

sociation, these were put into a form to the satisfaction of both companies. They then formed a partnership so that they could operate in conjunction rather than in opposition, the object of the company being, of course, to make the whole co-operative movement function on a co-operative basis for the benefit of those dairy farmers who believe in trading on co-operative lines. When we went into the details of registering the partnership we found there was no provision in the Act permitting of a partnership formed of two co-operative companies being registered. At the request of both the partners under the agreement I made representations to the Attorney General, and he has kindly brought in this Bill. It is a matter that requires attention because we desire to complete our registration. I suppose to-day we are producing from 600 to 1,000 cases of butter per week more than can be consumed in the State. In anticipation of the lean portion of the year, a considerable quantity is in cold storage. Of the total production of butter in this State, about 75 per cent. is produced co-operatively.

Mr. Withers: Exactly 83 per cent. of the butter produced in the State is controlled by the co-operative movement.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Very well; 83 per cent. I am glad to have it confirmed. When I speak of its being produced co-operatively, it is produced on what is known throughout the world as the Rochdale system, which was the original co-operative system introduced by the Rochdale weavers many years ago and has been generally in practice in Great Britain, where it has built up a huge co-operative system which has extended to other parts of the world. Western Australia is highly thought of in the Old Country; so much so that a great deal of our finance is provided by the Co-operative Wholesale Society Bank of Great Britain in regard to quite a number of concerns. It was considered that at the peak period we might have as much as £70,000 worth of butter in cold storage over and above our sales.

Mr. Parker: Is all this related to the Bill?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. As I say, £70,000 had to be paid, and we had to make representations to the bank for the purpose of getting the money so that it might be distributed to the cream suppliers. We com-

municated with the Co-operative Wholesale Society Bank in Great Britain offering to pay them 6 per cent. for the money. For the information of the member for North-East Fremantle I may say we nominated the interest rate at 6 per cent., but they replied stating that the money would be available at 5½ per cent. That is the kind of co-operative spirit we are fostering in a Bill such as this. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Mr. Panton called attention to the state of the Committee. Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Clauses 2, 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 18th November, 1930.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	1791
Bills: Vexatious Proceedings Restriction, 3rd., passed	1792
Roads Closure, recom.	1792
Reserves, Com., recom.	1792
Evidence Act Amendment, report	1803
Resolution: State forests, to revoke	1803
Motion: Collie power scheme	1806

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read, notifying assent to the Parliamentary Allowances Amendment Bill.

BILL—VEXATIOUS PROCEEDINGS RESTRICTION.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Minister for Country Water Supplies, Bill recommitted for the purpose of considering a new clause.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Minister for Country Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move—

That the following be added to the Bill to stand as Clause 7:—“That portion of Miriam-street in the North Fremantle municipal district extending from the eastern side of Bracks-street to the western side of Napier-street is hereby closed, and all rights-of-way over the same shall cease on the passing of this Act, and the land comprised therein is hereby revested in His Majesty as of His former estate.”

The object of the new clause is to save the necessity of introducing another Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: I should be glad if progress could be reported, as I desire to look into the new clause.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The new clause affects Mr. Fraser's district, and I agree that in such circumstances an hon. member should have an opportunity of looking into the matter.

Progress reported.

BILL—RESERVES.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 13th November; Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, the Minister for Country Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move—

That the following be added to the Bill to stand as Clause 15:—“All that portion of Class ‘A’ Reserve 6161 for reforestation, at

Yandil Siding, as described in the Fourth Schedule, is hereby excluded from such reserve to the intent that the land may be disposed of under the provisions of the Land Act, 1898, and amendments.”

The reserve referred to in the new clause should be thrown open in order that better use may be made of it.

New clause put and passed.

First, Second and Third Schedules—agreed to.

New Schedule:

On motion by the Minister for Country Water Supplies the following was added to the Bill to stand as the Fourth Schedule: “All that portion of Class ‘A’ Reserve 6161 bounded by lines starting from a point on the north boundary of Nelson Location 6687 situate about 14 chains from its north-east corner, and extending north-westward about 25 chains; thence north-eastward to the western side of a road passing along the western boundary of the Bridgetown railway reserve; thence along the said side of road north-westward for a distance of about 20 chains; thence south-westward about 22 chains; and thence south to the north boundary of Nelson Location 6687 aforesaid; and thence east along the latter about 37 chains 50 links to the starting point. (Area about 76 acres.) All bearings and distances being approximate and subject to survey.”

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with further amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 12. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Minister for Country Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

Clause 12—Portion of King's Park reserve to be set apart for water supply purposes:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That all words after “schedule” in line 3 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—“may be leased to the Minister controlling the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department for a period not exceeding twenty-one years: Provided that the terms and conditions of such lease shall be subject to the approval of the Governor.”

When Reserves Bills are brought down, members generally like to know the opinion of the local authorities on the subject. In this instance, the opinion of the local authority was given here by four members of that authority, namely, the King's Park Board. Nevertheless, in a thin Committee—I doubt if members realised the position—and against the wishes of that board members voted for the retention of the clause. If the park was to be interfered with against the desires of the board I for one would not continue a member of the board. That board consists of Mr. Nicholson, Sir William Lathlain, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Collier, Mr. Poole, Mr. Saw, and myself. The board desire that, whatever uses the park may be put to for public convenience, the whole of the park shall remain intact for the people forever, as it was set apart by the late Lord Forrest. For 40 years that policy has been adhered to. We have had a great deal of difficulty in carrying out our work, for year after year we have had to collect money in order to keep the park going. We have had no desire whatever to impede any public utility. The evidence of that is seen in the fact that the Water Supply Department, without any possession of the land, has already a pipe line running through the park to the reservoirs, and another main running from the reservoirs through the park, and that without any legal possession of the land, which is still under the control of the board. There are there two reservoirs built on park land over which the department have no legal control. Then there is a valve house in the park, outside the department's area altogether. In the early days the Perth Waterworks Company, run by Mr. McNeil and Mr. George, had a small reservoir up there and obtained the freehold for that reservoir. That alone is the freehold site which the department has within the park to-day. When the last reservoir was built the board offered no objection, and the Water Supply Department, taking full advantage of that attitude, began the construction of the reservoir and lodged all their spoil from the wall down there on the road, which is just at the point where there is a clump of pine trees. They swamped those pine trees with the spoil. The park board insisted upon the spoil being removed. Had the department held the freehold, the park board could have done nothing, and

the park would have been materially injured and the road rendered useless. Now for some reason or other there is a particular desire on the part of the department to get a little piece of land down on Mount's Bay-road, which is in portion of the park reserve, for the purpose of a new bore and a new pump house. The Minister said the other day the object was to have control over £25,000 worth of expenditure. That is not quite correct, because the bore and the pump house will not cost anything like £25,000, an amount which includes also the water mains. If members grant the freehold to this small piece of land where the pump house and the bore will be, they must also grant under another Bill the land to carry the pipeline to the waterworks.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: No; the department can run pipe lines anywhere. They have that power under the Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: They cannot run pipe lines through King's Park. That point has been definitely settled. However, we need not worry about that. But the natural corollary to granting the land for the pumping house and the bore will be to grant also land for the pipe line. And if land be granted for the pipe line, the board will have no control over that. What will happen is what we know is going to happen and what is at the back of the objection we have to the granting of this area. The department have the use of the land now, for the bore is down a good distance, and they have also their other conveniences in the park, which are of benefit to the public; but if members grant the department this small piece of land, this area will be further encroached upon. When the original waterworks were constructed, the reservoir was scoured out once a year. At that time it was mostly hills water in the reservoir, and so the sludge coming from it was rather of benefit to the park, for it brought down the clayey hills soil. However, since then the reservoirs have been enormously increased in capacity and, not hills water, but bore water poured into them. This bore water, having a temperature of about 105 degrees, has proved excellent for the growth of algae, which develops to the extent of about six tons to the reservoir. So from time to time the department's employees have

rowed about in a boat on the reservoir with a bag of sulphate of copper with which to kill the algae. The algae is then gradually precipitated to the bottom and has to be cleaned out. During the last three or four years the park board have been complaining to the department about the setting down of that sludge in the park. There is only one outlet pipe, and the stuff flows down the hill and right across to the children's playground. In 1928 the board complained, and in 1929 definitely asked the department to do something. But still the department let out the sludge. The public complained bitterly, and some people walking from the children's playground near Havelock Street, went up to their knees in this filthy sludge and, naturally, blamed the park board. We had to cover it over with sand. Nothing will grow on this sludge; wherever it flows, there we get a bare patch. This year, when the sludge pipe was opened the clear water came out first and went right across the area to the children's playground and close to the bowling green. Superintendent Heath told me what was happening, and I instructed him to stop the pipe. The department said they would put the stuff where they liked, and I had to threaten to take out an injunction to stop them. The Minister for Works (Mr. Lindsay) came up and looked into the matter, and was very reasonable about it. He said the sludge must be buried in a trench. The result was that the Water Supply Department dug a trench at a cost of about £80 and ran into it some 200 to 300 cubic yards of the filth. The idea was to sell it as fertiliser after leaving it exposed for a week. There were no buyers for the fertiliser and it had to be covered over with sand.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do they blame you for that £80 expenditure?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was merely in a position of trust, having control of the park, and it remained for me to do my job and not permit 200 or 300 yards of filthy sludge to run over the children's playground right on towards the bowling green. Following on that, a letter was received from the Water Supply Department in which it was set out that they desired an area of land on which in future they could put this sludge. The area could be only in the one place, that is lower levels to which the water could gravitate, and in November last this reply

was sent to the Minister by the King's Park Board:—

At a meeting of my board held on the 6th inst., I was directed to advise that your request for a transfer of some portion of the park lands be transferred to your department for the purpose of disposal of waste water and sludge from the reservoirs, could not be acceded to. You will recognise that the trenches dug this year and now filled with sludge cannot again be used, and each year extra land will be required and the cost of digging new trenches incurred. This land will only be required on the north or low-lying land which extends to the King's Park-road and my board cannot agree, nor would the general public approve, of this fine area of land being made a waste area. In the opinion of my board the first cost of conveying the sludge and waste through pipes to some area near Crawley would be the cheapest in the long run and obviate any need to use up any more of the park lands.

That is what the King's Park Board is fearful of if we allow the thin end of the wedge to be driven in. The board may be gone to-morrow by a stroke of the pen; the Government can get rid of the board and I have no doubt it would if the board acted perversely or did what was unreasonable. We fear that if this proposal now being considered is granted unconditionally, the next encroachment will be that suggested in reply to the letter which I have just read to the House. There must be something behind this otherwise this early application would not have been made for the freehold of the land. There is being spent, between the bore and the power house something like £5,000. Before the bore is completed and before potable water is obtained, money is being spent on building the power house. Those of us who have been here for some time know well that there are various artesian zones around the metropolis. Some supply good potable water. The bores around the river will not give good potable water; at any rate none has been given up to the present. A bore was put down at the Causeway and the money involved in sinking it was lost. A bore was put down at the cricket ground and the water it yielded was not fit for human consumption, though it has been used for watering the cricket ground. A bore was put down at the railway yards. That, too, was closed down. A bore was sunk in Wellington-street at the back of the old waterworks office. That also was shut down. A bore was sunk at South Perth and it gave highly mineralised

water said to have good curative properties. Two bores were put down at Osborne Park to a depth of 800 feet and when water began to flow it seemed to be good, but after it was pumped and allowed to stand for a while, it was unfit for human consumption. The use of the water from that bore had to be discontinued. In those instances pumping stations were built and the money spent on them was lost.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: What is the total amount spent on the bores?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot tell the hon. member, but I know the sum is considerable. The cricket ground bore, for instance, cost without the pumping plant, £1,500, whilst the bore at South Perth cost £2,000. I am not suggesting that this latest bore will not supply good water. They are down already 800 feet and apparently they have struck good water, but it may become unfit for human consumption by being oxygenised. I understand it is intended to go to a further depth. I watched the putting down of the cricket ground bore and found that it went through sea bed after sea bed and even after 800 feet or 900 feet there was struck decomposed sea-weed. Probably the same thing will occur at this latest bore along Mount's Bay-road. However, what I desire is that the Committee will not permit the Water Works Department to have practically the fee simple of this land in the park.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What do you fear?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I fear the ruination of the park which some of us, for 30 or 40 years past, have done our utmost, regardless of time and expense, to convert into a beauty spot for the benefit of the community. So as not to block the bore, I am proposing to amend Clause 12 to give the King's Park Board power, which it has not to-day, to lease the area to the Water Works Department. The department can want nothing more than that unless there be an ulterior motive. I submit the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: On the second reading I unfortunately made a misstatement through having been supplied with wrong information, and I am taking this opportunity of correcting what I said. I am very careful in respect of what is supplied to me, my desire being that all the information I give to the House shall be absolutely correct. I told the House that the

King's Park Board had agreed to give so much land away for the widening of Mount's Bay Road. The information should have been that the board were prepared to remove part of the cliffs so as to enable the road to be widened.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What we want to know is, why should the water works people have the freehold and not the leasehold of this bit of land?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: On Thursday last I think I was more than generous to Sir William Lathlain, Mr. Lovekin, and Mr. Franklin. I fully realised that Mr. Lovekin would not accept the decision of the Committee. I have been long enough in the House to know that he will keep on barking to gain the desired end. On Friday morning I took the opportunity to make an inspection of the site of the bore and also the locality over which the sludge was emptied. Sir William Lathlain told us that the engineer for the Water Supply Department desired a residence and that a slice of the park had to be alienated for a site for that residence. The hon. member could not have been aware of the true position.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The house is there; I know that.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The residence of the officer in charge of the reservoir is really on a reserve that belonged to the City of Perth Water Supply Company, and no portion was taken from King's Park. That reserve was arranged before King's Park Board came into existence. Further than that, what is the water supply plant there for but for the benefit of the taxpayers of the metropolitan area. It will readily be understood why the alienated site was reserved at that time for the taxpayers themselves; it was to secure the fall for the water. In that respect hon. members will realise that the reservation of the small area of land was to provide for the interests of the ratepayers, who are identical with the taxpayers represented by some hon. members here. For the information of Mr. Nicholson, who said that the engineer was not living in the residence now, I can inform him that the engineer in charge of the reservoir is in residence there.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Mr. Parr is not there.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Sir William Lathlain

also said one would imagine the Water Supply Department had given the King's Park Board no trouble, and that in the first instance a large area was wanted for the reservoir site, and the board had willingly granted that, because it was to serve the interests of the people. Before I conclude my remarks I shall prove to hon. members that, contrary to Sir William's statement, it has been the King's Park Board who have caused whatever friction there has been, and not the Water Supply Department. In 1910 an area of 6.4 acres was added to that reserve under an agreement with the King's Park Board, and in consideration of the transfer an allowance of 12 million gallons of water per annum was granted to the King's Park Board. That was rather a substantial allowance in exchange for a few acres of land that was required to serve the interests of the people.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It was a good deal.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The value of that allowance of water is estimated at £450 per annum. A further allowance of eight million gallons of water was granted to the board in 1917 at their request, as a further measure of assistance in the maintenance of the park. The annual value of the water, allowing 9d. per 1,000 gallons, granted to the park since the first agreement was entered into, amounts to £13,530. That is a jolly good price for 6.4 acres of land there.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That price of 9d. is wrong; you are not correct.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I want the Committee to understand that the information I am giving has been taken from the files of the department.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There was a lease.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: After all, I can understand Mr. Lovekin's statement, when I remember the explanation of some of his other statements here! At any rate, I think hon. members will agree that that concession represented a substantial grant to the King's Park Board and that generous consideration has been extended to them. Certainly it will show that the board have not been over-generous as Sir William Lathlain suggested. However, the benefits gained by the King's Park Board did not end there,

for the board receive as their portion of the traffic fees, an amount of £1,691 per annum.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What has that to do with this question?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: In addition there is the annual grant towards the maintenance of the park of £2,400.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What has that to do with the Water Supply Department's proposal?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: It has a lot to do with it.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: If the Government took over the park themselves, what would it cost them?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I shall deal with the hon. member in due course. Here we have the King's Park Board who receive benefits representing £17,621 annually, refusing to give a small area to the Water Supply Department, although the area concerned is practically useless to the park. Sir William Lathlain also said that there had been no alienations from the park for many years past, except those in which the Water Supply Department was concerned. He said it was true that in the early days concessions had been granted to the High School, and to the bowling and tennis clubs, but during the last 10 years no alienation of any part of the park had taken place. It is perhaps well to remind the hon. member that three years ago the board, rightly so—I certainly agree with their action on that occasion—agreed to the excision of certain parts of the park in order to widen King's Park Road and Thomas Street, and also surrendered some land so that a circus could be constructed at the top of Malcolm Street. I commend the board for having arrived at that decision, and yet we are told that no alienation of land has taken place there in the last 10 years!

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: That was only transferring land to the Government.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It was a public matter.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: And so is the transfer of land in this instance. Public money is to be spent by the Water Supply Department, and yet the King's Park Board oppose the excision of about one-eighth of

an acre of the park! Doubt has been raised regarding the widening of Mount's Bay Road. Mr. Franklin said that the alienation of the land would affect the proposal to widen Mount's Bay Road. He said it had been suggested it would not have that effect, but he believed it would. I am absolutely astonished at the hon. member making such a statement, seeing that, as Lord Mayor of Perth, he took part at the conference which dealt with this very question. The fact must have escaped his memory.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: I did not take part in any conference with regard to putting the bore down at that spot. The conference dealt with the widening of Mount's Bay Road.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The hon. member said that this proposal would interfere with the widening of Mount's Bay Road.

Hon. C. B. Williams: At any rate, the hon. member's responsibility has ceased, because his term of office as Lord Mayor has practically expired.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I made an inspection of the site on Friday last and I found that there is a little cliff at the back of the buildings where the bore is situated. The workers had to cut into the hillside where the slope is low, so as to get the building far enough back, and to keep a good distance from the roadway. I found that the alignment of the building is 40 feet back from the road as it exists to-day, and that when the new road is constructed, seeing that it can go only 10 feet further in, the buildings will still be 30 feet from the alignment of the new roadway. It will not be possible to extend the alignment of the road beyond 10 feet further in, because of the cliff that juts out at the corner. So that hon. members may have a better opportunity to appreciate the position, I have available for them here a plan of the site, showing where the bore is and how the cliff juts out towards the proposed new roadway. I have gone further than that, and secured photographs taken from different angles, showing clearly that the site will not interfere with the new roadway when it is extended. It also shows the position of the cliff.

Hon. A. Lovekin interjected.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I was very patient when listening to the speeches of hon. mem-

bers, although I disagreed with practically all their statements. It is surely not too much to ask them to be patient while I reply to their remarks. Bearing on this question, I shall read a report from the Town Planning Commissioner, which deals with what took place at the conference I have referred to—

When it was decided to augment the water supply of the city, the Engineer-in-Chief conferred with me regarding the site selected by him to meet the engineering requirements at a minimum of cost. The aspects that concerned me were—(a) the future widening of Mount's Bay Road; (b) the necessity for the bore, tank and pump to be in the least conspicuous place; (c) the preservation of convenience and amenity of the King's Park. Investigation showed that all these requirements were met at the selected site. Any widening of Mount's Bay Road will take place on the river or southern side of the road, principally on account of the steep ground of the park west of the bore coming sharply to the northern building line of the road. A number of proposals for widening Mount's Bay Road in the vicinity of the brewery were considered by the following at a conference called by the Hon. the Minister for Lands:—Mr. Forbes (representing the Swan Brewery), the Surveyor General, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Town Planning Commission, the Lord Mayor, the Town Clerk, the City Engineer, and the Town Planning Commissioner. Alternatives were discussed and it was agreed that any major widening would have to be on the river side of the road and that engineering considerations would limit any widening on the park side to a distance that would not interfere with the bore or the steep park lands. These points are illustrated on the photographs herewith. I can therefore assure the Hon. the Minister that the bore is in the best position, as—1, It is the cheapest site for the constructional and engineering requirements; 2, It will not prevent any future widening of Mount's Bay-road; 3, It will create a minimum of disturbance to the King's Park, and 4, It will not disfigure the park or cause inconvenience therein, permanently.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: Can I ask the Minister to say—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot do so now; he will have an opportunity to speak later on.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: We have heard a lot about the sludge from the reservoir and I have heard a great deal about it privately. I made an inspection of the park on Friday to see what had actually happened. I think hon. members will agree that I know something about agriculture and the growth of fodder. I made a thorough inspection of

the site, and I found no portion where the sludge had been, where there was not a rich growth of fodder, while surrounding it was the hungry sand, which grows nothing but impoverished bush. There was no indication of what Mr. Lovekin stated was the result of the spread of the sludge in the past.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You are not referring to where the sludge went.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The results I indicate were made by the sludge itself, and hon. members can test that statement for themselves. They will see, if they bend back the growth of fodder there, that there is a good clay soil from the reservoir. The statement was made by Sir William Lathlain that bluestone had been mixed with the water. I am informed by a departmental engineer that if an analytical chemist were to analyse the water, in which a small proportion of bluestone is mixed, he would probably be unable to find a trace of it, so little is there of the bluestone put in. There is no indication anywhere in the park that the sludge has done the slightest damage to vegetation.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Did you dig up the soil to see for yourself?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Dig up the soil to see whether vegetation was growing on top of it! If the King's Park Board were seized with the possibilities of the position, they would be glad to make more use of the sludge and so improve a greater area of the park.

Hon. V. Hamersley: In any case, the park is to be conserved in the interests of the State as a whole.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Mr. Lovekin stated that he had taken the Minister for Works (Mr. Lindsay) through the park to show him where the water had done damage to the area. I may point out that there is a difference of opinion at this stage, particularly regarding what Mr. Lindsay may have said. I well remember Mr. Lindsay coming into the office in a towering rage, and saying "There is a doubt about a few pounds' worth of fodder, which I offered to buy from Mr. Lovekin for £10, which is five times what it is worth, and he has forced me into an expenditure of £80 of the taxpayers' money." He repeated that statement to me a few minutes ago behind the

President's dais. The whole crop of fodder there cannot be worth more than £2.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are not talking about the value of the fodder.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: On top of that, the Government have had to pay some of the metropolitan taxpayers' money by spending £50 on digging a drain to convey the sludge away, which ordinarily would have manured the ground.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Well, why don't you try to sell it?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Mr. Lovekin disputed my statement when I spoke of the Government having power to put in a pipe line. The pipe line has been put there without proclaiming the land, which still belongs to the people. The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act, Section 24, contains the following:—

For the construction, extension, maintenance, repair, alteration or improvement of any works, the Minister and all persons acting with his authority may enter upon any land and . . . (c) construct, alter and maintain under any street, and through, across or under any land, aqueducts, flumes, pipes or other works necessary for conveying water.

King's Park is a Class A reserve and is controlled by the board. The Government are asking for a little corner which is of no use for any other purpose. The Government desire the land for a water supply for Perth, and I am advised that it is not for to-day or to-morrow, but that so long as Perth exists, it will be necessary to depend upon bore water to a large extent. The bore has been carried down to 820 feet and there is a flow of water exceeding 1,000,000 gallons per day. The water is a little warm. I drank three-parts of a mugful and noticed a little mineral in it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Quite right, so did I.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Thousands of people in the country would be glad of a water supply much worse than that. The bore is to be carried down to 2,200 feet. There is no doubt on the part of the responsible officers. They feel absolutely sure, as they were when they started boring, of reaching a satisfactory water supply at that depth.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What about the other bores?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I am explaining

the position regarding this bore. The original estimate of the cost was £25,000. Since the work has been in hand it has been possible to purchase requirements more cheaply than was anticipated and the amended cost is as follows:—Bore, £7,012; rising main, £3,726; suction tank, £1,455; pump house, £2,172; foundation specials, £1,629; pumps and motors, £2,032; total, £18,026. The three bores at Osborne Park, to which the hon. member referred the other day, cost £9,708, an average of £3,236 each. The average depth of those bores is 670 feet. There is a vast difference between that depth and 2,200 feet. The total cost of the Osborne Park bores, including pumping mains, suction tanks, etc., was £24,046, and the maximum yield is 2,285,000 gallons per day. The King's Park bore is estimated to produce as much as those three combined. The Government are spending more than £18,000 of the taxpayers' money. The taxpayers of the metropolitan area are responsible for the metropolitan water supply.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And they object to bore water.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: They have to take whatever water that can be supplied. Surely, when their money is invested to that extent on a small bore site, only one-eighth of an acre out of a 1,000-acre park, Parliament should ensure that the Government have full control of the area.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What is the objection to a lease?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: It would have to be reconsidered at the termination of the period, 21 years hence. Mr. Lovekin will not then be on the board, and there might be a cantankerous board who would say to the Government, "Go off the land." Many members here and in another place favour the metropolitan supply being placed under a board or trust.

Members: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I do not think the day is far distant when it will be placed under a board or trust. That being so, members should visualise the trouble that might arise between such a body and the King's Park Board. There might be a repetition of the trouble we have had over the sludge, the correspondence on which does not reflect credit on the King's Park Board. Mr. Lovekin, in speaking the other day,

asked, "What if the board refused the pipe line?" I ask members to appreciate the position that £18,000 of the money of metropolitan taxpayers has been invested in that small piece of land, and the expenditure should be protected. When the Government began the work, they did not contemplate any refusal on the part of the King's Park Board.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Why not a lease?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Why cannot the State get back part of its own land?

Hon. A. Lovekin: The people have it now; that is why it is a Class A reserve.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The Government are out to protect the taxpayers. It is a small piece of land required for public purposes, and Parliament should authorise its excision from the park as proposed in the Bill. I hope the clause will be retained.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Many of the statements made by the Minister are hardly relevant. Many questions are involved, but I am concerned with only one, namely the permanent occupation by the Water Supply Department of the portion of King's Park in question. The Minister said the bore was to be permanent, and that the people of the metropolitan area must expect a supply of bore water for all time. Notwithstanding the Minister's statement, the people of Perth are not prepared to take bore water for all time.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: If it is not possible to get a sufficient supply of potable water from the Canning scheme, there are other streams to be tapped. The first right of every city is to a good supply of potable water. Those people who have had any experience of the bore water know that it is, to say the least, unsatisfactory. I was rather surprised that the Minister should question my statement that no portion of the park area had been excised for a considerable time. He referred to the fact that excisions had been made for widening King's Park-road, Thomas-street, and at the University endowment lands. The Minister said he agreed with what had been done there. That being so, why should he find fault? Those excisions were made in the interests of the ratepayers, which he stressed so much, and not to give particular people rights over portions of the park. The

Minister has endeavoured to make a strong point of the agreement between the King's Park Board and the Water Supply Department regarding the supply of water. I think he was wrong in computing the value of the water at 9d., because the files show that it was to be 6d. A more important fact for members to know is that, previous to the construction of the reservoir in King's Park, the board drew their water supplies from a well fed by a spring at the foot of the cliff. It was a fine supply of water, and a small engine was used to pump it over the cliff. When the agreement was made with the department, we had to discontinue using the spring water and had to use the water supplied by the department. The Minister has stressed the opinion of the Town Planning Commissioner. I am not concerned about that, or about the widening of King's Park-road. The vital point is that I do not believe the bore will be there for all time, and if the area is permanently granted to the department, when the bore is no longer required, the land will probably become a store yard for pipes and refuse. Everyone realises that the cottages on Mount's Bay-road belonging to the Swan Brewery must go to permit of the widening of the road. Apart from the question of widening the road, they would have to be removed to permit of the beautification of that section. Although the area where the bore is situated is very unsightly, further along the park has been beautified and is one of the prettiest spots in the city. The board have constructed steps and terraces and have taken great interest in beautifying that most difficult section of the park. A lease of 21 years will give the Government all they require.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What lease are you giving to the bowling and tennis clubs?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: We are not giving them any lease. We could put them out to-morrow if we cared to do so. The Government are already in occupation of this strip of land, and have their plant and concrete upon it. We are prepared to allow them to go on in that way, but they now want to go further.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It is a waste of time to discuss this matter.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is ratepayers' money.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If £18,000 is available to spend on water conservation, it ought to be spent in the country, say in my province.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You have had millions spent in your province.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Most of the borrowed money has been spent in an around Perth, but any money spent on the goldfields water scheme has been repaid and the State is now existing on it. Perth has been beautified at the expense of my province.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: It is the other way about.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It is a question of the Government or the King's Park Board. The board offer a lease of 21 years to the Government. I am not prepared to grant a lease of this land to anyone. If one is granted to the Government, the sporting bodies will be applying for the same sort of thing. Whilst I admire the work the board are doing, I must say that the chairman, Mr. Lovekin, is becoming rather autocratic. He is beginning to think the board own the park. The sooner they understand it belongs to the people, the better. Are the board afraid that the Water Supply Department will close down the bore and ultimately sell the land? There must be some reason for the opposition to the Government taking control of this block. I should certainly like to hear more about that side of the business.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Williams should understand that this is Crown land now. The £18,000 is to be spent on land which is already under the control of the Government. We offer the Government the use of that land for as long as they please, but do not want them to transfer it to the Water Supply Department. The bore may peter out, or the water may prove unfit for consumption. What then will happen to the land? The Minister has based his statement on information received from the department. It is not all correct. With regard to the traffic fees received by the board I remind the Minister that the Government of which he was a member refused to grant to the board at a time when the roads were going to pieces. Members of the board had to put up their own money, because users of the roads were down in sand. The Collier Government then came along and said we were entitled to a share of the traffic fees in order to maintain the roads, and as a result we have received a grant every year from that source. The result can be seen in the roads themselves. The £2,400 is paid

away in wages, and the rest of the expenditure on horse feed, etc., is made up out of what we can collect from the public and the friends of the park. We are doing the best we can for that reserve, and we want to keep it as it should be kept. If the Government think we are doing wrong, they can get rid of us by a stroke of the pen. There is no valid reason for transferring the land from the board, which, in a sense, is a Government department, to another Government department. The board are there for all time, but the Water Supply Department may be merged into a trust and carry with them the freehold of all public lands over which they have jurisdiction. I do not like criticising departmental officers, and will not say anything that is not borne out by the facts. A select committee inquired into the Churchman's Brook scheme. Members know what a fiasco that enterprise has been. It was put in hand at the instance of departmental engineers. One of them is now recommending this particular proposal in collaboration with an engineer for the Goldfields Water Supply. These officers put up a paper dealing with the Mundaring Weir. The basis of that paper was that the weir was waterlogged. When the matter came before the select committee, we said if that was the state of the weir, the sooner we looked into the question and ascertained the facts the better would it be for the country. A paper was put up by the two engineers for the engineers' society at Home saying that they had put down three bores, that the bores had deflected water outside the wall into clay below in the reservoir, and that the water had raised the bore holes. On that thesis the officers received some credit from the body of engineers at Home. As Mr. Collier has said, monuments, costing many thousands of pounds, to the incapacity of engineers can be found all over the country. Mr. Williams said, "Look at the Goldfields Water Supply; it has paid its way." It never did pay its way. There was a sinking fund of three per cent. to be provided annually, and every year the sinking fund was paid out of revenue. However, this scheme is provided not by the general body of taxpayers, but by the ratepayers of the metropolitan area solely. It is making a profit, and the Government at present are using that profit for their own revenue purposes instead of ap-

plying it to the waterworks. The Government having appointed a board to control the King's Park, will the Committee of this House now say that there is no confidence in the board, but that there is confidence in the Water Supply Department and that therefore this land is to be handed over to the department? At the same time, it can make no difference to the country, because this will still be a Class A reserve and Crown land, with which the Government can do as they like. I shall only carry on as a member of the King's Park Board as long as I have the confidence of those with whom I am associated. We say to the Water Supply Department, "If you want to get some title to this land, take a lease and let the land revert to the board when the time comes, when the bore peters out or the water proves unpotable." Under the amendment the land will always be Crown land for the benefit of the people.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I support Mr. Lovekin's amendment, and consider that the members of the King's Park Board deserve the thanks of the people for the manner in which they look after the park. The park is a Class A reserve, which is to be there for all time. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment and thus retain the park permanently.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I support Mr. Lovekin's amendment. Although I happen to be a member of the King's Park Board, yet I have the interests of the State at heart; and I strongly oppose the continuation of the bore system for supplying the metropolitan area with water. We are already over supplied with bores. The bodies interested have not been consulted regarding this matter. In less than 21 years, the term of the lease proposed by Mr. Lovekin, Mount's Bay-road will have to be widened. The Minister says this scheme will not interfere with the widening of the road, but the plan shows the bore located adjacent to the cottages owned by the Swan Brewery. Bores should never have been installed in the metropolitan area. Have the present Government, or previous Governments, considered the advisableness of adopting a different source of water supply? Mundaring water has already been brought to Perth through a 9-inch pipe. Why did not the Government of that day, when pipes and labour were cheaper, lay down a line to bring a suffi-

cient supply of Mundaring water to Perth? It has been stated that the overflow from the weir during winter is more than compensated by the inflow during summer. Engineers of repute support the claim that more than an adequate supply for the metropolitan area could be obtained from Mundaring by building one or two more dams above the elevation of the present dam. I agree with Mr. Lovekin that it would be a good thing if the Government resumed control of King's Park. This Committee should oppose any alienation of the area of the King's Park. The bore is being sunk in the wrong place, as it will hamper the widening of Mount's Bay-road.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Those listening to the debate must be struck with the zeal exhibited by both branches of the Public Service, as represented by the King's Park Board, and as represented by the Water Supply Department through the Minister. But when we consider that an hour and a half has been spent on what could have been expected to be settled by a brief conference of the two parties, one wonders whether their zeal has not been a little misplaced. I voted with the Government the other day because I realise they are charged with providing an adequate water supply for the metropolitan area, and I know we have no reserve of water, and so by the time the summer comes along the city will be short of it. This position has been discussed, not only here, but also in the City Council, and it has been pointed out that even with the Canning service completed and the Churchman's Brook service in full supply, yet, with the increased population within another five or six years there will again be a shortage, and we shall have to go on to the Serpentine, and still the trouble will soon arise once more. So I think there will have to be a combination of hills water and bore water for the metropolitan area. I am supporting the Government in respect of this bore because I believe they are actuated by a desire to provide an ample supply during the summer. Also I am in sympathy with the King's Park Board's desire to keep the park intact for the people. I do not like to see it being whittled away, and I commend the board for making a stand against encroachment. I hope some com-

mon-sense scheme will be arrived at between the two bodies. Also I am in sympathy with the board's protest against the sludge being discharged in the park. Some months ago, when walking through the park one morning, I came upon a body of men working in hip boots among that sludge. I agree with Mr. Lovekin that the sludge would not assist the growth of flowers and shrubs in the park. If there is likely to be any chance of the new bore petering out, I should like to know that the area set aside for the board will revert to the King's Park Board. I inspected the area yesterday and wondered what the idea was regarding those cottages. Mr. Forbes, representing the Swan Brewery, must have been generous to permit the department to build so close to the cottages, which I feel sure must be removed in course of time. I shall still support the Government, but I would like an assurance from the Minister that the King's Park Board will have every consideration in keeping the area intact and that something will be done to remove the evil of the sludge.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I am assured by my advisers that in the first place the bore will be successful, and in the second place it will be required for all time. We are now within a week of the date when water restrictions were imposed last summer. Quite early this year it was seen that some extra provision would have to be made for the metropolitan area. With the limited funds at the disposal of the Government it became a question of what course ought to be taken, and it was determined that only a bore could be considered. Then came the matter of site, and the one selected was chosen largely because it meant only half the cost of the other one. As for what would happen the buildings and machinery if the bore were to peter out, they would all be removed to another spot; but that is not at all likely. As to the condition in which the building will be maintained, members will agree that existing pump buildings are a credit to the foreshore, and I can assure them the new building also will be in every way creditable. It will serve to beautify a corner at the foot of the cliff which I do not think the King's Park Board would be able to beautify for many years to come. I regret to say Mr. Lovekin has had to receive medical attention this evening. In de-

ference to his absence I agree to report progress.

Progress reported.

BILL—EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

RESOLUTION—STATE FORESTS.

To Revoke Dedication.

A message having been received from the Assembly requesting concurrence of the Council in the following resolution, the message was now considered:

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 4, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 29, 36, 38, 39, and 42 laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly by command of His Excellency the Governor on Tuesday, 4th November, be carried out.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move—

That the Council concur in the resolution forwarded by the Assembly.

The resolution is the result of a proposal of the Conservator of Forests for the partial revocation of the State forests referred to. The proposal provides for the excision from State forests of 25 areas embracing a total area of about 4,686 acres. Under Section 21 of the Forests Act, 1918, a dedication of Crown lands as a State forest may only be revoked in whole or in part as follows:—(a) The Governor shall cause to be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament a proposal for such revocation. (b) After such proposal has been laid before Parliament, the Governor, on a resolution being passed by both Houses that such proposal be carried out, shall, by Order in Council, revoke such dedications. (c) On any such revocation the land shall become Crown land within the meaning of the Land Act, 1898. Each of the areas mentioned in the proposal has been carefully classified and the relationship to adjoining private property and the State Forest in each case has been considered with the result that the Conservator has recommended the excisions of the

areas as being in the best interests of the State.

The following is a brief explanation of each area:—Area No. 1 is of about 9 acres and consists of 22 lots (and adjacent roads) which were surveyed some years ago for twonsite purposes at Collie, but were subsequently included in the State forest. The Lands Department advise that there is a good demand at present for town lots at Collie and it is desired that the lots referred to should be made available.

Area No. 2 covers about 4½ acres of non-jarrah country which has been applied for by the adjoining settlers.

Area No. 3 comprises about 1,825 acres. It is non-jarrah country on the Western fringe of the State forest. Included in the particular country are two areas in respect of which applications have been received.

Area No. 4 is of about 112 acres. Most of the area is good cultivable land and it has been applied for by a resident of the locality.

Area No. 5 takes in about 26 acres of good land between the road and Harris River. It has been applied for together with other country, not State forest, by a resident of the locality.

Area No. 6 is of about 150 acres and it is mostly good land practically hemmed in by private property blocks. The area is desired to meet the requirements of an adjoining settler.

Area No. 7 is of about 7½ acres and it has been held as a garden area under the provisions of the Mining Act. The holder now desires better tenure of the area which is non-jarrah country.

Area No. 8 is of about 120 acres and it is mostly good soil. It has been applied for by a resident of the locality.

Area No. 9 embraces about 13½ acres. It is bounded on three sides by private property and has been applied for by the holder of an adjoining property.

Area No. 10 is of about 156 acres. It comprises two locations carrying practically no timber. Applications for it have been received from persons resident in the locality.

Area No 11 is of about 166 acres. It is non-timber country and has been applied for by a local resident.

Area No. 12 is of about 64 acres. It is good soil country and the owner of the adjoining private property desires to acquire it in exchange for some jarrah country at the present time included in his holdings.

Area No. 13 is of about 61 acres and comprises location 2,663 which includes a flat of good land. It has been applied for by a relative of the holder of adjoining land.

Area No. 14 is of about 220 acres. It is poor timber country and portion of it is the subject of an application by the holder of an adjoining lot.

Area No. 15 is of about 335 acres. It comprises a flat of good land and some poor timber country. The holder of private property in the locality has applied for it.

Area No. 16 is of about 200 acres. It comprises two flats of good soil and some poor timber country. It has been applied for by a settler in the locality.

Area No. 17 is of about 56 acres. It is good soil and has been applied for by an adjoining settler.

Area No. 18 is of about 35 acres. It is good soil and has been applied for by an adjoining settler.

Area No. 19 is of about 31 acres. It is portion of group block 11048 which was surveyed in the wrong position and on which considerable improvement work has been carried out.

Area No. 20 is of about 5½ acres. It is required by an adjoining settler to give him access to the river.

Area No. 21 is of about 100 acres. It is location 7074 and it comprises a black-box flat which has been applied for for the purpose of an aerodrome site and landing ground.

Area No. 22 is of about 660 acres in two parts. It is good soil practically over the whole area and it has been applied for by a settler in the locality.

Area No. 23 is of about 48 acres and it comprises a good marri flat which has been applied for by a resident of the locality.

Area No. 24 is of about 80 acres. It is location 10137 and it comprises first-class land which has been applied for by a group settler who holds two blocks in the locality.

Area No. 25 is of about 200 acres. It is good land and carries practically no timber. A resident in the locality has applied for it.

I may add that all these blocks have been part of forest reserves and are of no use for timber purposes. I feel sure hon. members will agree it is advisable, where we can use up such land for agricultural purposes, that we should do so.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In the absence of a map, I am at a loss to know where this particular land is situated. We do not know whether it is in the South-West or on the goldfields, or it may even be at the Peel estate.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: It is all jarrah country.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: We have nothing to show where it is; it may even be sandalwood land. I do not intend to oppose the motion because I know that many settlers have from time to time complained about the large tracts of land dedicated to forestry, and which should have been made available for settlement because of its suitability for settlement. I should like to know whether these areas will revert to the Lands Department or whether they are to be dedicated away from the Forests Department for agricultural purposes, and whether the Forests Department will still retain control. I understand there is a dual system of control by the Forests and the Lands Departments, and I should like to know how the settlers who may take up this land will link up with the Agricultural Bank, and whether the bank will be in a position to make advances to those who take up these areas.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is only one point I should like the Minister to clear up, and that is with reference to the terms under which this land can be taken up. He has not indicated that. Is it all to be taken up under the one section of the Act? I should also like to know what will be the terms and conditions under which the land will be thrown open.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Almost without exception, the blocks referred to are in jarrah country in the South-West. The resolution means that the areas have been excised from forest reserves and returned to the Lands Department, and almost without exception there are applications for them under the usual conditions.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They will all be under the one authority?

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Yes. The land is suitable for agricultural purposes only. There are thousands of acres of forest reserves that should revert back to the Lands Department, and the sooner the Lands Department gets those areas the better will it be for the State. The blocks in question are all small.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Will everyone have an opportunity to apply for them?

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Yes, all must be thrown open for selection. The attitude of the Lands Department is that every block must be thrown open for public selection and approval must come from the Land Board.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Including any land that may be excised from a reserve?

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: All must come under the same category.

Hon. E. ROSE: Most of this land is in the South-West Province, and a good deal is in the mining districts of Greenbushes and Collie. There is quite a huge area of land not suitable for forestry purposes but suitable for closer settlement. I am pleased the motion has been brought forward because a number of residents in the South-West have spoken to me about all this land being locked up. There are thousands of acres that are useless for forest purposes and which, if thrown open for selection, will readily be taken up. In a majority of these instances the successful selectors will require very little assistance, if any. The more of this land that is thrown open for settlement, the greater will be the production in the South-West. I, too, would have liked to see a map of the localities, but I agree that wherever country is wanted for agricultural purposes, those who require it should be given the opportunity to select it. I support the motion.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I am concerned somewhat by the statement of the Leader of the House that a number of local residents had already applied for these areas. We know there are many people who are anxious to take up land, but who are afraid that local applicants, those who already have blocks, will secure preference, that in fact there will not be any competition. I am glad to have the assurance, however, that the land will be thrown open for general selection.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I understand that the areas indicated by the Minister are all comparatively small and that in the eyes of the people in the several localities are ideal for selection and cultivation. After a good deal of agitation it has been agreed to make them available for selection. So far as I understand, the ordinary procedure will be followed, that the areas will be open for selection and that the Land Board will decide who is to have them. I am pleased to see that the Government have at last realised that a good deal of land in the South-West has been held up. Had it been released some years ago, it would by now have been carrying quite a considerable number of people. In Western Australia we have arrived at a position, gained from our experience with group settlements and other such schemes, where it is possible for us to utilise virgin land and turn it at comparatively little expense into profitable areas. I know the Government intend to go further than this because an announcement was made at Greenbushes last week to the effect that the Minister for Forests proposed to take the Conservator of Forests, the Minister for Lands and the Premier, to that centre to consider an area that had long been in dispute, the Lands Department claiming it to be agricultural country and the Conservator of Forests that it should be retained for timber purposes. I think that is the proper procedure to adopt when two departments are in conflict. I support the motion.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I wish to deal with the point raised by Mr. Mann regarding the excision of these areas, and to ask the Minister if it will affect the policy of dedicating certain lands to forests purposes. Has the department made arrangements to replace the land to be released, with other reservations? If that has not been done, shall we not be reversing the accepted policy and interfering with the programme for forest conservation in the South-West?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Was it not provided that a certain acreage should be reserved?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I think an area of 3,000,000 acres was laid down as the ideal to be attained. I would like to know how far that policy is being followed, and whether this motion does not indicate a departure from it.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I regret I am not in possession of the information desired by

the hon. member. So far as I know, no arrangement has been made to replace these areas with others. I think the intention is rather to bring under agricultural development, all land that is useless for timber purposes. As hon. members are aware, the policy of the Government is to bring as much land as possible into use, instead of permitting it to remain idle.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

MOTION—COLLIE POWER SCHEME.

Debate resumed from the 13th November on the following motion by Hon. A. Lovekin:—

That in the opinion of this House, the best interests of the State will be served by installing any new units for production of electric power at Collie instead of at East Perth.

HON. SIR CHARLES NATHAN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.3]: Mr. Lovekin, by his motion, seeks to draw an expression of opinion from the House that it is in the best interests of the State that any new units for the production of electric power shall be installed at Collie instead of at East Perth. I rise to oppose the motion because I consider such an expression of opinion from this House would be one that could not seriously be entertained, and consequently I think, should not be furnished. At the present time, the Minister has told us, the generating plant at East Perth is capable of producing 32,000 kilowatts, while the maximum consumption now is approximately 22,000 kilowatts. We have also been told, and I have reason to believe the statement to be correct, that a generating plant at Collie would not be justified under at least 45,000 kilowatts. At the present rate of consumption, it will be quite ten years before we would be justified in erecting a central plant at Collie, if at all, and in the meantime, what is the State to do? The modern portion of the present plant at East Perth is taxed to its utmost capacity, and there is only one unit of 12,500 kilowatts capacity. If it were to break down, the power station would not be able to produce the load required at peak periods. In addition, the boiler power is definitely limited and there is ever present a serious danger should anything go wrong with the boilers. I believe

the Government have under consideration the provision of another 12,500-kilowatt set at a cost of £300,000. It is impossible to believe we will hold up the installation of necessary plant to keep the East Perth power house going, until such time as the scheme at Collie is justified. As mentioned by Sir William Lathlain there are no technical difficulties; it is merely a question of economics. We have been told, and I believe the figure is reasonably correct, that the construction of a power house at Collie would cost between £1,000,000 and £1,500,000, but that will not represent the whole expense because, if the current is to be used throughout the area over which transmission will take place, it will mean, assuming the current is generated at 40,000 volts, that in stepping it down to say 2,000, and for distribution, to 440 or 250 volts, additional plant will be required in the shape of switch gear transformers, buildings, and so on, which will mean at least £150,000 to £300,000 additional for that purpose. There is still another point that Mr. Lovekin, I think, has hardly taken into consideration. I cannot imagine, bearing in mind the discussion that took place in the House recently on the question of the desirability of a Royal Commission to inquire into conditions obtaining in the coal industry, that hon. members would deliberately commit the country to the expenditure of £1,500,000 on the erection of a central power generating station at Collie, to be entirely dependent on privately-owned coal mines, particularly if they are run under the conditions that have been described to us. Hon. members will recognise the logical conclusion to action committing the Government to any such proposition. If we are to have a central power-generating station at Collie, we should have a nationalised coal industry. If we are not to have that, then the Government must at least own and operate a coal mine, and seeing that 75 per cent. of the output of the present collieries is for Governmental purposes we should soon close them down. I advance that as a reason why I, at any rate, consider it undesirable that we should agree to the motion. There is still one other aspect. Suppose for one moment that we were justified in considering the erection of a central power station at Collie, we certainly would not be justified in committing the Govern-

ment to the additional expenditure of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 at the present juncture. Mr. Lovekin may be able to advise the House how it would be possible to obtain the necessary finance, and I suggest that if he can do so, Mr. Hamersley and some of his agricultural colleagues will be able to indicate a way in which that money could be utilised at the present time to the greater advantage of the State. I propose to vote against the motion.

HON. W. J. MANN (South - West) [8.11]: While I am strongly in favour of the spirit of the motion, I have to confess I think the time rather inopportune for it. Sir Charles Nathan referred to the consumption in the metropolitan area, and the estimated consumption necessary to provide sufficient loadage for a power scheme at Collie. I think that hon. member overlooked one phase, and was inclined, like a number of other hon. members, to regard the metropolitan area only as concerned with the scheme. In his journeyings around the world, Sir Charles must have seen, as others have, how much of the drudgery and difficulty of work among the rural communities in various countries have been eliminated by the use of cheap electric power. That is one of the ideals that the rural communities entertain when they speak of the central power scheme at Collie. Such a central powerhouse would be able to radiate electric power without appreciable loss over large areas. Sir Charles Nathan shakes his head as though he doubts my statement. In other parts of the world, I have noted how electric current has been despatched for upwards of 400 miles without any appreciable loss. In Victoria current is being sent from Morwell almost to the borders of the State at Serviceton and on to Wagga. In addition, a tremendous number of towns are supplied with electric power as well. It will be seen, therefore, that power transmission is no longer at the experimental stage. That it can be done effectively has been proved, and I hope the time is not far distant when it will be possible in Western Australia. I do not intend to labour the question except to express my opinion that ultimately the State will have to adopt this suggestion. For the time being, I have to agree that we are not in a position seriously to entertain the proposal, because we cannot raise the money necessary, which takes the matter out of court for the present.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [8.15]: The views expressed by the last two speakers bear out very fully what has been stated by the Leader of the House in reply to the motion moved by Mr. Lovekin. There is no doubt that the ideal embodied in the motion is one that appeals to many of us provided it could be carried out. I am inclined to share the views just expressed by stating that this is hardly an appropriate time to expect the Government, handicapped in the way of finance, to find the capital essential adequately to carry out such a scheme. There is another point that has occurred to me. In 1926 we passed legislation giving certain powers which I think might seriously conflict with the powers that would be required in the event of establishing a central power station at the seat of the coal supply. The Act I refer to is the South-West Electric Power Act, 1926. It provides for authority for the construction and management of works for the generation and supply of electricity within a portion of the South-West division of the State. That measure was passed at the instigation of the Municipal Councils of Bunbury and Collie, and it gives certain rights to the trust proposed to be created. Before any Government embarked upon such a scheme, the provisions of the Act would need to be carefully considered. When the measure was passed I think it was suggested that if the idea of establishing a power station at Collie were undertaken by the Government in the near future, that Act would interfere with the scheme. Prior to the passing of the Act, I remember Mr. Ewing moving a motion of a somewhat similar nature, during which he supplied details to show that current could be transmitted over distances such as Mr. Mann has mentioned. Mr. Lovekin, who had been studying the question, followed Mr. Ewing and explained that, in other parts of the world, current had been transmitted over considerable distances at a minimum cost. The whole question depends solely upon finance, and I agree with the Minister that, even assuming the Government were prepared favourably to consider the proposal, it could not possibly be entertained in the present state of the finances. In the circumstances I cannot do other than support the Minister.

On motion by Hon. E. Rose, debate adjourned.

The **MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES**: I voted against the motion for the adjournment of the debate and should like briefly to explain my reason for so doing. Mr. Lovekin, who is not in his place at present, asked me to go on with the motion and have it finalised.

House adjourned at 8.21 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 18th November, 1930.

	PAGE
Ministerial Statement, meeting of Loan Council	1806
Papers: University	1818
Questions: Railway Department, retrenchment	1809
Town Planning Commission	1809
Motor licenses, checking	1809
Colliery coal agreements	1809
Marsupial skins, royalty	1810
Stud bulls, potatoes	1810
Assent to Bill	1810
Bills: Stamp Act Amendment (No. 2), report	1810
Hospital Fund, recon., report	1810
Vexatious Proceedings Restriction, returned	1818
Stipendiary Magistrates, Council's amendment	1818
Companies Act Further Amendment, 3A.	1819
Farmers' Debts Adjustment, referred to Select Committee	1820
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagees' Relief, 2A., Com.	1820
Traffic Act Amendment, Council's Amendment	1837
Orders of the Day, postponement	1819
Resolution: State Forests, to revoke dedication, Council's Message	1820

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Loan Council Meeting.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.33]: It is usual after a Minister has returned from a meeting of the Loan Council, particularly when the House is in session, for him immediately to make a statement to members as to what happened at the conference. Of course, members know pretty well what happened from what has appeared in the Press, but I ask them to listen to me for a few minutes while I make a brief statement. I attended a meeting of the Loan Council held at Canberra on the 11th

November. The terms under which the £28,000,000 of maturing loan is to be converted, were discussed and the Council decided that the rates of interest should be

- 6 per cent. for two years,
- 5¾ per cent. for 10 years, and
- 5½ per cent. for 20 years,

leaving to those who subscribe to the loan a choice between the three conditions. Naturally the chances of converting the loan were discussed at considerable length, and it was agreed that there ought to be no difficulty in raising the money. The London money market is still closed to Australia, and apparently must remain closed until the Commonwealth Treasurer is able to raise a loan to pay off the £36,000,000 of short-dated Treasury bills and other advances owing. The Premier of New South Wales asked that his State should be freed from the provisions of the Financial Agreement, but it was decided that this could not be done. The Commonwealth Treasurer has voluntarily surrendered to New South Wales £200,000 of the Commonwealth's quota of the Loan Council's £15,000,000 authorisation for the year. It was reported that the Victorian Government had, since the previous meeting of the Loan Council, surrendered £500,000 of its quota to New South Wales. A portion of the £15,000,000 has yet to be raised. Another matter discussed was the Federal Aid Roads Agreement. It will be remembered that the new agreement is much more favourable to the States in that it relieves them of the necessity to contribute 15s. for every £1 provided by the Commonwealth. It also gives the States much greater freedom in the expenditure of the money. The new agreement has been signed by all the Governments, but I understand it will not be submitted to the Commonwealth Parliament for confirmation until after the return of Mr. Scullin. Meanwhile the road grant to this State of £384,000 per annum will be continued. The delay in submitting the new agreement to the Commonwealth Parliament is due to the fact that Mr. Scullin interested himself in the making of the new agreement. The Federal Government had contemplated reducing the amount to be paid to each State by 25 per cent., but, after discussion, the Federal Treasurer agreed that it would not be fair to make a reduction and so the present payment will be continued.