

The Attorney General: Having in view the roads it has to construct.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It will have to construct roads here. I am endeavouring to show the difference in treatment. Here it will charge a maximum of £80 an acre, yet it is deliberately circumventing the provisions of the War Service Homes Act by making a substantial profit out of soldiers.

The Attorney General: I do not think it is.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I know it is. I am not in the habit of saying things here that I cannot prove.

The Attorney General: Yes you are. You are inaccurate quite often.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Attorney General should back up his statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Melville must address the Chair.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I appreciate that, but you, Sir, would not take from anyone what the Attorney General has said to me. I am giving him an opportunity, through you, to substantiate his statement.

The CHAIRMAN: He can speak after the hon. member has finished. The hon. member must take no notice of interjections.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister will not speak. I do not claim that every statement I make here is accurate. I believe it is when I make it but, if it is subsequently proved to me that it is not, I have no hesitation in apologising.

The Attorney General: I agree with that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: When I make a statement I believe it to be accurate, but I cannot say that for some members on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the member for Melville had better discuss the schedule now.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, but you, Sir, will agree that the interjection was such as to cause anyone to make an explanation. I can give the name of the soldier if it is required. I have discussed this case with the war services homes section of the Housing Commission and with the officer concerned at the R.S.L., and I say deliberately that when the Housing Commission buys land and allows a soldier to select a block which was originally bought for the purpose of erecting on it a Commonwealth-State rental home, and the War Service homes section is charged such a price as enables a profit to be made by the Housing Commission, it defeats the intention of the War Service Homes Act. There should be some uniformity in treatment. If it is reasonable in order to encourage an industry to come here to make

land available to it at a low figure, the State should not at the same time endeavour to make large profits out of ex-Servicemen. I hope the Government will have the matter looked into and put right.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know nothing of the conditions which have been described by the member for Melville, but I shall certainly take them up with my colleague. As regards the matter under discussion, this arrangement was made in order to encourage the industry to come here. If by any chance it pays £80 an acre—and I feel it will be paying a considerable price—it will be because the land has become so valuable through its coming here.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 11.18 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 13th March, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Onion Marketing Board, as to negotiations for imports	1972
Oats, as to formation of compulsory pool	1973
Education, (a) as to South Bunbury primary school	1973
(b) as to High School, Lake Monger	1973
Bunbury Harbour, as to notice to employees	1973
Mines Regulation Act, as to fatality at Norseman	1974
Sewerage, as to odour, Leederville electorate	1974
Lake Monger rubbish tip, as to abating nuisances	1974
Electricity supplies, (a) as to installation charges	1974
(b) as to suggested increase in charges	1974

CONTENTS—continued.

Questions—continued.	Page
North-West, as to deep sea port, Point Torment	1975
Proposed steel mills, as to B.H.P. Pty., Co., Ltd. and Bradford Kendall & Co.	1975
Housing, (a) as to rental homes for teachers	1975
(b) as to purchases by teachers	1975
(c) as to release of resumed land, Wanneroo	1975
(d) as to accommodation for evictees	1976
Railways, (a) as to standard gauge, Kal- goorlie-Perth section	1976
(b) as to footway, Maylands station	1976
(c) as to warning signals, Caledonian Avenue crossing	1976
(d) as to compensation for chord line resumptions	1977
Gold, as to sales on free market, etc.	1977
Agriculture, as to file on Kudzu	1977
Fisheries, (a) as to under-sized crabs, prosecutions	1977
(b) as to profit on Mandurah catch :	1977
(c) as to investigating scollop beds	1978
Transport, (a) as to trolley-bus stop, Mt. Hawthorn	1978
(b) as to Tuart Hill service	1978
Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd., as to capital and shareholding	1978
War service land settlement, as to appli- cations and allotments	1978
Princess Margaret Children's Hospital, as to finances and Chinese patient	1978
Goldfields nurses, as to free railway passes	1979
Cement, as to increasing supplies	1979
Guildford Road, as to declaring main thoroughfare	1979
Swan River pollution, as to waste dis- charged from brewery	1980
Co-ordinator of Works, as to trip abroad	1980
Prices control, (a) as to staff and cost	1980
(b) as to dry cleaning charges	1980
Foundry fuel, as to waste wood briquettes	1980
Bills : Workers' Compensation Act Amend- ment (No. 2), leave to introduce, refused	1981
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area), 2r, remaining stages	1982
Motion : Broken Hill Proprietary Co., Ltd., as to use of Koolan iron-ore	1990
Adjournment, special	2000

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

ONION MARKETING BOARD.

As to Negotiations for Imports.

Mr. OLDFIELD: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has there been any negotiation in any form between the W.A. Onion Marketing Board and the Victorian Onion Board to establish board to board trading, or any similar method of trading, in relation to the importation or marketing of Victorian onions?

(2) Is there any likelihood of the W.A. Onion Marketing Board negotiating with the Victorian Onion Board with a view to establishing board to board trading, or some similar method of trading, in relation to the importation and marketing of Victorian onions?

(3) In view of the fact that the W.A. Onion Marketing Board paid all the expenses incurred by Mr. Alec Murray during a recent visit to Victoria, what was the nature of the business negotiated by Mr. Murray on behalf of the board?

(4) (a) What is the purpose of Mr. Murray's present visit to Victoria?

(b) Is the Victorian Onion Board financing this visit?

(c) Is the W.A. Onion Board financing this visit?

(5) If the W.A. Onion Board were to import onions on a board to board basis, would commission be paid to the board's broker?

(6) Is it a fact that a number of merchants in this State have received advice from Victorian merchants as follows:—

We understand that the W.A. Onion Board has approached the Victorian Board with a request that onions forwarded to W.A. this year should go through the W. A. Board. The position is that two alternatives are supposed to have been given to your board, namely—

(1) That all orders placed by them should go through Victorian merchants on a quota basis.

(2) That W.A. merchants shall order through their board, nominating the Victorian merchant who is to supply onions through the Victorian Board to the W.A. Board?

(7) Is it a fact that a letter from the W.A. Onion Marketing Board, dated the 14th February, 1952, and addressed to the Potato and Onion Merchants' Association of W.A., read as follows:—

In regard to onions that may be released by the Victorian Onion Marketing Board for distribution through this board to merchants in this State, it would seem from your writings that the members of your executive do not wish to be included in any such allocation. This, of course, will be acted upon as and when the occasion arises?

(8) If the answers to all, or any, of (1), (2), (5), (6), or (7) are in the affirmative, does he consider the answers supplied by his department to questions asked by me on the 6th March to be inconsistent and irreconcilable with the information received by Perth merchants?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes, after receipt of requests for such a procedure from wholesale traders not members of the Wholesale Potato & Onion Merchants' Association, and even then only with the approval of the Government, similar to that given in respect of imported potatoes.
- (3) Seeking avenues for sale of surplus Western Australian onions.
- (4) (a) Unknown.
- (b) Unknown.
- (c) No.
- (5) The Board has no legal authority to import onions under the Marketing of Onions Act.
- (6) The Board has no knowledge, not being a direct recipient of such advices.
- (7) Yes, with emphasis on the last sentence.
- (8) See (5).

OATS.

As to Formation of Compulsory Pool.

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware of a move to form a compulsory pool for the handling of oats?
- (2) Is he aware that if this comes into force, the entire oat crop, regardless of variety, quality and grade, will be mixed, causing all varieties to lose their identity?
- (3) Is he further aware that a few dirty samples could ruin the entire crop of any certain district by being stored in the local bulk bin with sound quality grains?
- (4) Is he aware that such a pool would be contrary to the best interests of the oat-milling industry, be detrimental to the export of rolled oats and would further have an adverse effect on the export of milling oats?
- (5) Does he agree that the formation of such a pool would be analogous to the complete socialisation of the entire cereal-growing industry?
- (6) Would not such a pool accentuate the present acute shortage of seed oats?
- (7) Is he aware that Mr. Braine, the prime mover for a compulsory pool, was well to the forefront in the movement which defeated the Government's Wheat Stabilisation Bill last year?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No such suggestion has been made nor is it likely to be made.
- (3) An Act would prevent such practices far better than at present.
- (4) It could and would effectively cater for all sections of the trade.
- (5) No more than wheat or barley.

(6) No. Would tend to prevent it.

(7) No. Any move for such legislation must come from the growers to the Minister.

EDUCATION.

(a) As to South Bunbury Primary School.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Will he inform the House when the South Bunbury Primary School is likely to be ready for occupation?

(2) Will he state why there has been such a delay caused in the supply of cement to the contractor for this important contract?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) April, 1952.
- (2) Cement was allocated by Government when requested, but the suppliers were unable to arrange immediate supply.

(b) As to High School, Lake Monger.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When can the parents of children in the Leederville area and adjacent districts expect that the high school planned for Lake Monger will be commenced?

(2) How long is it anticipated that the erection of the school will take after commencement?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is quite impossible to say when the work of erecting the high school at Lake Monger will be commenced.

Consideration has been given the design prepared by the Public Works Department and the papers are before the Treasury Department.

(2) It is anticipated that the work of erecting the school would take at least two years.

BUNBURY HARBOUR.

As to Notice to Employees.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Works:

Will he inform the House the reasons for the notices given last week to eight men employed on the work of extending the Bunbury Harbour?

The MINISTER replied:

Eight men who were engaged for the specific work of guniting piles, in terms of the Department's contract with an Eastern States firm for the carrying out of this work, have been dismissed following the completion thereof.

It is expected that these men will be taken over for work with another department, because at the moment there is no other work in connection with harbour improvement, in which they can be engaged.

The step taken by the Department will not, in any way, interfere with the progress of the work of Bunbury Harbour improvements now in course.

MINES REGULATION ACT.

As to Fatality at Norseman.

Mr. MOIR asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) Who was responsible for the appointment of an employee of the Iron King pyrites mine at Norseman as coroner to inquire into the death of Hone Anderson Roberts, a fellow-employee of the company, who died in the mine on the 23rd February, 1952, by asphyxiation which was apparently due to the inadequate ventilation provided by the employer?

(2) Was the provision of section 32, subsection (3) of the Mines Regulation Act carried out in this case? If not, why not?

(3) Will he take the necessary action to ensure that in future inquiries into the cause of fatal accidents on mines will be carried out according to the provisions of section 32, subsection (3) of the Mines Regulation Act?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

(1) Being a fatal accident, the matter would immediately come within the jurisdiction of the Coroner for the district, who is responsible for the coronial inquiry arrangements.

(2) and (3) Section 32 primarily relates to accidents other than fatal ones, and the procedure outlined therein is and will be followed in such cases.

SEWERAGE.

As to Odour, Leederville Electorate.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Water Supply:

In "The West Australian" of Saturday, the 23rd February, he stated that efforts were being made to stop sewage odour in the Graylands, Karrakatta and Shenton Park districts?

(1) Is he aware that a very distressing odour from a similar source is prevalent in the Olive Grove section of the Leederville electorate?

(2) Will he direct his efforts to stop this smell also?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) The Department is carrying out the essential work of reconditioning the main sewer, and in connection with this work it is absolutely necessary to open certain sewer manholes in the

evening in the Olive Grove district. Offensive odours at certain times will occur, and are unavoidable.

The work will be completed towards the end of April, when the odours referred to will cease.

LAKE MONGER RUBBISH TIP.

As to Abating Nuisances.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is she aware of the plague of "midges" that infests the neighbourhood of Lake Monger, particularly near the rubbish tip in the Anzac-rd. area?

(2) Does she propose to take any action to alleviate the distress caused to local residents, particularly mothers and young babies?

(3) Is she aware of the nuisance caused to residents of the same area by the constant smoke and smell from the said rubbish tip, and will she take steps to eliminate this nuisance?

The MINISTER replied:

(1), (2) and (3) No. I have discussed this with the Commissioner of Public Health, who is taking the matter up with the local authority which is responsible.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

(a) As to Installation Charges.

Mr. HOAR asked the Attorney General:

(1) What was the cost per point of installing electrical current in the metropolitan area and in the country, as at the 31st December, 1951, and what is the cost today?

(2) Has the Prices Branch any control over these charges? If not, whose responsibility is it?

(3) What justification is there for the recent increases?

(4) Are any steps taken to protect the public against over-charges? If so, to whom does one apply? If not, why not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) and (2) The service of installing electrical current is not under price control.

(3) and (4) I am not aware that the charges are excessive.

(b) As to Suggested Increase in Charges.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works:

Is there any truth in the report that the State Electricity Commission proposes to impose another increase on electricity and gas charges shortly, after the end of this special session of Parliament?

The MINISTER replied:

The prices of electricity and gas are varied automatically with variations in the basic wage and cost of coal.

NORTH-WEST.

As to Deep Sea Port, Point Torment.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY asked the Premier:

In view of the present circumstances, is it the intention of the Government immediately to proceed with the erection of a deep sea port at Point Torment?

The PREMIER replied:

No decision has been reached. The matter is still under discussion with the Federal Government.

PROPOSED STEEL MILLS.

As to B.H.P. Pty. Co. Ltd. and Bradford Kendall & Co.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

To what extent will the proposed establishment of Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. near Kwinana, affect the Government's commitments to Bradford Kendall and Co. in connection with works at the Smelters for purposes similar to B.H.P.?

The MINISTER replied:

There is no similarity between any proposals of Broken Hill Proprietary Company and the activities of Bradford Kendall. The latter firm are steel founders, and their establishment here is very welcome. Any activity which B.H.P. may undertake in this State, wherever it is undertaken, will not affect Bradford Kendall's operations.

HOUSING.

(a) As to Rental Homes for Teachers.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When the State Housing Commission makes Commonwealth-State rental homes available to school teachers, does it extend to them the same rights and privileges with regard to those houses as are given to other tenants?

(2) Does the Commission impose the same obligations on teachers who are tenants of Commonwealth-State rental homes as are imposed on other tenants?

(3) Has the Education Department any responsibility to the Housing Commission with regard to houses which have been made available to teachers under the provisions of the Commonwealth-State Rental Homes Agreement?

(4) What is the nature and extent of any such responsibility?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, other than purchase where such houses have been provided or built in country centres at the request of the Education Department.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes.

(4) It nominates the tenants and guarantees the rents in the event of the homes remaining unoccupied.

(b) As to Purchases by Teachers.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Under what power, or authority, does the State Housing Commission deny to school teachers who are given a tenancy of a home erected under the Commonwealth-State Rental Homes Agreement, the opportunity to purchase such home?

(2) When a profit is made on the sale of land upon which Commonwealth-State rental homes have been erected, to what account or fund is the amount of profit credited?

(3) Is such profit taken into account when the financial position of the Commonwealth-State Rental Homes Scheme is ascertained?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Houses in country areas have been allocated by the Commission and built expressly for key personnel of the Education Department at the request of that Department. These homes are being purchased by the Education Department in order that they may be retained for teachers. Houses provided in this way are not available for purchase by the tenants.

(2) Profit on sale of land is credited to the oldest outstanding loan under the Agreement.

(3) Such profit is not taken into account when the financial position in accordance with the provisions of the Second Schedule to the Agreement is ascertained.

(c) As to Release of Resumed Land, Wanneroo.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Housing:
In view of—

(a) the decision of the Commonwealth Government to discontinue finance to the State for erection of Commonwealth-State rental homes; and

(b) the proposal of the Government to build 1,000 homes in Kwinana area.

is it the intention of the Government to release any part of the property in Tuart Hill-Yokine-Wanneroo Road area, which was resumed by the State Housing Commission late in 1950?

The MINISTER replied:

There has been no decision by the Commonwealth Government to discontinue finance to the State for Commonwealth-State rental homes, but the amount of loan funds available has been

restricted for the current year to an amount sufficient only to carry on with contracts where the Commission is actually committed. Further building under this scheme will be dependent on the loan position prevailing in the future, portion of which will be available for housing.

It is not the intention of the Government to release any of the areas recently acquired.

(d) As to Accommodation for Evictees.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Between the 6th March, 1952, and the 12th March, 1952, what number of evicted families who had not applied before the former date, made application to the Housing Commission for accommodation?

(2) Between the 6th March, 1952, and the 12th March, 1952, for how many families evicted after the 30th September, 1951, did the Housing Commission provide accommodation?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) One.

(2) Twenty-three (includes 19 evictions in metropolitan area and two country evictions under amended rent legislation. Also two emergent evictions not under amended legislation).

In reply to a question by the hon. member on 6/3/52, the answer related only to evictions in the metropolitan area under the amended rent legislation.

The question of the 12th instant was not confined to the amended rent legislation and the answer given related to all evictions and included 19 in country areas and 11 emergent evictions not under the amended rent legislation.

The difference between the 250 plus 23 and 299 includes 17 country evictions and nine emergent evictions prior to the 6th March, 1952.

RAILWAYS.

(a) As to Standard Gauge, Kalgoorlie-Perth Section.

Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

(1) Is he aware that Senator McLeay, Minister for Shipping and Transport, stated in Canberra on the 13th February, 1952, that the standard rail gauge of 4ft. 8½in. from Brisbane to Perth would be completed within two years?

(2) That an agreement existed between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments whereby the Commonwealth would finance 70 per cent. of the cost and South Australia 30 per cent.?

(3) What stage have negotiations reached between the Western Australian State Government and the Commonwealth, and on what basis?

(4) Does he anticipate that the stringent import restrictions imposed by the Commonwealth Government will interfere with Senator McLeay's time limit? If not, when will a commencement be made with the Kalgoorlie to Perth section?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) A Press item attributed to Senator McLeay concerning standardisation of gauges has been seen.

(2) Yes.

(3) No definite stage has been reached in the negotiations to date on standard gauge. Discussions are in abeyance at present.

(4) Answered by No. 3.

(b) As to Footway, Maylands Station.

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) When will the present overhead bridge at Maylands railway station be replaced by a new footway and ramp leading up to the footway?

(2) Does he not agree that the timber position has eased sufficiently to allow this work to be undertaken?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) When the present structure is due for complete renewal which should not be for some years.

(2) Both labour and material are involved and the demand for essential works is too insistent to allow of renewals such as this being undertaken before the work is absolutely necessary.

(c) As to Warning Signals, Caledonian Avenue Crossing.

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) When will flash-light warning signals be placed at the Caledonian-avenue crossing?

(2) Will he ensure that when such signals are installed that they be fitted with a warning bell as at Meadow-st. crossing, to be an effective warning of approaching engines to the blinded residents of the area?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Caledonian-avenue presents certain technical difficulties, some of which are also present at Swan-st., North Fremantle. Special equipment is on order for both crossings, and that for Caledonian-avenue will be installed when the problems at Swan-st. have been solved by practical experience.

(2) This will be considered.

(d) *As to Compensation for Chord Line Resumptions.*

Mr. BRADY (without notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Can he state when the people of Bassendean whose property is to be resumed for the purpose of the proposed new chord line will be compensated?

(2) Can he expedite the settlements on the property concerned?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) and (2) I understand from the Minister for Railways that the settlement of these claims will take place as quickly as possible, but I think the best course I can pursue is to bring the hon. member's question under the notice of the Minister for Railways and ask him to supply the information. This I will do.

GOLD.

As to Sales on Free Market, Etc.

Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

(1) Has he received a current report from the Gold Producers' Association indicating—

(a) quantity of gold disposed of on the free market since the 1st September, 1951;

(b) what average price per fine oz. was realised;

(c) future prospects as to sales?

(2) Is he aware that Canadian gold producers are concerned at the continued low price for gold being offered on a "free market" basis?

(3) As the Federal Treasurer is reported through the Prime Minister to have no complete or authoritative knowledge of premium markets, will he undertake some other means of getting this information for the gold mining industry of this State?

(4) Has the State Government any fixed policy for the immediate future of gold mining in Western Australia, and if so, what is the general outline?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No report has yet been received from the association which only came into being in December last. It is understood however that all gold produced since November less Australian requirements has been sold at a premium.

(2) No.

(3) Information on this position will be sought.

(4) It is the policy of the State Government to do everything possible to ensure the future of the gold mining industry.

It has been closely associated with all approaches to the Commonwealth Government regarding some increased price for gold.

AGRICULTURE.

As to File on Kudzu.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

Has the Department a file on Kudzu? If so, would he lay it on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

The file dealing with this fodder plant can be made available at the Department of Agriculture.

FISHERIES.

(a) *As to Under-sized Crabs, Prosecutions.*

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) How many prosecutions have been recorded since the 1st November, 1951, until the 1st March, 1952, of persons caught with under-sized crabs?

(2) How many prosecutions in that period covered activities in the Swan river?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) None.

(2) Answered by 1.

(b) *As to Profit on Mandurah Catch.*

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware that in the first week of the current month many hundreds of cases of cobblers from Mandurah reached the metropolitan markets, which realised less than twopence per pound, and that a large quantity of this fish was retailed at not less than 1s. per pound?

(2) Does he consider this a reasonable margin of profit? If not, what action was taken by the Prices Branch?

(3) Were there any prosecutions?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) The maximum prices for each type of fish are specifically fixed. Margins are not added by the retailer to cost. The approved prices for Cobbler are:—

Headed and gutted—Fisherman's, 11d. lb.; Wholesale, 1s. lb.; Retail, 1s. 4½d. lb.

Not headed and gutted—Fisherman's, 6d. lb.; Wholesale, 7d. lb.; Retail, 9d. lb.

(3) No. If the fish were sold wholesale and retail at prices not in excess of those shown above, the question of prosecution does not arise.

Mr. Kelly: In that case they can get 600 per cent. without any difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

(c) As to Investigating Scollop Beds.

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware that the Federal Minister for Agriculture and Commerce has intimated that he will favourably consider any request which may be made by the Government of Western Australia for a C.S.I.R.O. fishing research vessel to determine the location and extent of scollop beds which are known to exist off our South-West coast?

(2) Is he aware that the scollop fishing in Tasmania is a large and prosperous industry and that an unlimited demand exists for them, both in the Eastern States and in the U.S.A.?

(3) As the development of our scollop beds could lead to the establishment of an industry comparable with our cray-fishing industry, will he consider approaching the Commonwealth Government with the object of obtaining the services of the Commonwealth Research vessel?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) I am aware that scollops are an important item of production in Tasmania.

(3) Yes.

TRANSPORT.*(a) As to Trolley-Bus Stop, Mount Hawthorn.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

Will he give favourable consideration to the request of residents of Mount Hawthorn that Fairfield-st. (corner of Scarborough-rd) be made a stopping place for trolley-buses on the inward journey to Perth at least?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

A similar request was received last September and the matter was then investigated. There has not been any altered circumstance which would warrant the creation of an additional stop at Fairfield-st.

(b) As to Tuart Hill Service.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware that there is still strong dissatisfaction among residents of Tuart Hill due to the refusal or inability of the North Beach Bus Coy. to maintain an efficient service through the district?

(2) Will he take necessary action to ensure an efficient service by the company, and in the event of its failure will he undertake that either some other company or the State service will meet the transport needs of the district?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) The Minister is aware that certain complaints have been submitted by a section of the residents at Tuart Hill. These complaints have been investigated.

(2) The present service is considered reasonable and will be increased from time to time as may be warranted by the development of the area.

ANGLO-IRANIAN OIL CO. LTD.*As to Capital and Shareholding.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What is—

(a) the nominal capital;

(b) the paid-up capital;

(c) the subscribed capital of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. Ltd.?

(2) What is the extent of the respective amounts of shareholding, if any, in the company, by

(a) the Commonwealth of Australia;

(b) Royal Australian Navy;

(c) the British Government;

(d) the British Navy?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) This information is not available in the department.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.*As to Applications and Allotments.*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) What is the total number of applications for War Service Land Settlement farms?

(2) How many applications are outstanding?

(3) When is it anticipated that farms will be allocated to unsatisfied applicants?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) One thousand five hundred and nineteen qualified applicants.

(2) Seven hundred and ninety-five qualified applicants. Of this number, approximately 150 may not now be interested.

(3) Dairy farmers—One to two years. Other applicants—Time will vary according to heavy 'dozers being available and willingness of applicants to assist in developmental work. The objective of the Land Settlement Board is three years.

PRINCESS MARGARET CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL.*As to Finances and Chinese Patient.*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What was the total income and sources thereof, and the total expenditure of the Princess Margaret Children's Hospital for the last 12 months?

(2) Is it a fact that a Chinese girl has been an inmate of the hospital for the past four or five years, and is likely to remain there for a further two years?

(3) Are not her parents, who reside in Singapore, exceedingly wealthy?

(4) Is it true that no hospital fees have been paid in respect of this child?

(5) Is this fair to local taxpayers?

(6) Is this fair to members of those local organisations which raise funds to provide additional amenities, etc., at the hospital?

(7) Could not the parents of the child in question have paid for treatment in a private hospital?

(8) What does she intend to do about cases of this nature?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Income—

	£
Commonwealth Funds	34,196
State Funds	109,364
Fees	5,033
Donations	1,486
Miscellaneous	1,193
	<hr/> 151,277

Expenditure 150,228

(2) The child was admitted on the 8th December, 1948, and will probably be ready for discharge in about six months.

(3) Reputed to be wealthy.

(4) Yes. The child is in a public ward bed, for which no charge can be made. The hospital authorities have approached the parents for a substantial donation.

(5) The circumstances are unusual in this isolated case.

(6) Answered by (5).

(7) Owing to the nature and duration of the illness, medical opinion is that the child could not have been satisfactorily treated in a private hospital.

(8) It is expected that when a new hospital benefits agreement is negotiated with the Commonwealth, provision will be made for this type of case.

GOLDFIELDS NURSES.

As to Free Railway Passes.

Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is she aware that nurses employed at the Kalgoorlie District Hospital, and who have their homes in the metropolitan area, are supplied with free rail passes when returning to their homes on holidays?

(2) Is she aware that nurses who have their homes in Kalgoorlie or Boulder are not supplied with such passes?

(3) In view of the fact that almost all Government employees on the Goldfields receive free passes to proceed on holidays

each year, will she extend this concession to all Goldfields nurses in Government employment?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Yes.

(3) It is not a fact that almost all Government employees receive free passes but it is a provision under the award to give trainee nurses a free rail pass to their home town when on annual leave.

CEMENT.

As to Increasing Supplies.

Mr. SEWELL asked the Premier:

In view of the extreme shortage of local cement, and the control placed on imports of this commodity by the Commonwealth Government, will he state what action the Government is taking to increase supplies?

The PREMIER replied:

The Minister for Housing yesterday informed the House of steps taken to increase production from existing works.

The Government has for some time been engaged in discussions which it is hoped will lead to the establishment of a second cement works in this State. Details of these discussions cannot be divulged at present.

Such a project in any case could not get into production for two or three years. The Government is therefore approaching the Federal Government for permission to import such quantities of cement as are essential for carrying on works, housing and general State development.

GUILDFORD ROAD.

As to Declaring Main Thoroughfare.

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Will he be gazetting Guildford-rd as a main road?

(2) If the answer to (1) is in the negative, what assistance will the P.W.D. give to the local authorities concerned?

(3) When is it expected to start putting this road in order?

(4) If no decision has been reached, when will it be decided as to what action can and will be taken?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is not proposed to gazette Guildford-rd. as a main road.

(2) The local authorities concerned have been requested to formulate proposals to rehabilitate the road over a period of years. Government assistance will be determined when these proposals are submitted.

(3) Commencement is dependent on (2).

(4) A decision is also dependent on (2).

SWAN RIVER POLLUTION.

As to Waste Discharged from Brewery.

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware that a drain from the Emu Brewery discharges into the Swan River below Spring-st.?

(2) Is he aware that large amounts of solids are contained in the water from this drain?

(3) Has any calculation been made of the amount of wastes discharged from the drain?

(4) Has any action been taken to have these wastes diverted to the sewerage system?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes.

(4) Investigations have been made and proposals are being considered.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What does the drain discharge into the river?

CO-ORDINATOR OF WORKS.

As to Trip Abroad.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has he seen the report in "The West Australian" credited to him, that Mr. Dumas is to be sent abroad in order to report on the possibility of using Collie coal in low-grade furnaces for the expansion of other industries in Western Australia, and also for the revising of the plan for the extension of the Fremantle Harbour?

(2) Would it not be better to send Mr. Dumas' successor rather than an officer who is just finishing up his term with the Department, and also could not the revising of the plan be left to Mr. Tydeman, the officer who designed the proposed Fremantle Harbour plan?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) No. Mr. Dumas' long experience as Director of Works is an important factor in respect to a selection of a suitable officer to undertake the particular enquiries now intended on behalf of the Government.

(b) The review of all engineering plans which might be affected by the proposed oil refinery construction is being undertaken by a committee of two engineers, Mr. Dumas and Dr. David Brisbane. Mr. Tydeman will be fully consulted on any proposal for alteration of existing harbour plans.

PRICES CONTROL.

(a) As to Staff and Cost.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN asked the Attorney General:

(1) Will he inform the House as to the number of people employed in the Price Fixing Commission in the State of Western Australia?

(2) What is the cost of employing them?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) One hundred and five persons are at present employed in the office of the Prices Control Commissioner.

(2) The expenditure incurred by the Prices Control office for the six months ended 31/12/51 was as follows:—

		£	s.	d.
Salaries	40,508	0	10
Other	6,414	7	2
		<u>£46,922</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>

(b) As to Dry Cleaning Charges.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (without notice) asked the Attorney General:

Is he aware that the lifting of price control on dry cleaning activities was immediately followed by a price increase? If so, can he indicate to the House what he proposes to do about it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

Yes, I am aware of that. The Prices Commissioner advised me that he would make a recommendation to me of an increase of 12½ per cent. in respect of dry cleaning. On further consideration I decided it would be better to de-control dry cleaning and, as a result, the increases have not amounted to what was predicted by the Prices Commission.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: They soon will.

FOUNDRY FUEL.

As to Waste-Wood Briquettes.

Mr. OLDFIELD (without notice) asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has an application been received from J. K. Young for financial assistance to enable him to embark upon full production of a foundry fuel briquetted from waste woods?

(2) If so—

(a) Is consideration being given to the proposals submitted by J. K. Young?

(b) Will a full investigation be made of the possibilities of this product?

(3) Is it not a fact that certain foundrymen have intimated their desire for an intention of using this fuel?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Yes.

(2) (b) Some inquiries have been made.

(3) One such person advised me that samples used by him had been satisfactory.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

As to Leave to Introduce.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [4.51]: I move—

For leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1951.

I would like briefly to indicate that the purpose of the amendment is to give to those workers who were injured before the passing of the 1951 Act and who are still incapacitated, and also to those workers who were injured before the passing of the Act and suffered a recurrence of the injury after the Act was passed, the benefits of the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1951.

The Attorney General: Was not that considered this year?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I will deal with that aspect in a moment. The position is that in 1948 the present Minister for Education who was in charge of the Bill was good enough to make such provision. It was clarified by an amendment in 1949, and all those types of workers that I have mentioned received the full benefit of the 1948-49 amendments. All that we seek to do is to carry on that principle, and I hope that there will be no opposition to the proposed amendment. The Attorney General asked whether consideration was not given to this proposal. I regret to say that he gave it scant consideration—very scant consideration indeed. As a matter of fact, the point was taken on the question as to whether the proposed amendment was valid or not.

Without detracting from any ruling you may have given, Mr. Speaker, and merely to show how the same matter can be dealt with in different ways by various Houses, it may interest you to know that an amendment which was not allowed in this Chamber was ruled as being in order by the President in another place. All that I am anxious to do is to help the workers. I think the members of the Government would appreciate the position and hope they will have due regard and sympathy for the proposal. When the 1948 amendment was inaugurated at the instigation of the present Minister for Education, the basic wage, speaking from memory, was £5 15s. 9d., and the maximum weekly compensation was raised, from £4 10s. to £6 a week. Now the basic wage

is £10 14s. 1d. a week and workers who are in receipt of £14 a week have their same family commitments, but are only entitled to benefits under the provisions of the old Act if injured before the passing of the 1951 measure.

The tendency is for the basic wage to increase—both the State and the Federal basic wage have shown this tendency and they are bound to increase in the next few months. It may be that the Attorney General will say, "We will give consideration to such an amendment next August or September." But that is six months hence and the efficacy of the amendment will have largely disappeared. Unfortunately there will be workers who will be still incapacitated with injuries received before the passing of the 1951 Act.

I hope, therefore, there will be no opposition to leave being given to introduce this Bill, and that no technical point will be taken as to its validity or otherwise. I have consulted various authorities—indeed I think you, Mr. Speaker, are the only authority I have not consulted—on the constitutional aspects of such an amendment, and they are all in favour of it and say that the Bill is quite in order.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—Mt. Lawley) [4.8]: As some comment has been made on this proposal I intend to make a few remarks. First of all, I would emphasise that the position of the Government has been that during this meeting of Parliament only the two Bills specifically proposed by the Government should be dealt with. That still stands.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Has not Parliament a say?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, of course! The hon. member is fully aware that this is a legal and technical difficulty and it is not an easy one to solve, because it is necessary that at some date the liability of an employer should be crystallised. In every Act in Australia and Great Britain it is crystallised at the date of the accident, and this State has merely followed what is now law in every other State in Australia and in Great Britain. It would cause a good deal of confusion if it were not so because one would not know his exact liability. Not only that, it would cause a great deal of dissatisfaction because one day a lump sum settlement might be contracted for and settled on, and then such an amendment is made and no redress is given.

So, if one takes all the circumstances into consideration I think it is easily seen that the proper date is the one that is universally accepted for crystallisation of the liability and that is the date when the accident occurs. What would be the position if, as has happened before, the basic wage declined? Should that occur, is the Government immediately to recover the

extra payments from the workers concerned, who will be asked to refund the payments they have received? Of course not! There are many difficult aspects associated with this matter, and I think the decision of the Government on the last occasion was correct and that this proposal could be considered during next session.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	19
Majority against	3

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Cornell	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Manning
Mr. Brand	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Watts
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Hill	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Mann
Mr. Styants	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Needham	Mr. Yates
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Totterdell

Question thus negatived; leave refused.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

As to Position on Notice Paper.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE: On a point of information, I desire to refer to the notice paper. I observe that the notices of motion have been divided. The first notice is the one in the name of the member for Mt. Hawthorn, who sought leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, and the second, of course, stands in my name. The two notices of motion have been separated by the Order of the Day relating to the second reading debate on the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Bill. I would like to know from you, Mr. Speaker, whether the separation of the two notices of motion was due to a mistake in the preparation of the notice paper or was done by direction of the Leader of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the normal course has been pursued in the matter.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Would I be in order in moving that notice of motion No. 2 be now taken?

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion to that effect can be moved and voted on.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: In that case, I will move that Order of the Day No. 1 be postponed until after consideration of Notice of Motion No. 2. Order of the Day No. 1 deals with a non-controversial matter.

The Premier: Then let us clean it up and finish with the Bill.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I would agree to that if the Premier will give me an assurance that my notice of motion will be debated.

The Premier: Very well.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: In the circumstances, I will not proceed with the motion I have indicated.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (KWINANA AREA).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 6th March.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melville) [4.16]: It will be readily appreciated that some action must be taken to prevent widespread speculation in land, which will undoubtedly occur as a result of the projected establishment of a very large industry at Kwinana. Because of the very strong demand that will ensue for adjacent sites, there is bound to be keen competition for land, and the sellers will be able to ask almost any price. It is therefore very desirable and necessary that some steps be taken to prevent such widespread speculation, and so regulate prices to what is reasonable. I do not know that any member of this Chamber would quarrel with that desire and intention.

The power which is being sought under the Bill is no less than that which is possessed by the Soviet, to the extent that it is completely totalitarian; whichever way we look at it, the power is confiscatory. It proposes to take away from individuals land that they possess and which they may have intended to use for specific purposes, and it will have the effect of preventing those people from carrying out such purposes. It will prevent them from gaining any financial advantage that might have accrued to them through their foresight, and it will permit the Minister to do what he likes with the land. That is the effect of the Bill—to take away something which belongs to someone else, and allow the Minister to do what he likes with it under his own conditions. Furthermore, should he allow someone to make use of the land, he can impose the conditions under which it shall be held and dealt with.

I agree it is necessary that some control be taken, but it is remarkable that the political party which has preached against controls and which really secured power through making promises about all

and sundry matters, including the lifting of controls, should come forward now with a proposal for absolute control such as this. Nothing could be more complete or more confiscatory than this. I am not prepared to allow this tremendous power to be reposed in one Minister. I am not clear which Minister is meant but, even if I were, I should still not be satisfied to leave the decision to one Minister. On a hot night, he could become inebriated.

The Minister for Lands: Quite easily.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and make a decision that would be a very bad one.

The Minister for Lands: One should not make decisions when one is inebriated.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But they are made at such a time.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Not by this Government.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Minister could be intoxicated with power.

The Minister for Industrial Development: There is no fear of that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: When the Government proposes to leave it to one Minister to exercise confiscatory power of this sort, I consider it to be bad legislation. Therefore I intend at the appropriate time to offer an amendment to one of the clauses of the Bill that will permit of someone else having a say with regard to what the Minister intends to do, before he actually does it. If the Minister's intention is a correct one, he will have nothing to fear from my proposed amendment, because the course would be recommended and the Minister could carry it out. If, on the other hand, the course he proposed to follow were not regarded as being sound, the recommendation would be against it and the Minister would not be permitted to proceed. That is a reasonable safeguard in the circumstances.

If the power proposed to be given were not so wide and extensive, I might be prepared to allow the Minister to act alone on the ground of expedition, but this is a very wide power going far beyond anything I would have expected from the Government in view of its previous protestations. Force of necessity, however, has made a very deep impression upon a majority of the Ministers. If not all of them, and so we have this Bill before us.

A measure somewhat like this is undoubtedly required, because we could not leave the position wide open so that speculation would be rife and prices would become fantastic. With the general principle, I have no cause to disagree, but with the very wide powers being sought, I have

some disagreement along the lines I have indicated. Therefore I indicate a general acceptance of the Bill, stating again that at the appropriate time I shall endeavour to secure an amendment to provide a reasonable safeguard so that persons whose land is to be confiscated will receive fair treatment and that the land will be used for a specific and proper purpose.

I repeat that I am not clear as to which Minister is intended, but that makes no difference. In view of the powers being sought, I consider it is not right that they should be placed in the hands of one man. This would be very bad in a democracy, though all right in a totalitarian country because that is part of the setup in such a country, but it is quite foreign to our belief regarding the way things ought to be carried on. Provision ought to be made for consultation between and consideration by several rather than that one person should deal with the matter and make the decision.

With the best intention in the world, a Minister, relying upon his own judgment, might make a very grievous error and, as a result, do a serious wrong to some party or parties. If we make provision for consideration of the intended action by somebody else, we shall provide a safeguard which, in my view, is very necessary in order to ensure that in the difficult circumstances that may arise, justice will be done. I support the second reading.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville) [4.26]: I wish to ask a couple of questions which I should like the Minister to answer. Consideration of the Bill has brought those questions to my mind, one of them being the date of expiry. I understand that the Co-ordinator of Works is to go abroad and find a town planner, who is to produce a plan as required under this measure. As the Co-ordinator of Works has not yet left the State and has not found the town planner or brought him here and as the town planner has not seen the land, it appears to me that the period of 20 months specified in the Bill may not be sufficient. The Minister might consider whether he should extend the period.

Secondly, I am not quite conversant with the term "set apart" which is used in relation to the land to be taken or resumed. If I may apply the usual meaning to the term, I would conclude that the land at present in private ownership may be embargoed under the plan and remain in private ownership. I feel that the term "set apart" should also be added to the clause dealing with compensation, because members will appreciate that privately-owned land embargoed for a purpose different from that for which it

is at present being used could require compensation and lead to an increase in the value of the land according to the terms of such setting apart.

I know some of the Kwinana area fairly intimately. Were it required by the plan that an area now used as a flower farm were to be used for a tannery, the value of that land would change immediately. The Minister, in moving the second reading, said it was necessary to allow a mortgagee in possession when selling to dispose of the land free of all encumbrances, in effect, because it was difficult to make the requirements of the law stick. I consider it is not beyond the capability of the Minister or his advisers to draft the law in such a manner that it would stick and, if this measure is not so drafted, it should be withdrawn and so dealt with.

If, as appears to me, being uninitiated, it is capable of being made to hold, I then consider that the clause freeing the land from conditions, if it is held by a mortgagee in possession, should be withdrawn because there is power in a later clause authorising the Minister to vary any of the conditions. That variation also includes the total removal of the previous banning. I feel that this clause is one that will give rise to the possibility of faking. If an owner were to find that under the plan his land had been tagged for a purpose with which he did not agree, there would be nothing at all to prevent his mortgaging it, breaching his contract, the mortgagee entering into possession, and selling it free of all encumbrances and so taking a profit. I feel that is a matter which should be given consideration.

MR. GRIFFITH (Canning) [4.31]: The member for Melville describes this Bill as a soviet-like measure. I would like to point out to him that all land resumption Acts could perhaps be referred to as soviet-like in their action because their effect in many cases is harsh. Sometimes one could say that their effect would be unconscionable. The existing land resumption Acts have that effect, but I am certain that the hon. member will agree that for a Government to have power of land resumption, although it could be harsh, is very necessary; and, with the experience I have had of listening to the member for Melville, I think he would be the first person to criticise any Government which did not in this instance protect the taxpayers' money by introducing a Bill to prevent wholesale land speculation.

This Bill throws a blanket over an area of land, but it is not the Government's intention to take for the purposes of the oil refinery all the land which is surrounded by the lines marking the area in the schedule of the Bill. Upon that

point, I desire the Minister to give me one or two explanations. One is on the question of value. The Bill provides, in order to prevent wholesale land speculation, that values shall be fixed as at the first day of January, 1952. How are those values to be determined and who will be the people to determine them? The first of January, 1952, is some time between the period when the oil refinery was rumoured to be coming to this State and the period when it was actually known that the Anglo-Iranian Company intended to establish the industry here.

No doubt the Minister will say that that would be a reasonable date at which to fix the values, but I want to know how they are to be determined. Then, when they are fixed, how will individual people who own this land be affected? May I put it this way? There is an area of land described in the schedule of which the Government will require to take a certain amount for the purposes of the refinery. Let us assume for a moment that the value fixed according to the Bill on one area of land is £100. The person who owns that block may have it taken from him by the Government for the purpose of establishing thereon a school.

The person who owns a block of land adjacent to the one I have mentioned could, if he so desired, trade in it. He could dispose of the fee simple or enter into a contract of sale or a lease, provided he did so with the permission of the Government. When the owner of such a block applied to the Government for permission to sell and the Government said it did not want that piece of land, I venture to suggest that the price the man would obtain by selling it to some private individual would be far in excess of the £100 which would be paid by the Government to the owner of the land resumed. I am certain that the Minister will agree that that would be the case. So we would have the position that because one person owns a block which the Government wants he would receive, say, £100; while the person whose land was next door and was not required by the Government could sell the property and ask almost any figure he wanted for it. I would like the Minister to give me some explanation in that regard.

There is another matter which concerns me and that is the finality of this position. When are the people who own land in the Kwinana area to be told whether or not that land is required? I am still being asked when the Government intends to make certain decisions in connection with land which was to have been resumed for the purposes of the Welshpool-Bassendean chord line. That project is now held up. I know men who understood that their property was to be resumed for the purposes of this

line but do not now know where they stand, because there may be a change. I hope that position will not arise in regard to the Kwinana land, because it is most unsatisfactory to land-owners who desire to dispose of their property, even if it is for a profit. Frequently men buy land and hold it with a view to disposing of it subsequently for a profit, and it is only fair and equitable that there should be some determining period other than that stated in the Bill, so that they may know when they are able to dispose of it.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling—in reply) [4.38]: I thank members for their reception of this measure. Dealing first with the remarks of the member for Melville, I agree substantially with the observations made in that connection by the member for Canning. Resumptions that take place under this measure, if and when they do take place, will be effected under the Public Works Act, and substantial areas of land have been resumed for public purposes under that Act by different Governments over a very long period of years. The only substantial difference in the procedure under that Act, as persisting in the past and as it will take place in this measure, will be that the values throughout the period the Act is in operation will be dated back to the 1st January, 1952, a matter of 21 months, as against the normal six months under the Public Works Act, and that land can be taken for purposes not strictly those of public works as defined by the Public Works Act.

The principles will be much the same, and the assessment of compensation as provided by the Bill will be, I think, as under the Public Works Act except insofar as provision for the back-dating of the time and value is inserted in the measure. So I suggest that to refer to the Bill as totalitarian, confiscatory and so forth, is somewhat unwarranted. It is not necessary to dwell on that aspect any more because the hon. member was good enough to agree that some such proposal as this was necessary in the peculiar circumstances of the case. It was that aspect which I tried to make plain was in my mind when I addressed the House on the measure a few days ago.

I said that the circumstances in the area were unprecedented, and that no-one at that stage could know what the future would hold, but it was, however, quite obvious that great advantage could be taken of the enormous expenditure which would take place in the area, and that not only the persons who might desire land in the vicinity for industrial purposes, but also the taxpayers of the State, in respect to the need of the Government for land for public works in convenient places, could because of highly speculative prices be deprived of large sums of money to the profit of those who had done little or nothing to deserve it.

Therefore it is in the interests of the taxpayers, as much as anyone else, that the Bill appears before us.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: A moment or so ago you made reference to a period of 21 months. Where do you get that from?

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: The date in the Bill is the 31st December, 1953, and this is March, 1952. A little rough mental arithmetic arrives at one year and nine months between now and then.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: What has the present date got to do with the date of fixing the value, and the date of expiration of power to acquire?

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: It has nothing whatever to do with fixing the value, but if the hon. member agrees with me on the subject, and I think he will, he will find that the power sought to be exercised under the measure must be exercised before the 31st December, 1953. Therefore 21 months will be the period, I assume, from the passing of the Act.

The question of value, of course, is one of dating back to the 1st January, which is quite another matter. It will be within the competence of Parliament in 1953, if it so desires, to extend that date. That is the answer I would give to the hon. member—the member for Leederville, I think—who referred to the expiry date as being too soon. If by October, 1953, Parliament comes to the conclusion that the expiry date of the 31st December, in the light of what has taken place, or has not been done, is too soon, then the period can be extended. But it was considered that at this stage a great deal could be determined in the course of the 21 months to which I have referred. Already two parties of surveyors are doing the contour surveys. It is expected that a townsite will be ear-marked before long.

Certain industries, such as the proposed cement works, know where they want to place themselves in the event of their becoming established. Other inquiries are being made. I think much good can be done between now and the end of December, 1953, and what is achieved will not involve much work to be carried out by any town planner, because only general principles will require to be laid down in order to determine which areas shall be available for particular purposes. The period, for the time being, is long enough and should not be extended without careful consideration in the future.

I believe the use of the words "set apart" is really on all fours with that of the word "resume." I think it is one of those curious legal phraseologies where the same thing is said in three words instead of one. I have always understood that is so, except that the expression

"set apart" may have more particular reference to land set apart for public purposes, such as recreation reserves and so on, rather than for other purposes.

The member for Canning gave the impression that he thought the Bill was to resume land for the purposes of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. If I did not misunderstand him, that is the impression he must have given the House. The measure is not to do that at all. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's Bill deals with the land for that company, and the land connected with that particular concern is entirely excluded from this measure. The hon. member talked, if I remember aright, of the position that would arise if the Government, having taken land under the Bill for the oil company, wanted to do something with the block next door. I assumed he was thinking this was the Bill under which the company's land would be taken. Well, this measure has nothing to do with the oil company's land.

Mr. Griffith: It is in connection with the oil company—schools, etc.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: This is not in connection with the oil company but the people who will go there because the oil company is there, or those who go to establish industries to serve them, or to improve the industrial capacity of the State, and to provide the necessities for life or industry that may be required. This is not a Bill to do anything for the oil company.

Mr. Griffith: If the oil company were not going there, you would not have the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Precisely! I have already indicated that point as well as I could. As I understand the measure—and I do not want to enter into a controversy on the point with the hon. member—it is to ensure that the industries and people who will go there as a consequence of the oil company's activities can be provided for. I would say to the hon. member, in furtherance of what I said earlier, that the procedure of resumption being under the Public Works Act, it will naturally be subject to the same principles, except for the one I have already mentioned, as have been applied under that Act for many years.

The final determination of the value of any particular block as at the 1st January, 1952, in the event of its being impossible to reach agreement between the Government and the individual concerned, must be left to the court of assessors under the Public Works Act and that court, I think, is presided over by a Supreme Court judge and sitting on it are representatives of both parties. They will finalise the matter, as they always have done. In this instance the evidence as to value that

they will want to receive and check will be what the value was on the 1st January, 1952, in the opinion of the persons most concerned and the people giving expert evidence. I think my remarks cover all that has been said except what was stated by the member for Melville in regard to his proposed amendment, which up to a few moments ago I had not seen, but of which I now have a copy. I think it would be best dealt with in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Industrial Development in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Power to take certain lands:

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: According to the memorandum handed to me by the member for Melville, it is his intention to seek to amend Clause 6. From his second reading speech I understood the idea was that the taking of the land should be subject to the consideration of somebody other than the Minister, but by making the amendment to Clause 6 I think the hon. member would achieve the position that the Minister, having taken the land, would simply have to ask advice as to what he should do with it. If that is what the hon. member intended, I am prepared to discuss it on those lines, but I doubt whether that was his intention.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: There has not been a great deal of time in which to give this matter the thought it requires. On seeing the need for this amendment, I fastened on Clause 6 and it was my intention to have the resumption of the land, as well as the dealing with it afterwards, under the control of more than one man but, on reflection, I believe that if the Minister knows that, having resumed the land, he cannot dispose of it in any way, until the committee which I shall propose has looked at it, it is unlikely that he will make any unwise acquisition.

I think my purpose would be completely served by amending Clause 6, though I certainly intend that the business of taking this land and disposing of it in any way shall be under the control of more than one man. I would like to see the Minister for Lands dealing with it. When we resume land under the Public Works Act or for industrial development purposes, it is the Minister for Lands who acts. His officers are experienced in the acquisition of land and have the best knowledge of land, so I think that Minister should do the job. Under the present wording I think it could be some other Minister. I am concerned about somebody else having some say as

to what is to be done with the land and, while I would prefer that somebody else should also deal with the actual acquisition, lack of time makes it difficult for me to think of an appropriate amendment. I believe my purpose will be met by amending Clause 6.

If the Minister will agree with what I am aiming at and will co-operate to amend Clause 5, I shall be happy to do that. I wish to make it clear that I believe the business of taking land for any purpose and disposing of it for any purpose—this very wide power—should not repose in the hands of one individual. It is conceivable that someone might want to establish a hotel, which would be a very lucrative business, in the area concerned. I would not like to be the Minister to make the decision as to who would be the person to get the allocation of land for that purpose, because there would be so much money involved, so much room for thought about it and for the wagging of idle tongues. I would not like to be the Minister solely responsible for making the decision. I would like it to be fortified by a recommendation from somebody else.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Would you care to discuss this with me for a few minutes?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will be happy to do so, if that is possible.

The CHAIRMAN: I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 4.57 to 6 p.m.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—Dealing with land taken:

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: The member for Melville, as was arranged, has discussed this matter with me and with the Parliamentary Draftsman, and amendments to this clause upon which we are completely agreed have been prepared. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 before the word "Any" the letter "a" in brackets, thus "(a)" and the words "Subject to the provisions of the succeeding paragraphs of this section" be inserted.

In fairness to members, I might state that this is a preliminary towards a reference of matters affecting the disposal of land under Clause 6 to a committee constituted similarly to that set up under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, 1945. The proposal of the Minister is to be referred to that committee, and if the committee approves, the proposal is to be acted upon; if it does not, then the proposal is not to be acted upon, and if the committee has an alternative proposal it is to be at the discretion of the Minister whether he accepts the alternative or not.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I move an amendment—

That in line 10, after the words "thinks fit" the following paragraphs be added:—

- (b) Before the Minister exercises any power conferred upon him by paragraph (a) of this section he shall refer his proposal to exercise the power to the Advisory Committee referred to in paragraph (e) of this section.
- (c) Unless the Committee approves the proposed exercise of the power the Minister shall not exercise it.
- (d) If the Committee recommends to the Minister an alternative proposal for the exercise of his power, the Minister may, but without being obliged to do so, adopt the recommendation and exercise the power accordingly.
- (e) The Advisory Committee shall consist of four members ex officio, namely, the persons for the time being and from time to time holding respectively the offices of—
 - (i) Surveyor General;
 - (ii) Director of Industrial Development;
 - (iii) A member of the Town Planning Board as constituted under the Town Planning and Development Act, 1929, such member to be appointed by the Minister, and
 - (iv) A representative of the Chamber of Manufacturers.
- (f) The four members shall elect one of their number to be the Chairman of the Committee.
- (g) Any three members shall form a quorum.
- (h) The Committee shall meet at such times and at such place or places and shall transact its business in such manner as it shall determine unless and until regulations are prescribed relating to those matters and when regulations are prescribed in accordance with the regulations.

I think that the subject matter is clear enough from the discussion that has taken place and the terms of the amendments as I have read them out. The committee, constituted under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, 1945, consisted of the Surveyor General, the director of Industrial Development, the chairman of the Town Planning Board and a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures. We have substituted, in lieu of the chairman of the Town Planning Board, a member of the Town Planning Board of which, of course, the chairman is one. The possibilities are that the chairman of the board may be going on leave for some time, and as a consequence a member can be appointed to act on the committee in his stead. That is the reason for the slight alteration, and, of course, the committee is called an advisory committee.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The amendment is designed to do precisely what I suggested ought to be done with this clause, inasmuch as it provides a necessary safeguard against Ministers being placed in an invidious position when a decision has to be made on the disposal of land for a specific purpose. As I said when speaking before, I would not like to be the Minister whose sole responsibility it is, for example, to determine the site for a hotel and to what person it was to be granted. The amendment will ensure that if the Minister desires to dispose of the land in a certain way his proposal shall be examined and reported upon by a competent and representative committee. If that committee agrees with the Minister's proposed action it will recommend accordingly and the Minister can then proceed. If the committee disagrees with the Minister's intention he will not be able to proceed and, further, if it submits some alternative recommendation then, quite rightly, the Minister is not obliged to accept it.

So this is not an attempt to over-ride the power of the Minister and render him merely a cypher, but it is a very necessary safeguard against errors and actions which might not be correct. Not that I have any fear that a Minister would deliberately set himself out to do something that was wrong, but he could quite easily be misinformed on a point or led astray by strong representations and he could, quite conceivably, although acting in all good faith, make a bad decision. I consider that it is essential that other minds should have an opportunity of considering any proposed action to be taken by a Minister, and here we are inserting a provision enabling experts in their particular line to examine any proposal.

It is most desirable that the Town Planning Board should have some say in the use and disposal of land. Unless the Town Planning Act is to be completely over-ridden—and I do not think anybody

would desire that—and if we are to have proper town planning, the Minister should not be left to decide what type of business shall go here or there, but expert knowledge should be brought to bear on the question. This committee will be so constituted that expert opinion will be available for the guidance of the Minister and he will be assisted in whatever way he will require advice. So I believe the amendment is a distinct improvement on the Bill as drafted and I hope the Committee will accept it. I appreciate greatly the co-operative attitude of the Minister, and we had no difficulty in deciding as to which was the right course to follow. It was then only a matter of obtaining legal assistance in order that the amendment might be properly framed.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Prior consent necessary to leasing or mortgaging land:

Mr. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

I do so for the reasons I gave earlier and because the Minister did not reply in detail on that statement, I feel I am taking the correct step. The clause opens the way to misuse of legal action to achieve an objective which is contrary to that intended by the Bill. The method which could be adopted under the clause would be a slow-moving one, but anyone with a legal knowledge could see it is quite possible. That is, a person entering into possession of land which has some condition attached to it under the terms of this legislation could, with the consent of the Minister, take out a mortgage with somebody other than the Minister, make default, go through the steps leading to foreclosure and sell, and in that manner avoid the reservation that the Minister had, quite rightly, placed upon it.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSON: I feel that the authority included in Clause 10 to amend the proscriptions which may be placed on land is sufficient to cover the requirements of a mortgagee entering into possession, and for that reason I move my amendment.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I hope the hon. member will not press this amendment. During the second reading I endeavoured to explain that the insertion of this provision in the measure was deemed absolutely essential to ensure that moneys can be raised on land which is subject to conditions such as this. Mortgagees, particularly banking institutions—and here I would suggest that the hon. member who has moved this amendment may have had some experience prior to his entry into Parliament—with their

attitude towards securities, will be most unlikely, I would suggest, to lend money if the realisation by themselves is to be such that restrictive conditions are imposed which may hamper the realisation of their securities and the recovery of their money if the worst comes to the worst.

I am aware that it is possible for the steps to be taken along the lines suggested by the hon. member but in my experience of legislation of similar character those steps have not been taken, and these moneys in the great majority of cases, if not in all cases, will be raised under this measure for the purpose of improving the land by the erection of buildings for industrial or other such purposes thereon. In consequence it is extremely unlikely that any such happening would occur.

One has to realise that it is difficult enough, particularly in these times, to obtain funds for the enlargement or establishment of industry without placing the lending institution in the position of either running some risk of loss of an obvious character or, alternatively, claiming that that would be the position and in consequence adding to the difficulty of raising the necessary funds. I referred to other legislation. There was inserted in the Land Act of 1948 the following provision which has been used for half a century or more:—

(4) (a) By order the Governor may direct that any land shall be granted in fee simple to any person subject to the condition that the person shall not lease or mortgage the whole or any part of the land without the consent of the Governor and subject to such other conditions and limitations as the Governor shall deem necessary to ensure that the land is used for the purpose.

The purpose being defined as the purpose for which the land is reserved pursuant to the provisions of this Act. The amendment of 1948 went on to provide—

(5) When the mortgagee of any land mortgaged with the consent of the Governor, whether before or after the commencement of the Land Act Amendment Act, 1948, completes the exercise of the power of sale or foreclosure pursuant to the mortgage, the land shall by force of this enactment be freed from any trust, condition, limitation, or other restriction, created or imposed in relation to the purpose.

(6) The provisions of this section shall apply in respect of all land reserved pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to or after the commencement of the Land Act Amendment Act, 1948.

That provision is on all fours with what is in this measure and it was inserted after long experience of the Land Act, and the difficulties that trustees and others who had land vested in them for any specific purpose had of raising money for the carrying out of improvements or works upon the lands in question because upon realisation the land would be subject to the restrictions, conditions and reservations and therefore mortgagees would not lend the money. I am advised that on more than one occasion, in order to enable the moneys to be raised, special legislative enactments have been put through Parliament in spite of certain reservations from time to time providing that the mortgage money might be raised and the mortgage executed notwithstanding these reservations.

So the advice I have received and the slight experience I have had in the matter can lead me to only one conclusion and that is that we want to make it reasonably possible for people to raise money on the security of land which may have been subject to some condition as this. We would naturally take all the necessary steps to ensure that the money is spent upon the land for the purpose for which it was intended. If the position subsequently arises that foreclosure or sale has to take place under the powers conferred on the mortgagee we will have to relieve the land of these restricted conditions, otherwise great difficulty will be experienced by the mortgagors—as was experienced before the passing of the Land Act Amendment Act and which was the reason for its passage—in raising money and in consequence render them unable to finance their operations.

While there is a scintilla of risk that at some time or other somebody may succeed by indirect means, and in spite of all precautions, in taking advantage of this provision, it is not known, I am advised, to have happened before. I think it is a very small risk we can take on this occasion rather than risk the possibility of people, who are bona fide and anxious to develop their industry or business upon the land, being prevented from financing their negotiations.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 12, Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

MOTION—BROKEN HILL PTY. CO. LTD.*As to Use of Koolan Island Iron-Ore.***HON. A. R. G. HAWKE** (Northam)
[7.44]: I move—

In view of the statement by the Minister for Industrial Development, as published in "The West Australian" on the 6th instant, wherein he announced the intention of the Government to lease under royalty the iron ore deposits at Koolan Island, Yampi Sound, to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, this House is strongly of the opinion that no iron-ore should be taken from Koolan Island, except for processing within Western Australia; the House already being aware that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited now controls 38 million tons of iron-ore at Cockatoo Island, Yampi Sound.

On the 16th October, 1951, the Premier spoke at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Manufactures. Among other things he said—

It would be the objective of the Government to see that whoever might obtain a lease at Yampi Sound would take an interest in the development of Western Australia.

He went on to say—

The ore should not be just shipped out of the State.

In "The West Australian" of the 18th January of this year, there appeared a report headed "Plans for a Steel Industry in Western Australia." It stated—

Representatives of two companies interested in establishing a steel industry in this State would be in Perth in the near future, the Minister for Industrial Development (Mr. Watts) said yesterday. They would discuss their proposals with him and with various State officers.

Mr. Watts said that in both instances Australian companies were involved. One was an exploratory company formed in Sydney in conjunction with substantial English steel interests. The other was a well-known and purely Australian concern.

Later on the Minister said—

The first-mentioned company held out hopes for the establishment of a large-scale iron and steel industry. The other company offered the early establishment of a portion of a steel industry on a limited scale only.

The company the Minister referred to there is the completely Australian company. The Minister continued—

The Sydney company, however, wanted Government financial backing of a nature which presented many difficulties and some considerable

objections. The proposals of the Australian concern involved no Government assistance.

We see, therefore, that in January of this year two companies, one an exploratory company formed in Sydney, having contacts with substantial English interests, and an all-Australian company—the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. Ltd.—were negotiating with the Government of this State for the purpose of attempting to do something in Western Australia along the lines of establishing a steel industry. On the 30th January of this year an article was published in "The West Australian" headed "Steel Man's Hopes of Decisions." The report stated—

He was hopeful that present discussions with the Western Australian Government on the establishment of a steel industry here would result in decisions giving advantage to the State and his company, the general manager of Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. (Mr. L. McLennan) said yesterday.

Among other things said by Mr. McLennan, as reported in the newspaper, was the following:—

Western Australia had certain natural resources which were of interest to his company and he was now discussing the means by which the company could be more closely associated with the State's future.

On the 21st February the following statement appeared in "The West Australian" under the heading, "B.H.P. Plans Kwinana Steel Mill; Use of Gas from Refinery Likely." The statement went on to say—

The Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. believes that within three years it can have a 10 in. steel mill operating in this State, it is understood.

In five years, the company estimates, it can have an open-hearth furnace using gas supplied from the proposed Anglo-Iranian oil refinery.

On the 28th February of this year a statement appeared in "The West Australian" headed "W.A. Told to Use its Iron in Bargaining." The statement, in part, read—

Western Australia has the finest deposits of iron-ore in Australia, the members of the Fremantle Rotary Club were told at their luncheon yesterday. The speaker was the manager of the Wundowie Wood Distillation, charcoal-iron and steel industry, Mr. A. C. Harris.

Mr. Harris said that at Cockatoo Island, Koolan Island and Koolyanobbing, there were 250,000,000 tons of high-grade ores. In the opening up of new industries in this State, it was to be hoped that the Government would realise what big bargaining power it had.

On the 5th March the following statement appeared in "The West Australian":—

**Cabinet Agrees Over Steel Scheme.
Industry to Start in this State.**

The State Cabinet yesterday agreed to proposals by the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. for the establishment of a steel industry in Western Australia.

The company will build a suitable steel rolling mill within the next four or five years on a 600-acre site expected to be announced within the next few days.

Expressing his satisfaction last night at the company's intention, the Minister for Industrial Development (Mr. Watts) said that an agreement would be drawn up for ratification by Parliament.

Mr. Watts said that the Government would lease to the company, under royalty, the iron-ore deposits at Koolan Island, Yampi Sound.

One of the conditions would be that the ore from Koolan Island must not be disposed of outside Australia.

The establishment of the steel rolling mill, including wharf equipment, roads and other facilities would involve an expenditure of about £3,000,000 and would, following the oil refinery, represent the second most important step forward in industrial progress in the history of the State.

The Minister then went on to say that work would be provided for 200 men in the steel rolling mill, and that well-planned investigations could now be put in hand with a view to the development of an integrated steel industry in the knowledge that these would have all the experience and technical skill of the B.H.P. behind them. He also said that these negotiations had been based on whether the company would undertake to erect a modern steel rolling mill for the production of angles, channels, flats, rounds, and other merchant-size sections and having a capacity of 50,000 tons a year, which was twice the current requirement.

The Minister also said that the mill would be regarded as an initial step in the establishment at some future date of an integrated iron and steel industry for Western Australia. He added that the company has given an undertaking to investigate other things, and, in all, the Minister's statement covered a column of space in the newspaper. On that day, I gave a statement to the "Daily News," which was published the same afternoon, in which I expressed my intense dislike of some of the features of the steel agreement between the Government and Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. I said—

I find it hard to believe that the Government has agreed to hand the Koolan Island iron-ore deposits to the company.

B.H.P. already controls the iron-ore deposits at Cockatoo Island, estimated at 38,000,000 tons. It is understood that these deposits are being used to the extent of about 1,000,000 tons a year.

On the 7th March in this House, I endeavoured to obtain some information from the Minister for Industrial Development. The information was not made available. The Minister gave the House to understand that the agreement between the company and the State Government was to be the subject of detailed drafting by legal and technical officers of the Government and the company, and would take some time. I also asked the Minister whether he would table any written advice or reports on the proposals that he had received from the Co-ordinator of Works and Industrial Development (Mr. Dumas), the Board of Management of the Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry at Wundowie, and the Under Secretary for Mines (Mr. Telfer). The Minister's attitude to my request was to refuse to make the information available, saying that all necessary information would be given when the Bill for the ratification of the agreement was presented to Parliament next session.

It was obvious to me that the Minister had every desire in the world to prevent me or anyone else on the Opposition side of the House from having an opportunity of seeing any papers associated with the negotiations that had been carried on to that stage. This was a stage when agreement had been reached on principles, and very important principles some of them were. In "The West Australian" of the 7th March there was a reply to my criticism as follows:—

The Minister for Industrial Development said yesterday that he had read with some surprise a statement attributed to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hawke) regarding the proposed agreement with the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. to establish a steel industry in this State.

Mr. Hawke had said that he could hardly believe that the Government had agreed to hand over the Koolan iron-ore deposits in Yampi Sound to the company.

I am sure that, when the whole of the agreement and the surrounding circumstances are placed before Parliament later this year, Mr. Hawke will find cause considerably to modify the views he expressed.

Then the Minister gave expression to this gem—

It is, of course, impracticable, at this stage to convey in a Press statement the various advantages to the State, which I am sure will be apparent to Parliament.

On the 4th March, the Minister was overflowing with information, because that is the date when he gave the column-long statement to "The West Australian" newspaper, the statement published on the 5th March. He set out most of the major benefits that would be likely to arise following the decision and action by the B.H.P. to establish a steel rolling mill in this State. The Minister gave the newspaper the broad principles of what had been agreed upon between the Government and the company prior to that time.

Included in the important points agreed upon was the decision by the Government to lease, under royalty to B.H.P., Koolan Island situated in Yampi Sound. As I read from the Minister's statement, he also pointed out the employment benefits that would develop and the industrial progress that the establishment of this industry would contribute. He indicated the assurances the company had given to investigate even greater undertakings than the one included in the agreement to establish a steel rolling mill in this State. Yet, two days later, on the 6th March, he said, "It is, of course, impracticable at this stage to convey in a Press statement the various advantages to the State which I am sure will be apparent to Parliament." The B.H.P. company, as indicated in the motion itself, already has control of the iron-ore deposits at Cockatoo Island. It is estimated that there is at Cockatoo Island, above high-water level, at least 38,000,000 tons of iron-ore.

Mr. Grayden: Is that high-grade ore?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Very high-grade, though not quite as high-grade as Koolan Island ore. Therefore, we start on the basis that this company prior to the recent negotiations being commenced already controlled completely approximately 40,000,000 tons of iron-ore above high-water mark at Cockatoo Island, a very great quantity of high-grade ore indeed. I am given to understand that the equipment installed at Cockatoo Island by this company to handle the iron-ore for the purpose of placing it into ships to enable it to be transported to Newcastle has a maximum capacity of 1,000,000 tons per year. In other words, the B.H.P. company will, with the present handling capacity installed at Cockatoo Island, still be taking iron-ore from Cockatoo Island in the year 2000.

In addition to the approximate 40,000,000 tons of iron-ore at Cockatoo Island above high-water mark there is, of course, a very large quantity of similar ore below high-water mark. I am not suggesting for a moment that all the iron-ore under high-water mark could be economically recovered, but I do suggest very seriously that a goodly quantity could be recovered economically. On the 12th December, 1951, there appeared in "The

West Australian" a statement headed, "W.A. Iron-ore Being Shipped to Newcastle." The statement read as follows:—

Australian Iron and Steel Ltd., a subsidiary of Broken Hill Proprietary, is now sending high-grade iron-ore from its leases on Cockatoo Island, Yampi Sound, to Newcastle for treatment.

Figures issued by the Mines Department show that in the September quarter Australian Iron and Steel lifted an initial shipment of 10,384 tons of ore with an assayed iron content of 6,500 tons worth £10,297 from Cockatoo Island, where the company has been preparing for some years to ship the ore.

So we can see that this iron-ore is valued on the site at approximately £1 per ton. At that valuation, the company has at Cockatoo Island iron-ore to the value of £40,000,000 above high-water mark. I should say there would be iron-ore which could be economically recovered below high-water mark of at least 20,000,000 tons, valued at perhaps not quite £1 per ton, because of additional handling costs, but valued I should think, by the company, at somewhere very close to £1.

At Koolan Island, which is situated very close indeed to Cockatoo Island, there is above high-water mark approximately 60,000,000 tons of what I understand to be the highest quality iron-ore in the world. If we value that iron-ore to the company on the site at £1 per ton, the company, if the Government agrees to hand Koolan Island over to it, will have £60,000,000 worth of iron-ore put into its hands, and on our western coastline will then be in possession of at least £100,000,000 worth of iron-ore above high-water mark. Probably the company would be in possession of another £50,000,000 worth which could be economically recovered below high-water mark.

There would be only one possible justification for any Government in this State handing over the iron-ore deposits at Koolan Island to any company. That justification would be if the company concerned, and I would not care what company it was, bound itself hand and foot, in the legal sense, to establish without any qualification a large-scale iron and steel industry in Western Australia, and to use all the iron-ore taken from Koolan Island to process in the industry established within the State. What has the Government obtained from the company in return for its agreement to hand this huge deposit of valuable iron-ore over to the control of the company? What has the Government actually received from the company? What has the company bound itself to establish within Western Australia in return for this priceless gift of somewhere near £100,000,000 worth of high-quality iron-ore?

The only thing the company has bound itself to do which is practical in character and which the company will surely do, and be legally bound to do, is to establish a steel rolling mill—that is all—a steel rolling mill which will provide employment for only 200 men. This steel rolling mill will not process any iron-ore taken from Koolan Island or Cockatoo Island. It will not process one ounce of iron-ore. All the iron-ore from Cockatoo and Koolan Islands will be taken to New South Wales and be processed at Newcastle. It might even receive some additional processing at Port Kembla and, when it has been processed into steel billets, it will then be shipped from the coast of New South Wales to Fremantle and receive such treatment in the steel rolling mill at Kwinana as will be necessary to turn out the products referred to by the Minister in his statement published in "The West Australian" on the 5th March this year.

I should hope that the Government has not irrevocably committed itself to this agreement. It would be a political scandal of the first magnitude if the Government had committed itself to the agreement, or even to the broad principles of it. If it has committed itself to hand over Koolan Island to B.H.P. then the Government deserves to receive not only a direction from Parliament on the issue but the strongest possible censure from Parliament for having betrayed the best and the long term interests of Western Australia in connection with the matter. In order to emphasise the point, I would like to read again the statement made by the Minister in relation to Koolan Island as published in "The West Australian" of the 5th March—

Mr. Watts said that the Government would lease to the company under royalty the iron-ore deposits at Koolan Island, Yampi Sound.

There is no doubt about that. It is as clear and decisive as it could possibly be. Whether the Government is now under a complete legal obligation to the company to do this proposed thing I do not know, but at least, and beyond any doubt, it is under a tremendously powerful moral obligation to lease Koolan Island to B.H.P. Even if the Government, now that the matter is receiving some of the publicity which it deserves, desires to go into reverse in respect of Koolan Island, it could easily find itself in considerable difficulty if the company wished to enforce the particular principle of the agreement on this point as already approved by the Government on the one side and the company on the other.

It is not difficult to understand why B.H.P. would be desperately anxious to get a grip of Koolan Island. Earlier in my speech I read a statement from the Minister himself, published in "The West

Australian," in which he told the public that representatives of two companies were then negotiating with the Government in regard to the establishment of an iron and steel industry in Western Australia. The representatives of B.H.P. would know that the representatives of the other company were in the field. If the representatives of this other Sydney company, which was acting for strong British steel industries, were in the field, then B.H.P. had some reason to fear that a company other than the B.H.P. might get control of Koolan Island iron-ore and it would then, undoubtedly, in the process of time establish within Australia—within Western Australia—an iron and steel industry which would be in competition with the present iron and steel industry established by the B.H.P. at Newcastle in New South Wales.

The Minister for Industrial Development: But you see, the other withdrew completely.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not concerned about that. I do not think it affects the issue in the slightest degree.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Oh!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The fact is that at that stage there were two companies negotiating with the Government in connection with the possibility of establishing a large scale iron and steel industry in Western Australia. The B.H.P. company could not help but know that the representatives of another company were in the field. Consequently, the representatives of the B.H.P. would be even more anxious than normally to see that the iron-ore deposits at Koolan Island were not obtained by any other company, but were in fact obtained by the B.H.P.

Let us say that the representatives of the other company withdrew completely, for some reason or other, from the negotiations. That would not lessen in any degree the anxiety of B.H.P. to get control of Koolan Island. Once B.H.P. got control of Koolan Island it would be in the tremendously happy and powerful position of controlling all the worthwhile iron deposits on the coastline of Australia. It does not need me to say very much to indicate to members what a tremendously powerful position that would be for the B.H.P. company to be in.

We all know that sea transport is much more economical than land transport—especially in regard to a material such as iron-ore. Consequently the B.H.P. representatives would almost fall over themselves to grasp an opportunity to tie up in their own hands and under their own control every coastal iron-ore deposit in Australia; and now they have done that. The Government of this State has allowed them to do it, and in my opinion it is a politically wicked thing to have done. As I

pointed out earlier, the B.H.P. already controls 40,000,000 tons of iron-ore above high water mark at Cockatoo Island, which is enough to last it for the next 40 or 50 years at the rate at which it is taking the ore from the island at present. The B.H.P. company also controls a huge deposit of iron-ore in South Australia at a place called Iron Knob. So we can see how the grip of this great monopoly is spreading over the continent.

I am not here this evening to criticise the Broken Hill Pty. Company as a company engaged in the production of iron and steel and many other things, through subsidiary companies, in Australia. I think the production and technical record of the company is something of which every Australian can well be proud—there is no shadow of doubt about that—but at the same time the company is not entitled to be given an absolute monopoly of the iron-ore deposits in Australia which are most easily and economically workable.

A member of the Government, or any apologist for the Government in this matter, might say there is a large deposit of iron-ore at Koolyanobbing some 30 miles north of Southern Cross. So there is, and it is quite good quality iron-ore, too, but the fact remains that it is by no stretch of the imagination as economically valuable as the iron-ore deposits on our coast at Koolan and Cockatoo Islands. No business concern associated with the production of iron and steel would prefer to take an inland deposit of iron-ore as against a deposit on or near the sea coast. Any such business concern would be desperately anxious—even though it might not show how anxious it was—to get control of the coastal deposits.

I would not be surprised if the company, during these negotiations with the Government, tried also to get control over the Koolyanobbing deposits. That would be understandable because, as the only company in Australia producing iron and steel, its representatives would be keen to secure any iron-ore deposits in the Commonwealth that were worthwhile, and that would at some time be capable of being operated in a manner profitable to the company. There could be no justification or excuse for the Government's having agreed to hand over the deposits at Koolan Island to the B.H.P. Fancy handing over anything up to £100,000,000 worth of iron-ore to a company that is going to invest only £3,000,000—for certain—in this State in return; a company which in return is going to employ only 200 men in the steel rolling mill that it will be bound to establish! That is all we are sure of getting in exchange for an asset worth to this company at least £100,000,000.

By no stretch of imagination could one think of any stroke of business more disadvantageous to Western Australia from a long term point of view. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company tried to get hold of these deposits on a previous occasion, but were then told they could have them only provided they processed all the iron-ore taken from Koolan Island within this State. That should have been the attitude adopted by the present Government in its negotiations with the representatives of the company during recent weeks; but no. The company said to the present Government: "We will agree to establish in Western Australia a steel rolling mill that will cost us approximately £3,000,000 and which will employ permanently 200 men, provided that you give us in return a lease over the iron-ore deposits at Koolan Island on a royalty basis."

What royalty will the Government charge the company per ton for the iron-ore that it is to take from Koolan Island? I imagine it would not charge a royalty of more than 1s. per ton, and probably not as much as that. I understand that the figure which has operated for many years in this State does not exceed 6d. per ton but, even if the royalty in this case were 5s. per ton the Government would be giving the company, for that consideration, iron-ore worth at least £1 per ton to the company on the site at Koolan Island. I have never been more convinced of anything than I am that the B.H.P. representatives concerned in these negotiations were out to get control of Koolan Island. It is well known that the steel rolling mills of the company already established in the Eastern States are being worked to only 70 per cent. of their full capacity, which means that the B.H.P. could easily, within the framework of its present milling capacity in Eastern Australia, produce many times more of this particular commodity than would be its output from the steel rolling mill proposed to be established at Kwinana.

The proposal to establish the mill at Kwinana is hopelessly uneconomical from the company's point of view, when contemplated separately and alone, but it immediately turns into a tremendously beneficial and profitable proposal for the company when we see that in return for doing a comparatively small thing the B.H.P. is to be given control over £100,000,000 worth of valuable high-class iron-ore on the Western Australian coastline. Any company in the world interested in feeding an already established iron and steel industry would grab at this opportunity. I was amazed, when reading Press reports from day to day, to note how quickly things were happening in regard to these negotiations.

The representatives of the company moved faster than ever before in their lives, and why not? They were thoroughly entitled to move at jet-propelled speed to ensure that the offer made by the Government with regard to Koolan Island should be signed, sealed and delivered before any public outcry could be raised in this State against the proposed agreement. What are these other assurances that the company has given the Government worth from a practical point of view? They are worth nothing at all because the company will not bind itself, in any agreement made with the Government, to undertake the establishment of additional industries in this State. Does either the Premier or the Minister think he could prevail on the company to bind itself legally to establish, even on a small scale, an integrated iron and steel industry in Western Australia? I suggest that the Government try that out and, if it does not already know what hard-headed gentlemen it is up against, it will soon find out, if it proceeds on the basis I have suggested.

Do the Premier and the Minister think they will be able to prevail on the company's representatives to bind themselves legally to establish in Western Australia an industry to produce pig-iron from our iron-ore? If they do have such fanciful ideas they will soon find just what sort of people they are negotiating with. The representatives of the company will not bind themselves legally along those lines. I say that no Government is entitled, under existing conditions, to barter away the tremendous asset the State has at Koolan Island simply to obtain for certain a steel rolling mill which will employ 200 men. That is chicken-feed, nothing more than that, when compared with the great asset which the State has already agreed to hand over to the company.

Earlier in my speech I quoted from a statement made in an address given by the manager of the charcoal-iron industry at Wundowie to the Fremantle Rotary Club early this year, in which that gentleman said that we in this State possess a tremendous bargaining power in the iron-ore deposits we have at Koolan Island. Yet this Government has given away that tremendous bargaining power for a handful of chicken-feed, speaking in the comparative sense. We know only too well that B.H.P. are established upon a tremendous basis in Eastern Australia. We know to some degree the extent of their financial investments over there and we can quite imagine that, from the business point of view, they would be anxious to continue to concentrate upon large-scale production where the production can be kept reasonably under the one supervision all the time.

As a company B.H.P. have never shown any real, genuine intention of establishing an iron and steel industry out of the Eastern States. In my judgment they

have no present intention, and no intention for many years to come, of establishing any large-scale industrial operations in Western Australia. If the Premier and the Minister think they have, let them put this proposition to B.H.P.: Let them say, "Well, we consider that your control of 40,000,000 tons of iron-ore at Cockatoo Island Western Australia has given you something of very great value. In return for that we think you ought to establish a steel rolling mill in this State. We think you should agree to do that without asking the State to give you control over any more iron-ore."

Let the Premier and the Minister put that up to B.H.P. and see what the reaction will be. Of course it is as obvious as the noon-day sun on a cloudless day that B.H.P.'s overwhelming desire in this matter is to get a grip on the huge deposits of iron-ore at Koolan Island. That is the only matter which concerns them to any great extent.

I know that £3,000,000 for the establishment of a steel rolling mill in Western Australia impresses us somewhat because in this State, in the years of the past, we have been inclined to think in smaller sums. But let us dwell for a second upon what £3,000,000 means to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. Why, it is only cigarette money to a company of that magnitude! If they were establishing this proposed steel rolling mill in our State without having control of Cockatoo Island, let alone Koolan Island, they would be doing very little for Western Australia.

Yet the Government has already agreed to give B.H.P. control of Koolan Island iron-ore deposits in return for the establishment of this comparatively small industry; small now to Western Australia and of practically no significance at all to B.H.P. on the basis of the standards to which they are accustomed. What is wrong with the Government's insisting that B.H.P. continue to control Cockatoo Island and, at the same time, establish a steel rolling mill in this State? What is wrong with that? What could the representatives of B.H.P. justifiably say against it? Could they argue that they have not sufficient iron-ore available to allow them to follow that course?

Could they say, "We are very sorry, Mr. Premier and Mr. Minister for Industrial Development, but we are short of iron-ore and we could not possibly think of establishing a steel rolling mill in Western Australia because, if we did, we would not have enough iron-ore to produce the steel billets in New South Wales to send over to Western Australia to be rolled in the steel mill you want us to establish in your State." Of course the representatives of B.H.P. could not logically or justifiably say that. They have

ample iron-ore deposits at Cockatoo Island—a supply for the next 40 years at the present rate of handling. As a matter of fact, I think it would be safe to say that at the present rate of handling they have enough at Cockatoo Island for the next 200 years.

But doubtless the rate of taking the iron-ore away from Cockatoo Island will be speeded up when the company is able to get its machinery up there fully into operation, and is able to have constructed sufficient additional iron-ore carrying ships to keep the machinery at the island working to full capacity.

In my judgment this matter comes down finally and almost completely to the question of whether we are prepared, as a State, to hand over Koolan Island to the company. That is not the only question involved, but it is the overwhelming one. It is the major question and one with which every member of this House ought seriously to concern himself, because if Koolan Island is handed over to B.H.P., upon the basis outlined in the Minister's statement as published in "The West Australian" on the 5th March this year, Western Australia has lost for all time the greatest lever which it might otherwise hold to ensure the establishment within its borders of a large-scale completely integrated iron and steel industry.

I have no doubt that B.H.P. will carry out all these investigations and inquiries which it has assured the Government it will do when the agreement is legally finalised and when it has been passed by Parliament, if it ever is passed. Of course the company would be legally bound to carry out the inquiries and investigations concerning the production in this State, or the possible production in this State, of pig-iron and the possible establishment of a fully integrated iron and steel industry. But the company will not be bound to go any further than that. What would be the good of investigations and inquiries if, finally, no matter what information was obtained as a result, nothing more was done?

Surely the Premier and the Minister will agree that the company when it completed the investigations and inquiries would please itself entirely as to whether it would do any more concerning the possibility of producing pig-iron in Western Australia and of establishing a completely integrated iron and steel industry in this State. What a glorious position for the company to be in! Talk about writing one's own ticket! This suggested agreement gives the punter—if we can describe the B.H.P. as the punter in this instance—the unlimited opportunity of writing his own ticket. All it has to do is to put up a wager consisting of the steel rolling mill. In return for that it is immediately

guaranteed control of anything up to £100,000,000 worth of iron-ore—the best in the world—at Koolan Island.

All the company has to do in addition to establishing its steel rolling mill is to carry out certain inquiries and investigations. It is not bound to do anything beyond that. It stands to reason, in my judgment, that a huge company such as the B.H.P. would prefer to carry on its iron and steel activities in New South Wales, and to whatever extent it is already carrying them on at Whyalla in South Australia. From every point of view it pays the company to concentrate its activities on the production of iron and steel in those places. That should be obvious because the company has already invested, I should suppose, hundreds of millions of pounds in establishing and operating those industries at those centres. Therefore, there would be everything against the company establishing a large scale industry in this State for the production of iron and steel.

If we give control of the Koolan Island iron-ore deposits to this company we are absolutely shot in all future years in regard to encouraging, prevailing upon or persuading any other company to establish similar industries in our State. Say for argument's sake these negotiations between the B.H.P. and the Government break down for some reason or other! Say for argument's sake the Government does not bring an agreement to Parliament because of such a breakdown or, let us say that the Government does bring an agreement before Parliament for ratification and Parliament rejects the Bill! What do we lose? We lose the proposed steel rolling mill. We lose the assurance of the proposed inquiries and investigations into the possibility of producing pig-iron and the possibility of establishing a large scale iron and steel industry within our State. But we still hold at least 100,000,000 tons of high grade iron-ore, and we would always be in a position to negotiate successfully with any other group of interests; American, English German or even Australian, which subsequently might become interested in the question of establishing a large scale iron and steel industry within our borders.

On the other hand, let us say that the Government finalises, in the full legal sense, an agreement with the B.H.P. along the lines stated by the Minister in "The West Australian" on the 6th March. All right! The B.H.P. takes control of Koolan Island! That company establishes a steel rolling mill in Western Australia. It carries out inquiries and investigations into the possibility of producing pig-iron in this State from our own iron-ore, and also into the possibility of establishing a large scale iron and steel industry which would be fed by our own iron-ore. For good, bad, or indifferent reasons, following the

completion of its investigations, the company might say, "We are very sorry, but we have found, as a result of our inquiries and investigations, that it would not be economically practicable to produce pig-iron in your State and it would not be economically practicable for us to establish an iron and steel industry in your State."

Where are we then, Mr. Speaker? We are left not only without an industry on a large scale for the production of pig-iron, not only without a fully integrated iron and steel industry, but also we are left without the possibility of getting those industries established by some other company because the Government will have given away, supported by Parliament—if Parliament were mad enough—the very thing that would place it, for all time, in the position of being able to encourage or persuade someone else to enter the State and establish the industries to which I have referred. What chance would we have of prevailing upon any other company to come into Western Australia to establish a large scale iron and steel industry if Koolan Island were lost to us? We would have no hope in the wide world!

The optimists might say, "We still have Koolyanobbing." We would, or I should hope we would, but what a prospect would face any company that came into Western Australia to enter into competition with B.H.P. on the Australian steel market or the export steel market if the B.H.P. were obtaining all its iron-ore from the coastal deposits, and the other companies had to pay the large and heavier cost of transporting iron-ore from Koolyanobbing to, say, Esperance, Fremantle or Bunbury. Of course, the suggested competing company would not be in the race, and I should say we would not get any iron and steel company in the world to face the risks and dangers which would be inherent in a situation of that kind.

In my view, it would not be sufficient for the Government to say, "Well, we will grant these leases to B.H.P., but we will insist that they take no iron-ore from Koolan Island until such time as they establish an industry in this State for the production of pig-iron or until they establish a fully integrated iron and steel industry," because that would still tie the leases up in the hands of the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. and they could continue to hold them. They would not be available as a basis for negotiation by this Government or some future Government with other companies which might be interested in doing something in Western Australia of a practical nature to process within our State the iron-ore from Koolan Island.

From whichever angle one approaches this matter, one can find no justification whatever for the decision of the Government already made—already publicly an-

nounced—to hand over the Koolan Island iron-ore deposits to B.H.P. The company already controls 40,000,000 tons of our best iron-ore, which is a coastal deposit. It is already taking that ore away from the Island to Newcastle and is processing it into iron and steel products. It is not entitled to receive any more from us unless, as I said earlier, it is prepared to bind itself completely, in the legal sense, to establish within a reasonable time an industry for the production of pig-iron and, within a reasonable time after that, a large-scale fully integrated iron and steel industry within our State.

If the company is not prepared to face up to a reasonable proposition of that kind—and it would be most reasonable—then I think the company should be told that until it is prepared to take a more reasonable view of the situation we in Western Australia will hang on to Koolan Island, and if need be, do without the steel rolling mill. We have been told that the establishment of this steel rolling mill within our State will most likely make available to our people more of the products of that mill than we have received in the past. There is no guarantee of that. Pig-iron will still have to be produced and will still have to be processed at Newcastle or Port Kembla; it will still have to be transported to Fremantle before it can get into the rolling mill.

We know just how many things can happen as those various processes are running their course. So the idea that we may get more of those products available is not very solidly based. We might get them; on the other hand, we might not. As I said before, the steel rolling mill proposed to be established in Western Australia will be most uneconomical to the company; I should think it would be losing money on it—a lot of money. Their steel rolling capacity in the Eastern States is already 30 per cent. below full output for various reasons, which means they could produce 30 per cent. more of these products in their steel rolling mills over East than they are doing at present.

Mr. Ackland: Do not you think they would, if they could get the coal?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is the answer. Most certainly they would, if they could get the coal, and if there were no other difficulties to prevent them from using their steel rolling mill to capacity. The point I make is that when they establish a steel rolling mill in this State, they are still up against the same difficulties in the Eastern States in getting the iron-ore into steel billets so that these, when ready and available for shipment, could then be transported to Fremantle.

It is quite easy for people to say, "There is a great heap of iron-ore at Yampi Sound; it is not doing anything; it is not earning anything for the State, and is certainly not costing us any-

thing. Here is a company prepared to expend £3,000,000 in Western Australia for sure if we give it that heap of iron-ore, so we will let the company have it, and get it off our hands." Any person who takes that point of view is taking a point of view which is not in keeping with present-day requirements. The fact that an oil refinery is to be established at Kwinana within a few years indicates the extent to which this State will become industrialised in the future. It would indicate that we should be extremely jealous at this time—at this period of our development—of the tremendous asset which we have at Koolan Island.

So I appeal to the Premier and to the Minister for Industrial Development to think furiously about this matter before they completely finalise any legal agreement with B.H.P. I would like to know just how deeply the Government has already committed itself, especially in regard to handing Koolan Island over to the company. If the Government has committed itself up to the ears, as it might appear in regard to that matter, then it had better pray hard that something will crop up between now and the time when the negotiations are finalised to cause those negotiations to collapse. If the Government does proceed along the lines which it has so far followed, and brings the agreement to Parliament in August or September this year inaugurating the broad principles set out in the Minister's statement which I read to the House earlier, then I should say that members of the House, with a full sense of their responsibility in this matter, would be justified in pulling down the ceiling about the ears of the Government in order to prevent an agreement as suggested, coming before this House, let alone permitting it to be considered in another place.

I think members of this House have an opportunity to express themselves on this matter and to direct the Government along the lines I have suggested in my motion. This motion can in no way be regarded as party political. If we of the Opposition had wished to treat the matter on a party basis, we would have attempted a censure motion and not a motion expressing the opinion of the House on the matter. Therefore it should be clear to every member that he is absolutely free to vote as he thinks he should in this matter; that he is absolutely free to indicate to the Government just whether, in his opinion, he thinks Koolan Island should be given to Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. in return for next to nothing at all.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling) [9.0]: There is a very old and wise saying to the effect that there is a time and place for everything. While this is undoubtedly the place in which the member for Northam is entitled to submit a

motion such as the one he has just discussed, I suggest this is certainly not the time. I say that because any arrangement that may be finalised with the Broken Hill Proprietary Coy. Ltd. cannot become operative unless, and until, it is ratified by both Houses of this Parliament in an Act of Parliament. I said so in the Press statement to which he referred. I said so in answer to questions he asked me without notice in this House, and in consequence I would suggest that the right time for this matter to be discussed is when all the surrounding circumstances can be made known, when the whole of the agreement can be placed before the House, when supposition will not play so large a part in the matter as it has in the hon. member's speech this evening.

In other words, when a Bill comes before Parliament in consequence of undertakings already given—the fact is that the company itself desired that the matter should be brought before Parliament quite apart from the Government's undertakings—that is the time to deal with this issue. I said in answer to questions directed to me a few days ago without notice, in effect, that the agreement was in outline only, that it was subject to detailed consideration by the legal and technical officers of both sides and that it would be—as I repeat now—of no effect until ratified by Parliament and therefore, if not ratified, of no effect at all. The Government was, and is, quite prepared, when the agreement can be included in a Bill and brought before Parliament, to give all the information that it will be possible to present.

This evening I am not in a position, with regard to some aspects, to deal with statements, some of them supposititious, that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition, but I will say that for years past successive Governments in this State have tried, without success, to obtain the local establishment of some sort of steel industry. Records show that for something like 30 years, efforts have been made by all sorts and shapes and sizes of people to bring into Western Australia something, big or small, that would produce here at least some of the steel required in this State—so far completely without success. During the time that I have held my present portfolio of Industrial Development, at least four interests have been encouraged by the Government to submit practical proposals, but without any worthwhile results at all. None of them have been prepared to finance themselves.

All of them to a greater or lesser degree have asked for Government grants, Government guarantees against risk of losses, Government subscriptions of millions of capital or some such proposition. Some would have involved the Government in the expenditure of many millions and in processes which were purely in the research or laboratory stage and might, or might not, have resulted in something of

the type of £3,000,000 worth of progress of a successful character that the Leader of the Opposition scorned a few minutes ago.

I heard the member for Moore and others last evening express opinions regarding expenditure by the Government in connection with certain developmental work that had to be undertaken to encourage the Anglo-Iranian Oil Coy. to establish its refinery in Western Australia. They pointed out that this would be likely to minimise the resources that might be available—known to be always limited, at least to some extent, to the Government—for other important developmental works in the State.

Thus if the Government had plunged into any of those propositions, as it might have done, it might have been involved in the raising of millions—in one instance it would have meant raising £18,000,000 or £20,000,000—over a period of years for something that our advisers told us was unlikely, as presented, to offer satisfactory results. Had we done that, then I submit we should have indeed placed the Government in a position where it would have been most unlikely to have been able to provide for many of those requirements for which those in this community are crying out for expenditure year by year, and which are essential, as several members mentioned last evening, for the development and the continuance of industry in various parts of Western Australia.

As I stated previously, one proposal was based on the theory that the process would use Collie coal for the smelting of iron-ore which, as is well known, is still in the laboratory or experimental stage and which would have absorbed very great expenditure. None of these methods, we are advised, has reached the stage where an economic commercial primary furnace proposition has been developed. Any primary furnace melting less than 300 tons a day has not the least chance of economic success. The utmost, it is claimed, that any of these research projects can develop with Collie-type coal is 60 tons a day, and that, of course, would be an expensive and uneconomic proposition.

I suggest, and am advised by persons such as the Director and Co-ordinator of Works, that no one would contemplate heavy governmental expenditure on what amounts to an unproved theory. Mr. Dumas has been in contact with experts from Germany and elsewhere in pursuing inquiries into this matter, and every member knows that he is a man who does not reach such conclusions without substantial grounds for them.

The Government wishes to make some real progress that will put a period to the absence of local iron and steel supplies in Western Australia. I feel that the best advice I have been able to obtain has been along the same lines. In all the circumstances of the case, when the

agreement with B.H.P. is finally completed and put before Parliament, I believe members will feel that a tremendous step has been made towards that end.

Western Australia, in the opinion of the Government, if it wants to have a developed iron and steel industry in this State, wants to do it on Collie coal if that be possible. The various laboratory and research propositions—the low shaft furnace and the Baum process—are all directed to the use of Collie-type coal, but none of them has reached any further than the stage I mentioned a few moments ago—a stage where it is claimed that 60 tons a day might be dealt with. To handle the business on that basis would, I repeat, be not only unwise, because it would be substantially an unproved proposition, but also uneconomic, because of the smallness of the capacity, supposing that capacity could be established.

The creation of an industry based on Collie coal, which I say is the desire of the Government and which would produce the development and expansion of the Collie coalfield that I believe is justified, cannot be done yet. I am fully convinced, and am firmly of opinion that Parliament will be convinced when the matter is placed before it, that it is the intention of B.H.P., after having completed its research and found a satisfactory answer, as we all hope it will do, whereby our Collie-type coal can be used, to proceed to set up the other section of an iron and steel industry in this State. I am satisfied that it is the aim and objective of the company so to do.

I am also satisfied—as are also those better acquainted with and having a far greater knowledge of this industry, men in the Government service and outside of it—that to undertake the attempted establishment of an integrated iron and steel industry based on Collie coal, with the known present possibility of using that type of coal successfully, could easily involve any organisation or any Government in huge financial losses. In my own mind, I believe that the reason why other people who were interested in the use of these methods were so anxious that the Government should subscribe and guarantee and so forth was because they held the same view as I do, namely, that the risk was very great.

Dealing with the matter of co-operation in research, it is well known that we have but few people in this State with great experience of the steel industry, and to add to that very small force those who have had lengthy and vast experience with B.H.P. must make some contribution towards ensuring the success of any project that may be put forward in future. As I said in effect in my statement to the Press, the highlight of this proposition is for the closest co-operation of the Government with the aim and objective of

constituting a fully integrated iron and steel industry in Western Australia, using Collie coal if that be possible.

If such research succeeds, as I am more than hopeful it will, and permits of production on an economic scale, which I am advised should be not less than 300 tons a day—at the present time the creation of an industry of that capacity would run into at least £20,000,000—it would give a tremendous fillip to a number of our industries, and a delay of a few more years will be well worth while. In the meantime, however, we do get something that we have never had before; we do get someone making some steel products in the State that will be useful to us, and we do get the benefit of having considerably increased quantities of steel made available to us.

Mr. W. Hegney: There is the question of the price of handing over the Koolan Island iron-ore.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I do not think any question of price has arisen. It is a question of an agreement made between two parties who have been considering the very difficult problems associated with the establishment of an integrated iron and steel industry in this State, if that is practicable—an agreement that is not to have any force or effect until it has been fully explained to and ratified by Parliament. As the Leader of the Opposition said in the course of his remarks, quoting, I think, my Press statement, as far as the export of iron-ore is concerned, the agreement if ratified will bind the company not to export any iron-ore from Australia.

This point is perhaps of more importance than has been indicated up to date. It is now many years since the Government of Western Australia granted Cockatoo Island to a subsidiary of B.H.P. It certainly was not this Government. I think it was about 1926 when it happened. If that is so, it was during the first Government of the late Hon. Philip Collier. Whoever it was, however, no provision was made for preventing the export of iron-ore from Cockatoo Island to any part of the world. Once taken out of the island by the B.H.P. or its subsidiary, it could go to any part of the world, and that is the position today. But if this agreement becomes operative after ratification by Parliament, the iron-ore won from Cockatoo Island will be subject to the same restriction as the iron-ore won from Koolan Island—that it is not to be exported from Australia.

As a matter of fact, I must confess to having been somewhat surprised at the attitude taken up in this matter so suddenly by the Leader of the Opposition, before all the facts could possibly be made known, before all the information which I should like to place before Parliament at the right time could possibly be placed before it. I am surprised that before the

Leader of the Opposition had really had an opportunity to judge the case upon the whole of the facts, he should have taken up the attitude he has.

There was little or nothing in the behaviour of past Governments which the hon. member adorned to indicate that there was the slightest objection to iron-ore being taken out of the Koolan Island deposits and sent to the rest of Australia, some of it immediately being returned to this State in the form of steel and some of it in the form of billets for processing into steel. It is not very long ago, and within the memory of many members who are in this House today, when the strongest possible exception was taken by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, to an embargo which was placed by the Commonwealth on the export of iron-ore from Koolan Island to Japan and other parts of the world.

It was only in 1937 and 1938 that this controversy took place, when the hon. gentleman had been approximately two years in the then Ministry of which the Premier was the Hon. J. C. Willcock; and the Koolan Island leases which, prior to that time, had been held by various people, were first of all surrendered or forfeited by the then holders and revested by the Government in a concern known as Yampi Sound Mining Co. Ltd. That company proceeded to do some development up there and to enter into an agreement with Japanese interests for the sale of 1,000,000 tons of ore to be shipped yearly from Yampi Sound to Japan. It was stated in "The West Australian" of the 7th February, 1938—

It is anticipated that 1,000,000 tons of iron-ore will be shipped yearly from Yampi Sound to Japan, according to Mr. M. Omori, an officer of the Nippon Mining Company, who reached Fremantle yesterday by the motorship "Charon." He is on a business visit to this State where he expects to remain for several months.

The Nippon Mining Company has a buying contract with the Yampi Sound Mining Company, which, it was recently announced, will commence production shortly. Mr. Omori said his company was anxious for production to start as soon as possible. He anticipated that possibly 20 or 30 vessels would be engaged in the carriage of the ore and thought that Japanese, British and Australian ships would be employed in the trade.

At Fremantle yesterday Mr. Omori was met by the managing director of the Yampi Sound Mining Company who recently returned from Great Britain.

Later on, the Commonwealth Government apparently got wind of this, and not being satisfied, I suppose, with the position imposed an embargo on the export of iron-ore outside Australia, but before it did so

it apparently wrote to the Government of this State which, on the 31st August, 1937, replied in these terms, in a letter addressed by the Premier to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth—

I have to acknowledge your communication of the 11th August, the contents of which come as a surprise to this Government.

In the first instance it is obvious from correspondence received from the Queensland Government at the commencement of the present month, that a similar letter to that under acknowledgment had already then been received by that Government. Your communication to me thus appears rather belated. Apart from this, however, it is well known to your Government that there are leases in force in this State upon which actual operations are in progress for the production of iron-ore, which is destined for export to a foreign country.

I refer to the leases situated at Yampi Sound and held by Messrs. Brasserts Ltd. Both our respective Governments were advised of the Company's early negotiations with Japanese interests and have been kept fully aware since of the agreement arrived at and of the progress of activities and expenditure in connection therewith. This Government is very hopeful that, in conjunction with the sale of iron-ore to Japan, a cattle trade will also eventuate. The benefit which would result to the North-Western portion of this State from the establishment of these industries can be easily understood.

Recently, however, paragraphs have appeared in our Press from Canberra to the effect that it is possible that your Government may adopt export restrictions in regard to this iron-ore. These paragraphs have caused the company concerned considerable perturbation, and in the opinion of my Government the time has arrived when some authoritative statement should be issued from Canberra in order to clarify the position.

As far as the granting of mining titles in regard to other iron deposits is concerned, I would point out that several of our main deposits are at present held by various persons under the provisions of the State Mining Act, and we are unaware whether any of them contemplate disposing of the ore to foreign powers. So far as this Government is concerned, it has a duty to do what it can to develop adequately all the natural resources of the State in order to increase production and thus help in the progress and prosperity of the people of Australia and Western Australia in particular.

Unless there is reasonable evidence that any development and trade consequent thereon is distinctly inimical to the interests of the Commonwealth, my Government is not prepared to co-operate with your Government in preventing our citizens participating in profitable trade with other countries of the world, and unless your communication means that pending the survey mentioned, all trade in export of iron-ore will be prohibited by your Government, my Government intends to encourage the production and sale of iron-ore and its products in every possible way as it is felt that our resources have remained dormant too long already. It would be appreciated, therefore, if you would kindly advise us frankly of your views and intentions in this matter.

(Sgd.) J. W., Premier.

That was Hon. J. C. Willcock, as I said a moment ago.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Yampi file is a most interesting one.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: There are only two phrases in this letter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House—and the first is—

Operations are in progress for the production of iron ore which is destined for export to a foreign country.

Later on, having said that, Mr. Willcock stated—

So far as this Government is concerned, it has a duty to do what it can do to develop adequately all the natural resources of the State in order to increase production and thus help in the progress and prosperity of the people of Australia, and Western Australia in particular.

So the development of the resources of the State and the helping to populate the North-West were, according to the hon. gentleman, assisted considerably by taking iron-ore from Koolan Island to send to foreign countries. Our proposition is to take iron-ore out of Koolan Island to send to the rest of Australia. Are we a nation, or are we a pack of children? That is what I want to know. Is this country Australia? Have we not taken advantage of the resources of the Eastern States and obtained them whenever we could for use in this State; and are we not entitled to give consideration, if a reasonable proposition is made, to doing that in reverse? The question is for Parliament to determine, as I have said, when the whole of the facts are placed before it—which I am prepared to do at the right time, and when they are all available. My point in saying as much as I have said this evening is to establish in the minds of

members that the motion is premature and so should be defeated or washed off the notice paper.

Mr. Rodoreda: Do you know why the B.H.P. cannot use the ore it already has at Cockatoo Island?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I am not aware that it cannot.

Mr. Rodoreda: It has not used any for 12 months—not one shipment.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: There may be some reason, and I will undertake to ask what it is when I get the opportunity. I shall go a little further. Later, in 1938, the Commonwealth Government did impose an embargo, apparently after considerable inquiry, upon export. On the 19th May, 1938, Mr. Willcock, as Premier, I think, telegraphed to the Prime Minister, and this telegram, I submit, indicates that the Government of the day had suffered no change of heart in regard to this matter which applied, in different circumstances, to Australia and not to other countries of the world, because the telegram indicates, if members will listen attentively to it, that if the Premier expressed the views of the Government, as one must assume he did, he was extremely annoyed a year, or nearly a year, after receiving the communication which I have just read. The telegram states—

Announced here today that your Government is banning the export of iron-ore as from 1st July next Stop This will be the means of ending the development of Yampi Sound deposits Stop My Government emphatically opposes and resents any such action being taken and considers that the enforcement of an embargo will only add to this State's many injuries under Federation Stop Mention has been made of compensation to the company affected but what about the blow to the State in this hostile attitude towards the development of an area depending almost entirely upon its mineral resources, and for which the Government and the people of the North have made many sacrifices Stop Is this territory and its mineral resources to remain undeveloped and to stagnate because of your Government's precipitate action on mere superficial information Stop The Government of Western Australia strongly protest and urge that the project be allowed to proceed without further hindrance or molestation thus ensuring development and activity in that portion of Australia most needing it.

So it is quite clear that in 1938 the development of these leases by the exporting of iron-ore all over the world, including

Japan, which might have been in the ultimate a most unpleasant matter, was not only not objected to, but fully encouraged by the Government of the day.

The Minister for Lands: To fire back at us in the form of shells.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: So I think I am justified in feeling some surprise that at this time the Leader of the Opposition, whatever he might have wished to do later when the whole of the facts were placed before him, should see fit to act in the manner he has in moving his motion.

Mr. Johnson: When was the embargo on the export of iron-ore lifted?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: That I could not say. In the ordinary way—as is well known—a Minister dealing with a motion of this kind should not only by way of benefit to himself but also by way of courtesy to the mover of the motion—in order that the Minister might have a proper look at everything that the mover has said—adjourn the debate for probably a week but, as everyone knows, the position here at present would not warrant that action being taken. I was therefore obliged to forecast, to the best of my ability, from the terms of the motion itself, what the mover might be going to say, and I hope I have said enough to indicate, at the very least, that there are distinctly two sides to this case and that now is not the time to take concrete action in regard to it.

As I have said, I am prepared to produce to members of the House a great deal of information at the time when a Bill is presented to Parliament for ratification of this agreement and it is in its final form. I am prepared to give members every reasonable opportunity to study the information thus placed before them, and to allow them to form their opinions in the light of what has already taken place in this regard in Western Australia, and with a knowledge of the prospects for the future if some such action as we contemplate is not now taken, and the strangulation of our future hopes of industry that will occur if we are just to wait until someone is prepared to turn up with sufficient finance and willing to take the risks involved in an unproved system of using Collie-type coals or, alternatively, the vast expense that might be involved in some other method of which we at present may or may not have knowledge.

When members are in a position to set both sides of this question on the scales and study with care the recommendations that have been made during the negotiations, and the reports that might be made afterwards by technical officers of the Government, they will be able to arrive at a considered opinion, but at this stage nobody could do so. I trust that members will arrive at the opinion—I believe they

will—that this motion is premature and ought not at this stage to receive the support of the House. The Government has displayed great anxiety to establish a steel industry in this State and it believes that the House will recognise, when everything is put before it at the right time, that the action taken will ultimately contribute substantially to that end. At that I leave the question, hoping that the motion as at present moved will not be passed.

MR. BOVELL: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	13
Majority for	8

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty	
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder	
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo	
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Oldfield	
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Owen	
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn	
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Watts	
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Wild	
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Yates	
Mr. Hill	Mr. Bovell	
Mr. Hutchinson		(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch	
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Moir	
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda	
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman	
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin	
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Kelly	
Mr. May		(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Corneli	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Perkins	Mr. Styanis
Mr. Manning	Mr. Hoar
Mr. Totterdell	Mr. Needham

Motion thus passed; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—

Murray) [9.48]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 3.30 p.m. tomorrow.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [9.49]: I oppose the motion, as I do not think there is any justification for the House adjourning at this stage, and certainly no justification for its adjourning until 3.30 p.m. tomorrow. The House has uncompleted business before it—the business which was adjourned a few moments ago, and which is of the greatest importance to the State. We should therefore certainly not adjourn at this stage until a late hour tomorrow. When the notice paper was produced to us today, Mr. Speaker, I drew your attention, at a certain stage of the proceedings, to the fact that the two notices of motion had been divided by the Order of the Day, and asked you whether that was due to some printing error, or whether it had

been brought about as a result of some direct attempt on the part of the Government to divide the two notices of motion.

It seemed to me, as I looked at the notice paper earlier today, that the Government was anxious not to have No. 2 notice of motion debated at all. I moved, in an endeavour to have No. 2 notice of motion discussed, to postpone consideration of the Order of the Day. The Premier intervened and said that if I were prepared to withdraw my motion he would give the House an opportunity to debate No. 2 notice of motion. On that assurance, which I accepted as being an assurance for a full debate, I agreed to withdraw the motion which I had moved and it was accordingly withdrawn.

The Order of the Day in question was then considered and finally decided in a favourable way by the House. Notice of motion No. 2 then came forward for discussion. I made a speech in support of it and the Minister for Industrial Development, as was proper in the circumstances, followed me and immediately he sat down the Government Whip, the member for Vasse, stood up in his place and moved the adjournment of the debate; in other words he moved that there be no further discussion on this notice of motion during this sitting. We on this side took exception to that and forced it to a division.

The Government members supported the motion for the adjournment and it was subsequently carried. The effect of the carrying of that motion will be that there will be no further discussion or debate upon my notice of motion and no decision will be given by the House upon it. There are other members in the House who wish to speak upon it and I think most members desire that there should be a vote upon it.

One would think that members of the Government would desire a direction from the House upon such a vital point as the one covered in the motion I moved. The motion for the adjournment, as just carried by the House, means that there will be no further discussion and no further debate upon my motion because it is the clear intention of the Government to meet tomorrow only for the formal purpose of receiving messages from the Legislative Council in regard to the oil refinery Bill and the Kwinana land Bill. Therefore, it is as certain as can be that there will be no further discussion or debate, and certainly no vote upon my motion. To that extent the assurance which the Premier gave me earlier this afternoon has been broken.

The Premier did not say when he gave the assurance, that only the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister for Industrial Development would be allowed to

participate in the debate. Does the Premier consider that a debate can be called a debate when action is taken to limit the number of speakers in it to two in a House of 50 members? That is not a debate at all, as you would readily agree, Mr. Speaker. That is an absolute and severe restriction of debate because it means that the motion before the House is only partly debated and only two members out of 50 have had the opportunity to speak to it and put forward their views.

Therefore to the extent of nearly 90 per cent. the Premier has broken the sincere and earnest assurance which I thought he gave me this afternoon. That is bad business and I resent it very much indeed. If the Premier had allowed the motion to go to a vote, and had allowed other members who desired to speak on it an opportunity to speak, and the motion had been finally defeated I could have had no complaint, and would have voiced none. But I resent very much the fact that the Premier should this afternoon trick me into withdrawing a motion which I had moved by giving me an assurance that, if I did that, notice of motion No. 2 on the notice paper would be debated.

I have always endeavoured to be extremely reasonable with the Premier and helpful to him, but when trickery of this kind is put over me my attitude forthwith will be reconsidered and the Premier will probably have to look in vain for the same sort of 100 per cent. co-operation, help and consideration which he has received from me during the 12 months that I have occupied the position as Leader of the Opposition. I am disgusted with the Premier and ashamed of the trickery in which he has indulged. There was no justification whatever for what he did and there was no justification for the Government's stifling a debate upon this matter, especially when the Premier gave an assurance that the matter would be debated. There is certainly no justification for preventing the House from voting upon my motion.

The Deputy Premier told us that this was not the time to debate my motion. Of course there could be no more appropriate time, unless it had been earlier, if we had known about it earlier. Why should not a House of Parliament debate a vital matter of this kind and give an opinion to the Government, if not an instruction, as to what it should do to safeguard the best interests of the State? Why should not the House, if it thinks it necessary, try to save the Government from its own folly in a tremendously important matter such as this? This is the vital time to discuss this important question and for the House to give an opinion to the Government. That opinion could have easily been obtained this evening, probably within the

next hour, if the Government had not put over the slick trick of breaking an assurance given openly by the Premier in the Chamber this afternoon.

What does the Government think it gains by indulging in trickery of this kind? Is it afraid of the vote which members might have cast upon this motion if they had been allowed the right, which should be undoubtedly their right, to vote upon my motion? Is the Government afraid that the majority of this House would have voted in favour of the motion? Is the Government afraid that some of its own supporters would have voted for it? I know, in fact, that some of them would have voted for it. Probably the Premier knew the same thing and to avoid the probability of the motion being carried he arranged with the Whip to have the debate adjourned—to kill it and prevent any vote from being taken upon it tonight, tomorrow or any time before the agreement between the Government and the company was finally signed, sealed and delivered.

The attitude of the Government in this matter could not be worse, especially in view of the assurance which the Premier gave me across the floor of the Chamber this afternoon. If the Premier wanted to avoid a vote being taken, why did he not try to do the same thing as he did last week? Why did he not refuse to give us an opportunity of discussing the motion at all? That would have been more acceptable to us; it would have been more direct and more honest; it would not have been as misleading as the assurance which the Premier gave me has proved to be.

The Deputy Premier, in his speech, did not deal with the motion; he did not try to justify the action of the Government in agreeing to hand over Koolan Island to the B.H.P. He said that the statements I had made upon the motion were based upon supposition whereas, in fact, as you know only too well, Mr. Speaker, the statements I made were practically all based upon those made by the Minister and published in "The West Australian" newspaper on the 6th or 7th March last. They were nearly all based upon the fact that the Minister had told the public through "The West Australian" that the Government had agreed to hand Koolan Island over to the B.H.P., and that is all that is in the motion. It does not deal with any supposition! It does not deal with the things which the Minister says he cannot tell us about at this stage!

The motion deals with something which the Minister told all the people in Western Australia about through an official Press statement a week or so ago. It deals with an open statement by the Minister on behalf of the Government, pointing out that it already agreed to hand Koolan Island over to the B.H.P. So there is no supposition about it! The motion is based

upon solid fact and information given by the Minister himself, and its purpose is to ask this House to express an opinion so that it will be available for the Government's benefit. The Government would not be legally bound to take notice of the opinion if it felt that circumstances were such as to justify it in acting against the opinion of the House, but at least such expression of opinion by members would have been some guidance. It would have indicated how seriously a majority of members of the House regard the action of the Government in having agreed to hand over these iron-ore deposits to the B.H.P. company.

If the Government, on reconsideration of the whole situation, following the carrying of the motion by the House, considered that the agreement that it has made so far with that company on the point was not, in fact, justified, it would have been given the opportunity of trying to prevail upon the representatives of the company to permit that part of the agreement reached so far being deleted from the final legal drafting, the details of which, according to the Minister for Industrial Development, are being worked out at present between representatives of the Government and representatives of the company. Instead of the Minister dealing with the motion as such, he went away into many sidetracks. I am not speaking now in an attempt to justify my motion now before the House, but all the talk about embargo upon the export of iron-ore from Koolan Island is beside the point. We are not concerned now about what happened in 1937, 1928, 1932 or 1912. We are concerned as to what is likely to happen in 1952.

Anybody who has followed the development of secondary industry policy in this State will know that Western Australia did not have an industrial development policy worth a snap of the fingers until about 1939. It was only about that year that the Industrial Development Department was put upon a solid, practical and technical basis. Prior to that time it had been a Government department of a kind which appealed to people through the Press to buy local products and that sort of thing. But when the new policy of industrial development was fostered and established—I think it was early in 1939—that was the first time in the State's history it was put upon a practical and sound footing. From that time on considerable progress was made; increasing progress was achieved and the whole outlook of industrial development in Western Australia changed.

Prior to 1938-39 people in this State thought only about wheat, wool, gold, meat and butter, except for, as I have said, these spasmodic appeals by the Industrial Development Department to the people to buy locally manufactured goods.

Therefore, in view of the new industrial policy, in view of the appointment of technical men to the staff of the department, it was only natural that the outlook of Governments and that of the people generally on the future of the State should alter drastically, as indeed it did; so much so that today the State is extremely industrially minded. All the people in Western Australia today think about industrial development and most of them talk about it. I think it was the member for Nedlands who, last night, said that our economic system on the production side is becoming more balanced and that such balancing of our productive system was a good thing for Western Australia as long as the balancing was properly maintained as between primary industry, secondary industry and the mining industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is really opposing the special adjournment, is he not?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, I am opposing a special adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Opposing the special adjournment!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am opposing the one moved by the Premier because I think the adjournment proposed is unjustified in the circumstances. It stems from a trick which the Government put over the Opposition this evening on notice of motion No. 2 on the notice paper. Therefore I am opposing the Premier's motion for adjournment until 3.30 p.m. tomorrow. If the House passes this motion I will then oppose the next motion for the adjournment of the House in order that I may express the protest which is overwhelmingly justified in the circumstances. The House should not adjourn with this motion incomplete. There is an obligation upon every member of this House to complete the consideration of the motion in question and to vote upon it.

The only reason why the Government would not want a vote is the fear that the motion would be carried and the Government would therefore be shown to be unable to carry with it, in connection with this matter, all of its own supporters. We know that no Government appreciates being defeated in Parliament on any matter. Obviously any Government would hate to be defeated upon a vital matter of the description covered in my motion. The Government would probably feel very humiliated indeed to be defeated on that motion, because it has already committed itself to the Broken Hill Pty. Co. in connection with this matter.

I am sure now that the Government has committed itself right up to the ears to B.H.P. to hand over Koolan Island to the company. I was in some doubt about it until the Government adopted the attitude it did in adjourning the debate, and

the attitude which it is now adopting on the motion at present before the House. I think the Government has committed itself so far to B.H.P. as not to be able to retreat. We know that B.H.P. is a tremendously powerful company. No-one knows where its influence begins and where it ends; no-one knows who is associated with it and who is not; no-one knows just what it controls and whom it controls.

In an earlier speech I said that I had great admiration for its technical ability and for the great things it has done, in the production field, for Australia. I repeat that. Yet I know from my own personal knowledge that it is ruthless; it is a company that can become ruthless when it considers it should be so, or when it considers that its interests are better served by its adopting ruthless methods and using them against weaker companies and individuals. We know all about that.

The Premier: It has been a God-send to Australia. Our industries would not have been worth anything had it not been for that company.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have already said that. The fact that the company has done great things for Australia in some respect or other does not entitle it to run the roller over and completely crush those other companies and those other individuals which it did not want to continue in existence. In view of the attitude of the Government in connection with the matter, I am sure that it is committed absolutely, beyond any possibility of alteration, to B.H.P. in connection with Koolan Island. As far as the Government is concerned, it has given Koolan Island away to the company and it is not now in a position to retreat. Naturally, therefore, I suppose, from the point of view of the pride of the Ministers, they would not want a motion such as the one upon the notice paper to be carried. They would not want themselves to be humiliated in the eyes of the representatives of this gigantic company. So it seems to me that the pride of individual Ministers is the only thing that is causing the Government to refuse to members of this House who would like to speak upon the motion, and who are anxious to speak upon it, the opportunity to do so. It is the only thing that is causing the Ministers and the Government to refuse the House the opportunity to vote upon the motion.

What sort of Government is it? What sort of Ministers are they when they are afraid to allow a motion of this kind to be given full debate and subsequently submitted to a vote of members? Some member on this side of the House—I think it was the member for Melville—made reference a few days ago to the fact that the word “democratic” is often used by the Liberal Party, and that it is part of the title of the Country and Democratic League. Well, what sort of democracy is

being handed out to us now? You have been a keen student of democracy over the years, Mr. Speaker; you have read a great deal about the various systems that operate in different countries of the world for the purpose of governing people, or for the alternative purpose of keeping them compulsorily under control. You know what real, true democracy is as against the spurious kind.

Yet here we have a Government supposed to be democratic, supposed to believe in democracy, supposed to trust Parliament, and yet on this issue which is extremely controversial and vital the Premier and his Ministers get into reverse gear in regard to democracy; they go backwards as fast as it is possible for them to do. They grab hold of the Soviet and Fascist technique and say, “There is to be no further discussion upon this matter; no vote upon it; no decision upon it; Parliament is not to be given an opportunity to have a vote. The Government will make its own decision; it won’t give Parliament the opportunity of even expressing an opinion.”

This evening the Minister for Industrial Development gave us to understand that there are lots of things he would like to tell us but which he is not able to tell us. That is all a certain kind of dust, and it is not the kind of dust that would be in the least bit likely to blind the judgment of anyone in this House. As I pointed out in a previous speech, the Minister for Industrial Development spread himself at tremendous length in “The West Australian” a week or so ago in connection with the matter. He could not say enough about it and probably gave “The West Australian” more than they could find space for. He was probably anxious to build himself up after he had missed the bus in connection with the oil refinery deal. He was probably just bursting to throw himself into this negotiation with B.H.P. and to show that though he had missed the bus in connection with the oil refinery, he would now come good with B.H.P.

I can understand the Minister wanting to boost himself; I can understand his being tremendously annoyed when he did not think in the early stages that there would be a chance of Western Australia getting the oil refinery and consequently leaving a junior Minister—one junior to himself, anyway—to tackle the job. However, when he found the junior Minister had succeeded in achieving what he thought was the impossible, the Minister for Industrial Development was desperately and overwhelmingly anxious to boost himself up in some way and somehow.

Mr. McCulloch: Give him the O.B.E.!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The negotiations with B.H.P. were put through very quickly. I have no doubt the Minister for Industrial Development said

"Yes, yes, yes" to everything the company put up in order that the broad principles of the agreement between the Government and the company could be finalised. As soon as it was finalised on the broad principles, the Minister spread himself in the columns of "The West Australian" to a remarkable extent. Yet in reply to a statement I had in the newspapers a day or so afterwards, he said that it was not possible to tell the people much about the agreement, and in the House tonight he repeated the same thing.

What more is it necessary to tell the public or Parliament in connection with the matter than the Minister told Parliament or the people in his Press statement a week or so ago? As if that is everything! There cannot be anything still to be told to the public of one-tenth the importance in comparison with what the Minister has already acquainted them in his public statements. Yet the Premier wants to rush Parliament into an adjournment now. He wants to close down Parliament now because when we adjourn tonight, we know that for all practical purposes it will be the end of the session and we will not meet again to discuss any further business until—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: August.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Or possibly September. We know what sort of a session will be held then.

The Attorney General: It will be very much like this one.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Government will make it as short as possible. As a matter of fact, all members will want it to be reasonably short because next year is the black year for them. It is the election year. We know what will happen and what sort of session is likely to be held. There will be rush and bustle and so on.

Mr. W. Hegney: Window dressing will not be in it!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: There is no excuse for Parliament to adjourn now. I know some members have outside work to which they want to give their undivided attention. They regard the business of Parliament as a side-line. That is all right if they can get away with it and their electors do not mind. I am not complaining, but I think we are justified in saying that the small volume of business remaining on the notice paper ought to be completed before we adjourn tonight. The only business on the notice paper requiring further debate and a vote is the motion dealing with the intention of the Government to hand Koolan Island over to B.H.P. What possible justification can there be for Parliament adjourning now when by giving at the most a further hour's attention to that particular question, all the business on the notice paper could be completed?

I say to the Government that this is simply an attempt to gag Parliament upon a vital matter, one that has already been partly debated and respecting which the Premier this evening gave me an absolute assurance that there would be a full debate. The statement he made cannot possibly be interpreted in any other way. Yet under pressure from the Deputy Premier, he allowed himself to be persuaded to put over the trick he did half an hour ago! I protest very strongly at the trickery indulged in by the Government. I protest very strongly against the action of the Premier in breaking the assurance he gave me. I protest against the action of the Government in refusing this House an opportunity fully to debate one of the most vital matters ever brought before it and also the opportunity to vote upon the matter, so that the opinion of a majority of members might be available for the guidance of the Government in connection with the negotiations that still have to be finalised as between the Government and B.H.P.

MR. BUTCHER (Gascoyne) [10.25]: I voted for the amendment, but that does not mean that I do not support the motion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Which motion?

Mr. BUTCHER: Your motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member referred to supporting the amendment, but I take it he meant the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BUTCHER: Yes, I supported the motion for the adjournment of the debate, but that is not to say that I do not support the motion presented by the Leader of the Opposition. I acquainted the Premier with my decision before the debate, so there is very little else for me to say.

The Premier: You acquainted me! When did you do that?

Mr. BUTCHER: Yes, I acquainted you with the fact when you were sitting here.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Yes, we could hear it over here.

Mr. BUTCHER: When the Premier was sitting over here was when I told him.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Surely the Premier is not going to deny it!

Mr. BUTCHER: That is the position. Though I supported the adjournment, I said it was my intention to vote against the Bill when it was presented to the House. That is the explanation I wish to make.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melville) [10.26]: This is the application of the gag in a new form.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: In a very dirty form.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Government is breaking new ground this session with the application of the gag. We had an example of this previously when the Government deprived members of an opportunity to speak on the Address-in-reply. The complete debate in that respect was entirely eliminated, and now the Government has taken action, firstly, to refuse leave to introduce Bills so that they could not even be explained and, finally, is now preventing the Leader of the Opposition from replying to the speech by the Minister for Industrial Development, and also preventing any other member from having an opportunity to speak if he desires to make his position plain with regard to the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Gascoyne has really let the cat out of the bag.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He certainly has.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: When the Premier gave his assurance to the Leader of the Opposition that a debate on this motion would be permitted, he was very obviously not then aware of the attitude to be adopted by the member for Gascoyne. He therefore felt quite safe in giving the assurance that he did. Subsequently, upon being acquainted with the attitude the member for Gascoyne intended to adopt, the Premier became scared of the result and decided that, although it meant repudiation of an undertaking he had given, it was far safer to follow the course he has than risk an adverse vote in the House. That is the reason for the course the Government has decided to follow.

Although the Government has made no pronouncement upon the point, it is well known that when the current session has terminated, members will not again have an opportunity to deal with public business until August at the earliest, and probably not until very late in that month. The excuse that will be put forward is that, as there has been a special session, the opening of Parliament for the next session can be delayed later than usual—we customarily meet for a new session in the last week of July—but there will be no justification for any such excuse because during this part of the session the Government has done its best to restrict the activities of members and to limit speeches to matters that the Government itself has brought forward.

We were told by the Attorney General that the only matters to be discussed during this part of the session were those which the Government itself would introduce. In other words, the Government decided that it would use Parliament for its own purposes only. Parliament does not exist for the purposes of the Government only; it exists to give members representing different parties and various constituencies and points of view an opportunity of dealing with the business of the country and moving such motions

as they consider are necessary in the interests of the country. But we have been told that the Government decided that the only business to be discussed would be the Government's business. The Government had no right to determine that.

The Attorney General: Anyone knows that the Government has not that right.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then why did the Government make such a decision, which is quite undemocratic?

The Attorney General: I said the decision was in the hands of the House.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No, I said that, as the record will show.

The Attorney General: And I agreed with you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But that was not the statement made by the Attorney General in the first place. We would have had ample time to discuss the motion fully and come to a decision. Parliament is not here simply to talk about things. Decisions on important motions are desirable. We could have obtained a decision and a direction on this question had the Government taken the risk. Of course, when the member for Gascoyne disclosed his intention, the Government would not take the risk of an adverse vote being recorded.

A large number of matters ought to be debated at this special session. For example, there is the increase in rents, completely unjustified under the powers, even having regard to the amendment of the Commonwealth-State Rental Housing Agreement. From my study of the replies given by the Minister, I say that there were no grounds for the increases that have been made. That matter ought to be discussed and put right, but we shall not have an opportunity to discuss it tomorrow because, when we meet at 3.30 p.m., if the Legislative Council has not then completed its consideration of the two Bills, the sitting of this House will be suspended until the ringing of the bells. When the Legislative Council has completed its consideration of the Bills, we shall be called together again to deal with the formalities. Thus, the motion means the end of any further discussion by this Parliament.

I repeat that a number of important matters affecting our people ought to be ventilated and decided. I emphasise the very important matter that affects almost 5,000 people, namely, the tenants of the Commonwealth-State rental homes, who have been subjected to largely increased rentals because, we are told, of the increase in the cost of administration. This is supposed to have been done under the housing agreement, but a perusal of the Auditor General's report shows that a large proportion of the losses was

incurred on Army huts. Has the Government any right to charge the tenants of rental homes with the losses sustained on Army huts and the losses on the war service homes agency? That is what appears to have been done, and it is a point that needs examination and explanation.

Now is the opportunity, during this session of Parliament, to deal with the matter, but we shall be denied the opportunity, because the Government has decided that the only business to be discussed is its two Bills—nothing else. It matters not how urgent the question might be or how important to the people it might be. This means nothing to the Government, because it has decided that the only matters to be discussed are those which it will permit to be discussed.

I say again, as I said the other evening, that this is the technique of the totalitarian country and the dictator. It is the end of free speech, and ultimately means the end of democracy if we are allowed to discuss only those things that suit the party in power and are debarred from discussing any other matters. It is the technique that was adopted by Hitler and Mussolini.

Mr. May: And led to their downfall.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and the same policy will eventually cause the downfall of the present Government. There is no justification for the action of the Government unless it be that it is taken for the Government's preservation. This might be advanced as a justification from the Government's point of view for curtailing the session and gagging members. From time to time, I have heard members on the Government side express their opposition to the use of the gag, but the Government's action in this instance represents the application of the gag in its worst possible form.

Had the speeches been long and tedious, the Government might have been excused for applying the gag on the ground that sufficient discussion had taken place, but in this instance there have been only two speeches, one by the Leader of the Opposition and one by the Minister for Industrial Development. The Minister made a number of statements that could not be substantiated by facts, but members on the Opposition side of the House have been denied an opportunity of pointing out just where the Minister erred in his speech. He spoke about there being no grounds for the statements of the Leader of the Opposition, and yet the very grounds were supplied by the Minister himself in his statement to the Press, a copy of which I have before me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate on that motion has been adjourned.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course it has; that is what I am so annoyed about. It would not have been adjourned had the Premier lived up to his undertaking and given members a reasonable opportunity to pronounce judgment on the proposals of the Government. I believe that, when the Premier gave the undertaking, he was quite sincere and intended to afford members an opportunity to debate the motion on its merits, but his being informed by the member for Gascoyne of his intention to vote for the motion of the Leader of the Opposition made all the difference, and so the Premier was prepared to sink his principles and forget that he had given any assurance and, at the first opportunity, applied the gag.

The Minister for Lands: It ought to be applied more.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister thinks it should be applied more?

The Minister for Lands: Yes, I would do so.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is proof of what I have been saying. This sort of thing grows by what it feeds on. Having started to apply the gag as it has done, the Government wants to continue and carry it further.

The Minister for Lands: The Leader of the Opposition spoke for 2½ hours tonight.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In other words, to follow more and more the pattern of the totalitarian countries where you allow such discussion as suits you and then apply the gag. That is something new on this side of the Commonwealth—this prevention of the expression of ideas on motions brought before Parliament. The Government broke entirely new ground the other evening when it prevented the introduction of Bills or motions. This is a further step in the same direction, and the Minister for Lands wants to go further still. So it will be seen where we will finish up if he has his way.

The Minister for Lands: Before the House finished its sitting at Xmas, you and the Leader of the Opposition cleared out. You did not stop to see the finish, and to state your case.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am glad the Minister for Lands has brought that up.

The Minister for Lands: You cleared out and left your boys to it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am glad the Minister has brought that up, because that session will go down to the discredit of the Government. Having kept us here for 20 and 22 hours at a stretch, with sittings like that for a full week, is it any wonder that the members on this side were completely exhausted? It was all right for members on that side, for Ministers who did their job and then got up and went out. But the members of the

Opposition had to stay here to keep an eye on what the Government was up to. The whole time Parliament met we were in our seats. Hour upon hour, for up to 20 hours at a sitting!

The Minister for Lands: It was not noticeable anyway.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Was it not?

The Minister for Lands: No.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Because the Minister was not here to see it.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, I was.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister was outside.

The Minister for Lands: Never in your life!

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is for the adjournment.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Neither the Leader of the Opposition nor I left this House while it was possible to do any business of the House. The actual work of the House had been completed before we left the precincts of the building, and all that was left were the formalities.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Minister for Lands would not know that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us leave that now and come back to the motion.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I claim that I was entitled to reply to the Minister's interjection, seeing that it was allowed. Otherwise we would have a repetition of what I am complaining about, and that is that the Government side of a matter is placed before the Assembly and receives full publicity and there is no reply to statements made by the Government. That is precisely what will happen with regard to publicity on the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Full publicity will be obtained by the Government's publicity officer for the case which the Minister for Industrial Development presented, and that will show that the Minister has said there was no justification for the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Attorney General: You will admit that the whole of it has to be debated later on.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What is very necessary for us is that, with the limited publicity which is given to what is said on this side of the House, we should endeavour to see that as far as possible a fair presentation of our views is given to the general public.

The Premier: I do not think you should complain about lack of space in the newspapers.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am not complaining about lack of space. What I am complaining about is that from time to time statements are made in this House

which are completely at variance with the truth. Those statements go out to the general public as factual statements and they believe them.

The Minister for Lands: No, they do not. They go out as statements made.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and they are regarded as factual statements. Let me give a case in point. A statement was made by the Minister for Housing that all evicted persons would be housed by the Government. I stated to the newspaper, and I said in this House on more than one occasion, that that statement was not true. The Minister's statement has appeared in the Press; but although I told the Press, and although I said here that the statement was not true, and although the Minister knows the statement is not true—

The Premier: I do not know it is not true.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Premier does not?

The Premier: No.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Well, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will put this to the Premier: Will he say that all evicted persons who became tenants prior to the 1st January, 1951, are being housed by the Housing Commission? Yes or no?

The Minister for Lands: You are under cross-examination now!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes or no? Let the Premier prove his bona fides! Members can see what the position is. The Premier said that he does not know the statement is not true. All he has to say to my question is either yes or no.

Mr. W. Hegney: He is not game.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course not, because he would give the show away! I will tell the Premier the statement is not true and I will resign my seat in Parliament, if he can prove it is.

The Minister for Lands: We will have to try to prove that!

Mr. McCulloch: Would they not be happy?

The Minister for Lands: You sure know, Mac!

The Attorney General: That is a rash statement.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is not rash at all, and I will not squib it either. We can see where the Government stands on this matter when it comes to a showdown. I complain that untrue statements are made. They are published as if they are true statements, and when we attempt to show what the true position is no publicity is given to our statements.

The Premier: I think that is a reflection on our Government officers. Do you believe they would really set out to mis-

lead you, that they would set out to tell lies? You should know, as an ex-Minister, that when questions are asked they are forwarded to the departments concerned and answers are sent to the responsible Ministers.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Do not bring the officers into this matter.

The Premier: Yes, I will!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister stated in the Press—

The Premier: Did he compile the figures?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: These were not figures. This was a statement. The Minister said that all evicted tenants who were tenants prior to the 1st January, 1951—that is, who had not become tenants subsequent to that date and therefore were not without protection—had been housed by the Housing Commission. I rang the Minister up, as he knows, and I told him that statement was not true. I quoted from a letter of his which I had in my possession to prove that it was not true.

So it is not a question of figures being compiled by the Minister's officers at all. It is a question of a statement by the Minister, and the fact remains that that statement was not true. The Minister knows it was not true, but people outside believe it because nothing has appeared anywhere to indicate that that statement was not true. When I rang the newspaper I said, "I have spoken to the Minister. I have told him his statement is not true and I ask you to say now that the statement is not true." I was told that it would have to be referred to the Minister. I said, "All right. That will not make any difference to me, because I still say the statement is not true and the Minister knows it is not true."

But my statement never appeared and, although I have said in this House a number of times since that the statement was not true, no publicity of any kind has been given to that. So my complaint comes back to this: That although we might have a lot of space given to us from time to time, when it comes to a matter of contradicting things which are vital we do not always get the opportunity to let the public know the other side. That is why in this House we have to endeavour to take the fullest advantage of what the Standing Orders provide for, namely that private members shall have the opportunity of bringing forward matters which they think ought to be debated; and we should not be restricted to those matters which the Government decides shall be debated. That is our complaint about this session. I know it is hard to drag the Government to Parliament. I tried it last year. I tried to get the Government to come to Parliament early enough to amend the rent legislation so as to prevent people from

being evicted but no, the Government did not want to come here; it hates the place—

The Premier: No wonder!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN:—because it has to stand up to criticism here.

The Attorney General: It is the time taken up that worries us.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Government's administrative acts can be probed here and some light can be thrown on what is happening, but that does not suit the Government. It wants to carry on its administration without criticism, and it expects to be able to do so. Fortunately the Standing Orders and the Constitution provide for something different from that, and we are safeguarded to some extent. But then the Government uses its majority to stifle discussion. If the member for Gascoyne was really in favour of the motion he should have been sufficiently wide awake to see what the Government was up to. He supported the Government in its action to prevent discussion on the motion.

The Attorney General: He made it quite clear just now that he did not like the agreement, and he will get an opportunity of voting on it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But he had to do that on the motion for adjournment. If the Leader of the Opposition had not opposed the motion for adjournment there would have been no indication from the member for Gascoyne as to where he stood on the motion.

The Attorney General: At the moment.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This is when we want to know, because the motion is here now. There would have been no indication as to where the hon. member stood. I will be charitable enough to say that I believe the member for Gascoyne was not fully appreciative of the action being taken by the Government when it moved the adjournment, and that he did not fully realise what was being done.

Mr. Butcher: I am not asking for charitable treatment. I merely stated a fact.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not say the hon. member did ask for it. If I am wrong in believing that was the reason for his attitude, then I will not hesitate to blame him for it, because if he intended to support the motion he should have voted against the motion for adjournment so as to give expression to his point of view. We have to face up to the certainty that the Government will rush away from here at the earliest opportunity and keep the place closed for as long as it can. The Opposition complains about that treatment and says it is a completely

new departure for Western Australia, and that it is unjust and against the best interests of the State.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray—in reply) [10.55]: I did, of course, tell the Leader of the Opposition that his motion would be debated. I might say that I had nothing to do with the notice paper, and it took its usual course. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any reason to complain. He was given the fullest opportunity, in his own time, to ventilate his feelings on this matter and to let the House know exactly what he felt about it.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What about the other members? What about a vote?

THE PREMIER: Then he was given the courtesy of a reply by the Minister. I do not think, particularly because the whole matter has to come to Parliament, that the Leader of the Opposition should complain of unjust treatment.

Mr. May: You made a promise.

THE PREMIER: I kept the promise.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You did not. You broke the promise.

THE PREMIER: Here we have a motion upon which members are asked to vote, but, as explained by the Minister for Industrial Development, they do not know what the agreement contains.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Not much!

THE PREMIER: Certainly they have seen some Press statement. The Minister for Industrial Development also said that the agreement was still subject to examination by legal and technical officers on both sides.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Do you deny that the Government has agreed to hand over Koolan Island to the B.H.P.?

THE PREMIER: At this stage I do not think I am called upon to make any admission in regard to this agreement.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: We know.

THE PREMIER: If members voted in ignorance on the motion and carried it, it might easily have the effect of killing the whole agreement, and in our not having a steel industry established in the State for many years.

Mr. Kelly: Was there any truth in the Press statement of the Minister for Industrial Development?

THE PREMIER: The Minister gave an outline of what is to happen, but the whole agreement is not there.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Minister for Industrial Development spilled the beans.

THE PREMIER: I do not think so. The Leader of the Opposition is on the wrong track about wanting to rush in and get publicity. He is off the target.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Minister for Industrial Development spilled the beans on the Government.

THE PREMIER: No member of the House is being gagged on this particular motion. The whole agreement has to come here to be ratified.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: When will it come here?

THE PREMIER: As soon as Parliament meets. Where the hon. member gets his information that Parliament will not meet until September, I do not know.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: I said, August.

THE PREMIER: That is news to me, also.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It may be October.

THE PREMIER: The member for Gascoyne and all other members who want to express themselves on this agreement will have the fullest opportunity to do so.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is choice.

THE PREMIER: It is factual.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I will tell you something about it in a minute.

THE PREMIER: I say again there is no attempt being made to gag anyone. I am not going to cover all the ground that has been covered in speaking to my motion for the adjournment of the House until 3.30 p.m. tomorrow, but I repeat that I do not consider the Leader of the Opposition has been tricked.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He certainly was tricked.

THE PREMIER: He has not been tricked.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He most certainly was.

THE PREMIER: This is not the end of the particular matter under discussion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Premier gave an unqualified assurance, which he has broken.

THE PREMIER: No, I did not. I gave the Leader of the Opposition an assurance that the matter would be debated.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Without qualification.

THE PREMIER: It has been debated and the hon. gentleman has taken the fullest opportunity of expressing his views. What he has said tonight will receive consideration by the Government, but by no manner of means am I going to give him an assurance that any suggestions he has made will be embodied in any future agreement.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I will take no assurance from the Premier in future.

THE PREMIER: Do not say hasty things.

Hon A. R. G. Hawke: I am never hasty, but I never allow the same person to trick me twice.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has not been tricked. If it was the intention of the Government to prevent the Leader of the Opposition speaking on the motion we could have done it when he asked for leave to introduce it.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I expected that.

The PREMIER: As proof of our bona fides, that was not done.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Premier gave me an unqualified assurance and then broke it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member says I did, and I say I did not. It is a matter of opinion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is a matter of fact and not of opinion.

The Attorney General: The Leader of the Opposition should study English.

The PREMIER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said I was influenced in my action by the determination of the member for Gascoyne to support the motion. The member for Gascoyne says that he told me he was going to do that, but frankly, I did not understand from him that that was his intimation to me. I readily admit that he does not beat about the bush when he wants to let me know his attitude on certain matters and he may, in conversation with me, have given me an indication in that direction which I failed to appreciate. Whatever he may have said, however, did not have any effect on the action I took in this regard. I do not know that I need say anything further, except to repeat that members are not gagged and will have every opportunity, when Parliament meets again, of seeing this agreement, of expressing themselves and of taking whatever action they think should be taken.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	13
Majority for	8

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Naider
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Oldfield
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Owen
Mr. Donev	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Watts
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Yates
Mr. Hill	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Hutchinson	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Molr
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Kelly
Mr. May	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Styants
Mr. Perkins	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Totterdell	Mr. Needham
Mr. Manning	Mr. Hoar

Question thus passed.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Am I at liberty, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment to the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 47 states—

A motion, "That the House do now adjourn," shall always be in order, if made without interrupting a member when speaking, and, if seconded, shall be forthwith put from the Chair. But no such motion can be made or seconded during a debate by members who have spoken to the question.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I wish to ascertain whether I would be in order in moving to delete the word "now", thus amending the motion before the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have a ruling in our records that there can be no debate on this motion.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What was that ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: There was such a ruling in 1938 when the late Mr. Johnson was Speaker.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.7 p.m.