintiff.

It will be seen, therefore, that the warrant of execution is only one way of enforcing a judgment. If this Bill is carried it will give protection only to a man's bare necessities in the way of furniture, etc.; it will not protect anything over and above a value of £150 in regard to the furniture, which is the main item. The wives and children must be considered, and surely it is reasonable that they be left with their beds, bedding and furniture to the value of £150. If these bare essentials of a family are protected, the plaintiff has a judgment summons, and a garnishee proceedings to use against a debtor if he so desires.

I submit it is nonsense for anyone to say that this Bill will make warrants of execution ineffective. Warrants can continue to be issued, and will be issued. The only

effect of this Bill is to protect the barest essentials, in the way of furniture, clothing and the bedding of a man and his family.

The proposal in this Bill will give protection in some small measure; and in view of the money values when the original legislation was passed, and those today, some consideration should be given to this matter. It is proposed, therefore, to increase this amount, as members will notice. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke (Premier), debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

MR. ROBERTS (Bunbury) [10.14] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is an Act to amend the Electoral Act 1907-1957. It was introduced in another place, amended there, and has now reached this Chamber. Hon. members will recall that last year considerable amendments were made to the Electoral Act, and two clauses amended Sections 94 and 95, relating to postal voting. Since those provisions came into force there has been a biennial election in the State and we have had an opportunity of seeing the new machinery in action. I feel confident that all hon. members will agree that a number of irregularities occurred. The Bill before us seeks to rectify some of the anomalies which have arisen. It is an honest attempt to rectify one particular anomaly that has cropped up since the amendment of last year.

Mr. May: You said it was an irregularity.

Mr. ROBERTS: In certain cases it was an irregularity in that a witness could not perform certain duties in the State and outside of the State. If the hon. member will be patient I shall explain the provisions of the Bill. It contains two slight amendments to Sections 94 and 95 of the Act. In order that hon. members may be aware of these two sections I shall read them out. Section 94, as repealed and re-enacted last year, now reads as follows:—

(1) The following persons are authorised witnesses within the meaning of this Division—

- (a) within the State—any person who is enrolled as an elector on a roll for a District;
- (b) outside the State and within the Commonwealth of Australia—any Justice of the Peace for any State of the Commonwealth; any member of the Police Force of the Commonwealth or of any State, any officer of the Public

Service of any State or of the Commonwealth employed in any State or Commonwealth Electoral Office; any legally qualified medical practitioner; any minister of religion; any postmaster or postmistress and any commissioned officer of the Naval, Military or Air Forces of the Commonwealth.

Section 95, as amended and re-enacted, reads as follows:—

(8) Where an elector is an inmate in an institution or is a patient in a hospital, which institution or hospital is prescribed by the regulations as one to which the provisions of this subsection apply, then notwithstanding any other provision of this Act a person shall not—

- (a) give to the elector an application form for a postal ballot paper;
- (b) witness the signature of the elector to the application form;
- (c) give to the elector a postal ballot paper;
- (d) be present when the elector indicates his vote on the postal ballot paper;
- (e) sign his name on the certificate on the envelope containing the postal ballot paper; or
- (f) take custody of or transmit to the Chief Electoral Officer the envelope containing the postal ballot paper;

unless authorised in writing by the Chief Electoral Officer to do so.

I feel that the qualifications required of a person to witness an application form for a postal vote outside of the State are rather ludicrous. A witness within the State for an application for a postal ballot form can be an elector on the roll of a district; in other words, if a husband and wife were on holidays somewhere within the State and desired to make application, they could obtain an application form, and each in turn witness the other's signature.

However, if those two people were outside the State they would have to get another person to witness the application for a postal ballot paper, and the witness has to be one of the following persons:—A justice of the peace, a member of the Police Force, an officer of the Public Service or Commonwealth Electoral Office, a medical practitioner, a minister of religion, a postmaster, a postmistress, or any commissioned officer in the armed forces.

I am sure that hon. members will agree that the amendment contained in Clause 2 of the Bill will rectify this position, because it will enable the husband and wife, when

outside of Western Australia, to make application for the required ballot papers. I do not think it would be possible for them to make application if they were outside Australia because in all probability they would not be able to obtain the necessary forms.

There are in existence many forms which need not be witnessed at all. When a person makes application for a Commonwealth-State rental home, the signature on the form need not be witnessed. I am of the opinion there is no real necessity to witness the signature on the application for a postal vote, but the Bill sets out that the form shall be witnessed.

I consider the provision in the Bill to enable an elector on the roll of a district to witness signatures while persons are travelling in other States of Australia is an excellent one; and I am sure all hon. members will agree.

A further amendment relates to Section 95 of the Act. During the last biennial elections some difficulty was experienced in getting persons to agree to become authorised officers to take postal votes in institutions and hospitals. Such a person had to be appointed by the Chief Electoral Officer. This meant that no member of a family visiting a sick relative in a hospital or an institution was able to take along an application form for a postal vote, or to witness the signature of the inmate. It happened that matrons in the hospitals were asked to become authorised officers. To my mind, that is wrong. I feel certain that if the Minister for Health was present he would agree that matrons of hospitals have many other duties to perform than to arrange for postal votes during elections.

Mr. Jamieson: They have many other duties than to supervise those who are party-political and who want to go into the institutions.

Mr. ROBERTS: The existing provision relates to an elector who is an inmate of an institution or a patient in a hospital, but the Bill deletes the reference to a patient in a hospital but still retains the institution. An amendment was submitted in another place by a member of the Government to retain the institution, and it was agreed to. My own personal view is that the reference to institution should have been deleted.

During the last biennial elections many electors were disfranchised because they were unable to obtain the necessary ballot papers and to have them witnessed. The hon. member for Beeloo well knows that the Chief Electoral Officer had difficulty in appointing an authorised person in the St. John of God Hospital, Subiaco, and some of his own officers had to carry out the duties required of an authorised person in that institution. The same thing could

happen in many other hospitals in the metropolitan area as well as in country districts where the matrons are too busy to carry out the duties of an authorised person. I think it is right they should refuse those duties, because they are not appointed to carry out the duties of the Electoral Office.

Mr. Bovell: In the country, the matrons have already a great deal to do.

Mr. ROBERTS: They have more than their fair share of work in country districts. I trust that hon. members will give serious consideration to the two small amendments in the Bill, because with them an opportunity will be given during the elections next year to persons desiring to vote by postal ballot, to do so early and with the least possible inconvenience. I commend the Bill to the House and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke (Premier), debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 9th October, 1958.

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :

State Building Supplies, Railway Royal Commissioner's report re combine of saw-millers	1357
Electricity supplies, power line from Perth central station to Serpentine	1357

BILLS :

Traffic Act Amendment, 1r.	1358
Health Education Council, report	1358
Supply Bill (No. 2), £18,000,000—	
2r.	1358
Com., report, 3r.	1375
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2r., defeated	1375

Page

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

STATE BUILDING SUPPLIES.

Railway Royal Commissioner's Report re Combine of Sawmillers.

1. The Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the interim report by Railways Royal Commissioner A. G. Smith, tabled on the 7th October, will the Minister inform the House—

- (1) Is it true that the State Building Supplies are part of a combine known as Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants of W.A.?
- (2) If the answer to No. (1) is in the affirmative, and as such association is against the original intention in setting up State sawmills, can the Minister say how long this state of affairs has existed?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) State Building Supplies is a member of Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants of W.A. Under its constitution the association has no power to fix prices binding on members.

(2) State Building Supplies has been a member of Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants since it was founded as Associated Timber Industries in January, 1948, other than from the 1st July, 1950, to the 20th October, 1952.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Power Line from Perth Central Station to Serpentine.

2. The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) In view of the answers given to questions on Tuesday, the 7th October, why then has the W.A.G.R. not constructed its own power line from central station, Perth, to Serpentine, in order to keep the "railway safe working lines free of general power supplies"?

(2) In view of the statement made in answer to a question on the 7th October that no detailed survey has been made by the State Electricity Commission of the Keysbrook-North Dandalup area, how was it possible to justify the answer to the previous question on the 7th October that the Keysbrook-North Dandalup request for power had been refused because the loads offering are small and the distances excessive?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) The answer to question No. (3) on the 7th October stated that the railway power line will be connected to a State

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.