not fair seeing that the matter being dealt with is a public asset. The Government should have placed before members the report received from Sir Ross McDonald and others so that it could be fully discussed before anything was done. I have received complaints about the Beam Bus service and a letter to the secretary of the W.A. Transport Board from the secretary of the Belmont Park Road Board reads as follows:—

6th February, 1952.

From time to time this board has received complaints of the poor service rendered by Beam Bus company in conducting the transport monopoly for this district. Lately the number and variety of complaints have increased. At the last meeting it was resolved to ask your board to enquire closely into this bus service with particular reference to the following items:—

(a) Poor mechanical condition of buses, including faulty brakes.

(b) Unclean state of buses generally.

(c) Numerous failures to adhere to timetables.

(d) Overcrowding of buses.

There is such widespread dissatisfaction that specific complaints are considered unnecessary.

The Board is also concerned that if the announcement in the "Daily News" dated 4th February is correct we can expect further deterioration of the service when the company dispenses with the services of a number of conductors.

The rapid development of this area and consequent increase in population obviously warrants an efficient transport service.

In August last, the chairman (Mr. R. H. Selby) of this board made personal representations to the Beam Bus company regarding the improvements desirable in the service here. The Acting Manager (Mr. Hebiton) gave assurance that the company was aware of the need and proposed many changes which would provide an efficient service and remove the cause of complaints. I am to state that in the past four months there has been a steady deterioration and this Authority asserts that the Beam Bus company is failing to provide a reasonable service to the people of the district.

The mechanical condition of some of the buses is such as to warrant immediate action in the interests of public safety.

(Sgd.) H. L. McGUIGAN—Secretary.

That gives an indication of the condition of the transport services operating in that area. The time is overdue for us to have one electoral authority. There are many new homes in the districts I represent and with an officer from the Commonwealth Electoral Department going round many people are in a quandary as to how they should enrol. One roll should be sufficient for both State and Commonwealth purposes and that system operates successfully in N.S.W. and some other States. There are other matters with which I wish to deal but I will mention them when speaking to the various items.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 13th November, 1952.

CONTENTS.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

NATIVE AFFAIRS.

As to Proposed Reserve, Success Hill.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER (without notice) asked the Minister for Transport:

When is it proposed that Success Hill Reserve at Bassendean be handed over to the Native Welfare Department or other organisation for purposes of a community centre or other such purpose?

The MINISTER replied:

There have been rumours reaching individual members of Cabinet that such a proposal is in the minds of some, but I would say it has not been discussed at Cabinet level, and, as far as I know, there is no intention of granting any such request.

COLLIE COAL.

As to Supply and Requirements.

Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the supply of coal from Collie sufficient to meet the daily needs of this State?

(2) Is it the policy of the W.A. Coal Committee to try to induce users of coal or coke, to use coke in preference to coal?

(3) What are the relative prices of—

(a) coke at depot;

(b) coal at depot?

(4) If the answer to No. (1) is in the affirmative, is it essential that allotments of coal to users be issued by the W.A. Coal Committee?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Supply of coal from Collie does not yet equal the demand.

(2) No.

(3) (a) Large coke, loose, £7 per ton; bagged, £7 10s. per ton. Grade cooker coke, loose, £7 5s. per ton; bagged, £7 15s. per ton.

(b) Amalgamated coal, 102s. 11d. per ton; Griffin coal, 106s. 9½d. per ton.

(4) Answered by No. (1).

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 2).

Introduced by the Minister for Transport.

2, Plant Diseases Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker in the Chair; the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Section 28A added:

Hon. G. FRASER: This clause deals with controlled-access roads and I thank the Minister for having tabled the plan. I had hoped that at this stage members who had perused the plan would state their conclusions based on it so that we could form a better opinion as to whether we should vote for or against the clause. It seems to me that all the backyards will face the controlled-access road and that another road will have to be built at the front of the houses.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is whether the clause is to stand as printed.

Hon. G. FRASER: I want members to express an opinion on it before it is agreed to. I repeat that it looks as though another road will have to be built at the front of the houses whose backyards will face the controlled-access road.

Hon. W. R. Hall: A right-of-way?

Hon. G. FRASER: No, another road, and that would add considerably to the expense of road-making.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: The plan was drawn to illustrate how the system might work under certain conditions and notes were prepared showing how it might work in practice. The idea of these roads is to afford fast traffic an opportunity of travelling freely from point to point, and it is presumed that settlements might spring up along such roads. They would have their own service roads to accommodate the traffic. In the case illustrated, there is the service road running parallel to the controlled-access or main road, and the strip between might be taken up by park land. The road would probably be built before settlements occurred along its route. Few people would desire their backyards to face the highway and most would probably have the choice of building elsewhere.

Hon. G. Fraser: It could happen.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Yes, but it is expected that as settlements develop they will have their own roads, and it is possible that there will be no road directly parallel with the highway. The plan shows that where possible angle roads and cross-roads are avoided. Instead of having a cross-road, there would be a road coming in at right angles in the form of a "T" at one point, and perhaps a little further on another road coming in from the opposite direction, also in the form of a "T." As a person travelled over the road, he would have to take into account only the traffic coming from one direction at a time. If, by reason of the nature of the country, there has to be a cross-road, the idea is to have a circus to regulate the flow of traffic, or traffic lights might be provided, if necessary. This follows the system in use in America, Britain and Germany and it has been found satisfactory and enables faster through traffic, with far less chance of accident.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I regret that I have not seen the plan that has been provided, but I visualised that these roads would be similar to Shepperton-rd., which runs parallel to Albany Highway.

The Minister for Transport: That is only a by-pass.

Hon. W. R. HALL: But it is a good idea, too, and Shepperton-rd. fulfils a great service and minimises the enormous amount of traffic that would otherwise travel along the main highway. The Bill is a step in the right direction, and if we do not make some progress we shall, for many years to come, be in the same boat as we are now. From the safety angle alone, these controlled-access roads and local-access roads will be a good idea. I am in favour of them, even though the scheme may involve the spending of a large sum of money.

Hon. G. FRASER: It appears that the motorists in the Chamber are not concerned about this question, and therefore I am prepared to agree with them. From the Minister's explanation, it appears that these roads will mainly be constructed in areas that have not been built up. That overcomes a good many of the objections I had when I first looked at the plan. I am always prepared to support anything that will be an improvement, and the only way to find out is to put the scheme into operation.

The Minister for Transport: This will not be an experiment; it has been tried and proved.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sir Charles Latham—Central) [3.25] in moving the second reading said: Members may recall that in 1946 an Act was passed to enforce the testing of cattle for T.B. The Government of the day started a fund by making a contribution of approximately £36,141 from the Treasury. That fund became known as the Dairy Cattle Compensation Fund. T.B. testing of cattle commenced in 1947, and up to the 30th June of this year, 100,375 cattle had been tested, revealing 7,310 re-actors, and compensation to the extent of £129,739 had been paid to the owners of the cattle.

When the Act was first passed, it was compulsory for dairymen to make a contribution to the fund but, for reasons which I do not desire to enumerate here, it was found impossible to force them to pay into it. Since then the fund has been continued on a voluntary basis. Dairymen who do not contribute do not receive any compensation, and a few dairymen are willing to carry their own insurance. The Government makes a £ for £ contribution to the fund. In the first two years, there was a heavy percentage of reactors. The first year, there were 2,964 reactors and £48,740 was paid in compensation. In the second year, there were 2,725 reactors, and £47,912 10s. was paid in compensation.

The fund became depleted in 1949 and the Treasury made a special advance of £10,000, which was subsequently repaid in 1951. For the year ended the 30th June, 1951, 25,758 cattle were tested, and 740 of them were reactors; a sum of £14,674 was paid in compensation. During last year, to the 30th April, 1952, 17,615 cows were tested, revealing 301 reactors, and £6,017 was paid in compensation. At the 30th April, 1952, the fund had a balance of £26,654, and practically all herds of licensed dairymen had been tested.

Hon. A. L. Loton: What recoupment was there in respect of those diseased or condemned beasts? The Government gets a certain amount of compensation back.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member will let me finish my speech, I will advise him of that later. The reactors are now becoming less in number, and the greatest number of reactors has been found in the metropolitan area. Results from the cattle feeding on irrigated pastures show that there are fewer reactors in those areas. Tests taken of cattle in the South-West coastal dairy area reveal only 2 per cent. reactors.

Due to the low incidence of disease and the large amount that has accumulated in the fund, contributions were reduced from ½d. to ¼d. in July of this year. When the parent Act was passed in 1946, cattle prices were as low as one-third of those ruling at present. Today it is doubtful if a really first-class cow can be purchased for less than £30. The law as it now stands provides that the maximum amount that can be paid in compensation is £20. I will now deal with the point raised by Mr. Loton. When a beast is condemned it is slaughtered and those parts that are affected by tuberculosis are removed and the rest, if passed as fit for human consumption, is sold and the proceeds obtained are credited to the fund.

Hon. A. L. Loton: I would like to know the amount if the Minister has it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have not, otherwise I would let the hon. member have the information. When tests are made, reactors are generally valued by arrangement between the veterinary officer and the dairyman. That is to say, we do not fix a standard price for all cows; they are, of course, valued. If it were not for the keen observations of our own officers, it would be possible for a man to go to the market, buy a wholemilk cow which subsequently, when tested, might prove to be affected. If the cow had cost the dairyman £15 or £20, he would receive the full compensation allowed.

The amendment included in the Bill before the House is for the purpose of providing increased compensation for cattle only. When the Bill was originally intro-

duced in another place, it allowed for payment of a sum not to exceed £35. However, another course was decided upon, and I will explain to members what actually happened. If the Bill had passed in its original form in another place, compensation would have been paid on the higher amount immediately the Bill was assented to. The amendment that was carried by another place passed over to the board, which is an outside body, the fixing of the amount of compensation to be paid out of the fund. The board has statutory powers, and the Government has no representation on it.

The Bill, as amended in another place, provides that the board shall determine, during the month of July in every year, the amount to be paid for compensation, which has to be approved by the Minister. The effect is that under the Act at the present time we could make no additional payments in excess of £20. I want to amend the Bill for two reasons and I want members to appreciate this point: Whatever right they have in another place—and I do not know how it escaped the attention of the Speaker—it has always been the practice that when Government expenditure is provided for in a Bill, the Government shall have sole right to determine the expenditure, by means of parliamentary authorisation.

In this instance we are to hand this right to an outside board, which might mulct any Government of a large amount of expenditure, without the Government having any say whatsoever and without even the approval of the Minister, who should have the right to approve or reject its authorisation. At one stage the fund was exhausted, and it would be natural for the board at such a time to seek to raise considerably the rate of contribution payable to the fund to meet the amount it anticipated would be required in the future. By that means 50 per cent. of the money provided by the Treasurer might be spent. The board would thus be usurping, in effect, the right of the Crown to determine what money should be taken from the Treasury for any purpose.

Members know that the introduction of a Bill authorising expenditure has to be preceded by a Message from the Governor recommending appropriation. I understand that you, Sir, have already received a certificate signifying that this Bill was introduced after a Governor's Message had been received. I want to make that plain because I am not anxious to establish a precedent in this House against a long established principle which has been in existence ever since King Charles authorised the raising of taxation.

In this instance, money cannot be found without taxation being imposed in one way or another. As it stands, the Bill gives the right to certain individuals to determine what money shall be raised and how it shall be spent, without any authority from Parliament, which is thus taking away from the Minister, the right to initiate expenditure on behalf of the Crown. For that reason I am anxious to see the Bill passed in the form that it was originally introduced. Before this legislation was enacted, if a diseased cow had to be destroyed, the owner suffered complete loss. Now, to safeguard the health of the people, the Government is making a substantial contribution to a fund, from which compensation payments are made to dairymen who suffer such losses. The amendment moved in another place means that the authority to appropriate revenue for this purpose will pass from ministerial control to a board.

This means the initiation of expenditure by an outside authority, which is adverse to the axioms of constitutional government, because the power of the purse has always been restricted to executive members of Parliament. For this reason I cannot approve of the Bill in its present form. The Bill as drafted originally fulfilled the Government's desire to pay increased compensation from the time of its assent. The Bill, as amended, delays the payment of the new compensation rate until any day between the 1st and 30th of July.

I am speaking on behalf of the Government when I say that, in order to correct a provision in the Bill to which it cannot agree, I propose to ask members to accept an amendment, which I propose to place on the notice paper, and to request another place to approve of it. I found the other day that cattle that were being sold varied from springers at £20 to milking cows costing up to £40, while young cows were sold at from £23 to £25.

Hon. F. R. Welsh: Where were they sold?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They are sold at Subiaco every Friday. I know that some people immediately they have an inkling that the cow is not healthy pass her in and, if they have any trouble, get rid of her as quickly as possible. That is one avenue by which to get rid of cows, for which subsequently we will have to pay compensation. I do not say that always happens, but it has been known to occur. The Bill was introduced in another place reasonably early in the session and for some time I have been trying to overcome the difficulty that has arisen with regard to the amendment.

Hon. A. L. Loton: What is your proposed amendment?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The purport of it is to restore the provision for the payment of compensation by the board to the extent of £35. I will have the amendment put on the notice

paper after the Bill has been read a second time, so that members may have an idea what it is all about. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [3.42]: It is somewhat difficult to enter into a debate of this nature on the second reading of a Bill when it has only just been introduced, and the Minister has intimated that he proposes to amend it. My interpretation of what he proposes to do makes me believe that we will contravene the Constitution. I do not want to raise any hares, but, on the other hand, I would not like to see the Bill returned as being obviously out of order. I would like to quote Standing Order No. 46 (2) which reads:—

> The Legislative Council may not amend Loan Bills, or Bills imposing taxation, or Bills appropriating revenue or moneys for the ordinary annual services of the Government.

So we have a reference there to Bills appropriating revenue. My contention is that immediately we amend the measure by providing for the payment of £35 as compensation, we appropriate revenue. As the Minister pointed out in his opening remarks, the Government pays £ for £ subsidy on the amount provided for the dairy people. I fail to see how we can amend it as he suggests. I am just as anxious as the Minister to see the dairy people get full compensation for cattle that are destroyed for the good of the community.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Can we request an amendment?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I do not think we can. I have discussed the matter with the Minister and he and I disagree on the question. I want the House to take the proper course; I want to do the right thing by the producers and see they get their full compensation in the quickest possible way. I do not know whether I am in order, Mr. President, in asking for your ruling at this stage as to whether the Minister was not out of order for not having given notice of what he proposed to do.

Hon. G. Fraser: You can only get a ruling when the amendment is moved.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I know the quandary in which the House finds itself, particularly as we know that the Minister desires the Bill to be proceeded with. If it is proceeded with and the Bill is ruled out of order, I do not know what action could be taken then.

The PRESIDENT: The Bill is in order at the present time.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Then that is the only way we can discuss it. After the Minister gave an intimation of what he proposed to do, a doubt was raised in my mind and I wanted to bring the point before the members of the House. If the Bill is in order at the present time, we have to find ways and means of overcoming the difficulty confronting us in not being able to apply the provisions of the Bill until after the 30th June next year. That means that £20 is the maximum amount that can be paid as compensation. I am sorry that the Minister was not able to give the amount the board had been able to secure by way of recoupments, as a set-off against the total amount of the compensation payments.

I think the Minister said that the Treasury did advance £10,000 one year, but the amount was repaid in the following year. The board's finance must have been rather buoyant last year when the rate of the levy was decreased from a farthing to an eighth of a penny. So it must have recouped itself out of the £10,000 the Treasury advanced the board during the period when a very vigorous and active testing of the dairy herds was carried out. It is unfortunate that all the cattle in the southern portion of the State were not included at the one time, because of the very active steps taken by the Department of Agriculture.

We are all very pleased to note the low number of reactors to the tests in the districts where the testing was first carried out. In some places where the condition of the herds was very bad, infection has totally disappeared and new herds have been established in areas further from the metropolitan area. The disease is practically wiped out. I am prepared to do all I can but, as I say, it is somewhat difficult at this stage. All we can do is to agree to the second reading of the Bill, and after the Minister's amendment has been put on the notice paper, I propose to raise the points I have already mentioned to the House.

On motion by Hon. H. K. Watson, debate adjourned.

BILL—UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [3.50]: I was surprised to find that the definition of "building" in the measure is to include not only a building but also the whole or part of its furnishings, fittings and equipment. That is an extraordinary definition to give of a building and it appears to me to be quite wrong, particularly as the Bill sets out to authorise certain powers for the raising of finance. It would be a dangerous precedent to permit a loan to be raised for expenditure on furnishings, fittings and equipment, though it would be quite sound to devote such expenditure to the erection of buildings.

The Minister for Transport: This would be technical equipment to enable the work to proceed for which the buildings are to be provided.

Hon. G. FRASER: Even technical equipment should not be financed out of loan money.

The Minister for Transport: I think my remarks in moving the second reading clearly set out the position.

Hon. G. FRASER: But that does not overcome my difficulty. I have no wish to hamper the passage of the Bill, but I draw attention of members to what is proposed. I shall feel inclined in the Committee stage to move for the deletion of the reference to furnishings, fittings and equipment so that the expenditure of funds raised in the manner proposed shall be devoted to providing buildings. I doubt whether the Minister could point to any other instance where similar provision has been made. To me it appears that we are being asked to break new ground and I urge members to consider this point very seriously before agreeing to the proposals.

On motion by Hon. A. L. Loton, debate adjourned.

BILL—BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY STEEL INDUSTRY AGREEMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [3.53] in moving the second reading said: Consequent upon the absence of results over a long period of years from all other proposals for the creation of a steel industry in Western Australia, the Director of Works and Co-ordinator of Industrial Development, Mr. Dumas, suggested towards the end of 1951 that, in the hope of making some real progress, a discussion might be opened with Broken Hill Proprietary Ltd. to ascertain whether it would be prepared to invest a substantial sum in the beginnings of an industry in this State.

In this connection it should be realised that quite apart from the Government's reluctance to plunge into further socialistic enterprises—which have hitherto proved so unprofitable—the smallest degree of a steel works in Western Australia would involve from £3,000,000 to £4,000,000, while the whole industry would probably involve £15,000,000 to £20,000,000 which, in any circumstances, there seemed no prospect of any State Government being able to provide, and which it was clear, in view of many technical difficulties as regards coal, etc. would be unlikely to succeed.

The suggestion by Mr. Dumas was made to the Minister for Works, to whose office he was then completely attached, and as a result of discussions between the Minister for Works, Mr. Dumas, and the Deputy Premier, it was agreed that a tentative approach should be made to Broken Hill Proprietary Ltd. to ascertain whether it was interested. The result was that officials of the company visited Western Australia and, after a great deal of negotiation and discussion, the outline of an agreement was ultimately arrived at towards the end of February, the details having taken until about the 23rd June to complete.

The background of the agreement—and indeed of the whole matter—is that at the present time it is an established fact that iron-ore cannot be economically smelted with Collie-type coal, and therefore it is not practicable to give consideration to an integrated steel industry based on the construction of blast furnaces to utilise Collie coal. One very important consideration must be the economics of any such scheme, namely, if it will produce steel at all, will it produce it at anything like a competitive price?

An iron blast furnace requires a fuel of high carbon content, as carbon is the source of heat as well as being the reducing agent to convert the iron-ore into metallic iron. The carbonaceous fuel must be porous and mechanically strong to resist shattering during handling and to enable it to support the weight of the heavy column of charge in the furnace shaft without crumbling and packing into a solid mass. Should the fuel crumble to any degree, it will interfere with the even passage of the large volumes of gases which pass up through the furnace charge, and if the crumbling is of a serious nature, the furnace will fail to operate.

Coke and charcoal are the only two fuels which have met the above requirements, and coke is a stronger fuel than charcoal, and in almost every case by far the cheaper. The use of coal as a blast furnace fuel is limited, mainly due to its low physical strength in comparison with good metallurgical coke. In addition, if coal is used direct in a blast furnace, all the valuable by-products are given off in the furnace itself, and the expense of recovering them, if possible, would then be so great that the price of the resultant iron product would be considerably increased and become uncompetitive.

All coals do not form coke when the volatile matter is driven off by heat. The geologically young coals, such as lignite and sub-bituminous coals, do not form a coke when heated; they form an incoherent mass of carbonaceous particles lacking completely in strength. Unfortunately, Collie coals belong to the sub-bituminous type. Even bituminous coals may not fuse to form a satisfactory coke. Certain of the coals in the western districts of New South Wales are of no value whatever in the blast furnace for their large lumps of coke are mechanically weak. Open-cut coals, particularly are useless for the formation of metallurgical coke.

Naturally, there have been constant efforts to find a method by which the sub-bituminous and weaker types of coal

could be utilised, but, up to date, such processes variously known as the low shaft furnace, Baum and Klockner Humboldt processes, have not progressed beyond the laboratory stage and no one—it is quite clear—should attempt to expend Government moneys running into many millions of pounds in a small and unproven direction which must at best result in an expensive product and at worst in the possibility of complete failure.

Sitting suspended from 4.0 to 4.20 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Prior to the suspension I had mentioned the great difficulty facing the State if it desired to embark on a project to unite Collie coal with iron-ore in establishing a local steel industry. It appears that at best it might result in an expensive product, and at worst in the possibility of complete failure. This has been confirmed by recent investigations by the Co-ordinator of Works and Industrial Development into the Baum and Klockner Humbolt low shaft furnace in Europe when he met not only the director of the Klockner Humbolt Company, but also three representatives of the Broken Hill Proprietary Ltd., who had been sent to Europe pursuant to the understanding with the Government of this State that the company would co-operate in investigations of methods for the use of sub-bituminous coals.

While in his report dated the 7th August last, Mr. Dumas says that the low shaft furnace holds out possibilities for an ultimate solution, it is agreed by everyone that this stage has not yet been reached. The Klockner Humbolt Company did enter into contracts to supply such furnaces to Spain and Portugal but of its own volition, because its research was not sufficiently advanced to enable it to give any guarantees as to the performance of these furnaces, it has indefinitely deferred these contracts. At the conclusion of his report, Mr. Dumas says: "It therefore appears that neither the low shaft blast furnace nor any other process has yet been developed to the stage where it could be installed in Western Australia with any confidence to operate Collie coal."

It can be taken as an established fact that iron-ore cannot be economically smelted with types of coal such as are available at Collie and, therefore, it is not practicable at the present time to give consideration to an integrated steel industry based on the construction of blast furnaces to utilise Collie coal. It takes approximately 1½ tons of iron-ore to make 1 ton of pig iron. I have gone to some trouble to ascertain what will be the iron-ore requirements of the company as soon as the new blast furnaces, among the largest in the world, now being erected, and almost completed, at Port Kembla, are ready. The figure will be approximately 4,000,000 tons to provide the necessary materials for the blast furnaces in question.

In consequence, the resources at Iron Knob and Cockatoo Island are unlikely to last indefinitely and it is obviously reasonable that a company of this nature whose reputation as to efficiency, price and quality of its products is second to none, and which has contributed more to the industrial stability of Australia than any other venture, should seek long term assurance of continuity of supplies. The capital investment which it is proposed to make in this State will, with the sole exception of the proposed expenditure of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, be easily the largest industrial development which has taken place here.

The rolling mill, the fence post factory, and the wharves and equipment will, on the most recent estimate, need an expenditure of approximately £4,000,000 as against a Government expenditure of, perhaps, £200,000, in providing the necessary dredging to enable access to the wharves, upon which last mentioned sum it will be noted the company will provide full interest and sinking fund until the whole of the amount is amortized. Thereafter it will continue to pay dues to the harbour authorities, so that the State may expect to show some profit. The company is relieved of wharfage dues in respect of its own outward cargoes.

Recently the Deputy Premier has seen in New South Wales a rolling mill—one of the mills in operation at the B.H.P. works there—almost exactly similar to that which is proposed in Western Australia, and he was astonished at the magnitude of even that section of the works. The rolling mill is to have a capacity of 50,000 tons production, equivalent roughly to twice the present State demand for its steel products, and the company agrees to establish this mill in four years or, at most, not more than five years from the passing of the Act. The company will fulfil orders from within the State for the products of the mill for use within the State.

The company has also decided to establish a factory for the manufacture of steel fencing posts, and has informed the Government that this will be proceeded with as quickly as possible. The company will acquire, approximately 600 acres of land, and pay for it whatever it costs the State, with a view to developing its activities in this State. This area of land is many times more than sufficient for the rolling mill and the steel post factory, and is being acquired so that the mill can be laid out in a position which the company's plans provide to enable it to fit in with a completely integrated industry. The company also undertakes to continue and pursue investigations, and carry out research in collaboration with the State,

into the use of coals from the Collie coalfield in primary furnaces for the conversion of iron-ore into pig iron.

It will also keep in touch with oversea developments in blast furnace practice, will arrange to send officers and technicians oversea to study and gather information on the latest practices, and to keep the State informed. As a matter of fact, officers of the company are already in Europe for this purpose. The company will not export iron-ore from Australia and will, if requested by the State, make available to the State iron-ore from the islands up to 200,000 tons per annum for use in the State as the State may require.

Therefore, it will be obvious that if anyone else is prepared to establish blast furnaces in Western Australia, for which it may be mentioned there are special provisions in the Bill, the company will provide from Koolan Island or Cockatoo Island, or both, sufficient iron-ore for a blast furnace of up to 140,000 tons of pig iron per annum and this leaves out of contemplation altogether iron-ore which the State could acquire from Koolyanobbing or other sources. Provision is in the agreement for the control of price of this iron-ore.

The company will construct and maintain its own wharves with equipment, and when it does not interfere with its own requirements, will permit the wharves to be used for handling inward and outward cargo under terms and conditions to be approved by the Fremantle Harbour Trust. Vessels, as distinct from cargo, will be charged tonnage rates only, based upon the present-day rate of one penny plus 20 per cent., apart from charges for services. The State indemnifies the company against soil erosion caused by the wharf.

The ultimate purpose of the agreement is the establishment of an integrated iron and steel industry in Western Australia. The agreement provides that if and when this becomes economically practicable, and the company decides to do so, the State will co-operate with the company in locating suitable deposits of limestone, magnesite, dolomite, fireclay and silica. Electric power is to be provided as progressively required, starting from six months after the passing of the Act, and water, not exceeding 4,000,000 gallons a week, as may be progressively required at not less than six months' notice. The price to be paid for such water shall be the ruling price for industrial purposes unless it is bore water, in which case the price shall be agreed, based upon a present-day price of 6d. per 1,000 gallons. The State will also provide rail and road access to the work site.

The State within three years of notice from the company, or within two years of completion of the company's retaining wall—whichever is the longer period —will dredge to a depth of 30 ft. at low water, the berth and swinging basin. The State has at least four years within which to dredge the channels shown on P.W.D. plan 33486. The State will maintain dredging depths. Within one month from the passing of the Act the State will extend the lease of Cockatoo Island to coincide with the term hereafter mentioned in respect of Koolan Island. It will lease to the company the Koolan Island leases and extensions of ore bodies subject to the provisions of the Mining Act as defined and to the payment of royalty for a period of 50 years from the passing of the Act, with rights of renewal for successive periods of 21 years. The royalty is to be 6d. a ton on all iron-ore shipped from the islands. The state agrees not to alter the covenants of the leases, licenses and rights during their currency or any renewal thereof, or otherwise disturb the company's rights under the agreement.

It is provided that if the labour conditions on one island satisfy the total labour conditions of the whole of the leases, that shall be sufficient, and provision is made for the use of machinery on the basis of six horsepower equals one man, as in the Whyalla agreement. I might mention here that already approximately £1,750,000 has been spent by the company at Cockatoo Island and 100 men are employed there. It is expected that 1,000,000 tons of ore will be shipped from that island during the next 12 months and progressively increased as will the number of men employed. A quantity of half a million tons will be shipped in the company's iron vessels and the balance, provided ships can be obtained, in chartered vessels. The periods of the leases will be almost identical with those embodied in the South Australian Act in relation to Iron Knob and it is interesting to note that while the Act provides only for a blast furnace at Whyalla, ship-building yards and other industrial establishments, valued at many millions of pounds have been erected by the company of its own volition.

There is no express agreement by the Government to build any houses but there is a clause that says that if the State erects in the areas from which the company shall principally draw its labour, workers' dwellings under the State Housing Act, and the same shall be available for that purpose, the State will make available to the employees of the company a reasonable proportion of such dwellings. If the company undertakes to proceed with the blast furnace, but as a result of investigation and research finds that it needs other ores, Crown resources will be made available on favourable terms. There is a covenant by the State not to resume land purchased by the company and there is a mutual agreement that it is understood between the State and the company that the aim of the parties is

the establishment in the said State of steel-making furnaces and auxiliary equipment to provide steel for the mill, and while the company intends to pursue such an establishment in good faith, any decision in this respect by the company must be its own decision.

There is also a provision that except in regard to that part of the company's land where permanent residences shall be erected, rating shall be on the unimproved value and not be subject to a discriminatory rate. This is substantially the procedure followed in the Eastern States where a rate known as an industrial rate is struck on the company's areas. A most important provision is in relation to the present policy of the company in selling its products in all the capital cities and main ports at the same price. While this policy, which has existed for 30 years, continues, the products of the mill will be sold in this State at the same price as they are sold at the Newcastle and Port Kembla works, even though the actual cost of production in Western Australia may be higher. If the policy is changed, the State agrees not to prevent the company from selling its products at a reasonable price, as fixed by Clause 5 (1).

The agreement, the term of which is 50 years, may be varied from time to time by the parties provided that there is no substantial variation. Its provisions are to be interpreted according to the laws of Western Australia. The agreement does not provide anything in regard to the iron-ore deposits at Koolyanobbing but by Clause 3 of the Bill the Koolyanobbing leases for a period of 10 years from the passing of the Act, shall not be declared to be open for mining or be temporarily occupied except that the State may remove up to 50,000 tons of ore in any year. This 50,000 tons of ore is mentioned because of the needs of Wundowie for pig iron, Koolyanobbing iron now being mixed with local ores for this purpose.

During the period of 10 years the State may enter into an agreement with any person for the establishment in the State of an iron-ore, smelting and steel melting plant with a capacity of not less than 100,000 tons of pig iron a year, provided that such person puts up a bond of £100,000. It is provided that in that case, if the plant is completed within six years the bond shall be cancelled. This proposal has three objects:—

(1) It permits anyone who is able to put up the necessary capital to develop, if he wishes to, blast furnaces, etc., in Western Australia, and of course does not exclude the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited itself.

(2) It is dovetailed with the provision in the agreement which enables the State to acquire up to 200,000 tons of iron-ore from Koolan Island, if necessary (as would probably be the case) for mixing with Koolyanobbing ore; and

(3) It ensures that if anyone is able to put up the necessary capital for the creation of such blast furnace, etc., the necessary raw materials will be available and in the possession of the State.

It is interesting to note that I have been informed that technicians from the B.H.P. have reached England in order to investigate, with a view to further research, experiments taking place in Europe in relation to the use of Collie type coals and other related matters.

It will be seen, therefore, that the agreement and the proposed Bill taken together envisage an immediate substantial industrial development greater than anything undertaken here before—an undertaking to engage in investigation with a view, if possible, to the establishment of a full industry in Western Australia within a reasonable time by the company, but with ample scope meanwhile if any satisfactory proposal is made from other quarters to negotiate with any such persons, and arrive at an agreement if the proposal is soundly based. I know of nothing more that could have been done to conserve the interests of the State and to ensure that the State's resources are put to use, to the great advantage, firstly, of Western Australia and, secondly, of the whole of the Commonwealth.

What I have stated represents substantially the views put forward by the Deputy Premier when introducing the Bill in another place. But as the result of certain matters that have cropped up during the course of the debate, I have been provided with other material to cover the points then raised. The points are as follows:—

(1) It has been said that the Fremantle Harbour Trust and Colonel Tydeman had never been consulted. The facts are that Messrs. McLennan (general manager), Newton (secretary), together with Mr. Dumas went especially to Fremantle and discussed fully the company's proposals and decided on the type of rating that should be adopted in order to obtain the necessary revenue to cover the annual charges and revenue to cover the cost of dredging.

(2) It has also been said that the Under Secretary for Mines was never consulted. The facts are that Mr. Dumas discussed the matter with him. He came to Cabinet and discussed it there, and later had a discussion with me at my office.

(3) It is of interest to note that B.H.P. pig iron on account of the capital city price system maintained by that company, can be landed in founder's yards at approximately £3 per ton cheaper than comparable quality from Wundowie. This means

that the ironmasters of Western Australia can be said to be paying a subsidy of about £30,000 per annum to Wundowie (See No. 10 on index and also Auditor General's report).

(4) It is alleged that the Bill will give the company a complete monopoly of the State's iron-ore resources. This is not so. The facts are—

(a) That of the ore at Koolan and Cockatoo Islands the agreement requires the company to deliver 200,000 tons a year to the State, when required, at cost price plus five per cent.; and

(b) the Bill will reserve to the State the 70,000,000 tons of ore of at least equal value at Koolyanobbing. Neither Clause 3 nor Clause 4 of the Bill will give any rights whatever to B.H.P., nor are they in any way part of the agreement. These are the clauses which reserve Koolyanobbing and also the Collie Burn coal leases.

(5) Under Clause 4 of the agreement the Minister is entitled to make a contract with any person—which includes a corporation—for the development and working of the Koolyanobbing leases provided that person, within the time stipulated in Subclause (4), sets up an integrated iron and steel industry in Western Australia of not less than 100,000 tons capacity.

(6) The Minister, however, before he enters into any such agreement, is to obtain a bond in the sum of £100,000 as a guarantee that the work will proceed; that is, the work of creating the iron and steel industry. This bond is to keep out men of straw and company promoters, for a person who cannot put up a bond of £100,000 certainly cannot put up an integrated iron and steel industry of even 100,000 tons capacity, which would cost at least between £10,000,000 and £15,000,000 Australian.

(7) Such an industry of that capacity could, as a matter of fact, be set up by simply utilising the ore from Koolan Island which B.H.P. is obligated to deliver on demand, for as it takes approximately 1.5 tons of iron-ore, to make one ton of pig iron, it is obvious that 200,000 tons of iron-ore would produce about 130,000 tons of pig iron.

(8) If the person anxious to set up the industry, however, were inclined to go as far as 350,000 tons per annum of pig iron and was prepared to put up a bond, and enter into the requisite agreement, he would require approximately 500,000 tons of iron-ore per annum. He would get 200,000 tons a year from Koolan or Cockatoo Island, or both, because the State could assign its rights to him, and he would be eligible also to utilise the 70,000,000 tons of iron-ore at Koolyanobbing out of which he would only require 300,000 tons a year, which 300,000 tons a year he could obtain for up to 233 years.

(9) It is interesting to note that 350,000 tons per annum would be at least seven or eight times the State's present demand.

(10) It is also alleged that the Bill would prevent some future Government from endeavouring to establish a State industry. We believe, of course, that the taxpayers of the State have had their fill of these State enterprises, which have been responsible for losses, running into millions of pounds and a large part of our unproductive debt, but the Bill, as a fact, does nothing of the kind. I have already shown how 500,000 tons of iron-ore would be available for a tremendously long period.

(11) If a future Government, within the 10-year period of reservation, desired to start a State industry, it would have several alternatives, the most obvious one of which would be to seek the repeal of Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill, in which case the Koolyanobbing leases would be available for any purpose and the iron-ore from Koolan would be available to the State.

(12) I would say, however, that anyone who desired to start such an enterprise would need to think at least twice. An industry as small as 100,000 tons per annum would cost up to £15,000,000; would be wide open to competition by larger—and therefor more economical—steel producers, even if Collie coal could be successfully coked which, although one may personally be confident will happen, cannot yet be guaranteed. If not, the only fuel for the blast furnace would be charcoal, and three points arise—

(a) The maximum capacity of a charcoal furnace is 200 tons a day or less, that is 65,000 tons a year.

(b) The cost of pig iron would, in consequence, be considerably dearer than pig iron produced from coking coal.

(c) The capacity of the furnace could not be expanded beyond 65,000 tons without double capital expense. The small plant at Wundowie has already lost £488,000.

(13) The next alleged reason for opposition is that the leasing of Koolan Island to the company less the reservation of 200,000 tons of ore per year to the State, was unjustified, and that the existing leases of Cockatoo Island should have been sufficient inducement for the £4,000,000 rolling mill. As a matter of fact, that would have been no inducement at all. Under ordinary Mining Act procedure and with no new agreement, the company, having expended neary £2,000,000 on Cockatoo Island and employed 100 men there, would have been entitled to hold its existing leases for periods from 53 to 81 years, before which time, at present rates of development, the iron-ore at Cockatoo Island would have been worked out.

(14) As to the quantities of iron-ore at Koolan Island, the New York firm of Brasserts in their report, and dealing with raw material resources for a steel plant in Western Australia (pages 4 - 6) give the quantity at Koolyanobbing as 69,000,000 tons, and with reference to Koolan Island go on to say:

> The main vein averages 134ft. wide, is 6,200ft. long, and dips south about 52°. The high point is 550ft. above tide, and the outcrop averages about 500ft. above tide. It has been proved by six crosscut tunnels. The main vein contains 42,000,000 tons above water level.

Although the geological reports referred to by Mr. Hawke were known to Brassert's experts, who also examined the locations of all known veins on the island, they have listed only the main vein in recording the availability of iron-ore for a steel plant. There is a great deal of difference between a geological estimate of quantities of ore on the island, and the quantity which a steel expert would say could be economically mined and shipped.

(15) It has also been said that the agreement gives the company the right to use secondhand plant. Clause 3 of the agreement reads:

> The company will, on the passing of the Act, commence the construction on the works site of a steel rolling mill or mills of modern design and construction . . . . such construction shall consist substantially of new plant machinery and equipment.

It would obviously not be possible in a plant of modern design and construction consisting substantially of new machinery to act as suggested.

(16) It has also been said that the rolling mill would work for only six months a year because its output would be twice the capacity of the State's present demand. Firstly, this demand must increase with increasing population and industrial development, both of which are rapidly expanding; secondly, the 50,000 tons capacity is based on three shifts, and one or two shifts could be worked. Two shifts are the most likely and can obtain an output of about 30,000 tons a year until more is required.

(17) The Kwinana site was especially selected by B.H.P. The area the company proposes to pay for is 600 acres and is the full amount required for a fully integrated industry. The proximity of the refinery, with butane gas as a by-product, was a special attraction.

(18) Incidentally, all that B.H.P. agreed to do at Whyalla in exchange for a similar lease of Iron Knob and Iron Monarch was to establish a blast furnace, and it certainly has not stopped there. Without any obligation, a huge shipbuilding yard and other industries have been established, and a model town set up.

(19) Butane gas: According to the State Mining Engineer, this is a most economic source of power for the heating of steel for a mill and has a very high calorific value.

(20) A special point of interest is that the company must not export iron-ore from Australia. At present there is no restriction on Cockatoo Island, but the company has agreed to the restriction in future on both Cockatoo and Koolan Islands. It would be little satisfaction to Western Australia, and a tragedy for Australia, if this ore were sold abroad. The clause will ensure that Australian technicians and workmen will be employed in converting this ore into pig iron and steel.

(21) As to the cost of the 20,000 tons to be supplied by B.H.P. on demand, the cost would be, vide Clause 3 (i)—

> Cost of production, including depreciation and interest on capital as well as all overhead charges taken properly into account in arriving at net profits plus five per centum.

If there were any dispute, it would be referred to arbitration. The price basis is quite a fair one. Brassert's estimated this cost to be 10s. a ton less if supplied by a company such as B.H.P., which was shipping a million tons of ore, than by a company which was shipping onl 200,000 tons per annum, and which had to provide its own jetty and loading facilities to deal with a 33ft. range of tides.

(22) The jetty and loading facilities required at these islands are extremely costly. Brassert's report, p.6, concerning Koolan Island reads—

> Annual requirements of 200,000 tons only are not large enough for the economical working of the Koolan Island mine, and much lower costs can be obtained if approximately a million tons a year can be produced. Since Koolan Island is entirely isolated and has no known water supply on the island, the operation of the mine required a relatively large unproductive force to care for housing, light and power, water, sewer system, medical care, supplies and commissariat, highways communications and transport both on the island and to and from the mainland, and this force would be nearly as large for a production of 200,000 tons a year as for 1,000,000 tons a year. Furthermore, operating efficiency would be higher with larger shovels and trucks working steadily than with smaller units wroking part-time.

Brasserts estimated that B.H.P., with an output of 1,000,000 tons per annum, could load the ore on to ships at 10s. per ton less than anyone on Koolan Island with an output of only 200,000 tons. Therefore, it would be beneficial for both interests jointly to use the one plant and equipment.

I trust that members will give the Bill very serious consideration and that the facts I have stated will lead them to support it. This will mean a tremendous benefit to Western Australia and is likely to grow and develop as the State expands, and we have the obligation under the agreement that the company will do its utmost to establish an integrated iron and steel industry using Collie coal with our iron-ore. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. G. Fraser, debate adjourned.

BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Second Reading.

Deate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [4.58]: Several members have intimated that they do not feel very happy about the proposal to continue the operation of the Act and have given various reasons, but I cannot see that many of their reasons hold water. One argument that has been advanced was that we should not continue the Act because we had been voting against the continuance of controls. The circumstances in this instance are vastly different.

The controls that we have been endeavouring to get rid of have been those exercised by boards over other people's affairs, but in this instance the proposal is to continue the operations of a board which is controlling the marketing of growers' barley and which is the choice of the growers. That is an entirely different matter. The board ensures the organised marketing of barley instead of each individual undertaking the marketing of his own grain, and the growers themselves elect their representatives on the board. So I repeat that this is a form of control entirely different from the forms we have been endeavouring to get rid of.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is, when you want it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The hon. member must appreciate the difference. On top of that we have the request by barley growers published in "The West Australian" of yesterday—growers who are probably responsible for producing 25 per cent. of the barley raised in this State. They have requested that the board be continued, that the Wheat Pool of Western Australia should be the selling agent, and also that there be bulk-handling of barley. Knowing that the Farmers' Union wants this board to continue, we can assume that the majority of the growers are desirous of the board continuing to operate.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Without caring two hoots about the wishes and requirements of the buyers.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The board is constituted to sell barley on behalf of the growers, and their representatives will make sure that it is sold in the best possible manner. The board will not sell the barley in a slipshod manner, knowing full well that if it does the market will be lost. Mr. Dimmitt was worried about the fact that barley going into bulk bins would lose its identity, or that the f.a.q. sample would not be good enough for the maltsters. For Mr. Dimmitt's information I might say that there were five different prices for five different types of barley last year. They were—

> Manufacturers, two-row in bags.
> Manufacturers, two-row in bulk.
> Manufacturers, six-row in bags.
> Manufacturers, six-row in bulk.
> Feed barley in bags.

The prices varied from 14s. 3½d. to 17s. 7½d., and down as low as 10s. 10½d. for feed barley.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: How would you separate them in a pool?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It might be stated that a certain amount of value is lost in bulk barley, or that the standard can-

not be maintained. I venture to say that we can maintain the standard better in bulk than in bags because in bulk the barley is open for the people to see, but it is not when it is in bags. Anyone who travels around the country and sees what goes into bulk bins, and what goes into bags, and what is refused in bulk, will realise that the bulk system provides a better safeguard than does the use of bags.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Will barley keep in storage for malting?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know much about the fundamentals of barley.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: It will not.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. Dimmitt was worried because the maltsters might not receive sufficient barley for a good brew. My experience of the beer in Western Australia is that it is a very good commodity, so the maltsters must be receiving good barley from which they make good malt.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Yes, but up to last year it was not received in bulk. The process has developed only within the last 12 months.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Therefore the reasons for the maltsters not wanting to get their barley in bulk must be premature.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: They had to import more from South Australia because of the bulking.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Yes.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No, it was on account of the extra price being received oversea. We also know that six-row barley is a better yielder than two-row, and when we get 17s. 7½d. for six-row, and the top price for two-row barley is 14s. 3½d., what else can we expect? If the maltsters were prepared to pay 17s. 7½d. for two-row barley, or an amount that would give the growers a return equivalent to what they receive for six-row barley, I am sure they would grow the two-row variety, and there would be no trouble at all. This board is different from the control boards that we have been discussing; and to allay the fears of Mr. Dimmitt in regard to the bulk-handling of barley, I might say that I am perfectly certain the bulk sample will be quite as good as the bag sample, and if the price of the two-row malting barley were as good as that paid for the six-row barley, then the growers would produce the two-row type. I think these three points cover most of the arguments put up by the hon. member.

On motion by Hon. C. W. D. Barker, debate adjourned.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sir Charles Latham—Central) [5.6] in moving the second reading said: The Bill contains several very necessary amendments to the Traffic Act. The first proposes to rectify an obvious omission in the Act, that is, it provides a definition of the term "parking" which, probably due to an oversight, does not appear in the parent measure. This morning's paper contained a reference to the powers under the regulations to control parking. This amendment has been included to rectify the position.

The second and most important amendment in the Bill seeks to arm the Minister administering the Traffic Act, who at present is the Minister for Local Government, with the power to approve, whenever it is thought fit, of the installation, in the metropolitan area, of lights and signs the purpose of which would be the control of traffic. As hon. members are aware, Section 14 (2) (b) of the principal Act provides that all license and registration fees paid in the metropolitan area shall be credited to an account at the Treasury, known as the Metropolitan Traffic Trust Account. From this account is paid the cost of repairing certain specified main roads, the balance, which must be at least a half of the total net amount in the account, being shared among metropolitan local authorities.

The Bill proposes that the cost of purchasing, installing and maintaining the new lights and signs shall be met from the Metropolitan Traffic Trust Act and that this expenditure shall not exceed £20,000 in any one year. This is a policy similar to that adopted in both Victoria and New South Wales where the costs of traffic lights and warning signs are paid from motor vehicle registration fees. A maximum payment of £20,000 per annum for this purpose will not greatly affect the financial stability of the Metropolitan Traffic Trust Account, as in the last four years the amounts paid from the account to metropolitan local authorities were—

1948-49	....	....	£220,246
1949-50	....	....	£230,492
1950-51	....	....	£243,492
1951-52	....	....	£260,492

Members will notice the gradual increase each year. It is expected that the total amount of license fees collected in the metropolitan area will continue to increase and therefore the impact on account of this proposal in the Bill will be almost negligible. The immediate expenditure on the new warning signs is estimated to be about £7,000. The signs which it is proposed to install and their costs are—

	£
657 "Major Road Stop" signs with approved white reflectors, £9 each	5,913
100 "School" signs at an approximate cost of £2 each	200
100 "Speed Limit" signs (the cats-eye type) showing "15," £2 each (without white reflectors)	200
20 "Speed limit" signs showing "30," with approved white reflectors, £5 each	100
20 "Speed limit" signs showing "25," with approved white reflectors, £5 each	100
20 "No entry" signs, £2 each	40
50 "Pedestrian crossing" signs with approved white reflectors, £9 each	450
Approximate Total	£7,003

The quoted figures to be shown on the speed limit signs refer to miles per hour. It is considered that an increased use of road signs is advisable, particularly in view of the ever-increasing number of new drivers using the road, together with the difficulties associated with any person being able to remember the regulations pertaining to a particular road or section of road. I might say that the Commissioner of Police requested that these signs be made available. Particulars have appeared in the Press regarding the proposed new traffic lights and it will be most interesting to watch the result of what is, so far as Perth is concerned, an innovation.

The next amendment seeks to increase the driver's annual licensee fee from the present figure of 5s. to 10s. Even if the proposed increase is adopted, the fee will still be no more than the lowest elsewhere in Australia. South Australia and Queensland each charge 10s., Victoria £1, and New South Wales £1 5s. The present fee of 5s. in this State has operated since 1919, and it is obvious therefore that, with the change in money values, the increase is warranted. It is expected that revenue will benefit to the extent of £37,000 from the increase.

It is proposed to confine the increase to drivers of private vehicles only, and that licenses for passenger vehicles and conductors licenses shall remain at the amount of 5s. The next amendment seeks to give the Commissioner of Police authority to suspend the license of any person who has been disqualified from driving a motor vehicle in any other part of the Commonwealth. This means that if any person who has had his license cancelled in another State comes here and attempts to drive, the Commissioner may disqualify him from so doing.

At a conference of police commissioners in Adelaide in 1951 it was resolved to recommend that legislative action be taken in each State to enable the cancellation of a license to be effective throughout Australia. Section 36 of the parent Act enables any person holding a license issued in another State or territory of the Commonwealth, to drive while temporarily in Western Australia. The proposal that such persons should not be permitted to drive in this State if their licenses had been cancelled or suspended, is necessary and wise.

The Bill proposes to provide authority for the making of regulations in regard to certain aspects of parking. The object of this provision is to prevent the type of parking that has caused serious accidents, more particularly the parking of heavy vehicles. This regulation will specify the class or type of vehicle which will not be allowed to park on any road, or on any particular road at any time or at any specified time. As I have said, the aim of the amendment is to stop the dangerous parking that we have all seen, particularly at night on ill-lit roads. The penalty for any such offence will be that prescribed in the Act for a breach of any regulation, that is, a maximum fine of £20 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month.

At the present time the parent Act provides that when any person—or club—advises a local authority that he—or it—desires to hold races or speed tests in any particular place, or on a specified day, the local authority may temporarily suspend traffic regulations for the period of the races or tests, and may define the conditions under which they shall be conducted. This provision gives the local authority the right to suspend temporarily the regulations for the purpose of the events but it does not specifically state that the local authority has a right to refuse the application to suspend the regulations. The Bill seeks to rectify this anomaly and, at the request of the Commissioner of Police, it states that any person will commit an offence if he does not comply with the conditions laid down by the local authority. The penalty for such an offence will be £20.

The penultimate amendment seeks to exempt from the provisions of the Act the personal vehicle of His Excellency the Governor, and also any other vehicle that the Governor may, by Order in Council, exempt. I am sure the House will agree that the car bearing the Governor should not be bound by traffic regulations, and it may be advisable, from time to time, to extend the same privilege to diplomatic or other high ranking visitors. A request has been received from the Perth City Council that the official car of the Lord Mayor bear a crest instead of the regulation number plates required under the Act. This is a privilege allowed by many British cities to their Chief Magistrates and one that could be sanctioned here.

The last amendment proposes to increase the fees relating to the transfer of licenses of motor vehicles. These were reduced by 50 per cent. in 1941 owing to petrol rationing, and as these circumstances no longer apply, the Bill seeks to increase the fees to the amounts operative prior to 1941. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned.

BILL—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.15]: I have listened with great interest to the extremely informative debate on the Bill. Various theories have been put forward by members with regard to natives, and it is obvious that they are all intended to promote their welfare. Some proposed amendments appear on the notice paper and, after having heard the debate and examined those amendments, I consider that they will overcome many of the objections that have been raised to the Bill. I suggest to members that they peruse the amendments, which I think explain themselves.

Firstly, they propose to give the Minister the right to declare who is a native and, secondly, when advised by the Commissioner, to declare who shall be a native. The Bill originally provided that full citizenship rights be given to all the natives, excepting full-bloods. One of the main objections to that proposal was that they were not ready to receive citizenship in blanket form; that it would not be fair to them or to other citizens of the State. However, I think the amendments will overcome this objection, and they will also overcome the difficulty respecting appeals to a magistrate for citizenship rights.

The Minister for Transport: You point out that the Commissioner has power to declare under the Act that the rights of citizenship be taken from a native.

Hon. G. FRASER: That could occur on many occasions because, if these amendments are agreed to, immediately the measure was passed the Department of Native Affairs would take action and would declare as natives all those persons unfit for citizenship rights. I suppose that would cover children in orphanages or half-castes living in unsuitable conditions.

The Minister for Transport: I think you will find that in practice it will lead to hopeless chaos.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not see why. It might if the Bill goes through in its present form and automatically confers citizenship on all natives, but if power is given to the department, the officials of which know them all, to declare who are natives under the Act, with the further right to decide that, when such people have progressed to the extent that they can take upon themselves the responsibilities of citizenship, they shall no longer come under the Act, the difficulty will be overcome.

Hon. H. L. Roche: In other words, you propose to give the Minister power to declare them natives or to grant them citizenship rights.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. The individual has further protection because, if the Minister, either on his own initiative or on the advice of the Commissioner, has declared a person to be a native, one of the amendments provides that such person shall have the right of appeal to a magistrate for citizenship rights. I therefore suggest to members that they give serious consideration to the amendments before casting their votes on the second reading. I support the Bill.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [5.23]: I have taken a great interest in the Bill and carefully listened to the debate. Some valuable viewpoints have been expressed. After listening to Mr. Craig and Mr. Roche, I was concerned whether the proposal contained in the Bill was advisable, but now I have perused the proposed amendments, I think we can safely pass the second reading. Like Mr. Fraser, I urge members to study them. If the Bill is passed, the half-caste population will automatically be entitled to full citizenship rights. However, Mr. Strickland now proposes a safeguard, which is that the Minister, on the advice of the Commissioner, can exclude any number from the operations of the Act. He will be able to declare them to be outside its provisions. He can make a list of 100 or 200 names and promptly exclude them from the operations of the Act. That seems to me a safeguard which gives the Bill some merit. In the hope that the proposed amendments will be agreed to, I support the second reading.

On motion by the Minister for Transport, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.26]: I did not think we would reach the Bill today, but now that we have, we should advance its stage a little further and, if possible, agree to its provisions. The proposals in the Bill are only minor, and its mover

is modest in his request, which I think should be acceded to. I see no serious objection to the proposal to reduce the age of eligibility for membership of this Chamber from 30 years to 21 years. The age of 21 is regarded as suitable for the election of members to almost every other Parliament in Australia.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Not to all of them.

Hon. G. FRASER: Well, to the main legislative Chambers; the Commonwealth Senate and the House of Representatives, and all the Assembly Chambers throughout Australia. I admit I have not checked the eligible age for members elected to other Legislative Councils in the Commonwealth. I cannot see why we must insist on a person being 30 years of age before he can be elected to this House.

Hon. H. L. Roche: It was a big help in your case.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know why or how it should be. As a matter of fact, I was many years ago a candidate for a selection ballot to choose a candidate for election to this Chamber. After it was under way, it was discovered that I was under age.

Hon. H. L. Roche: As I say, it was a big help in your case!

Hon. G. FRASER: I think I was just as competent and sensible then to sit in this House as I have been since I have been here. Admittedly, no man has the experience at 26 years of age that he has at 55.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Surely you do not think you have learned something in 30 years!

Hon. G. FRASER: Of course I have.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: You might have taught them something, too.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not think I was such a nincompoop then that I could not have been elected to this Chamber at 25 or 26 years of age. We grant to all citizens of the Commonwealth who are 21 years of age the right to elect members to both Commonwealth Houses. Surely members are not going to say that election to the House of Representatives is of less importance than election to the Legislative Council of this State! What is the reason for the opposition to reducing the age to 21 years? Will the hon. member who has been interjecting and who I do not think has yet spoken to the Bill, tell me the reason? I am always prepared to learn.

The Minister for Agriculture: My word, you are not!

Hon. G. FRASER: I am a good listener.

Hon. A. L. Loton: To whom?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am prepared to listen to any member who is willing to submit a case indicating why the age of 21 years should not be adopted. Why, we are told that nowadays children who are five years of age know more than their parents did when they were 30! If there is any truth in that assertion, why should we attempt to retain the age of 30 as applicable to anyone eligible to sit in this Chamber? Who has the say in deciding who shall be a member of this House? Is it not the electors? Should a person 21 years of age submit himself as a candidate and he was regarded as unsuitable or immature, the electors would not elect him.

Why not give the people an opportunity to say whether a man of 22 years of age or one of 42 should have the right to membership of the Legislative Council? I am still hopeful that substantial reasons will be advanced for the opposition to that part of the Bill. The measure also proposes to grant the franchise to the wife of a freeholder or of a householder. I have a clear recollection of a similar Bill being presented in this House. If my memory serves me aright, it was a Government measure and represented an attempt to fulfil a promise made to the people on the hustings. The object on that occasion was to extend the franchise to the wife of a householder. I am a little confused on the point as to whether a clause to that effect was embodied in a private member's Bill or in a Government measure. I think it was the latter.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: You are right.

Hon. G. FRASER: During the course of the debate on that occasion many specious arguments were raised. We were asked why we should give the vote to the wife of a householder and not to the wife of a freeholder. Of course, it is the usual practice when such matters are under consideration to resort to subterfuge of one sort or another. In this instance, it was urged that discrimination was to be shown between the freeholder and the householder, and because of that members would not vote for the Bill. At that time I suggested to the opponents of the measure that it was open to them to move an amendment, the effect of which would be to include both the wife of the freeholder and the wife of the householder. That course was not followed by any member who had voiced his objection to the proposal. The Bill now before the House seeks to extend the franchise to the wives of both freeholders and householders.

I cannot appreciate what possible objection can be raised to that proposal. The only argument so far submitted is that it will provide a little extra work for the officers of the Electoral Department. No such consideration should outweigh the advantage that would be obtained by the section of the community that would benefit by the proposed extension of the franchise. The only other matter dealt with by the Bill is the abolition of plural voting, which has been a bone of contention for many years. I have not heard anyone so far who could convince me that plural voting is right in practice.

The generally accepted principle is that of one man, one vote. I do not know that there has ever been any such instance, but under the existing franchise it is possible for one individual to cast as many as ten votes for candidates for this Chamber. We do not consider that right in principle. Evidently the Government is of the same opinion because of the inclusion of a similar clause in the Bill it introduced. Viewing the legislation from the Government angle, members of this House would naturally be expected to support legislation submitted by the Government to which they owe allegiance.

When election meetings have been held and particularly those at which party leaders have submitted their policies, members of this Chamber have sat on the platform and have heard the announcement of policy. The public would naturally assume that those on the platform at such meetings supported the policy enunciated by their leaders. If that were not so, we would expect such members to be fair to the public and intimate that they did not agree with certain parts of the policy in question. On the other hand, when those members who have sat on the platform and listened to their party leaders enunciate their policy, remain silent, it is only natural that the public would conclude that they supported the policy generally. When a Bill of the type now under discussion is introduced to give effect to portion of the reform promised to the public on the hustings, we find members opposing the Government measure.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Quite a number of members did not hold seats in this House when the policy was announced.

Hon. G. FRASER: Quite possibly.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Would you hold them to the policy?

Hon. E. M. Davies: It is Government policy!

Hon. G. FRASER: If they supported the Government and were elected to this Chamber—

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Subsequently.

Hon. G. FRASER: But they must have known what the policy of the Government was. When they went before the public and declared themselves as Labourites or members of the Country Party or of the L.C.L., it is only natural to assume that such candidates subscribed to the policy of their respective leader, and that is the policy on which they would be elected. Although some members adopted that attitude, they want the right to say, "That is all very well, but I do not agree with this particular part of the Government's policy and I will not support it." They should have informed the public that they were not in favour of that policy.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I have not adopted that attitude, and I cannot agree with your contention.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the position.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I have been explicit in saying what policy I supported.

Hon. G. FRASER: Then the hon. member should be an Independent and should not pose as a member of the L.C.L. Personally, I am proud to go before the electors as a Labourite and as a supporter of the platform and policy of the Labour Party. I do not want to pick and choose, nor do I want to put it across the public that I shall support only certain parts of the Laboury Party's policy. I go out a hundred per cent. behind the Labour Party and stand or fall by its policy.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Including socialism?

Hon. G. FRASER: If that is a part of the Labour Party's policy, yes.

The Minister for Transport: And you have no ambition above that?

Hon. G. FRASER: Above what?

The Minister for Transport: Above that policy.

Hon. G. FRASER: Not to that extent.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: And there are no bees in your bonnet!

Hon. G. FRASER: I deal with the public in a manner I consider entirely fair. I stand as a Labourite and stand or fall by Labour's policy and certainly do not desire to pick and choose.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I was able to go before the electors and say that I was an endorsed L.C.L. candidate.

Hon. G. FRASER: I assume from the hon. member's interjections that he does not intend to support the Bill which seeks to fulfil a promise made on the hustings by the Leader of the party he supports. He may have been able to go before the public and say that he was an endorsed L.C.L. candidate, but he did not tell them that he would pick and choose just what parts of the policy he would support. He has been entirely silent on that aspect. I bet that has been his attitude in that regard.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I am afraid you would lose your bet.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Betting is entirely disorderly.

Hon. G. FRASER: If I indicated that I was about to make a bet, Mr. President, I humbly apologise. The three matters covered in the Bill provide, after all is said and done, comparatively little. They represent the granting of reforms—I do not know that the reduction of the age limit for membership of this House was promised by the Government—that were promised by all three political parties on the

hustings. Is it asking too much that those belonging to the parties I mention should support the Bill that will extend the Council franchise in accordance with the policy enunciated on the hustings? To refuse to support it and in effect to tell the public that they would support only part of the Government's policy, savours to me of a confidence trick. I ask members to stand up to the policy endorsed by all parties. There are not many points on which all parties agree, but this is one of them.

Hon. H. K. Watson: We nearly agreed on price-control the other night.

Hon. G. FRASER: I think there would be some dissentients on that proposition. In the instance now under discussion we have been talking about franchise reforms for years and all political parties have agreed that the franchise for the Upper Chamber should be extended. It is not too late now to pass the measure and so do something along the lines we have been talking about for years. Some of the excuses advanced for not supporting the Bill have been remarkable. I heard Mr. Craig say the other night that the Bill did not go far enough. When Labour was in office, it had to be content many times with half the legislative loaf because of the attitude of members of this Chamber.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Until you got the Workers' Compensation Bill!

Hon. G. FRASER: I suggest to Mr. Craig that before he casts his vote on this measure he should not be the whole-hogger he makes out he wants to be and say that he is in favour of the franchise for everyone over 21, and that because the Bill does not go far enough he will not agree to it. I would ask him to do what we have had to do down the years—advance step by step. We are asking for these small improvements because we do not want to revolutionise the situation. We want to progress slowly towards the ultimate abolition of the property barrier.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I thought you were going to say the abolition of the House.

Hon. G. FRASER: Why put such thoughts into my mind? Apart from the objection mentioned by Mr. Craig, I cannot recall any other great opposition to the Bill. If any members have the same idea as Mr. Craig, let them give support to this measure and we will eventually reach the stage that he suggests. It may not be in my time or in his, but if we do not make a start we will never get there.

Do not forget that there will be an election next year, and it may be of great assistance to many members, or to the candidates of their respective parties, if they unbend a little and indicate that when the Government speaks from the platform and promises to do certain things if elected, it will endeavour to do them and its followers in the Upper Chamber will assist. They will be able to say, "Here is one thing that the Government promised in 1947—the widening of the franchise—and its followers in the Upper House have supported a move in that direction." Do not members think that action of that kind will assist their parties in the forthcoming elections?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: By saying that Labour did it?

Hon. G. FRASER: No. Labour can do it in this House only if members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party permit it.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: How about forgetting parties and doing the right thing?

Hon. G. FRASER: There could be no credit to the Labour Party if this Bill went through. It would be passed because the Liberal Party and the Country Party allowed it to be. Members of those parties can bolster up their candidates—and let me tell them that the candidates will need some bolstering!—by pointing out how the Upper House did something to put into operation the policy of the Government. Speaking seriously, I appeal to members. We are asking for very little, but it will be a first step towards providing more electors for this Chamber; and I think that the more electors there are, the better it will be. By that, I mean that there will be a better choice of candidates. The Chamber will not suffer in any shape or form if this Bill is agreed to.

On motion by Hon. W. R. Hall, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I move—

> That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 25th November.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Premier has fixed the date for Parliament's rising at the 12th December. If the House is adjourned till the 25th November, that will leave us nine sitting days I consider there is ample business on the notice paper to keep this House occupied for at least the 12 days that are left at present. I could fill in one myself explaining why the natives should receive better treatment. I do not know what the Minister has in mind in adjourning the House over next week; but as he is the Minister for Railways, I suggest that it is probably because he wants to meet the new Commonwealth diesel train and perhaps travel by it on its inaugural run. This air-conditioned express will come across from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie on Wednesday, the 19th November.

I have no objection to the Minister's going, but I consider that members should have had some indication that this was likely to happen. I know of one who received an invitation; and as the reply had to be returned by the 31st October, he wrote back and said he could not accept because of business in the House. Now we find that we are going to adjourn until the 25th November! This sort of thing should at least be made public a little earlier than when the House is about to rise. Getting back to the notice paper, we have another Minister in the House, and I see no reason why he should not conduct the business thereon. If either Minister is unfortunate enough to become ill, business has to continue just the same. I raise an objection to having this sort of thing popped on us at a minute's notice when there is legislation to be dealt with.

Hon. H. K. Watson: There is not a great amount, though such as there is does require consideration.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There are two Bills from private members that have been on the notice paper for a long time. In fact, they were there at the time when there were two others from private members under consideration, one of which subsequently went through in 20 minutes and the other in half-an-hour. We will finish up in a shambles, as has been the case in each of the other sessions I have been here, working into the middle of the night, with everybody becoming tired and business being rushed through in a manner that is not fair to anybody. I object to this short notice of adjournment.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (in reply): I think the hon. member's remarks demand some explanation. In the time I have been here, it has been regarded as the prerogative of the Leader of the House to try to arrange the sittings and the business in such a way that they will reflect as far as possible the actual attitude of the majority of members. On this occasion it has been represented to me that quite a number of members are desirous of attending what is an epoch-making event in the history of the State, and one to which I was invited as Minister for Railways, and which I was specially asked by the Premier to attend.

We have arrived at the stage when there is very little left on our notice paper to discuss. There is practically nothing that could not be disposed of in a very short space of time and nothing that could be regarded as urgent. In another place the Estimates are being discussed, and in my consultations with the Premier and the Deputy Premier I have gathered that it is very unlikely that anything, and certainly anything important, will be brought to this House in the next week. I also know that some members who are interested in shows in the Great Southern will be absent whether the House is sitting or not. In view of those circumstances, and in response to the known wishes of quite a number of members I, in my discretion, have asked the House to agree to an adjournment till Tuesday, the 25th November. I think there will be ample time after that to get through the business we have to do, including any which comes forward from another place.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.57 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 13th November, 1952.

CONTENTS.

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