

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 6th March, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Swearing-in of members	1869
Questions : Housing, (a) as to building costs and Commonwealth-State scheme	1869
(b) as to contracts and applications for Commonwealth-State homes	1869
(c) as to increased rents, Commonwealth-State homes	1870
(d) as to charges and costs necessitating rent increases	1870
(e) as to tenancy homes, Guildford-Midland electorate	1870
(f) as to evictees and accommodation provided by Commission	1870
(g) as to non-applicants for accommodation	1870
(h) as to names of evictees accommodated	1871
(i) as to Commonwealth-State rental homes policy	1871
(j) as to sites for Commonwealth-State homes	1871
Traffic, as to committee's recommendations on road accidents	1871
Hospitals, as to regional building, Bunbury	1871
Price control, as to groceries and profit margins	1871
North-West, as to air freight subsidy on additional perishables	1872
Transport, (a) as to Metro. Bus Co. fares and profit	1872
(b) as to controlling authority and union representation	1872
Licensing, as to bar dart-playing by women	1872
Argentine ant, as to supplies of insecticide	1872
Onion Marketing Board, (a) as to commission to broker	1872
(b) as to importations and control	1873
Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. steel mill, (a) as to tabling agreement and reports	1873
(b) as to permission to peruse papers	1873
(c) as to use of Koolan Island iron-ore	1873
(d) as to objection to making papers available	1874
(e) as to reports on project	1874
Swan River pollution, as to waste discharged from brewery	1874
Workers' Compensation Act, as to amending legislation	1874
Bills : Licensing Act Amendment (No. 3), leave to introduce refused	1875
Rents and Tenancies Emergency Provisions Act Amendment, leave to introduce refused	1877
Electoral Districts Act Amendment, discharged	1891
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, discharged	1891
Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Limited), Message, 1r., 2r.	1891
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area), 1r., 2r.	1891
Adjournment, special	1909

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

SWEARING-IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to administer to members, who were not present at the previous sitting, the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke (Northam), Mr. Cornell (Mt. Marshall) and Mr. Nalder (Katanning) took and subscribed the oath.

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING.

(a) *As to Building Costs and Commonwealth-State Scheme.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Premier:

(1) Is he aware that the high cost of building homes prevents many workers from taking on the responsibility of having a home built?

(2) Is he further aware that low deposits under the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act do not encourage the worker to incur the responsibility?

(3) Is he also aware that the decision to stop building Commonwealth-State rental homes will intensify the already acute shortage of houses?

(4) In view of the foregoing, will he request the Commonwealth Government to release sufficient credit to enable the building of Commonwealth-State rental homes to continue?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) There are undoubted advantages in home ownership which not only enables the occupant to build up an equity but ensures a title to the dwelling in which he resides. Low deposits enable the worker to secure these advantages and also effect some saving in weekly outgoing as present rentals must cover such factors as maintenance, administration and defaults, etc., not included in monthly instalments.

(3) No. It is estimated that more homes under the Commonwealth-State rental scheme will be built under existing commitments during the years 1951-1952 and 1952-1953 than during any previous year under this scheme and that an increased number will be built by private enterprise.

(4) The matter has already been the subject of special approach to the Commonwealth Treasurer.

(b) *As to Contracts and Applications for Commonwealth-State Homes.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) When will the present contracts for Commonwealth-State rental homes expire?

(2) What was the number of applications for Commonwealth-State rental homes outstanding on the 31st December, 1951?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is anticipated that Commonwealth-State rental homes being constructed under existing commitments will be completed during 1953.

(2) 11,684.

(c) *As to Increased Rents, Commonwealth-State Homes.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is he aware that the recent increase in rents for Commonwealth-State rental homes is a breach of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement?

(2) Is he aware that the agreement provides that the economic rent of a dwelling must be related to the capital cost of the dwelling?

(3) Will he get in immediate touch with the Commonwealth Government with a view to the cancellation of these illegal and inequitable rent increases?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) The agreement provides that the economic rents of dwellings must be related to the amount expended by the housing authority in construction of the dwellings included in the housing project and in carrying out any improvements on the land appurtenant to the dwellings and includes a formula which must be followed in the calculation of the economic rents.

(3) All economic rents are in accordance with the provisions of the agreement and are subject to audit.

(d) *As to Charges and Costs Necessitating Rent Increases.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Housing:

Will he table a list of all charges and costs necessitating the recent increase of rents on Commonwealth-State tenancy homes?

The MINISTER replied:

Economic rent is assessed on the capital cost of the dwelling and includes the following factors:—

(a) Interest and amortisation over 53 years.

(b) Maintenance—

Three-quarter per cent, on brick houses.

One per cent, on timber houses.

(c) Actual rates and taxes (which have been subject to recent increases).

(d) Insurance—

1s. per cent. on brick houses.

3s. per cent. on timber houses.

(e) Vacancies and Defaults. (Originally 5 per cent. of sub total of (a), (b), (c) and (d) but now reduced to 2½ per cent. sub total).

(f) Administration. (Originally £5 per dwelling per annum). Now, as a result of a recent amendment to the agreement, actual cost of administration which is approximately £12 per house per annum.

Additional increases were caused by increases in the capital costs of dwellings such as "rise and fall," extra cost of imported materials, developmental costs, etc.

(e) *As to Tenancy Homes, Guildford-Midland Electorate.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Housing:

As applicants in the Guildford-Midland electorate have been waiting for tenancy homes since 1947, can he indicate when they are likely to be accommodated?

The MINISTER replied:

No. Accommodation will be provided as soon as possible but the position will be governed by the funds available for building under the Commonwealth-State rental scheme.

(f) *As to Evictees and Accommodation Provided by Commission.*

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

(1) How many evictions have occurred since the 30th September, 1951, under the provisions of the amended rent legislation?

(2) For how many such evicted families has the Housing Commission provided accommodation?

(3) What number of evicted families have applied to the Housing Commission for accommodation since the 30th September, 1951?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Three hundred and twenty-five orders to vacate made by magistrates.

(2) Two hundred and fifty houses provided where warrants have been issued.

(3) Two hundred and fifty-three.

(g) *As to Non-Applicants for Accommodation.*

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

Will he supply the names of the evicted families who have not applied to the Housing Commission for assistance?

The MINISTER replied:

I think that is a tall order. The Housing Commission is not a court of law. A man attends the court on behalf of the Housing Commission, and he only keeps a list of those people who call upon him and not of those who do not attend.

*(h) As to Names of Evictees
Accommodated.*

HON. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

To simplify the matter for the Minister, will he supply the names of persons who have been evicted and who have been housed by the Housing Commission?

The MINISTER replied:

Again, I think it is asking too much. I can see no reason at all why a member of the State Housing Commission should have to sit down and spend considerable time detailing the names of people who have been housed by the State Housing Commission. The answer given to the hon. member this afternoon represents the number of people housed by the State Housing Commission.

*(i) As to Commonwealth-State Rental
Homes Policy.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

In view of the reported policy of the Commonwealth Government to discontinue making advances for the purpose of building Commonwealth-State rental homes, can the Minister give the approximate number of houses which have yet to be built before the scheme ceases to take effect?

The MINISTER replied:

Up to date, there has been no indication given by the Commonwealth Government that it is going to cease building under the Commonwealth-State agreement. There has been a curtailment of funds this year. In 1952-53 I think approximately 1,300 or 1,400 houses will be built. Roughly, this is a bit more than those built in 1951-52.

*(j) As to Sites for Commonwealth-State
Homes.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

Can he indicate where the Commonwealth-State homes for 1952-53 are likely to be built? Will they be built around Kwinana or will distribution be made as hitherto?

The MINISTER replied:

There will be no Commonwealth-State rental homes built at Kwinana. The distribution as hitherto will operate during the coming year.

TRAFFIC.

*As to Committee's Recommendations on
Road Accidents.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Has he read the report of the committee under the chairmanship of Mr. F. J. Huelin that inquired into road accidents?

(2) If so, will he inform Parliament what he thinks of the committee's recommendations?

(3) If he is of the opinion that they should be implemented, will he without delay bring down amending legislation with a view to checking effectively the increasing number of road accidents and fatalities?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) This report is now receiving the consideration of the Government.

HOSPITALS

As to Regional Building, Bunbury.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Can she give any particulars regarding the regional hospital in Bunbury?

(2) When is it intended to commence this building?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Preliminary sketch plans have been prepared in regard to such hospitals at Albany, Bunbury and Geraldton.

Before tenders can be called, the preparation of working drawings and specifications, which will take a number of months, must proceed and these will commence shortly.

PRICES CONTROL.

As to Groceries and Profit Margins.

HON. J. T. TONKIN asked the Attorney General:

(1) Have profit margins on some grocery lines in the retail trade been increased in the last three months?

(2) What are the particulars of such increases?

(3) For what reasons were the increases granted?

(4) What persons are supplied with particulars of increases in the margins of profit which have been approved by the Prices Commissioner before such increases are gazetted?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Average increase of 1½ per cent.

(3) To meet substantial increase in overhead costs.

(4) The secretary of the Retail Grocers' Association is notified of alterations in prices when they have been determined and approved by the Commissioner.

NORTH-WEST.

As to Air Freight Subsidy on Additional Perishables.

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

Will he favourably consider the inclusion of potatoes and onions in the list of subsidised vegetables to inland towns, such as Fitzroy Crossing and Halls Creek, during the wet season from November to April?

The PREMIER replied:

Inquiries will be made as to the quantity of potatoes and onions required at Fitzroy Crossing and Hall's Creek between November and April, and in the light of the information obtained the matter will be considered.

TRANSPORT.

(a) As to Metro Bus Co. Fares and Profit.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it a fact that the Metro Bus Company has recently increased its bus fares?

(2) Is it also a fact that the Metro Bus Company has recently declared a profit of about 10 per cent.?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Yes—on certain sections only in common with all other operators including the Government Tramways Department.

(2) No, but I understand Metro Industries Ltd., the parent company, recently paid a dividend of 10 per cent. but it must be understood that the parent company covers various activities in addition to transport.

(b) As to Controlling Authority and Union Representation.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Premier:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a transport authority to control all land transport?

(2) If so, what will be the composition of such authority?

(3) Will transport trade unions have representation?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) The question of over-all control of transport, particularly metropolitan passenger transport, is at present receiving consideration, but no decision has yet been reached.

(2) and (3) Cannot be answered until finality has been reached regarding the matter referred to in (1).

LICENSING.

As to Bar Dart-Playing by Women.

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Attorney General:

What authority has the Licensing Court to interfere with the playing of darts by women in the bars of hotels during lawful trading hours?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

The authority relied upon by the Licensing Court is Section 63, Subsection (2) (h) and Subsection (3) of the Licensing Act, 1911-1951.

ARGENTINE ANT.

As to Supplies of Insecticide.

Mr. NEEDHAM (without notice) asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is she aware that the Argentine ant is a daily increasing menace to householders, especially in the metropolitan area?

(2) Will she authorise an intense, concentrated, and continuous attack on Argentine ants in all ant-infested areas with a view to their ultimate elimination?

(3) In order to encourage the collaboration and co-operation of householders, will she arrange for an immediate supply of effective insecticide, at a price within the range of all householders?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) I am aware of the difficulties being experienced in combating the Argentine ant menace.

(2) This has been done since 1950, but this summer our efforts have been impaired by a temporary shortage of insecticides caused by a world shortage of supplies.

(3) Insecticides have been available since 1950, with the exception that early this year the department was short of supplies. They are now available to the Public Health Department and local authorities at cost.

ONION MARKETING BOARD.

(a) As to Commission to Broker.

Mr. OLDFIELD (without notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

Is it a fact that a broker, who is also a member of the W.A. Onion Marketing Board, receives commission on sales of local onions and, if so, does this broker receive commission on orders placed direct with the board?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

Section 3 (5) provides that one member of the board at least shall be a person of mercantile and commercial experience.

In 1940, to fulfil this, the Government appointed Mr. Alexander Murray, whose occupation was, prior to that appointment,

and still is, that of mercantile broker in produce lines. He has been re-appointed to the board at three-yearly intervals and additionally has acted as broker to the board, being paid brokerage only on such orders as, through his efforts, are placed with the board.

(b) As to Importations and Control.

Mr. OLDFIELD (without notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is there any intention to disturb the usual and normal procedure relating to the marketing of onions imported from the Eastern States which have in the past been marketed on a merchant to merchant basis?

(2) Is it a fact that the W.A. Onion Marketing Board is negotiating direct with the Victorian Onion Marketing Board to arrange for the importation and control of onions from the Eastern States?

(3) Is it a fact that the W.A. Onion Marketing Board paid the cost of a trip to Victoria undertaken recently by a member of the board who also acts as its broker?

(4) Did the board intend to pay a commission on such imports to its broker and, if so, at what rate per ton?

(5) If the answer to question (2) is in the affirmative, is this procedure in conformity with the provisions of the Marketing of Onions Act, 1938-1945?

(6) If the W.A. Onion Marketing Board arranges for and accepts responsibility for the importation of onions from the Eastern States—

(a) Who will provide the finance;

(b) Who will bear the loss, if any—

(i) W.A. onion growers.

(ii) W.A. Onion Marketing Board.

(iii) W.A. Government?

(c) Who will absorb the extra cost of distribution and handling?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) Yes.

(4) The board is not importing onions and therefore no commission is paid.

(5) The W.A. Onion Marketing Board has not arranged any importation of onions and therefore does not accept responsibility for this function.

(6) Not for present decision.

**BROKEN HILL PTY. CO. LTD.,
STEEL MILL.**

(a) As to Tabling Agreement and Reports.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (without notice) asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Will he table immediately a copy of the agreement made recently between the Government and the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd., as referred to by him in his statement which was published in "The West Australian" on Wednesday last?

(2) Will he also table immediately any written advice or reports given to the Government in connection with the proposal by—

(i) The Co-ordinator of Works and Industrial Development, Mr. Dumas?

(ii) The Board of Management of the Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry at Wundowie?

(iii) The Under Secretary for Mines?

(3) When will the Bill to ratify the agreement be introduced?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. The agreement in question is to be the subject of detailed drafting by legal and technical officers of the Government and the company which will take place in the course of the next two months and at present is an agreement in outline only.

(2) No. Consideration will be given to tabling such of these papers as are available when the Bill is presented to Parliament.

(3) Not until next session.

(b) As to Permission to Peruse Papers.

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

Would he allow me, as Leader of the Opposition, to peruse the papers covering the agreement, or the proposed agreement, between the Government and the Broken Hill Pty. Ltd.?

The PREMIER replied:

These papers are not yet ready for perusal. The Minister for Industrial Development is handling the matter, and he has still a good deal of work to do in connection with the whole agreement. The papers are not ready for the Leader of the Opposition to peruse.

(c) As to Use of Koolan Island Iron-Ore.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (without notice) asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Does the Government propose to give the Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. the right to use iron-ore from Koolan Island?

The MINISTER replied:

That is one of the terms of the agreement, as I think has already been made plain in the Press statement.

(d) As to Objection to Making Papers Available.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Premier:

If indeed an agreement has been signed between the Government and Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. what objection can there be to allowing the Leader of the Opposition to see the actual terms of the agreement which has been signed?

The PREMIER replied:

I suggest that the hon. member address his question to the Minister for Industrial Development, who has been handling the matter on behalf of the Government.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have no objection to addressing the question to the Minister for Industrial Development but, as it is apparently a matter of Government decision and policy, I thought the Leader of the Government would prefer to answer it. If he does not, I will then ask the Minister for Industrial Development, if indeed an agreement has been signed between the Government and Broken Hill Pty. Ltd., what possible objection can there be to allowing the Leader of the Opposition to peruse the document that has been signed?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT replied:

Because I think it would be premature. Ample opportunity will be given and, as I have said, all the papers can be placed before the House.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: In August next?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Next session. Whatever the agreement is, or however good or bad it is, it cannot become operative until it has been ratified by Parliament. That is the most appropriate course, and all the papers will be placed before the House.

(e) As to Reports on Project.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (without notice) asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Can he indicate from what other authorities, in addition to the Minister for Works, the board of management of the Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry, Wundowie, and the Under Secretary for Mines, reports were received by the Government in connection with the agreement, or the proposed agreement, to be made between the Government and Broken Hill Pty. Ltd.?

The MINISTER replied:

At this stage I do not propose to indicate anything of the kind.

SWAN RIVER POLLUTION.

As to Waste Discharged from Brewery.

Mr. GRAYDEN (without notice) asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware that in a statement in "The West Australian" on the 9th February, 1951, the engineer for the Metropolitan Water Supply, Mr. R. J. Cavanagh, said that about 240,000 gallons of waste from the Swan Brewery ran into the river each day?

(2) That Mr. Cavanagh had also stated that the Government had been negotiating with the brewery to overcome this source of pollution, and that plans were in hand to install settling pits in which the effluent which would be chemically treated and from there pumped into sewerage pipes at Mill-st., the brewery paying the cost?

(3) If so, what progress has been made in this direction in overcoming this source of river pollution?

(4) If none has been made, what steps does the Government intend to take to see that the plans are put into effect?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2), (3) and (4). Proposals involving heavy expenditure for connecting the Swan Brewery with the metropolitan sewerage system have been submitted to the brewery company, but no decision by the brewery has yet been made.

Negotiations are, however, in progress and reference has been made to the Public Health Department as to the severity of river pollution arising from the discharge of effluent from the brewery into the river.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT.

As to Amending Legislation.

Mr. W. HEGNEY (without notice) asked the Attorney General:

(1) Is it his intention to introduce during the current session an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act to provide that (a) Workers who were injured before the date of operation of the 1951 amendment and whose incapacity continues after that date, and (b) workers who were injured before the date of operation of the 1951 amendment and who suffer a recurrence of such injury after the passing of such amendment, shall be entitled to the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1951.

(2) If not, will he explain his reasons?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

The introduction of an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act will be considered for the next session.

Mr. W. Hegney: I mean this session.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not intended to do anything this session.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.
(No. 3).

As to Leave to Introduce.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [4.0]: I move—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1911.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [4.1]: I oppose the granting of leave to introduce the Bill. These sittings of Parliament, which represent a continuation of the session, were called to deal with a particular matter in connection with which the necessary Bills will be introduced during the afternoon. If it is right for the hon. member to introduce a Bill at this stage, that right will apply to every other member of the House, should he desire to submit legislation.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Members have that right.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Of course, they have.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What is developing now?

The PREMIER: I will tell the hon. member. Another reason why it is not intended to prolong the session is that the Legislative Council elections are to take place in May, and members who are contesting elections in the various provinces have in some instances large areas to cover. Even if some were to start out now, they would have difficulty in going through all parts of their provinces. There is no urgency in connection with this proposed legislation.

Mr. Graham: How do you know?

The PREMIER: I do know.

Mr. Graham: You do not know the context of the Bill!

The PREMIER: I know there is no urgency in connection with the amending of the Licensing Act.

Mr. Graham: You know nothing of the sort.

The PREMIER: We had lengthy sittings a little while ago when licensing matters were thoroughly thrashed out. I do not know what is contained in the Bill the member for East Perth proposes to introduce but I tell him that, if the object is to secure amendments as a result of the amending legislation passed by Parliament a few weeks ago, there is no necessity for that course at all.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I hope you will not disagree to the next notice of motion.

The PREMIER: I intend to disagree to all of them.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You are making yourself disagreeable!

The PREMIER: I am sorry about that, but in this life one cannot always make oneself agreeable.

Mr. J. Hegney: When did you find that out?

The PREMIER: One has to disagree at times. These sittings of Parliament were not called for the purpose of dealing with general legislation. The Government has no intention of introducing any other legislation, and in the circumstances I oppose the motion.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [4.5]: The Premier has taken up a most unreasonable attitude.

The Minister for Lands: It is an attitude that you would take up.

Mr. Bovell: How many times did you oppose such motions in the 14 years Labour was in office? How many times did you call Parliament together for a special purpose like this? You marched off and stayed away from the House for months.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Evidently the Government Whip is trying hard to earn his salary!

The Minister for Lands: He is pretty right, too.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is all very well for the Government to come to the House and say just why it has called the House together.

The Minister for Lands: It is in charge of the business of the House.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I would not say that, for members themselves are in charge.

The Minister for Lands: Does not the Government regulate the business of the House?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, to the extent that a majority of members approves.

The Minister for Lands: That is right.

The Minister for Education: That is what we are doing now, and we are going on with the Bills that are to be submitted later on.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, but the Premier is endeavouring to lay it down as a rule that, when Parliament is called together, this House shall deal only with such business as the Government brings forward.

The Premier: For that purpose.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: This is getting back to the Star Chamber!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: When the Premier made his public announcement it was to the effect that the session was to be continued and that at the sittings which are now current two Bills were to be introduced.

The Premier: I do not think there is any urgency about the second Bill I mentioned, but there is about the ones we are going on with.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I would say to the Premier that he told the public several weeks ago that he proposed to call Parliament together to discuss two Bills to which he then referred, one being to deal with the oil refinery proposal and the other for the purpose of amending the Licensing Act. Therefore at that time the Premier thought that the Licensing Act was an important piece of legislation that required urgent amendment.

The Premier: I think I said it would deal with two minor amendments.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not concerned whether the Premier said it would contain two minor amendments or whether one was minor and the other major.

The Premier: I do not think I said the measure was urgent.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier said it was the intention of the Government during these current sittings to bring before Parliament a measure to amend the Licensing Act. I say very definitely that any member of the House is entitled, during any sitting of Parliament, to bring forward a proposal for the introduction of legislation. That surely is a right given to every member under the Standing Orders, and the Government is not entitled to take that right from him.

Mr. Bovell: Standing Orders are suspended.

The Attorney General: At any rate, Government members have the right to vote on such a proposal.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I do not object to the Attorney General doing that. The Minister is entitled to exercise his vote. Probably he would like to have two votes to exercise.

The Minister for Lands: It would be handy.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is not the point. What we are discussing is the right of a member to move for leave to introduce a Bill, and surely that is his right.

The Attorney General: No.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I think it is.

The Attorney General: And your side is moving for that purpose now.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the Attorney General wishes to vote against any member exercising that right, he can do so when the division takes place. In my judgment, there is no room for any difference of opinion on the point I make regarding the right of a member to move for leave to introduce

a Bill to amend legislation. Why should the member for East Perth, the member for Albany or any other member who feels disposed to introduce legislation during these sittings, be denied the opportunity to do so. Most certainly he should not be denied the opportunity to at least place his Bill before the House and explain its contents. Only at that stage would any other member be in a position to decide whether there was any justification on the ground of urgency for the Bill so introduced. Surely the Attorney General cannot satisfy his conscience—

Mr. Needham: He has not got any.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —by voting against such a proposal at this stage!

The Attorney General: Of course I could.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: At this stage members do not know what the Bill will contain. What justification would the Attorney General have for voting against the motion moved by the member for East Perth? If he were to vote against the motion, he would be denying the right of any member to exercise a privilege conferred upon him by the Constitution Act and the Standing Orders. I could understand the Premier adopting such an attitude as he has, and the Attorney General supporting him, if we had reached the stage in connection with the proposed Bill where the member for East Perth had explained its contents to the House. Then, and only then could the Premier and his Ministers, as well as other members of the House, be in a position to know whether the contents of the Bill were sufficiently urgent to justify an early decision by Parliament in connection with it.

The Attorney General: I have had no representations made to me in connection with the newly amended Licensing Act.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I very much doubt that.

The Attorney General: You may doubt it, but I have not.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Is the Attorney General going to administer the law in connection with bona fide travellers?

The Attorney General: Yes.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is all right. I shall watch to see that he does so.

Mr. W. Hegney: Has that been enforced on the Goldfields?

The Attorney General: It will be, as undertaken by me in the House.

Mr. W. Hegney: Is it being enforced?

The Attorney General: Yes, it will be.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Attorney General is still his old delightful self. He has not changed a scrap, and I am sure the Opposition is very grateful for that. I sincerely hope that a majority of members will at least grant a member who wishes to take action to introduce a Bill

the privilege and right to do so and proceed at least up to the second reading stage.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth—in reply) [4.11]: I am rather astonished and not a little annoyed at the attitude adopted by the Premier, namely that before any member has an inkling of the purpose or intention of my Bill, the Premier is asking the House in all seriousness to reject the motion for leave to introduce it.

The Attorney General: We do know the general purpose of it, do we not?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Attorney General has no knowledge of it.

The Attorney General: It is to amend the Licensing Act, is it not?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely this is a session of Parliament and not a meeting of the Government! Surely it is the obligation of members to submit to this House the matters of public interest that they consider ought to be debated! Members having heard the pros and cons would then be in a position to judge and would have a perfect right to accept or reject the proposals submitted.

Unquestionably I consider this to be an insult, because a private member has as much right to introduce legislation as has the Premier himself, and it is equally an insult for the Premier to ask his supporters to deny a member that right. Surely private members have little enough in the way of rights and privileges at the present time!

Mr. Rodoreda: None, with this Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree entirely. This is the fourth Parliament of which I have been a member, and this is the first occasion on which the Leader of a Government has sought to prevent the introduction of a measure or a motion by a private member. As was rightly pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, the Government itself announced that, in its legislative programme for this extension of the session, amendments to the Licensing Act would receive consideration. Strangely enough, we have had an admission from the Government side this afternoon that there are only a couple of minor amendments to be made to the Act, but so far as the Premier is aware, the Bill that I desire to introduce may be extensive in its ramifications and of considerable public importance.

Members should have an opportunity to learn what my proposals are and decide whether they are worthy of support. Quite a number of members on the Government side have never sat in Opposition, and I suggest that they pay some regard to the rights and privileges of private members, because, if they do not, when the time arrives for the political

pendulum to swing—it has started to swing already—those members then sitting in Opposition may find themselves denied the right to initiate legislation as I, for one, would do everything in my power to influence my colleagues to mete out the same sort of treatment to them. It is up to supporters of the Government to decide whether private members are to be mere cyphers, whether members on the Opposition side of the House have any rights at all and whether members opposite are to act merely as voting machines to give a total of one or more in excess of the votes mustered by the Opposition. If that is their estimate of the rights and privileges of a private member, they will support the Premier in opposing my motion but, if they believe in the democratic principle of giving private members the right to initiate legislation, they will support me in my desire to introduce this measure.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	24
Majority against		4

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. May
Mr. Cornell	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Needham
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Read
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sweeney
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Lawrence

(Teller.)

Noes.

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. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hearnan	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Boveil

(Teller.)

Pair.

Mr. Marshall	Mr. Mann
--------------	----------

Question thus negatived; leave refused.

BILL—RENTS AND TENANCIES EMERGENCY PROVISIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

As to Leave to Introduce.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melville) [4.20]: I move—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Rents and Tenancies Emergency Provisions Act, 1951.

In view of what was said by the Premier earlier, and in view of the vote taken, I propose to give reasons why I should be

given leave to introduce this Bill. We have just seen an example of the Nazi and Fascist technique. That is the way it starts. There is an election in a Nazi country, where the only candidates for whom one can vote are those who support the party in power. So we are to have a Parliament where the only business that can be dealt with is the business introduced by the party in power. That has never been contemplated in a democratic country. As a matter of fact, in an ordinary session of Parliament—and that is all this is, a continuation of a session—

The Premier: For a specific purpose.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This is a continuation of a session. In all ordinary sessions the most that the Government can do is to ask that its own business take precedence over private members' business. Never since I have been in this House has there been an attempt by any Government before now to have a decision which will prevent the introduction of private members' business. There is a very big difference between preventing the introduction of legislation and deferring it until Government business is dealt with.

It would have been a reasonable proposition if the Government had put up a case to prove the urgency of the matters with which it has to deal, and asked that Government business should at all times take precedence over private members' business. If it had not been possible, under that arrangement, to have time for the discussion of private members' business, we would have had to put up with that, as has been the case in years gone by.

But here there has been an attempt—a successful attempt—by the Government to prevent the introduction of private members' business, let alone the discussion of it, and this has been done as a matter of policy—not because of anything in the proposed legislation to which the Government takes objection, but as a matter of policy—to make it impossible for any private member to bring up business for discussion at this session when there would be ample time during which consideration could be given to some very urgent matters.

I have not the slightest idea what was in the Bill that the member for East Perth sought leave to introduce. It might have contained provisions which required very urgent attention. But what I do know is that the Bill which I am asking leave to introduce is of a very urgent character, rendered necessary because amendments which were made to the rents and tenancies legislation last year were effected on false promises. In this Chamber, the Minister for Housing waved a bunch of keys as proof that the Housing Commission would be able to provide houses for

all evicted persons. He has since made statements to the effect that the Commission has done this. Those statements are not true and the Minister and the Premier both know that they are not true.

This afternoon, when the Minister for Housing was asked whether he could give any indication when applicants on the priority list whose applications had been lodged in 1947, five years ago, would be supplied with houses, he said that he was not in a position to give any indication, for the very obvious reason that houses which normally would have been available to meet the applications of those tenants have had to be used up in an attempt to provide for evicted families, the result being that no houses are available for applicants on the list.

So it is very clear that the number of evictions that have taken place are considerably in excess of those contemplated by the Chief Secretary and the Premier and the Minister for Housing when the legislation was amended last year. I was told then that I was exaggerating when I said there would be hundreds of families who would be evicted under the legislation. I knew very well that I was not exaggerating but the Government used that as an argument to get its legislation altered, and it stands condemned on this information alone; that it secured the passage of that Bill by giving an assurance that all evicted families would be housed by the Commission.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to work this out. There are, on an average, 25 evictions every week and the Housing Commission is building ten houses a week. That is the position. How then can we hope to continue to house evictees, and at the same time make good the State's undertaking to applicants as far back as 1947 who are placed on the priority list for houses, and some of whom are living in most appalling and distressing circumstances?

The legislation which has put the Government in this mess was the Act which made eviction easy—far too easy, because persons were enabled to get possession of their houses merely by stating that they required to have them, that they wished to have them. They did not have to give any proof that they reasonably needed them but just had to say that they wished to have them and then, upon the expiration of the necessary six months' notice, eviction became automatic. Because of that automatic eviction, we are getting, on the average, 25 evictions a week. That has been going on since the 30th September, with the Housing Commission for a big portion of that time not providing more than six houses a week and now, I am told, managing ten.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Do your figures cover the metropolitan area only?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, the metropolitan area only. In view of that situation it ought to be patent to anyone that something should be done to put the brake on the evictions so that any person requiring to have his house from the tenant should have to demonstrate that he reasonably needs it. If that were done, the magistrates, having power of discretion, would reduce the number of evictions and, I venture to say, there would then be a possibility that the Housing Commission could cope with the demand. As things are at present, it is absolutely impossible, even though the Government is flouting the wishes of the local authorities all round the place by building houses which are a long way below the recognised standards of local authorities such as half houses, and rooms which are really sleep-outs but which have not the ventilation required for sleep-outs, to cope with the demand just for evictees.

Look at the trick the Government has put over these unfortunate people who have been waiting since April, 1947, because that is when the Government stopped its allocations to applicants! Back in 1947 the applicants had to prove their need as they would not otherwise have got on to the priority list. Their living conditions were subject to inquiry and scrutiny, so they satisfied the Commission they were entitled to accommodation. They have now been waiting five years for the accommodation, but they have been denied it because the Government made eviction easy under the legislation, thus creating such a tremendous demand on the Commission's resources for housing evicted tenants that it was absolutely impossible for that authority to meet the demands of applicants. What sort of men would we be if, knowing that situation, we made no attempt to put it right?

The Bill for which I am seeking leave to introduce is an attempt to correct the situation, but the Government will have none of it. The Government intends to oppose the introduction of the Bill which would have the effect of stopping these wholesale evictions, and which would hold out some hope for the applicants of April, 1947, and subsequently. If the Government refuses the leave to introduce, it must take the responsibility—it cannot throw it on to the members of the Opposition—for a continuance of evictions at the present rate, or a greater rate, and for denying those applicants who have been on the list since 1947 the right to get into a home.

I do not know why the Government cannot be honest in the matter. Surely it must know that with the curtailment of loan funds, the action it took last year to provide for the erection of additional workers' homes was just a token action. It cannot be expected that many workers' homes will be provided this year, or next year, so there can be no adequate substitution for the Commonwealth-State

rental homes scheme. We therefore are to face a tapering off of the Commonwealth-State rental homes scheme, and a most definite retardation in the building of workers' homes because—I put it this way—would the R.S.L., and the high officers of that body, have been so outspoken about the building and purchasing of war service homes if there had not already been experienced throughout Australia a serious falling off of the volume of funds available for the purpose?

It is only logical to assume that workers' homes will fare even worse than war service homes. If the position is so difficult as to bring forward loud protest about the housing of soldiers from the R.S.L., then it must be ever so much worse with regard to the housing of workers who were not soldiers. Yet the Government is prepared to allow evictions to proceed at the rate of 25 or more a week because it denies a private member the right to bring in a Bill to alter the situation—and it will make no attempt itself to deal with it.

We are told—and I am anticipating a little here because I have not seen the actual agreement, but only published reports—that the Government is going to provide all the material and will erect the houses in respect to the Anglo-Iranian oil installation. The mere fact that the Government decides to do that does not increase the amount of material from which the houses will be built. It simply means the Government will use a quantity of material in that direction which will then not be available in other directions where the supply is inadequate. So, by the very nature of things, we have to anticipate that the rate at which houses can be provided for the people who are being evicted will continue to fall rapidly. In view of that indisputable fact, should we not immediately take action to stem the tide and to hold the evictions down to an absolute minimum?

It is common knowledge that the Government in this State went ahead of all other States with respect to removing controls. I have already told the House that the South Australian Government said we were crazy when we contemplated removing controls in the way we did. Of course, the Government was crazy. There was no justification at that time for taking the barrier completely down and so allowing evictions to occur automatically, as was done. But the Government did it, and it got the right to do it from this House on the guarantee that the Housing Commission would provide for all evicted families. That is the only way the Government got permission—by a guarantee backed up by a display of keys by the Minister for Housing as proof of his bona fides and that the Housing Commission would be able to house all evicted persons.

We know full well that the Government has not done anything like this because it will not house two-unit families consist-

ing of a widow and her son or a widow and her daughter. If such people are evicted and they apply to the Housing Commission for assistance, they are told to go and live in a hotel, or to live in rooms. If a single person—a widow or an elderly man—is evicted from an apartment-house, and makes application to the Housing Commission, that person is told to go elsewhere and that the Commission cannot and will not do anything for him or her. Any person who was a tenant at the time when the amending legislation went through, but who became a tenant subsequent to the 1st January, 1951, is not provided for, no matter how large might be the family.

The Attorney General: Who originally moved the amendment to make that provision?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If the Attorney General will be specific and give me the date, I will answer his question. I am dealing with what this House did last November. Then the Minister for Housing, having a knowledge of all that was contained in the Bill and the provisions for evictions, gave an assurance to this House that all evicted persons—no exceptions were made—would be provided for by the Housing Commission. If I had been a tenant in November last year, despite the fact that my tenancy had commenced only on the 2nd January of that year, I would have believed, and would have been entitled to believe from the statements of the Minister and the Government, that if evicted I would be provided for.

The Minister did not at that stage say that this would not apply to persons who became tenants after the 1st January. His statement was that all tenants evicted as a result of the legislation would be provided for, and so it did not matter how large the family might be or what their condition was. But the Housing Commission says, "No. Despite the undertaking given by the Government, we are not providing for you because you became a tenant after the 1st January, 1951," and so there are some hundreds of people who are being evicted as a result of the legislation that I desire to amend, and for whom the Government will make no provision because it cannot do so.

The Housing Commission has stated that it is physically impossible for it, as a Commission, to cope with the number of evictions resulting from that legislation. One has only to contemplate the figures; 25 evictions per week, and 10 houses being erected to house those people. It is that fact which makes me doubt seriously the figures quoted by the Minister this afternoon.

The Premier: Those are not the Minister's figures. He did not compile them.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They are the Minister's figures. When a Minister gets to his feet in this House and reads figures and subsequently says that they are correct, as the Minister did today—

The Premier: That is so, but he got them from the only source from which he could get them, and he would expect them to be correct. He would not think they were faked.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He cannot get out of it in that way.

The Premier: Do you think they are faked?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will put a question on the notice paper and will prove my point conclusively at the next sitting. In view of the knowledge I possess, it is impossible for me to reconcile the figures supplied by the Minister. There are a number of members who have from time to time tried to get houses for evicted persons, and a little simple arithmetic permits one to arrive at a total which, when added to the figures supplied by the Minister today, gives a result that cannot be reconciled, and that is why I sought this afternoon the names firstly of those who had been evicted but had not been supplied with houses—because I could easily have detected if any names that I had were missing from the list—and, when that information was refused, secondly, the names of those who had been supplied with houses, but that information also was refused. However, we will get it another way. The Minister cannot continue making statements that are not true and hope to get away with them.

The Attorney General: If you were evicted, you would not want your name raised in public debate.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The names are published in the Press from day to day.

The Attorney General: That is as regards the court proceedings, but not otherwise.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They have all to go through court proceedings before they are evicted.

The Attorney General: You would not like your name published in those circumstances.

[Mr. Perkins took the Chair.]

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The names are published in the Press, and that is worse than having the names supplied to me in Parliament. I would have been satisfied had the Minister permitted me to peruse the list in his office. Would there have been anything wrong with that? I admit it might have been difficult, and one can see why the Minister refused the information; he is doubtful of the figures, but it will not be long before we get at the truth of the position. If the Government can manage a certain policy it should say

so but, if it cannot manage that policy, it should admit the fact and should not try to make out that it is doing something which it is not doing.

I come now to the statement of the Minister for Housing published in the "Daily News." I rang the Minister and told him the statement was not true and that he knew it was untrue and that I could prove it was untrue, but the general public outside believe it is true. For how long are we to continue to hold the respect of the people if we carry on in that way? What is the use of making statements that are twisted in order to convey a wrong impression to the people? The public generally are entitled to know the truth, and if the Government is ashamed of the truth it should make an explanation of why the position is so bad.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the member for Melville is getting away from the motion.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That may be so, but I think you, Sir, will agree that when the Government contemplates using its majority to prevent the introduction of a measure such as this, I am entitled to use the strongest possible argument in an endeavour to convince the House that the course proposed by the Government is undemocratic, and will cause great hardship to a large body of people. The attitude of the Government might enable it to dodge discussion on this question by refusing me leave to introduce the Bill, and that is a serious enough matter in itself, from the viewpoint of the rights of a person in a democracy; but when we consider that the action contemplated by the Government will make it impossible to alleviate the distress of hundreds of families in the State, the matter becomes serious indeed. And that is exactly where we are at the moment!

It is a wonderful thing to have new industries established in your midst; it is a wonderful thing to provide employment for your people; but No. 1 consideration for your people is houses in which to live. The native in the bush with his mia-mia or his hut, with some protection from the weather and without a job at an oil refinery, is in a better position than a man who is worried stiff from day to day about what he is going to do for his wife and little children when eviction takes place, and he has nowhere to go.

If members of the Government went round to some of these houses, where there are six and eight people eating and sleeping in one room, they would realise how serious the housing position is and how necessary it is to do something to prevent these evictions from going on. A number of houses from which tenants are evicted remain empty for a considerable time after the tenants are put out. They remain empty awaiting the arrival from overseas

of persons who are going to occupy them while the previous tenants scratch round to provide accommodation for their families.

The other evening I referred to the fact that we are a very generous people. We put up houses and keep them vacant awaiting the arrival of tradesmen from overseas, and when those tradesmen arrive they go straight into these houses and at the same time we have tradesmen of our own who cannot get homes at all. You remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when I mentioned this the other evening the Minister for Housing said that if the names I had in mind were supplied to him he would look into the matter. I supplied him with the names of two tradesmen—one a bricklayer and one a carpenter and both of them engaged in house building. I have had an acknowledgment from the Minister, but so far as I know those two tradesmen are not yet living in houses. I am hoping that the Minister will make good his undertaking and put them in houses, because they have been waiting for a number of years despite the fact that tradesmen from overseas go straight into houses—we keep houses empty awaiting their arrival.

We now contemplate putting up 1,000 houses for persons who are going to work at the oil refinery and that decision, under existing circumstances, must inevitably make it more difficult for our people already living here and who are jammed in rooms, on side verandahs, in sheds, in tents and in caravans all over the countryside. Why does not the Government show some realistic approach to this question and face right up to the problem as it exists? What would it cost the Government to permit me to introduce this Bill which is designed to make eviction less easy than it is at present? It is not designed to take away from the genuine person the right to get possession of his own home, but is merely designed to prevent the wholesale eviction of 25 families a week. A number of these evictions are being made only to enable the owners to make money.

Here is a case where flesh and blood should take precedence over pounds, shillings and pence. We should not try to take the lead in this Commonwealth in removing barriers from landlords so that they can get possession of their properties simply because they desire to do so, and when no other State has seen fit to go so far as we have. Having gone this far, on a definite undertaking of the Government that all evicted persons would be housed, and the Government having found that it cannot make good that promise because it is beyond its capacity, the decent thing for it to do would be to say to this House, "When we made the promise that we would house those people we thought we could do so, but we were wrong. We have now found that we took

on something that was beyond us and so we ask the House to restrict the number of evictions by amending the law."

That would be the decent, reasonable and proper line to take. But no! This Government conveniently forgets the undertaking it gave to this House! That means nothing. The Government is prepared to allow a condition to continue where we are going to the bad to the extent of about 10 houses per week. It will get further and further in a jam as each week passes, but it is prepared to do that because the members of the Government will not be the ones to suffer. Those who will suffer will be the unfortunate individuals who are evicted and cannot get accommodation. They will be the ones who will suffer, and the Government is prepared to allow them to do so because it will not permit of any alteration to this tenancy legislation.

On its merits, the Bill is entitled at least to the consideration of this Parliament in view of existing circumstances. But the Government is afraid of a debate on this matter; it is afraid of a show-down on the housing question, because it would be shown up in a very bad light. How any Government, with any sense of responsibility, can sign an agreement to provide 1,000 houses for a company before honouring an undertaking to supply applicants who were admitted to priority in April, 1947, I do not know. The Government wants to sail blithely along and, I suppose, use its majority to force this legislation through. Whether the guarantee can be carried out or not, seems to matter little.

From the other point of view, as to whether in a democracy it is reasonable to deny private members the right to have their business discussed, there can be only one answer. If we get to the stage where the Government wants to determine what it will allow to be introduced into Parliament, we get precisely to the position of a dictatorship. The totalitarian countries almost determine what one is allowed to think.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Premier: Do you think you would be allowed to say this much in one of the dictatorship countries?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is the point the hon. member is making.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is where we are heading now and I have no hesitation in saying that, if the Premier could have prevented me from saying as much as I have this afternoon, he would have done so.

The Premier: You have made a good second reading speech today. We all know what is in your Bill by this time.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Does the Premier blame me?

The Premier: No.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am bound to take advantage of what vestige of rights the Standing Orders give me. I know the Government has taken away a number of them since it has been in charge.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government cannot take this present one away, much as it would like to do so.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: And would not hesitate to do so if it could. I have no doubt that the Premier had a good search through Standing Orders long before today to see what might be done about these matters.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Deputy Premier was busy looking through them a short time ago.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Unfortunately for the Premier there are two notices of motion on the paper—

The Minister for Education: I was not looking through Standing Orders on that account, I had another difficulty.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —and the Premier had to disclose his hand on the first one. That brings me back to the point that this is the beginning of the totalitarian technique practised by the Nazis and the Fascists—

The Attorney General: And the commo's.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and the commos.

The Attorney General: And Mr. Troy and several others.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is the company the Attorney General wants to be in; he wants to follow their lead and do as they do.

The Attorney General: And Mr. Chifley.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Attorney General wants to applaud their actions; as a matter of fact he does applaud them by adopting their technique.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: If the Attorney General were living in Russia, Stalin would be his lieutenant.

The Attorney General: Would you not like us to follow in Mr. Chifley's good footsteps? He was a very able leader, was he not?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He did not do this sort of thing.

The Attorney General: Yes, he did.

The Minister for Lands: He applied the gag regularly.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This is not applying the gag—

The Premier: It is not.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —because the Government does not know the way to apply it—not yet, anyway. This is a very different matter from applying the

gag. This is an attempt to make it impossible for the members of this House even to know what a private member wants to introduce in any session of Parliament. I have yet to learn that in a democratic country the only business which ought to be brought forward is the business which suits the Government. If the Government follows the line it commenced this afternoon, that is precisely where we would get in matters which do not suit the Government; those matters would not be discussed here and that is what the Nazis and the Fascists did.

Mr. Graham: They have their counterparts here. Look at them.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The very safeguard of democracy is the right of free speech—

The Minister for Lands: The member for East Perth should have a look at himself in the mirror.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —and the right of any private member to introduce legislation, and, in my view, the only time when there might be any semblance of a reason for refusing a private member the right to introduce a Bill would be when the Government had prior knowledge that the Bill was subversive or in any way objectionable. Then, as a matter of decorum, it might reasonably say, "Keep such things out of the Chamber." There is always an opportunity of dealing with a Bill on its first, second or third reading, but to refuse the right to introduce it, to refuse a member, who brings it forward, the right to show other members what he has in mind, is to take a step which is out of place in a democratic country.

The Attorney General: Of course, only the members themselves can do that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course that is so.

Mr. Graham: The members over there are automatons.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Political robots!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Oh, yes, only members can do that! But if it were against political policy the members opposite would not do that, if they did not want it done. Over the years we have heard about the discipline of the Labour Party and the way it could ensure the votes of its members. I venture to say that if the records were examined they would show that the number of occasions on which the members of the Labour Party have crossed the floor against their Government would be at least three or four times greater than would be the case in connection with members supporting this Government.

The Minister for Lands: You do not believe that, do you?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Do not believe it!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Compared with the members of the present Government we are only in the apprenticeship stage.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Every time the Government has been on a spot, even when it has been only a question of an inquiry, the Government whips come into action. Do not forget we would have had an inquiry into alunite if it had not been for them.

Mr. Manning: We had an inquiry into bricks.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: A very limited one. I have no doubt, therefore, that the Government, having shown its hand in this matter, will be able to defeat my motion for leave to introduce the Bill, but that will not relieve it of all responsibility involved in that action, and it will be of no use the Minister for Housing or the Attorney General saying that Parliament has to take responsibility for such action and that therefore the Opposition is equally responsible with the Government. Here is an attempt by the Opposition to help the Government out of the terrible mess it is in in relation to housing. If the Premier has any doubt about it I ask him to have a talk to Mr. Brownlie and Mr. Bond. The members of the State Housing Commission are at their wits' end to cope with the situation at present. We want to help them by steadying down the evictions but the Government does not desire that to be done. It wants the evictions to continue as they are doing, and the legislation to remain as it is.

The trouble rests on the Government's own head. I have done my best to indicate what the true position is. I have not exaggerated in the slightest degree. I am prepared to take any member or Minister around my electorate and show him these tenants and their families and the conditions in which they are living, and point out to them those who have been evicted but have not been housed by the Housing Commission. I am prepared to do that.

Mr. May: You have not got them all.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course I have not, but I have plenty. I have enough to throw serious doubt on some figures that have been submitted to the House from time to time—enough on my own notebook! Knowing that, I ask the House to disregard the obvious direction of the Government in this matter and to afford me the right, as a private member, to place before this Chamber a print of the Bill which I think ought to be passed by the Western Australian Parliament.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [5.8]: If the member for Melville when he rose had any grievance over not being allowed to state his views on this matter which he wishes to bring forward I think it has now disappeared, because he has indicated pretty clearly to the House exactly what he has in mind in the proposed Bill of which he has given notice.

Mr. Graham: It is not a question of indicating to you; it is legislation.

The PREMIER: Of course, there is another way by which one could get rid of the Bill if one so desired and the method has often been used in this House; that is, to leave it on the bottom of the notice paper and not worry about it.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is only done when there has not been sufficient time to deal with it.

The PREMIER: It has been done not only when there has not been sufficient time, either. I have seen many Bills kept at the bottom of the notice paper and they have never been dealt with. As I have said, the member for Melville has indicated to the House what he proposes to do if leave is given him to introduce this Bill. He intends, by the Bill, to amend the legislation which was dealt with only a few weeks ago. I cannot imagine anything likely to create greater confusion than to go to work to amend the legislation again. Neither landlord nor tenant would have any idea where either of them stood—

Mr. Rodoreda: Deal with it on its merits!

The PREMIER: —and it would certainly create utter confusion. To hear the member for Melville speak one would think the Government was not concerned over the housing problem today.

Mr. Graham: We would like a little evidence of that.

The PREMIER: Yes, I intend to give some evidence before I sit down. The hon. member also cast doubt on the figures given to him today by the Minister for Housing. I do not think any member in this House would believe for one moment that the Government would be responsible in any way for the compilation of these figures. The Minister certainly would not say to anyone in the Housing Commission, "Make as good a case of this as you can." The hon. member asked for figures and responsible officers in the State Housing Commission have provided them for him. We might have a look at these figures because they are interesting.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: They are!

The PREMIER: To show what is happening I will read them. Firstly the hon. member asked how many evictions have occurred since the 30th September, 1951, under the provisions of the amended rent legislation. The answer supplied was that there have been 325 orders to vacate by magistrates. The second question the hon. member asked was for how many of such evicted families has the Housing Commission provided accommodation, and the answer was that 250 houses have been provided where warrants have been issued. The hon. member then asked in his third question what number of evicted families have applied to the Housing Commission for accommodation since the 30th Sep-

tember, 1951, and the answer given was 253. Of those 253, 250 have been provided with houses.

Mr. Graham: You do not believe that.

The PREMIER: I do; they are figures supplied in answer to questions. Why should I have any reason to disbelieve them?

Mr. Graham: We will just have to show you how wrong they are.

The PREMIER: There is also a question from the member for North Perth which I propose to read. The hon. member wants to know whether I am also aware that the decision to stop building Commonwealth-State rental homes will intensify the already acute shortage of houses. The answer given was that it is estimated that more houses under the Commonwealth-State rental scheme will be built under existing commitments during the years 1951-52 and 1952-53 than during the previous year under this scheme, and that an increased number will be built by private enterprise.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is only a guess, of course.

The PREMIER: That is the number of houses under construction and for which contracts have been let and which will be built.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is only a guess.

The PREMIER: Members surely do not think that the Government is just sitting down and not taking any action in regard to the housing position! Only two days ago I had a lengthy discussion with the Under Treasurer in regard to ways and means of obtaining more money in order that we might get on with a more vigorous housing programme—that is obtaining money away from the Loan Council. I am hoping something will be done.

Mr. J. Hegney: Has money been made available?

The PREMIER: Money has been made available.

Mr. J. Hegney: For workers' homes £500,000 was provided. Is that being spent this year?

The PREMIER: From loan funds special provision has been made. From time to time we have been making money available from the loan fund as the Housing Commission has wanted it. What the exact figure is I do not know but the Minister for Housing informs me that we have made available over £250,000 from loan funds, the policy being to see that the Housing Commission is not short of money in order that homebuilding might continue as vigorously as possible.

Mr. May: Do you know that the Housing Commission is refusing to accept applications?

The PREMIER: I believe the Housing Commission is finding some difficulty, but I do not know that it is having any serious

effect on the building rate because the private investor is building houses and the housing rate, I believe, will continue as far as material supply will allow.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Where is the private investor building?

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: For himself, that is all.

The PREMIER: If he is building for himself he is vacating the house in which he lives, and is thus providing accommodation for somebody else. I do not mind how many houses private persons build.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: That is all right if he is coming from another house, but in most cases he is coming from his father's house or from a hotel.

Mr. May: The Commission is unable to accept applications at the present time.

The PREMIER: As I have said, the Government is fully aware of the housing position and it is taking every possible step to meet it. If we tinker with this legislation and allow the hon. member to introduce an amending Bill—and he has indicated to us along what lines his amendments are to be made—it will cause utter confusion and people will not know where they stand.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is not correct.

The PREMIER: I believe it is correct and I have no doubt about it. There will be another session of Parliament during which the hon. member will have an opportunity of introducing amending legislation, and by then I believe the position will be much clearer than it is today.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [5.18]: There is no legislation that people come to understand more quickly than legislation covering rents and tenancies. This legislation presses so vitally upon so many people in this community as to cause them very quickly and clearly to inform their minds upon it, no matter how frequently it might be changed. Surely the Premier would admit that the housing crisis in Western Australia today is a very desperate one, and one requiring very urgent attention. Yet here we are with Parliament now in full operation, and the Premier tells us that he and his Government have decided that they will permit no attempt to be made by any member of Parliament during these current sittings to alter the existing law. That is the stand the Premier and his Government are taking.

The Premier: I think it will cause confusion; I am sure it will.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is quite incorrect for the Premier to suggest that an alteration to the law would cause confusion.

The Premier: We passed a law a few weeks ago and now you want to amend it! Where do the people stand?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: As a matter of fact, the Premier ought to know that the confusion in regard to the housing crisis in Western Australia is mounting every day. I do not know whether there is any of this confusion in Pinjarra, which is the principal town in the Premier's electorate.

The Premier: What do you mean by that?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know there is a good deal of confusion in the principal town in my electorate, and I am equally sure that there is much in the metropolitan area. The housing crisis will increase, beyond all shadow of doubt. The very Bill to the consideration of which the Government desires to restrict Parliament on this occasion, will increase it. Let us look at the stand the Government is taking up with regard to the current sitting. It seeks to introduce a Bill to ratify an agreement entered into to enable an oil refinery to be established in Western Australia. In principle, we are all in favour of that step. We all agree that it is extremely important and urgent that Parliament should consider that agreement and, with whatever alteration or amendment may be found necessary, pass it into law with reasonable expedition. The Government is thoroughly justified in taking up that attitude. On the other side, in connection with the motion moved earlier this afternoon by the member for Melville, the Government says that the question of safeguarding the housing conditions of people of this State is not of such major importance as is the business of ratifying an agreement for the production of oil here.

The Premier: The Government is not saying that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier did.

The Premier: No.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He has already indicated it in his speech on the motion that was previously before the House. He said that in effect, in a very practical way. By his vote the Premier, and by their votes his Ministers, will say, beyond any shadow of doubt, that Parliament is not to be given any opportunity during the current sittings to do anything, in a legislative way, to deal with the housing crisis in this State. Thus we see that the Government places far more importance upon the establishment of an oil refinery than it does upon doing something legislatively to ease the position in connection with the housing crisis.

The Premier: We did something a few weeks ago about it and the proposal now is to throw it all into the melting pot.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Because you made so many mistakes in the legislation.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I do not know whether the Premier, in the course of his busy life, has had an opportunity to study the effect of the legislation that Parliament passed last year. It has been operat-

ing now for a number of weeks. In the principal town in my electorate it has had the effect of causing so many evictions as to compel the Housing Commission to allocate all the houses that have been completed since then to evictee families, whereas before those evictions commenced the houses had all been allocated to approved applicants.

Mr. J. Hegney: And possibly some of them had been waiting for their homes for five years.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is the position. Surely the Premier will not argue that Parliament is not entitled to alter legislation that has been found faulty and dangerous to the best interests of the community—simply because that legislation has been in operation only for 12 weeks or so.

The Premier: Parliament knew there would be evictions when it passed the legislation.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We know that the legislation was very hotly debated and contested.

The Premier: And would be again.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It would be, but that would not wipe out the merits of a Bill introduced so that Parliament would be given an opportunity to amend an Act that is now in operation. It is all very well for the Premier to suggest that an attempt can be made to alter the legislation next session. I would like him to concentrate his mind on the period that will elapse between now and when legislation passed next session would come into operation. In my judgment, there would be no possibility of that legislation becoming operative before the end of the year or possibly early next year.

The Premier: For how long do you want to keep Parliament sitting now?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not concerned about how long it should sit.

The Premier: I am.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am concerned that urgent matters requiring attention should be considered by Parliament. That is why Parliament exists. It is not a place to which any Government can come and say that this or that is the only legislation that Parliament will be allowed to consider. It is not a place where any Government should be able to say that certain legislation is all that members will be given an opportunity to consider. That cannot take place in a Parliament based on British practice and principles! If the Premier and his colleagues desire to turn this Parliament into such an institution, let them do it. Apparently they have the numbers at their command but, in doing it, they will be on dangerous ground.

The Premier: You get more freedom in this Parliament than is available in any other part of the world.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: No.

The Premier: Of course you do.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We did enjoy a reasonable amount of freedom—until this afternoon. The Government has laid it down, and has sufficient numbers to enforce its decision, that Parliament will be allowed to consider only such legislation as the Government approves. It means, in effect, that if the Government has a nasty problem on its hands and does not want anything done about it, Parliament will have no opportunity to deal with it.

The Premier: You know that will not occur.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is occurring now.

The Premier: Parliament has met in special circumstances.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier is the prime mover in causing this situation and he says we are meeting in special circumstances. It does not matter what the circumstances are.

The Premier: Yes, it does.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Whenever Parliament is sitting there is an obligation imposed upon members to give attention to any problem that is serious and urgent. The Premier has not denied, nor can he do so, that the housing problem in this State is tremendously important and tremendously urgent.

The Premier: And it is receiving the prime consideration of the Government.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It may be receiving the prime consideration of the Government, whatever that means.

The Premier: It is receiving the first consideration of the Government.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is not receiving the first consideration of the Government this afternoon.

The Premier: Yes, it is.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is receiving no consideration, except a very shoddy one, from the Government. The Premier has indicated that no alteration in any shape or form will be permitted in the housing legislation during this session. That is the attitude.

The Attorney General: Until July.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Here comes our friend the Attorney General with an interjection of tremendous weight! He is indicating that the Government attitude is that Parliament shall not be permitted to attempt anything with regard to housing and tenancy matters until July.

The Attorney General: I did not say that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What did the Attorney General say? As a matter of fact, he cannot remember what he said

a minute ago. However, I shall leave him on one side for the present. I say very seriously to the Premier and the Minister for Housing that the Government is placing itself in a very discreditable position by adopting such an attitude to this motion. The housing situation will become acutely worse before Parliament meets again and will, in my judgment, undoubtedly become a problem that will cause the Government no end of worry between now and our re-assembling in August.

I am inclined to think that the Minister for Housing, at the back of his mind, realises that pressure in relation to housing is going to increase very greatly during the next few months. The crisis cannot be overcome under the existing law. Some people say that the solution to the housing problem is to build more houses. Undoubtedly that is the ultimate solution, but the physical limitations in this State at present are such as to make it impossible for the Government or anyone else to build sufficient homes even to meet the worst of the cases now existing. The establishment of the oil refinery at Kwinana will impose a very great strain upon our housing resources. It will absorb building tradesmen, building contractors and building material, and consequently the ability of the Government to build homes to house evicted families and provide for others desperately in need of homes will be considerably lessened.

The Government in recent months has taken other steps which, in their operation, will intensify greatly the housing shortage. One of these steps has been to grant a permit for huge hotel buildings to be erected in the metropolitan area. Another step has been to grant permits for the building of huge blocks of flats in the metropolitan area.

The Premier: They will house people, will they not?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Of course they will; but what sort of people? What will be the rents charged for the flats to be erected? Obviously, those flats will be occupied only by people capable of paying very high rentals, and they will not be the people about whom we should be most concerned. They will not be the people who are suffering desperately today as they have been in many instances for years past because of the housing shortage. So I say there is an urgent responsibility upon the Government to amend the existing law dealing with housing and tenancies to ensure that some brake is put upon the present alarming rate of evictions. Unless the Government is prepared to give the House an opportunity to debate the Bill proposed to be introduced by the member for Melville, it will undoubtedly prove itself to be guilty of having denied the people most con-

cerned and most distressed an opportunity of gaining some relief in the present intolerable housing situation.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.34]: I shall not let the occasion pass without registering my protest against the high-handed attitude of the Premier and his Ministers and a lot of the jellyfish supporters behind them, and the other part of the Government known as the Country and Democratic League. Firstly, I would deal briefly with the subject matter outlined by the member for Melville, who related his remarks to proposed amendments to the measure passed last year. If the Minister for Housing spoke truthfully, he could do no other than express alarm and grave concern at the position that will arise in the next 12 months.

There are some thousands of people whose applications have not been satisfied by the Housing Commission. Some of the applications were lodged as far back as the early part of 1947, deserving cases, and they are still unsatisfied and, so far as I can gather, those applications will continue to be unsatisfied because, under the provisions of the Act as passed last year, precedence will be given to evictees, as the Government dare not allow evictees to remain in the public highways.

The Government is trying to smother up the whole trouble until after the next election. It is resorting to various kinds of ruses to mislead the people. The Minister for Housing, on behalf of the Government, continues to mislead the people in some of the departmental letters. These letters lead people to believe that they will be included in the next allocation and, although they may be in the next allocation, the recipients are not advised that there will be some hundreds, or thousands, of applications, so that 50 or 100 houses may have to be allocated between 2,000 applicants. The applicants are led to believe that, if they are included in the next allocation, they will get a house which, of course, is impossible.

From inquiries I have made, I am satisfied that there are people who would build under the State Act on the workers' homes basis, but at present there is no finance available for them, so far as I can gather, and if a number of houses are to be built at Kwinana—and they will have to be built if the refinery is to be established there—much labour and material required to build houses in the suburbs must be absorbed. Judging by reports in "The West Australian," I have formed the opinion—I may be entirely wrong—that the Commonwealth Government is about to or will discontinue advancing the requisite finance to carry on the Commonwealth-State housing agreement. If that is so, and the State Government cannot provide finance from some other source, it will not be able to continue the building of houses for people as it has been doing.

It may be true that private contractors will build homes, but, as the restrictions have been lifted, private contractors will build for private profit and will sell the homes to people who can afford to pay for them, and thus we shall still have with us the problem of many married people with families being unable to obtain homes because they have not the necessary finance, and they will continue to live in distressful and disgraceful conditions. All this is wrapped up with the amending of the Act—a question that the Premier refuses to allow us to consider. If the private contractors and builders are going to erect homes for those who can pay for them, other people are going to continue living under distressful conditions. This is clear when we realise what has taken place within the last few weeks.

I have here a cutting from "The West Australian" of the 1st March, which has the heading, "Plans to Start Flat Project." The Minister for Housing can either admit or deny the authenticity of this statement—

With the lifting of restrictions on the building of flats, a £2,000,000 project for the building of 50 blocks of flats in various parts of Perth and its suburbs will be proceeded with as fast as labour, materials and finance permit. . . . Mr. Krantz said that the Perth City Council has declared a six-storey flat area in East Perth between Hay-street and the river, and eastwards from Victoria-avenue to the Causeway.

There is provision, according to the article, for certain blocks of flats to be erected at Scarborough, but the major portion will be built in the city area, and I can visualise that the persons who will occupy those flats, worthy though they may be, will not be those who have had applications with the State Housing Commission for the last five years and established their priority. Neither will those flats provide for the young married man who is getting a small margin over the basic wage, and whose desire is to have a family and live a decent homelife as an Australian.

People talk of the need for increased population and declare that married people should have large families. Will this encourage young couples to have large families? The whole policy of the Government is lop-sided and unfair. It is not in the interests of Western Australia or its people. I am not going to enter into further details on that aspect of the question. Suffice it to say that one member of the Chamber desires to move an amendment to the existing statute. Parliament was called together some little time ago and adjourned until today. What is Parliament? It is not the Government, and the Government is not Parliament.

Parliament consists of 50 representatives elected by the people of the State, and if the Government chooses to call Parliament together—

The Attorney General: I thought it was 80.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am speaking of this part of Parliament.

Mr. Graham: The democratic section.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I will deal with the other section before I resume my seat and what I say will be quite relevant. The Government has called Parliament together and we are assembled to conduct the necessary business of the country. If any member of this Chamber—be he on the Opposition side, or be he an Independent or a member of the Liberal Party or the Country Party—desires to introduce a motion, either an ordinary motion or one to amend an Act, he should not be sand-bagged. As far as I can see, the dictatorial methods demonstrated by the Premier this afternoon are foreign to the attitude generally adopted by this Chamber. I have been a member for approximately 12 years. I will stand corrected, but I believe this is the first time that the Leader of a Government has refused to allow a member to proceed with a motion.

The Premier: No, it is not.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I said that I would stand corrected, but the Premier did not give me any instances.

The Premier: I can remember when Sir Ross McDonald was refused leave to introduce a Bill, and also the late Mr. Sampson.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: As I see it, this is a very bad trend for a democratic institution such as the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia to adopt. It has been the custom for any member desiring to introduce a Bill which he thought would serve the interests of the people in some way or other to be allowed to do so. Then the first reading takes place, and there can be no more democratic method than for the particular member to outline the provisions of his Bill at the second reading, for some other member of the Chamber to secure the adjournment of the debate to a subsequent sitting, and for the good sense of the House later to determine whether the provisions of the Bill would be in the interests of the country or not.

But that has not been done on this occasion and the demonstration that has been put on in this Chamber this afternoon has amazed and disgusted me. As far as I can see, the Premier and his Ministers had a Cabinet meeting previously and decided—and he has dominated Cabinet—to introduce the oil refinery Bill and that Bill only. They said, "It matters not what any of our members or any

of the Opposition members desire to do, they shall not be heard. They shall not be allowed to proceed with any measure to amend any Act, or to introduce any motion." Then the rank and file members of the Country and Democratic League and of the Liberal and Country League were instructed that not only were they not to introduce any motion or propose any amendment to an Act, but if any member of the Opposition sought to do so he must not be allowed to get as far as the first reading of any such measure.

The Premier glibly says that we passed this legislation just before Xmas, only a few weeks ago. But we also know that the responsible Minister introduced a measure in the early part of the session of last year, but it did not suit Mr. Watson and other members of the Legislative Council and the Government had to pedal backwards, take the Bill back, and introduce another that would be satisfactory to that august Chamber. Overnight the session was closed and members of the Opposition learnt at second-hand that there was to be another session. I for one shall object to these dictatorial methods, these Mussolini-like, Hitler-like and Stalin-like methods adopted for the purpose of trying to prevent the Opposition from fulfilling its legitimate function.

That may have a boomerang effect, and I would hesitate very much, if I were in such a position, to adopt such mean and undemocratic tactics. Only quite recently I read a pamphlet authorised by the secretary of the party to which the Premier belongs and that pamphlet indicated that if the Liberal Party's candidate for the Leederville electorate, Mr. Melville, were returned to Parliament, his rights would be free and untrammelled. He would be able to speak on behalf of the people of Leederville and do everything in their interests. If Mr. Melville had won the election—and I am pleased that he did not—and were sitting behind the Premier, he would be as silent as the member for Canning.

The last vote, which had relationship to the proposed amendment of the member for East Perth, showed that members on the Government side are a lot of jellyfish, speaking politically. Although they believed that the Bill could be allowed to proceed and be decided on the second reading or in the Committee stage, they did not have the courage to tell the Government where to get off. When a member introduces an important Bill, or even an unimportant one, he should be allowed to proceed with it, but because the Premier spoke—Caesar has spoken—all those who followed him, with one exception I am pleased to note, voted silently with him. Had the motion been proceeded with and the House decided the issue on the second reading or at the Committee stage, it would not have taken much longer than the debate this evening.

The Premier can giggle, but even if it had taken a week longer it would have been well worth while, because we would have preserved our democratic right to introduce legislation on the floor of the Chamber.

The Premier gave another weak excuse—almost an apology. He said the Legislative Council would be going to a general election early in May. This is early in March, so two months will elapse before the Legislative Council election will take place, and the whole procedure would take no more than one or two sitting days. This shows how short of valid arguments the Premier was when he indicated his opposition to any motion other than the one proposed to be introduced by the Minister for Works.

I assume the Premier's attitude extends to any motions that members might move to get the sense of the House on matters of public interest. I protest vehemently against the action of the Premier and his Government, and I hope that in connection with this motion some members of the Liberal Party and the Country and Democratic League will help members of the Opposition to preserve our democratic right to introduce legislation when we so desire.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle)

[5.53]: I trust the Government will not persist in refusing permission to introduce this most important Bill, which affects one of the biggest questions facing the country today. There has been industrial trouble in the past, and there will be a lot more in the future, particularly if people are not given a chance to right the wrongs done in the last session. There is no doubt that many mistakes were made then because of the rush and tear in putting the legislation through at the last moment, and the rushing to and from conferences. Hardly anyone knew what was in the amendments. As a result, mistakes were made that should not have occurred. We now have a chance of rectifying them, and the Government should agree to allow this Bill to be decided by the House.

The Premier's argument that the Legislative Council election is coming on in May, carries no weight, because the refinery Bill, to be introduced tonight, will not be finished for at least a fortnight. The Minister will introduce the measure tonight, and the Leader of the Opposition will want at least 10 days in which to analyse it before speaking on it. What are we going to do in the meantime? Are we to go for another holiday—go fishing or do something else—while waiting for the Bill to come on again, whilst at the same time a most important measure, in the rent Bill, is waiting to be dealt with? The Government would be well advised to let the House get on with the Bill and rectify the wrongs made last session. Notwithstanding what the Premier has told us tonight, we know that many people

have been evicted and have had no place to which they could go. They have had to scrape about as best they could and get on verandahs, and so on. Also, as the member for Melville has said, people have bought houses and kept them empty for months.

Quite a lot of foreigners have bought houses, and if they are not prepared to use them something should be done so that other people could do so. People have been given permission to alter their houses in order to accommodate extra tenants, but whilst they have done the work they have not taken in any extra tenants. I hope the Government will reconsider its decision, and allow the Bill to proceed. We know that the second session had to be closed quickly, owing to the attitude of one or two members in another place, and another session commenced in order to right a wrong. Then such an unholy mess was made of the Bill, as a result of the rush tactics, that more mistakes occurred. I trust the Government will be reasonable and allow Parliament, between now and when the refinery Bill comes up again, to discuss this measure so that we can put the matter right.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [5.56]: Whatever I said about the action of the Premier and his supporters in connection with my Bill, I say with much greater emphasis in respect to this matter. I am absolutely certain that the Government has no conception of the housing problem confronting us today. I place its supporters in the same category because they appear utterly callous in their outlook. It will be agreed by everyone—even in this Chamber—that the measure which is now law was prepared with an eye on the Legislative Council. It was drawn, not with a view to dealing with a certain situation so as to give justice on either hand, but in order to suit the whims and ideas of certain people in the Legislative Council. Everybody knows that is so; it is no secret. What is the position today?

I will guarantee that the Premier is not aware of the fact that since September of last year no houses have been granted to people with priorities; people who have waited five or six years; people who have established their hardship and been living under most shocking conditions affecting their health, their family relationships and everything else, because since last September all the houses, as they have been completed, have been given to evicted persons. Apparently the Government is quite content that that shocking state of affairs should continue.

I remember when a by-election was held for Boulder and Mr. Oliver was elected to this Chamber—he has since been succeeded by the present member—that the Premier, when speaking in support of the Liberal candidate—he just

managed to save his deposit—stated that this Government had done so well with the housing problem that it had caught up all of the arrears and was then dealing with current applications. I am unaware of the date when Mr. Oliver was elected.

Mr. McCulloch: In December, 1949.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is almost two and a half years ago now, and the Premier made an utterance then which he must have known full well was not in accordance with the truth. People who were placed on the priority list before this Government came into power five years ago are still waiting for houses, in spite of the fact that two and a half years ago the Premier made a public statement to the effect that the lag had been taken up and that the Government was then dealing with current applications. I repeat that since September last—I ascertained this not from the Minister but from his department—none of these unfortunate people, who have been disappointed year after year while still waiting hopefully, has got a single day closer than he was last September to having a house allocated to him.

The situation is growing increasingly worse. That may appeal to certain sections of the community; people who, in the main, would be supporters of the Government, because they are now told that they can build houses without any restrictions as to size or can add to their existing dwellings libraries, studios, billiard rooms, sun rooms and so on, whether those additions are essential or not. There are many such persons who will indulge in luxury building of that kind, particularly in view of the accumulation of their requirements over the past 10 or 12 years. A great number of those people, during the war period and in the immediate post-war years, accumulated many thousands of pounds, with the result that they have developed great ideas as to their own dwelling requirements.

In view of their resources and social standing many people of that kind are in a position easily to obtain materials that the humble worker is unable to acquire. What chance, Mr. Speaker, do you think the little man, who is doing his best to erect a self-help home, will have in this struggle for materials, as against the businessman at Dalkeith who desires to add a billiard room to his home? We all know that the humble citizen, who is in real trouble in the matter of housing, will run a bad last in a race of that sort, notwithstanding the legislation that was placed on the statute book at the dictates of the Legislative Council.

This Government is so oblivious of the requirements of the day that it goes on blissfully appeasing certain of its supporters and influential sections of the

community by removing restrictions, yet it does nothing to provide homes for the people who are really distressed. It is a scandalous thing that, when there is a mistake such as has unquestionably been made at the instigation of another place, we are helpless to do anything about it. It is beyond understanding that the Government should seek to use its pliable majority—members who call themselves liberals and democrats, though they show little semblance of any justification for using such titles—in order to prevent the Deputy Leader of the Opposition submitting to the House proposals designed to ease the present desperate situation.

Whether those proposals would prove sound or would be found practicable or acceptable is another question, but surely this Parliament and the public are entitled to learn what those proposals are. If that opportunity were given this House Parliament would have a chance, without prejudice, to do the decent thing and give justice to those in need by determining the value of such legislation on its merits. I have the greatest political contempt for those who surround themselves with fine sounding names but who, when it comes to the acid test, prove that their outlook is in exact contradiction to the ideals that their names and titles imply.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	23
		—
Majority against	2
		—

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Molt
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Read
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Kodoreda
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Kelly
Mr. May	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Brand	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Sewell	Dame F. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Mann

Question thus negatived; leave refused.

DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

On motion by the Premier, the following Orders of the Day were discharged:—

- 1, Electoral Districts Act Amendment.
- 2, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.

BILL—OIL REFINERY INDUSTRY (ANGLO-IRANIAN OIL COMPANY LIMITED).

Leave to Introduce, Etc.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move, without notice—

For leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to approve, ratify and confirm an agreement relating to the establishment and working of an oil refinery in the State; to enable the carrying out of the agreement; and for other and incidental purposes.

Question put and passed.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Message.

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

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. D. Brand—Greenough) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: The establishment of this refinery will mark a very important milestone in the history of secondary industry in Western Australia. I believe it will be a milestone of such importance that from now on we can expect that Western Australia will reach a stage of development far exceeding that which any of us envisaged two or three years ago. The Bill is brief and, in a schedule, it contains the agreement signed some days ago by the Premier on behalf of the Government and by Mr. Eric Drake, representing the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.

The negotiations which have taken place have been expedited because it was only on the 9th October last year that the Director of Works, Mr. Dumas, and myself were directed by the Government to go to the Eastern States and present a case for this State to a representative of the oil company, one named Mr. G. H. Coxon, Chief Executive Officer of the company's Planning Department, and a party of technicians who were to be sent to this State. Up to that time, it was extremely clear to me that the company's decision had been in favour of establishing this refinery in the Eastern States, particularly in Victoria, and this reflected the need of the company for extremely deep water, with certain land areas available in close proximity, and also the availability of electricity, water supply and housing accommodation.

Our case was presented mainly on the basis that we had a number of outports which could lay claim to being able to meet the demands and the conditions laid down by the company for the establishment of a refinery, and also Cockburn

Sound, just south of Fremantle. We were informed that the existing port of Fremantle was not sufficiently advantageous for the company to put this £40,000,000 project into operation. From the beginning, Mr. Coxon showed an interest in the possibility of establishing this industry on the shores of Cockburn Sound, and it was evident to me that he was attracted by

- (a) the extremely deep water available in that bay;
- (b) the land adjacent to it which was still unsettled and reasonably flat;
- (c) the fact that we could provide the 12,000 kilowatts of electricity necessary to operate the plant; and
- (d) that we were willing to undertake the provision of 3,000,000 gallons of potable water per day from the surrounding reservoirs and from underground.

At this stage, it was made clear that, provided it was potable, artesian water was acceptable for the requirements of a refinery. Whilst the Government made certain commitments, we were called upon to decide then and there that we must provide water, accommodation, roads, electricity, etc., if this area were to be opened up, and the mere possibility of opening up Cockburn Sound made our decision and commitments extremely worthwhile because it is quite evident that there is a growing interest by big industries in many countries, including Australia, to establish themselves in and around the oil refinery when it is erected. As far as I can make out, this bay is something out of the box, but it is sealed by two sandbanks, known to us as Success and Parmelia—each a mile wide—and it was well known that, if they were to be opened by the dredging of a channel, the work would cost many millions of pounds. However, here was some justification for that expenditure and, in making the decision, the Government realised that not only was it getting a £40,000,000 industry, but also that we would be seeing established the biggest industry in the Commonwealth. In addition, we would be opening up a new harbour designed to become a great industrial port of Australia.

Hon. E. Nulsen: The harbour will be used for the requirements of the oil refinery only?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not at all. The harbour will be opened up and, under the provisions of the agreement, other ships will be allowed to enter it. Of course, commonsense will prevail, in that, having spent £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 in opening up that bay, it is only proper that it should be made available to shipping of all kinds.

Hon. E. Nulsen: The Government will spend that sum?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. It is hoped that in time we will transfer a great amount of our bulkhandling to that area. I daresay it would be quite in order to state that there is a possibility of establishing, or interesting the Commonwealth Government in establishing, a naval base there. It is the Government's intention to proceed to Canberra at the opportune time with a view to placing before the authorities there the possibilities of opening up this area and establishing a naval base, and at the same time suggesting that because of that very fact—that is the provision of a naval base on the western coast—the Commonwealth Government should be prepared to help us directly with some of the finance expended on deepening the channel.

Mr. Graham: I do not think the member for Albany is looking very happy.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Albany I feel has sufficient vision and foresight to realise—

Mr. Rodoreda: You will get on.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: —that this oil refinery being established on the shores of Cockburn Sound is very worthwhile, and that the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. with its great international reputation and its establishments all over the world, would not have overlooked Albany, Bunbury or Geraldton or any other port—

Hon. E. Nulsen: What about Esperance?

Mr. Cornell: What about Dongara?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: —with the exception of Dongara if there had been any economic attraction in those ports. The oil company's decision was not based on sentiment so that what we are pleased to call the Cinderella State might be developed by the establishment of the oil refinery in Western Australia. Their decision was made on a hard, cold cash basis. So even though the member for Albany may be a little disappointed, as may other members also who would have liked to have seen this industry established well away from the metropolitan area, Cockburn Sound provided all the facilities necessary and upon its shores the company has decided to proceed with the work.

Hon. E. Nulsen: No more than Esperance.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The company weighed all the pros and cons and decided that it was more suitable than Esperance.

Hon. E. Nulsen: There is not more water.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think we will leave that for further debate. It is sufficient for me to say that the company, having decided it would ask for a sufficient depth of channel which would enable it to bring in 32,000 tonners, has already requested the Government to include in the agreement an alternative

scheme to provide for a channel of greater dimensions to enable it to bring into Fremantle 40,000 tonners if it is possible for the company to construct, or arrange for the construction of these ships. It may be well for the House to realise that for some years past it has been the policy to establish refineries at the site of oil production but now we see processing units being erected many thousands of miles away, and this has only been made possible because of the capacity of large ships to transport oil across the world's oceans. It may be because of international situations or the foreign policies of various countries, but this company at any rate has decided to refine its oil in countries where it can be assured of a friendly and co-operative atmosphere.

Mr. May: It could be relying on Exmouth Gulf.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not profess to know anything about Exmouth, and I am sure the member for Collie knows very little more, but once having got the decision of the company in favour of building here I think that is as far as we can go in discussing where the company should have decided to construct the refinery. Since the negotiations have been proceeding quite a number of people have raised the question of what we have paid—what price we have paid—to get the refinery here. Some people were led to believe that we had oil to exchange for a refinery. All we had to offer for the proposition of the oil refinery was Cockburn Sound, Albany or Bunbury as sites. It was necessary therefore in opening up this area to provide accommodation and the necessary services. This was a definite and clear-cut demand. As far as the company was concerned it undertook to accommodate 3,000, 4,000 and now, I believe 5,000 people necessary to construct this refinery before 1955 or 1956, which I understand, is the approximate target date.

It is evident from my discussions with the various representatives of this refinery that the company was also attracted to Western Australia because of its favourable industrial record, and I sincerely trust that we shall be able to maintain that good record, the company in its turn being most anxious, I am told, to comply with all our standards and perhaps even to provide better than those which have existed in the past. The company is most anxious that all its employees should be happy and satisfied and that they should become permanent residents of this State. In the working of this great oil industry it is anticipated that the company will employ a minimum of 1,000 people.

Mr. Graham: How many of them will come in from other parts?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I intend now to deal with the point raised by the member for East Perth. It is quite natural that from the publicity given people are anxious to get in on the ground floor as it were. I understand from Mr. Drake himself that not only from Western Australia but from all over the world there have been applications for positions at the oil refinery. We can readily appreciate the outlook of young people, young Western Australians such as farmers' sons, desiring to get into the industry.

Hon. E. Nulsen: They should have the first opportunity.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am well aware of the great danger of attracting people to the metropolitan area. It has been made public by all the representatives, Mr. Drake in particular, that the company is most anxious to bring in all the employees—the workmen and the labour—it requires in order to avert the impact upon our economy by employing labour in Western Australia.

Hon. E. Nulsen: It would be very unfair to those who have been working for their living in the country districts.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not here to decide the pros and cons as regards fairness, but as a policy it is necessary to keep the people who live in the country in that part of the State, seeing that, as a result of the establishment of this great industry and all it will need for the future, we shall find in Western Australia, quite apart from the experience in any other State, that we shall be short of the necessary food to feed the people. Therefore, it was very pleasing to hear the representatives of the company state clearly that they recognised the danger involved in a policy of employing wholesale everyone who applied for positions, and that in consequence they were willing to co-operate with the Government or any other authority with a view to maintaining the balance of our economy and some order in the labour market.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Will the company give consideration to providing petrol to people in the country districts at the same price as is charged in the metropolitan area?

The Premier: Is that not a bit premature?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was rather afraid of that question being raised, but I suggest that the member for Eyre discuss that point with the executives of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. He has a better chance of getting a reply from them.

Mr. May: Will that apply to crude oil?

Mr. Nalder: What we want in the country is water at the same price as that charged to the people in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: And the Minister can answer that question!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The matter of a flat rate for water is one of great interest, but I suggest it cannot be discussed here tonight. The Bill is very short. In the first place, it lays down that its purpose is to approve, ratify and confirm an agreement relating to the establishment and working of an oil refinery in the State, and to give statutory force to the provisions of the agreement. It states expressly that the agreement is "approved, ratified and confirmed" by Parliament. Members will find on a perusal of the measure that there are quite a number of statutes that require amendment to give force and effect to the agreement which has been arrived at between the State and the company.

Mr. W. Hegney: The Bill overrides the whole lot.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Where it is found necessary to implement the requirements of the agreement, the Bill gives authority for the amendment of the various Acts to which I have referred. There is also set out in the Bill itself authority for the Treasurer to acquire land which may not be land that could be resumed under the conditions and requirements of the Public Works Act, and land that is required under the agreement by the undertaking can be dealt with by the Treasurer. Let me here explain that one of the conditions of the agreement is that the Government shall provide 12,000 k.w. of electricity to the site at Kwinana.

The area in question lies within the district controlled by the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Board. Before the State could undertake that the State Electricity Commission would erect a power line and generate and supply electricity, it was necessary that the agreement between the Government and the Fremantle board should be amended to that extent. Because of the negotiations that were proceeding at the time and the possibility of coming to a satisfactory arrangement for the Fremantle undertaking to be sold by the board to the State Electricity Commission, the Government approved of the inclusion in the Bill of Clause 6, which reads—

- (1) To facilitate the carrying out of the provisions of the Agreement, and to enable the State to carry out its obligations under the Agreement, the State Electricity Commission of Western Australia may purchase from the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Board, which may sell to the Commission, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission and the Board agree, the electricity undertaking controlled and managed by the Board under the

provisions of the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act, 1903-1946.

- (2) In this section, the expression "undertaking" has the same meaning as in paragraph (b) of the interpretation "Undertaking" in section seven of the State Electricity Commission Act, 1945.

In order to facilitate the transaction, it was thought that if the Government were able to reach an agreement with the Fremantle board, the sale could take place, and thus unnecessary problems that could arise in negotiations would be avoided. Therefore, included in the Bill is power for one to sell and the other to buy.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: What you say is, "Sell to us—or else."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not so.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Is it not? We will show you later.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At any rate, that is not so.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Has a price been agreed upon?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot say, but negotiations are taking place. If an agreement is not reached, provision is made whereby the Government will supply the electricity required. If the sale takes place the agreement concerned will be brought before Parliament during the coming session for ratification and approval. I think that is only commonsense and quite sound, seeing that there is a real possibility of coming to an arrangement, because the Fremantle board itself was most concerned regarding the vast demand that would be made upon it as a result of the development that will take place.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You were threatening to take the undertaking from them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We did not threaten to do that. The board realised what development would take place at Kwinana, and felt it could not face up to the great capital expenditure that would be involved if it were to provide the necessary current. In the circumstances, it is quite wise that power should be given by Parliament for the necessary transaction if the board wished to sell.

Mr. Styants: More socialism!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But socialism of the right kind.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Just tell us how you distinguish between the two types.

Mr. Styants: Anyhow, it is an admission.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If there were more people who could strike the happy medium between whatever socialism means and capitalism, whatever that means, greater progress would be recorded.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cornell: That is the Liberal Party policy, is it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not sure where the member for Mt. Marshall stands. Coming now to the agreement, I feel that it is quite straightforward. The principles included in it have been published for a number of months—the commitments of the Government on the one hand and the undertaking of the company on the other hand. The agreement provides that the company shall on or with all reasonable despatch after the commencing date, which is a date of which it will advise us, proceed to erect on the area, coloured pink on the map attached to the Bill a refinery that will be capable of refining 3,000,000 tons of crude oil a year.

The company has made itself responsible for the provision of all the necessary wharves, berths and piers associated with the refinery, and undertakes to maintain those facilities in first-class order and in accordance with the laws of the State. The company also undertakes to establish at its own cost all the necessary buildings to accommodate the thousands of men whom it intends to employ over the next three or four years.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Does the company intend to import the raw materials for housing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I shall come to the question of housing later. The company has undertaken to pay certain sums of money to service the loans that we must raise for the dredging of the channel, and will advise the State in writing of the date on which petroleum is first received into the refinery from a tanker. It will advise us of the number of tons and supply any information requisite to permit of our arriving at the payment to be made by the company.

Because the dredging was the greatest work associated with the establishment of the refinery and the opening up of the Sound, we negotiated with Mr. Coxon to assist us in our financial problems. One year after the first day of July next following the date on which the company reaches full production, and thereafter annually on the first day of July in each succeeding year during the term of this agreement the company agrees to pay to the State or to its written nominee an amount equal to a sum of six per cent. of one-half of the cost as defined in clause 1 of the agreement, which, of course, refers to the cost of the dredging, calculated to the thirtieth day of June next before the due date of payment, or the sum of £120,000, whichever sum is the lesser.

Before we went to the Eastern States, the Director of Works made certain investigations as to what would be the approximate cost of opening up the Sound. He was fortunate in being able to contact

a representative of the dredging company now doing some work at Albany, who advised that to dredge to a depth of 38 feet, which was the requirement, with a bottom width of 450 feet, representing approximately $6\frac{1}{2}$ million cubic yards, would cost the State about £4,000,000.

I made reference earlier to an alternative scheme that the company wished to put up in order to provide for larger tankers. That was for the depth of 38 feet and a bottom width of 500 feet meaning that approximately 7 million cubic yards would have to be dredged at a cost of £5,000,000. In the event of the company's deciding that it wanted Scheme B, the second one to which I have just referred, it is prepared to pay 6 per cent. of one-half the cost or £150,000, whichever is the lesser sum.

One thing very evident to us was that, if the company desired to use any cement, as obviously it would do, it would have to import all its requirements. This the company has undertaken to do, and provision accordingly is included in the agreement. That represents a very big undertaking, but in the circumstances there was no alternative as the production of cement in this State does not by a long way meet the local demands.

The company has undertaken to indemnify and keep indemnified the State against all actions, claims, costs and demands arising out of or in connection with the construction, maintenance or use of the wharves etc. A similar provision is written into other agreements of this sort. The State shall sell to the company an area of land, coloured green on the map, of 75 acres at a total price not exceeding £750. That area was requested for the sole purpose of providing recreation grounds, social centres and the like. Reference is made in the agreement to a residential area, and I understand that caretakers and such-like people will be responsible for what will be quite a big area of buildings and will live in cottages erected on this land. Originally I, on behalf of the Government, undertook to provide a reserve of 75 acres, but I learn that upon the arrival of the company's attorney, Mr. Drake, negotiations took place and a decision was reached to make the land available in fee simple.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Was that area of land resumed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is Crown land. It is intended to reserve an area between the bitumen road and the sea for the purpose of a play-ground or sea-front, and I understand that it will be kept as a Class A reserve.

Mr. Graham: That will not become a public reserve?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it will be sold to the company in fee simple for the sum of £750. Originally I undertook to make a reserve available to the company. The company also undertakes to—

prohibit under penalty the use by unauthorised persons of the shore of the refinery site and the wharves, jetties, landing places and berths, and of the waters adjacent to such wharves, landing places and berths, and within 50 yards thereof in any direction, but so that such prohibition shall not apply to any waters north of the projection into the waters of Cockburn Sound of the northern boundary of the refinery site and south of a line running on a bearing 270 degrees from the southern extremity of the refinery site.

The complete frontage of the area is the one referred to. The company undertakes to purchase electricity which we make available to it at standard rates. I learn that there was some difficulty in getting headquarters in London to agree to that; but seeing that the generation of electricity in Australia as a whole is, generally speaking, such that we can hardly keep up with the demand, it was a matter for the company to pay the full rates or to put up its own generating station. If the company wishes, it can use its own fuel for generating electricity, but it was decided that in the meantime it would take supplies from us. We also undertake to—

provide and supply to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Public Health of the State at reasonable cost to the company, water and sanitary services in close proximity to the buildings erected on any of the land referred to in subclause (c) of this clause.

That will include what will be the construction camp. It was necessary, before the company could establish a camp to house 3,000 or 4,000 people, that we should undertake to supply water and sanitary conveniences complying with the public health regulations. We also undertake to construct and maintain all necessary roads and footpaths within the area of the construction camp, which will be built on land leased to the company outside the refinery area. I might add that the company undertakes, at the conclusion of the construction, to demolish all the buildings and so leave the land in a virgin state, as it will be when handed to the company. It will then be available for future industries.

Mr. Graham: Suppose the houses are still habitable?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That will be a matter for agreement between the company and the State. If accommodation is still at a premium, I trust

that the company will be only too happy, and so will we, to reach a decision to retain the buildings.

Mr. Graham: For evictees!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The next provision relates to the supply of electricity and reads that the State shall—

notwithstanding the provisions of the Fremantle Tramways and Electric Lighting Act, 1903-1946, or any other law within two and a half years from the commencing date, construct, or through the State Electricity Commission of Western Australia, cause to be constructed to an agreed point within the refinery site a high tension power supply system, but not including the transformers.

It is also provided that the company shall give us reasonable notice of the date it will require the 12,000 kilowatts we undertake to provide.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Will that be per day, per week, per month or per year?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The 12,000 kilowatts will be available at any time. Within six months of the commencing date, we undertake to provide the company with 1,000 kilowatts to enable it to proceed with its construction work and such power will be supplied at 440 volts, 50 cycle, 3 phase, such as is now being extended around the metropolitan area.

The suitability of the land is something which attracted the company. There are no great difficulties of demolition and the land is reasonably flat. Even if it had not been, I have been advised by various people of sufficient bull-dozers—possessed by contractors who wish to come here—to flatten anything! I did not know that so many bulldozers were available. I would point out that a great portion of this land belongs to the Commonwealth, and although negotiations with that Government have not been finalised they were sufficiently advanced to enable us to proceed with the agreement with the company. The next provision has reference to this point and provides that the State shall—

within three months of the commencing date subject to any necessary arrangements being made with the Commonwealth of Australia (the present owner of the refinery site) sell to the company which shall purchase an estate in fee simple in the land comprised within the refinery site for a price equal to the total of the sums payable by the State for and in respect of the acquisition of the land by the State from the Commonwealth but not exceeding £80 per acre.

We made certain inquiries and felt that as the company demanded the inclusion of that condition, we could arrange for the

purchase of this land in the first place for a price much less than £80. The next provision reads—

within two months of the commencing date supply to the refinery site for construction purposes not less than 200,000 gallons per day of potable water at the ruling rates from time to time prevailing for excess water for industrial purposes supplied by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department pursuant to the provisions of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I wonder what the people at Wangan Hills will think of that!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think the hon. member will find that they are quite happy and fully understand the situation.

Mr. Lawrence: Has the Government resumed any land adjacent to the refinery at £40 per acre?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government has resumed no land, as far as I know. No action has been taken because we have had no authority to do so.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: That does not worry the Government. It put up a building there without authority.

The Minister for Education: Like its predecessors in office.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was going to say that we were following precedent.

Mr. Styants: Two wrongs do not make a right.

The Minister for Education: Two rights do not make a wrong either.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have heard a good deal about precedent tonight and I am puzzled as to what is the correct course. The agreement also provides that within six months of the commencing date the State shall make or support representations to the Commonwealth with a view to facilitating the migration of the necessary labour for construction purposes.

The next provision deals with dredging. I have already referred to that and it is not necessary to do so again except to add that we undertake to collaborate with the company as to the terms and conditions of the dredging tenders and contracts, and the provision for damages to be paid by the contractor in respect of failure to achieve any of the dredging requirements of the contract. That may appear a little severe, but it must be remembered that the work of dredging the channel will take a number of years, and the company and the Government will have committed themselves to many thousands of pounds—perhaps millions of pounds in the case of the company—and it is therefore necessary to be satisfied that the company which is tendering for the

dredging is one that can do the work, or at least be prepared to back up its contract by worthwhile penalty clauses.

We come now to the question of housing. We have heard a good deal about housing, but it seems that all the talk in the world does not relieve the position.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It is just as bad as ever, and getting worse.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not so.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It is so, all right.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Minister does not know much about housing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Neither I nor the hon. member does personally. Nevertheless, I would like to emphasise the fact that one of the specific requirements of the company was that the Government should undertake to provide at least 1,000 houses within three years. It was that, or no oil refinery, because it was made clear to me that the company did not intend to go into the house-building business; that it had come out here with the intention of avoiding a drawing off of the accommodation already provided in the greater metropolitan area of London, and that during the period of construction accommodation would, by one means or another, become available for the permanent staff.

Mr. Ackland: Will the company buy the houses when they are erected?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I shall come to that. The Government has undertaken that at such places and of such standard designs of the State Housing Commission as may from time to time be agreed upon in writing with the company, it will provide at least 333 houses in each of the three years next following the commencing date; and to ensure that at least 100 of such houses shall be constructed in brick, of which at least 50 shall be completed within two years from the commencing date. We felt that the brick position would improve, and that we were justified in requiring the company to concede us the time of two years in which to build the first 50 brick houses. The State shall—

Let all such houses to the company at reasonable rentals, and otherwise upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed from time to time by the parties hereto, but so that the period of letting in respect of any house shall be such period not exceeding five years from the date of its completion as the Company may require. The Company shall have an option of renewal upon the like terms (except the covenant as to an option of renewal) in respect of each house for a period not exceeding three years as the Company may by notice in writing give to the State

at least three months prior to the expiration of the first-mentioned term.

The State shall—

Ensure that any house so let to the Company shall be occupied by such persons as the Company thinks fit to facilitate the construction or operation of the refinery.

In requesting that we provide these houses, the company had in mind that some provision would be made for its people during the constructional period. Under the various Acts of the State, we felt it was not possible to allow a group of bachelors to use a house, and in order to overcome that difficulty the company has undertaken the responsibility of leasing these houses, and to use them to the best advantage. We agree to—

Let the houses on the express condition that at the expiration of the tenancy of any house the Company shall, as soon as possible, place the same in proper order and condition in accordance with the provisions of the relative tenancy agreement, and thereafter the Company may nominate an employee of the Company to acquire such house, and the State shall then make available such house to such employee under the provisions of the State Housing Act, 1946-1950, and for the purposes of this paragraph any such employee of the Company shall be deemed to be a "worker" within the meaning of that Act.

We undertake to provide the necessary services, such as septic tanks, fencing and water supply.

Mr. Graham: The previous provision is a little unfair. The company is to nominate who is to have the right to purchase a Government house.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The condition in the first place was that 1,000 houses should be built for the permanent workers of the refinery, and there seemed to be no other way of satisfying the company that its employees would get these houses, unless it was done this way. In the meantime, it is natural to assume that, following on the subdivisions provided, houses will be built, and that 1,000 employees will be the minimum. Many hundreds of people will naturally migrate there to service those already working, and I should think that in not a great number of years distant many thousands of people will be living at Kwinana.

I have mentioned the requirement to provide the necessary 3,000,000 gallons of water within two and a half years of the commencing date. If the State shall sink a bore at or near the refinery site, any

water supplied direct from such bore to the company shall be paid for by the company at one half of the abovementioned rates. The rates referred to are those which apply to industrial establishments in the metropolitan area.

We also undertake, through the Main Roads Commissioner, to construct all the necessary roads outside, and, at a cost to the company, inside, because the company considers we have the specialists and it has not, and it is not interested in bringing out gangs to construct roads. The company requested that we undertake to lay down the roads inside the refinery, at its cost, and that such roads shall be of a standard to carry the oil tankers of the company; and the tankers, in turn, must conform to the standards and conditions laid down under the Traffic Act. The member for Eyre raised the point as to the use of the actual Bay. The State undertakes that—

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, 1902-1951, but subject to the payment by the Company within two months after the respective due dates of payment of the amounts referred to in subclauses (f) and (g) of clause three of this agreement, where the Company's wharves, jetties, landing places or berths are used—

- (i) by any vessel owned or chartered by the Company; or
- (ii) by tankers or other vessels bringing petroleum or equipment or materials for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the refinery; or
- (iii) by tankers or vessels removing petroleum or surplus material or equipment from the refinery—

neither the State nor the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners nor any other State authority shall make any charge to the Company or to any other person for such use, nor in respect of the following services, namely, entering into or departure from Cockburn Sound (including pilotage), and movements of the vessels or tankers within Cockburn Sound (excluding the Inner harbour of Fremantle and excluding tug hire). The provisions of section thirty-two of the last mentioned Act shall apply to any such vessel or tanker as though such vessel or tanker was liable to pay ordinary pilotage. It is further agreed that vessels or tankers other than the abovementioned which utilise the Company's wharves, jetties, landing places, or berths, for the purpose of bunkering or any other purpose than in this clause men-

tioned shall be charged for such use and any incidental services in connection therewith at a rate to be fixed by the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners;

Even though the company is providing the necessary wharfage, piers and jetties it was not felt that it would be fair or just that ships other than theirs should be able to come in there and avoid the various charges made by the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Generally speaking, this agreement appears to be generous to the company.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think so. We must not forget that in the matter of this agreement there had to be considered the prize of a £40,000,000 refinery.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I think you have paid a fair price for it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is the hon. member's opinion. Under the heading "It is hereby mutually agreed" appears the following:—

That the Company may at any time and from time to time during the term of this agreement, at its own cost, in all things erect, construct, lay down, establish, fix, maintain, and use pipes and all necessary incidental works for supplying and distributing petroleum.

It was put to us that in view of modern practice the company desired to transport its oil to Perth and Fremantle by pipeline rather than by road or rail tankers. They requested three pipelines especially; one from the refinery to Fremantle or the vicinity of Fremantle, one from Fremantle to Perth and the other from the refinery to Perth. They have been approved, but the routes must be further approved by the Treasurer, in whose name this agreement has been signed, and the company will be called upon to pay compensation and to conform to the conditions which are laid down in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act, and which apply to the Government when it lays a pipeline down.

Mr. W. Hegney: Is there a copy of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company Limited's (Private) Act, 1919, in the House?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. That Act was introduced in 1919 in the form of a private Bill. The conditions included in that measure were that the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company should pay as a rate on its pipeline to the local authority—I think it was the Fremantle Municipality—one-eighth per cent. of the amount actually received by the company for the sale of oil or liquid conveyed through those pipes in the preceding 12 months. Today the local authority

is receiving about £3,000 annually as a result of that arrangement and it was the desire of the company not to upset that agreement, but naturally they would not commit themselves further to any such arrangement where 3,000,000 tons of oil were involved. That Act is available to any member who wishes to see it.

Mr. Graham: The Bill contains a guarantee against socialisation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is so. The company, with all its experience, readily understands that the Parliament of any country is a law unto itself, but at least our having included that guarantee here, at their request is evidence of our good faith and confidence in our system of government.

Mr. Graham: The only trouble is that Commonwealth law prevails.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have no doubt that as this agreement is made with the State of Western Australia the company is mostly concerned with the Government of this State, and that if it fears any action by the Commonwealth it will endeavour to get some undertaking from that Government.

With regard to rating, it was undertaken that, notwithstanding the provisions of any Act, the valuation of the refinery's site shall, for rating purposes, be on the unimproved value; but that this subclause shall not apply to any part of the refinery site upon which a permanent residence is erected. Great consideration was given to that matter. As it is believed that this will become an important industrial area and that a policy will have to be defined with regard to rating in relation to some of these big undertakings, I regard this as being quite reasonable, because the unimproved value of the land must increase with the development of the area.

I repeat that that condition does not apply to any part of the land on which the company shall build a permanent residence. The agreement, which I think I have covered fairly fully, is to expire on the 1st day of January, 2,000, unless the company by notice in writing to the State not later than the 1st day of January, 1996, requires the agreement extended for such further period not exceeding 20 years as the company may nominate in such notice, and the agreement, save for the right of renewal, shall thereupon be extended accordingly.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Is there anything about a south-of-the-river railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not propose to discuss the south-of-the-river railway. However, although it is open to criticism, I feel this is a reasonable agreement. We had to offer a price in order that the refinery might be established here; it was an opportunity that would

come but once only and to use a common expression, we had to "get cracking." As far as the engineering works associated with the area are concerned, the Fremantle Harbour and the development of the railways, all decisions made so far will be affected.

Members will have read where the Government has appointed Mr. Dumas, the Co-ordinator of Works and Industrial Development, and Mr. David Brisbane, a civil engineer, to advise the Government in respect to these matters, and those two men have the right to call upon the various engineers associated with the work. As I mentioned at a dinner given by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company the other evening, it is quite possible that we will not develop the harbour upstream.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I also want to make it clear that we will not develop the harbour upstream to Point Brown. However, we will have to renew the railway bridge very soon and as far as sites upstream are concerned we will be limited to the existing road bridge site. That is a matter yet to be decided upon after careful consideration and it is obvious to everyone that there must soon be a decision made about a south of the river railway if railway services are to be provided in the area.

Mr. Graham: Can you tell us whether any consideration has been given to the possibility of pollution on the foreshore?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, there has been a good deal of investigation by the people concerned. It has been pointed out that no more oil will be permitted to drift away from the ships than would be permitted in any other harbour. It is not possible to make a special consideration of this particular harbour, but the company points out that it, too, is interested in preserving, as far as possible, the beaches for our people. Of course, the beach area around the oil refinery will be disturbed in any case because of the great industry that will be established. There has also been a rumour abroad that all plant life within 40 miles of the refinery will die. The gardeners and market gardeners around Spearwood wrote to me the other day requesting some assurance on that point.

When I discussed this with Mr. Drake he stated that the best gardens at Abadan were those immediately adjacent to the fences of the refinery. If members care to take the trouble to look at pictures of refineries at Haifa and other places they will find that plant life is abundant. It is evident that if the refinery does not improve the plant life, at least it does not impair it. As I was the Minister mainly concerned with the original negotiations for the establishment of the re-

finery, the Government decided that I, in company with the Director of Works, should continue the discussions with the company, and I have continued up to this point. I wish to thank all those associated with me, particularly Mr. Dumas, the Co-ordinator of Works, Mr. Goode and many others who have helped us in these negotiations. I believe that this agreement marks one of the greatest developments in the history of this State.

Mr. Griffith: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move:—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As to Adjournment of Debate.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I move:—

That the debate be adjourned till this day week.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker! Can there be any discussion on a motion for the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: Only if there is an amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is what I intend. I am loth to oppose such a motion for the adjournment but originally the Government decided that, as country members had been brought down to Perth for one day, the week-end and Monday should be sufficient for all members to study the agreement. The Leader of the Opposition, and the Deputy Leader, have pointed out that that is insufficient time and have requested us to allow the debate to be adjourned until Thursday next, the 13th March. I am prepared to compromise and adjourn the debate until Wednesday, the 12th inst. If we are to avoid bringing members down for one day next week it will be necessary to do this, otherwise there will be an adjournment of twelve days. That is most undesirable because the people representing the company are waiting for Parliament to ratify the agreement, or reject it.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: How can an adjournment for one week be an adjournment of twelve days?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If we are to avoid bringing members down on Thursday it will mean an adjournment of twelve days. I believe that that is unnecessary delay and that the adjournment of six days is fair and just. I would point out that Mr. Drake and his colleagues are anxious to proceed to Canberra, after having received the authority of this Parliament, to finalise outstanding points regarding land and migration and then to

return here and get on with the job immediately. It has been mentioned that a possible commencing date would be within two or three months, and if we were to hold them up here I feel that we would not be doing the right thing and would be causing unnecessary delay.

Mr. W. Hegney: When do you expect to finish the second reading and Committee stages of the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I therefore move an amendment—

That the words "this day week" be struck out and the words "Wednesday, the 12th March" be inserted in lieu.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (on amendment): According to my interpretation of the Standing Orders, no discussion on a motion for adjournment is possible and that is why, when I moved my motion, I made no attempt to explain why the Opposition desired an adjournment for one week. I have no right to deal with the matter advanced by the Minister for Works because he had no right to submit it and it places the Opposition at considerable disadvantage, inasmuch as the Minister has put up a case giving reasons why we should not adjourn for one week and the Opposition has not had the opportunity to submit its case why we should adjourn for that period.

Mr. Rodoreda: Keep on going!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do my best to conform to Standing Orders, and I looked up this point to see what opportunity was available to me because I understood the Minister had some objection to the course of action I proposed to follow. According to my reading of the Standing Orders there should be no discussion on a motion for adjournment but you, Sir, have permitted the Minister for Works to speak on it. I want to know whether you can extend to me the privilege of being able to put up the Opposition's side of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can speak to the amendment, of course.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Government has had a long time in which to negotiate this agreement and in making itself familiar with the points involved. The Opposition, up till now, has not sighted a line of the agreement or been aware of any of the approaches in connection with the signing of it. This agreement is not the simple thing it would appear at first sight to be. There are a number of provisions in it affecting other statutes which require to be examined. We on this side of the House have not the facilities that are available to the members of the Government. They can press the button and call for this officer and that to provide this file or the other, and obtain in-

formation from the Crown Law Department simply by inviting one of its officers to have a discussion on any problem, but no facilities such as that are available to Opposition members.

The Attorney General: Yes, they are. You have been down many a time to the Crown Law Department and have asked for information.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But the facilities are not available to us in the same manner as they are to members of the Government.

The Attorney General: Have you not interviewed the Solicitor General, time and time again?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: At his convenience.

The Attorney General: At his request.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No, but if the Government so desires the Solicitor General will come along at the foot. If we request something of him the information will be supplied depending on the extent of his duties at the time.

The Attorney General: Have you ever been refused information by him?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No.

The Attorney General: And frequently you have availed yourself of the Solicitor General's advice.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Rubbish!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have not consulted the Solicitor General more than six times in five years, if that number, and if the Solicitor General is busy on Government business I have to see him when he can find the time to give to me. I do not complain about that, but I have stated that merely to show what is the true position, and anybody who takes a commonsense view of it will know that the facilities available to the Government are not available to the Opposition members.

The Attorney General: No-one will suggest that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Well, it seems that the Minister was doing so.

The Attorney General: I was only trying to be helpful.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, the Minister was! If he desires to be helpful, then let him grant us his support for a week's adjournment. In a matter of such great moment and import as this we would not have been unreasonable if we had asked for an adjournment longer than one week. I can recall when matters of much less importance have been adjourned for more than a week, but this is a matter of serious import and implication. Take, for example, the provision relating to the Fremantle electricity supply! There are some matters concerning that which I want to go into, and that will not be done in five minutes, either. Seeing that we on this

side of the House have not seen a line of this agreement before tonight, I believe that we are entitled to have an adjournment of at least a week to consider it ourselves; to have discussions about some of the provisions. We have opinions and views on this side which have to be reconciled. This is not a decision which can be made by one or two on the other side of the House with the rest of us following like sheep.

Everyone on this side has a right to express his own view and to be heard, and party meetings will be necessary in order to get the opinions of members on this side and to decide what action we, as an Opposition, are to take and, in asking for a week to do that, we are not requesting an unreasonably lengthy time. The Government has said that these negotiations have been going on for weeks and we know that that is so. It then gets to the stage where it has the agreement ready for signing, then it signs it and I believe that the Bill was down at the printers only a few hours ago. So the Government has taken quite a lot of time to reach the stage when the Bill can be brought here, but we are not to be allowed an additional week on all that time to satisfy ourselves on the provisions it contains and what action is to be taken.

There are a number of provisions in the Bill—those relating to housing, for example—which require to be considered from a government's point of view and they will not be found from the Bill, but only after inquiry from certain sources. If the Government is to fulfil its commitments in regard to the provision of water, it will have to get a move on because the metropolitan water supply today is by no means satisfactory. We need to have only one hot day and we are threatened with restrictions. That is the water position today, and from that position we are going to undertake to supply 3,000,000 gallons of potable water to this company.

We require time to examine those provisions to ensure that we have, as a Government, reasonable grounds for telling these people that we can keep our side of the bargain. Those matters require consideration by everybody on this side of the House, and they have to be discussed after research has been made into certain points in order that our attitude can be defined. As the implications are so great for large numbers of people, we would not be doing our duty as an Opposition if we were pushed into this simply because the Government wants it rushed through. This could conceivably affect adversely many thousands of people in this State, not only in the metropolitan area but also outside of it, and those aspects have to be considered by us. It is not a case of establishing an industry at any price, much as we desire to have it.

Those aspects must be examined and we have a right to expect a reasonable time in which thoroughly to peruse the agree-

ment. I trust that the Government will not use its numbers to decide how long the Opposition is to have to consider the Bill, but will grant the week that we have asked for. I repeat that we could, within reason, have asked for a longer time, but in view of the fact that the Government desires to get on with the final negotiations we will content ourselves with one week, believing that that is by no means too great a time in the circumstances.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (on amendment): I have listened with great interest to the member for Melville, and in the past have sat in Opposition in the seat next to the one he is now occupying long enough to appreciate to some degree the sentiments that he has expressed. As I understood from the Minister for Works, he was quite agreeable to adjourn the debate until next Wednesday, which would be the week requested, less one day. I had thought, from my understanding of the position that I had previously and the discussions that had taken place between members on both sides of the House, that Wednesday was going to be acceptable.

I would ask the member for Melville—although I am not criticising the sentiments that he has expressed by any means—to consider the position of some of the members of this House. Coming here on Thursday—which is what it will amount to—indicates to them, as it does to me, that the debate on the Bill will not by any means be concluded and, in consequence, it will go into the next week. It might reasonably be assumed—at least as a distinct possibility—that the measure, if the debate be resumed on Wednesday, might begin to see the light of day by the conclusion of Thursday's sitting. So I was hopeful that the arrangement that had been made for the sitting to be on the Wednesday, which is the subject of the amendment moved by the Minister for Works, would be carried into effect without debate.

I am aware that the Government negotiators have taken a long time over this agreement. I am also aware that negotiating an agreement takes a lot longer than perusing it and understanding it after it has been negotiated, because when it is in a state of negotiation there is argument on every point and before it is reduced to finality there are comings and goings hither and thither to find the right people and the right language before one can reach that finality. But when it is a document printed and established, it contains clearly understandable principles as this measure does and I am perfectly certain that if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or the Leader of the Opposition, were to ask the Minister for Works to make special arrangements to discuss any points on which they may have doubt with the legal or technical officers of the Crown Law Department, they would receive a favourable response immediately. I hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition

and his colleagues will not press the proposition for Thursday. I would certainly have held the view that an adjournment short of Wednesday next would not have been reasonable to anybody, but I do think that the compromise that has been suggested is reasonable and I hope the House will agree to it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY (on amendment): Personally I am surprised at the Deputy Leader of the Opposition moving for an adjournment only till Thursday next.

The Minister for Education: You would be.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That remark was uncalled for, and I do not think the Minister meant what he said.

The Minister for Education: I did not say very much anyway.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I will deal with one of the Minister's remarks now. He said he was sure that the Crown Law and technical officers would give the Deputy Leader or the Leader of the Opposition any information required.

The Attorney General: They will.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I would like to tell the Minister and the Attorney General that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition are not the only people who are interested in this Bill. Every member on this side of the House is entitled to the same consideration. This is not a one horse show even if the other side is.

Mr. Oldfield: How many of you will understand it?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I know there is one member on the other side that does not understand it, and I do not expect him to. I think members on the other side of the House will agree with me, particularly one of them, though I will not mention any name! When he introduced the Bill the Minister for Works indicated that there will be millions of pounds involved by the State; he mentioned there would be 1,000 houses built. This matter is going to involve the State in some millions of pounds, and the Government is quibbling as to how long we should have by way of an adjournment to allow us to study the provisions of the Bill and the schedule attached to it. We are expected to make some contribution to the debate in regard to this proposed agreement. The following are some of the important statutes mentioned in the agreement which one will require to peruse and satisfy oneself upon:—

State Housing Act.

Public Works Act.

The Anglo-Persian Oil Coy. Limited's (Private) Act, 1919.

Fremantle Harbour Trust Act.

Fremantle Tramways Act.

We are expected to absorb the whole of those Acts and the import of the provisions of this agreement as well as the schedule to the Bill in five or six days. I appreciate the position of country members and if their feelings have to be taken into account it would be better to adjourn the debate until next Tuesday week. That is a reasonable proposition. If this Bill is passed and becomes an Act it is going to be of tremendous importance to the people of Western Australia. Yet when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks for an adjournment for one week, on a Bill which I suppose is one of the most important that this House has had to deal with—from the financial viewpoint at any rate, and the Minister for Works admits it—Government members hesitate to give us that week to study the agreement to enable us, if necessary, to take part in the debate and help to frame the Bill into an Act. It is not fair, and I take strong objection to any member of the Government saying that one member or two members on this side of the House can get the legal or technical advice that may be necessary.

The Attorney General: That was not the suggestion. I said any member.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I did not refer to the Attorney General. My remark was directed at the Minister for Education when I said I was surprised that there was such a modest adjournment as one week asked for. I do not propose to move for an adjournment until the 18th March, but I would sooner the debate were adjourned until that date unless some provision can be made for us to sit on Thursday. I hope Government members will not be adamant on the adjournment but will extend some courtesy to the Opposition so that we may have a reasonable opportunity of absorbing the provisions of the agreement.

Mr. J. HEGNEY (on amendment): I oppose the amendment because it limits the amount of time available to members of this House who will be called upon to vote in connection with the Bill. As has been pointed out, the Government has negotiated an agreement and Ministers of the inner Cabinet are conversant with it. The same position that applies to us will apply to members sitting on the other side of the House, because they would not have been conversant with the details until they got the Bill here tonight. I remember another agreement that was submitted to this House not so long ago. I refer to the kauri timber agreement. It came before Parliament and we were asked to give our assent to it. But when it was discussed here and the terms of the agreement were exposed, a Royal Commission was appointed and finally members on the other side of the House voted against the Minister's wishes. Yet here we have a Bill to which members are expected to address themselves in two or three days.

The Minister for Education and the Attorney General mentioned that the advice of the skilled officers and engineers and of the legal officers would be available to anybody who asked for it. In fact, there are only three days available to us because Saturday and Sunday intervene and Government offices are not open on those days. The Leader of the Opposition has unfortunately had to return to Northam and he would only have a couple of full days if the amendment were carried. The essence of the matter is that Parliament is the supreme body, and each of us is called upon and expected to give an intelligent vote on an important proposition of this kind. I submit members cannot do that until they have obtained a copy of the Minister's second reading speech. Members would then have to study the Bill and ascertain what it was all about, otherwise they would be casting a vote in the dark. Therefore there is little time available to members to know what is in the Bill and to cast an intelligent vote on it.

So far as the party of which I am a member is concerned, no doubt we will have to call a meeting for the purpose of discussing this matter and that cannot be done immediately. In the circumstances I think that the request of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a fair and reasonable one and should be agreed to. It is all right for Ministers who have their advisers at their beck and call and who have their speeches prepared for them so that they may read them in the House, but how can they expect us to know all about this matter? In the circumstances, we should have a little more time in which to consider the Bill. I know of two other Bills that were dealt with a couple of years ago in connection with which the Government had appointed a committee to investigate and report to it on the propositions involved. In the dying hours of the Parliament, Bills were placed before members, and I and the member for Guildford-Midland, as the two most directly interested, were told that the consideration of the measures would have to proceed on the following day. I refer to the Welshpool-Bassendean Railway Bill and the Bassendean Marshalling Yards Bill. Even the local authorities were denied the right to know what the legislation was about. The same position applies on this occasion.

Members knew nothing about the provisions of the agreement or the contents of the measure until the Minister spoke this evening. Members generally are entitled to know what is contained in a Bill, to be able to assess its merits and to understand how its provisions will affect the State. They are entitled to know whether any vital interests of the community are to be whittled away, and whether or not the powers sought should be handed over to the company concerned. Surely we are entitled to at least a week for consideration of the provisions of such a Bill. Parlia-

ment can be called together to deal with any important matter. It is quite understandable that it may be inconvenient for country members to attend on one day in a week, and to get over that difficulty the House could continue its sittings on Friday or even on Saturday. I oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	16

Majority for 7

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Brand	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Owen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Graham	Mr. Moir
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Needham
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Styants
Mr. May	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. Marshall
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Hoar

Amendment thus passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the words "Wednesday the 12th March" be inserted in lieu of the words struck out.

Amendment (to insert words) put and passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (KWINANA AREA).

Leave to Introduce, Etc.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I move, without notice—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorise, subject to special conditions, the acquisition of and dealing with certain land for an industry and for other purposes, and for incidental matters.

Question put and passed.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling) [9.16] in moving the second reading said: I think it can be truthfully said that the Bill may be described as the

corollary of the one that has just been introduced by the Minister for Works. It will, surely, be quite obvious to most members, especially when they give close consideration to the proposals that are contained in the other measure to which I have referred and the works and development involved in those proposals, that these undertakings are of such magnitude that it would be difficult to conceive just what they may bring in their train.

As the Minister for Works has already suggested in the course of his speech, it will be quite clear that in the areas surrounding the place where the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's refinery will be established, there will be a considerable aggregation of people and persons engaged in the various services. Those people will be entitled to expect what residents in any other area are entitled to expect. Further, because of the facilities that will be provided, such as roads, railways, electricity and water supplies and the like, this area and the country around it, particularly between Kwinana and the South Fremantle power station, will attract a considerable number of industries, both great and small.

It is, I would suggest, most difficult at the moment to conceive just what the actual effects will be, the types of industries that may be involved and the various trades, professions and occupations that may ensue as ancillaries to the considerable accumulation of people as well as to the industries themselves. I do know, however, that one of the earliest prospects, for example, would be that of another cement works, which everyone will agree is a most important matter and, if the negotiations that have been proceeding for some considerable time come to fruition, that industry itself will require land within the area defined in the schedule to the Bill which I am now introducing.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Have not you power under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: No; under that Act it would be impossible to do what is contemplated by this measure, but I shall deal with that point later on. Inquiries are being made already on behalf of other industries as to the possibility of establishing themselves within the industrial area comprised in the land set out in the schedule to this Bill, a clause in which excludes the land of the Commonwealth from the area and also excludes the land which is the subject of the agreement in the oil refinery industry Bill.

The reason for excluding the land included in the oil refinery industry Bill will be quite clear to members when they examine that measure because they will find that, in respect of the land required for that purpose, there are specific provisions for its acquisition and it is being made available to the company where acquisition is required. Some of it is Crown

land and it is within the competence of the State to deal with that land, but some of it is not.

The reference in the Bill excluding the land of the Commonwealth from the area will be obvious to members, firstly, because negotiations are proceeding between the State and the Commonwealth for the acquisition of Commonwealth land and those negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily; and, secondly, because the Commonwealth land that is not acquired by the State under these negotiations will be retained by the Commonwealth for the national purposes for which it is now held.

Therefore Commonwealth land has been excluded from the measure, but when the State does acquire the Commonwealth land desired—this is part of the area shown in the schedule—unless that land is covered by the oil refinery industry Bill it will become the property of the State, and the State will be able to deal with it as thought fit in the interests of industry. So this measure will have a greater application to land that comes in neither of those categories but is within the area defined in the schedule, and it is desirable, for reasons I shall give, that the State should have a considerable power of acquisition in respect to it.

The Government has given this matter very careful consideration and, in consequence of that consideration and the advice tendered to it, has decided that it is desirable immediately to put a brake upon any tendency to indulge in land speculation in this area. Clearly, unless some such action were taken, the possibility of speculators dealing in the land that should more properly be allocated to and made available for future industrial expansion would be very great.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I take it that the present holders of land will be dealt with equitably.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Yes; the hon. member will realise that we shall deal with them equitably because nobody would subscribe to a proposal that did not recognise the reasonable rights of holders. As an example of what could happen, I could mention an area of land in the vicinity, part of the country that is included in the schedule to this Bill, that three or four years ago was purchased for something under £1,000. It has been brought to my notice that the purchaser, who in the meantime has done nothing to the land, was asked to make a firm offer as to the price he would accept for the land for the purpose of industrial expansion and he suggested between £10,000 and £12,000.

As I have mentioned, nothing has been done to the land since it was purchased; certainly no building has been erected upon it. Of course, this has occurred in the early stages; it occurred before anything had actually happened; I think even before the announcement was made that an

agreement had been reached with the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. Thus there is a grave risk that speculation might run rife, and that would be undesirable from anybody's point of view.

Mr. J. Hegney: It would be a good principle to extend throughout the State.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I suggest to the member for Middle Swan that there are very few places indeed where circumstances such as have arisen in this particular area have occurred or are likely to occur. Nobody would have suggested that the normal practices should not prevail in this area, but for the extraordinary situation—certainly extraordinary for Western Australia and even for the greater part of Australia—that has arisen as a result of the tremendous expenditure contemplated by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company and the immense development, both in population and otherwise, that will no doubt result directly and indirectly from that expenditure.

So I suggest that while in the normal way it would be unnecessary in other parts of the State to contemplate such action as is proposed in the Bill, the Government has been wise to give consideration to this question in order that a reasonable level may be maintained and that everyone may be given a fair opportunity to acquire land in the area both immediately and in the future. As I have stated, it is impossible at this stage to determine just what the expansion is going to be.

Members are aware—and the member for Eyre has indicated by interjection that he was aware—that in 1945 Parliament passed the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act. That Act could apply anywhere in the State and, with certain very considerable restrictions and hedged around with all sorts of conditions, enabled land to be resumed for industrial purposes after private negotiations had failed; after the industrial committee had recommended; after the Minister for Lands had agreed; after the Treasurer had concurred; and after the owner of the land, if he felt so disposed, had appealed to a magistrate of the local court, whose decision was final.

That, I think, was sufficient in the ordinary normal way when speculation would not be rife; when, on a sudden, great changes were not taking place, although it is the opinion of the Department of Industrial Development that it has been too cumbersome even in those cases, and there have been instances where the department claims that the cumbersome nature of the provisions and the long delays involved, extending over weeks and sometimes months, have interrupted the expansion of minor industries. But there were not circumstances at any time which there are in this particular

area mentioned in the schedule to this Bill; and it can be said, therefore, that the Act of 1945 was achieving its purposes as far as one would wish normally to go.

Before I leave that question I might say that there have been cases that have been recommended by the committee, approved by the Minister and concurred in by the Treasurer, which have yet been turned down by the court. In one or two cases, I am advised, it has been a little hard to understand, seeing that the price offered was reasonable and the circumstances were in accordance with the intention of the Act, why the court came to its decision. But I am satisfied that for those normal types of cases the Act has operated fairly successfully and, in the ordinary way, should not be extended.

But the circumstances in which that Act was passed were entirely different from those which now face us, for the reasons I have given. The principle of this Bill is that within the areas shown in the schedule, between the time of the passing of the Act and the 31st December, 1953, the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister, may set apart or resume any part or parts of the land to which the Act applies as, in the opinion of the Minister, is or may be either immediately or in the future required for an industry, a public work or for any purpose of town planning mentioned in the First Schedule to the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928-1947. It will be noted that the provision contains the words "may be, either immediately or in the future, required for an industry."

The Bill provides that an industry includes any trade, profession or business because, as I indicated in my earlier remarks, it is considered that things which do not come within the definition of industry as commonly understood but which will provide services which may be required in those areas for a greatly expanded population, will have to be provided for. It is quite obvious that the same thought was in the minds of the promoters or introducers, in 1945, of the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, because in that instance industry includes every trade or business having for its object the manufacture of marketable products or things.

So it will be quite clear that both then and now industry was not and is not considered to include every trade or business. But whereas the Act of 1945 provides for trades or businesses which manufacture marketable products or things, in this Bill it is not proposed to impose such a restriction because it has to be taken for granted that various types of persons who do not manufacture but only serve the public with the necessities of life or the

services they require for congenial living should, if necessary, have land set apart for their activities, and the Government therefore considers they should be included.

It might be well also to refer to another purpose of town planning mentioned in the First Schedule of the Town Planning and Development Act. If members will look at that Act they will find that the First Schedule covers many things. It will be quite obvious that much will have to be done in the way of town planning in this area if, as one can reasonably anticipate, there will be, within a comparatively short period of years, 20,000 or 30,000 people within that area. As a matter of fact, it was with that thought in mind, in the event of the proposals then under discussion with the Anglo-Iranian Company coming to fruition, that the Government recently brought down the Bill to amend the Town Planning and Development Act. That Bill was designed to provide skilled and expert people to deal with a town planning emergency such as this, as well as the normal functions as set out in the measure, in the metropolitan district as now constituted. There was, of course at that time no certainty that this project of the oil company would proceed. It was, indeed, far from certain. But the reason why the provision was inserted covering not only the metropolitan district but any area adjacent thereto which the Government might declare was the fact I have mentioned.

So it will be quite obvious that many of the things that are provided for in the First Schedule to the town planning Act may have to be provided for and land reserved for them, and it is not unreasonable to suggest that it will take from now until the 31st December, 1953—a matter of 21 months—to arrive at even an estimate of the quantity and types of land that may have to be reserved for such purposes, quite apart from industry itself; and it will be quite clear that even if by the end of December, 1953, we arrive at a determination as to what land should be resumed or set apart, the use of it will not become operative for a further period of years which, at the moment, it is impossible to calculate. That is why the Bill has put it the way it is, namely, "as in the opinion of the Minister is or may be either immediately or in the future required." So, acting on the advice of the expert people and technical officers to whom I have referred, it will become the duty of the Minister to endeavour to assess the various eventualities and to proceed with the resumption of the land on behalf of the State.

Mr. W. Hegney: Have you any idea of the total acreage to be resumed under the Bill?

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: A great deal is Crown land. Much of it is Commonwealth land, some of which will come over to the State. So, only a fractional part of the area shown in the map will be open for actual resumption, but as it is scattered all over the place it is essential to define the area and give power to take the land as and when required. When it is decided to take any piece of land for any of these purposes, the Bill provides that such resumption or setting apart shall be in all respects as if the land were required for a public work, subject to this point, that the value of the land shall be regarded as the value on the 1st January, 1952.

This date appears to the Government, in all the circumstances of the case, to be fair to all parties. Prior to that time there was some suggestion that this expansion might take place; and shortly after that date it was announced that it would take place. It might be remembered that under the Public Works Act, if land is resumed before the 1st July in any year, the value at the preceding 1st January is to be taken as the value for compensation purposes. If it is resumed after the 1st July in any year the value as at the 1st July is taken. In this case, in view of the fact that the operation of the power given by the Bill can be effective only until the 31st December, 1953, it is considered that the Public Works Act should be varied, for the reasons I have already given, over the whole period back to the 1st January, 1952.

The Government considers that any value added to the land since the 1st January, 1952—unless of course it be in the nature of improvements, which I exclude from this argument—will be entirely due to the actual or prospective enhanced value as a result of the opening or the establishment of the oil industry and the enthusiasm resulting therefrom. So the datum point, for the reasons I have given, is fixed by the Bill as the 1st January. I think that is entirely fair. The Bill goes on to provide that any land set apart, taken or resumed under the Act thereafter may be reserved, used, developed, leased, sold, disposed of by the Minister or by him be permitted to be used or occupied upon such terms and conditions, including the reservation of restrictive covenants and for such rental, price or other consideration as the Minister, having regard to the industrial development of the area referred to in section 3 of the Act and of the State, thinks fit.

There is a definite resemblance between this clause and the section in the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, 1945, as to the taking of land under

that Act. There is something new, however, in the next clause of the Bill which provides—

The Minister shall, if required, issue a certificate in writing signed by him of any decision made, or any consent given by him under this Act, and judicial notice shall be taken of the certificate by courts and persons exercising judicial functions and by persons authorised to record transactions relating to land.

The Registrar of Titles, I understand, has argued that when land has been set apart under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, he is entitled to lodge a caveat against it so as to protect it pending its being disposed of according to law. But he has never had notification from anyone as to what has taken place. He has been obliged, if he has wanted to take action, to find out for himself what has occurred. Also the question has arisen as to how he could prevent the caveat being removed if anyone argued the point. So it is felt, for this reason among others, that the Minister should be able to give a certificate setting out the situation of which judicial notice could be taken, and notice also taken by such a person as the Registrar of Titles.

As the Minister can, under the Bill if it is passed, make conditions under which the land shall be leased or made available to anyone—he might for example say, "You can only have this land if you build a fellmongery thereon"—that should also be placed on record and evidence in writing provided so that the condition might be available to anyone who subsequently thought of dealing in the land with the person to whom it had been given. That is why it is suggested that the Minister, if required, shall give a certificate setting out the circumstances.

The next clause provides that the Minister may direct that the land shall not be mortgaged, or he may give his consent to a mortgage subject to conditions having regard to the industrial development mentioned in other parts of the Bill, if he thinks fit. But the situation will be that if the Minister does give his consent to a mortgage, which would naturally be for work to be done to improve the land, and subsequently the mortgagor made default so that the mortgagee had to call up his debt and exercise his power of sale under the Transfer of Land Act, the sale by the mortgagee thus made would not be subject to the condition that existed in the first place. It will be, as the Bill puts it—"freed from any condition, limitation or other restriction created or imposed by the Minister." One reason for that is that it is thought if the restriction were to continue it might, as I say, mean that the land

would have to be used only for the purposes of fellmongering, and it might be impossible for the mortgagee to find a fellmonger to buy the land; and so, with a condition of that sort hanging over his head it is unlikely that the mortgagee—particularly a banking institution—would desire to lend the money.

Another thing is that the provisions of the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act provide that nobody shall sell, mortgage, assign or encumber or otherwise part with the possession of such land without the consent in writing of the Minister, but there is no provision there exactly as in this clause. I am advised, in effect, that as soon as the power of sale is exercised by the mortgagee, even under that Act, the land ceases to be the subject of any condition imposed by the Minister, so rather than leave it in that uncertain state, and for the reason I mentioned earlier with regard to the financial position and the possibility of the mortgagee not desiring to lend money, with too many restrictive conditions that exist after default has been made by the borrower, it was thought advisable to state the position clearly in this Bill, and that has been done.

There is the same restriction in this measure against selling or disposing of the land without the consent of the Minister as is contained in the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, and the same type of penalty for the person who contravenes or attempts to contravene that provision. I heard somebody in the back benches murmur that there is too much of the Minister about it but there must be someone who shall determine these things. I do not think there is much risk of any rash or unjust decision being made in a matter of this kind because there has always been the strongest reluctance, except in the most necessary circumstances, to resume land. I, personally, feel that this is a power which must be used very carefully and I know that in the run of the years and under successive Governments the power has been used carefully or under express Act of Parliament such as that introduced a year or more ago with regard to the Bassendean railway, which set out just where the land was to be resumed.

I do not fear that any unwise or indiscriminate attempt at resumption will be made, but I submit that if power is not afforded to provide land for these various purposes at a fair value to enable people to be reasonably certain that they can acquire their needs in this area in proximity to power, light, roads and so on, our industrial development, which has hitherto been a little higgledy piggledy, will become violently so and, what is perhaps worse, persons who deserve little or nothing from the State will make large sums of money for doing precisely nothing except to let everybody else develop these indus-

tries. While I do not desire to take from any man what he possesses without paying him ample compensation, I do not think it is the business of the State, in these circumstances which are extraordinary and unprecedented, to allow unrestricted speculation to go on in an area such as this.

For so long as I am Minister in charge of this legislation—if I am Minister when it becomes an Act—I assure the House that it will be administered with discretion and to the best of my ability and the ability of those who advise me, in order to ensure that provision is made for the future development and expansion of this area and the requirements of the people who are likely to settle in it because of the developments that are taking place there. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. T. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Wednesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 12th March, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Swearing-in of members	1909
Questions : Housing, as to building of State homes	1909
Cement, as to supply and distribution	1909
Motion : Dairying industry, as to development of substandard farms	1909
Adjournment, special	1913

The **PRESIDENT** took the chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

SWEARING-IN OF MEMBERS.

The **PRESIDENT**: I am prepared to administer to members, who were not present at the previous sitting, the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Hon Sir Charles Latham (Central Province) and Hon. F. R. Welsh (North Province) took and subscribed the oath.

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING.

As to Building of State Homes.

Hon. G. FRASER asked the Minister for Transport:

When does the Government intend to commence the building of the long-awaited and long-promised State Housing homes?

The **MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE** replied:

The Government has already commenced the building of homes under the State Housing Act. The extent of operations is governed by the amount of loan funds available.

CEMENT.

As to Supply and Distribution.

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

(1) What quantity of locally manufactured cement has the Government used for all purposes since the 1st November, 1951?

(2) Is the Government aware that many local authorities are unable to secure supplies of locally manufactured cement to carry out essential road repairs and maintenance?

(3) Can the Minister give an indication of when supplies of locally manufactured cement will be available to country local authorities to carry out essential works?

The **MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE** replied:

(1) 2,323 tons.

(2) Yes.

(3) No. The Government has had to substantially augment its supplies of local cement with imported cement. In addition, it is pointed out that the quantity drawn by the Government from the local works was in respect of the Wiluna plant, the installation of which was finalised by the Government.

MOTION—DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

As to Development of Substandard Farms.

HON. C. H. HENNING (South-West) [4.40]: I move—

That in view of the serious decline in production of the dairying industry in this State this House recommends to the Government that a scheme for the development of substandard dairy farms be formulated and proceeded with without delay.

In the first place, I desire to deal generally with the problem and then gradually to confine my remarks to the smaller areas