

AYES.

Mr. Chesson
Mr. Collier
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cowan
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Lutey
Mr. Marshall

Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munzie
Mr. Rowe
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Whitecock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Davy
Mr. Doney
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Latbam

Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Thomson
Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Johnson
Mr. Corboy
Miss Holman

NOES.

Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Maley
Mr. J. M. Smith

Clause thus passed.

Clause 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Inspectors:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What will be the penalty if a receipt be missing when an inspector calls?

The Minister for Health: If there is a reasonable explanation there will be no penalty. If not, there will be a penalty as provided by the measure.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A penalty of £20.

The Minister for Health: That is the maximum.

Mr. Davy: No, the maximum is £100.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A worker who loses his ticket may be denied hospital accommodation and may be punished for not having his receipt.

The Minister for Health: I have no doubt that anyone entitled to hospital accommodation will get it, even if he has lost his ticket.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, it will be a case of no ticket no hospital.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order in discussing that. The question before the Chair deals with inspectors.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suppose inspectors will call at every house from time to time. Everyone will have to be careful not to employ more men than he

can help unless he has a strong-room in which to store his documents. How many inspectors will be appointed? A whole army of inspectors will be required.

The Minister for Health: Possibly three inspectors will be required.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suppose the inspectors will be paid out of the collections, or perhaps the fines will be sufficient to pay them.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 20 to 23—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.46 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 29th November, 1928.

	PAGE
Question: Agricultural Bank advances, Esperance ...	2008
Bills: Group Settlement Act Amendment, 3A. ...	2009
Electoral Districts Act Amendment, 2A. ...	2009
Licensing Act Amendment, 1A. ...	2100
Stamp Act Amendment, 1A. ...	2100
City of Perth Superannuation Fund, Com. ...	2100
Quarry Railway Extension, 2A., Com. report ...	2102
Water Boards Act Amendment, Assembly's message ...	2102

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

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK ADVANCES.

Esperance Mallee District.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Chief Secretary: Is the report, published in the "West Australian" of 27th November, to the effect that the Agricultural Bank trustees have decided to grant no further loans in the Esperance Mallee district correct? If so, will the Minister inform the House how the Government propose to meet the altered circumstances and thus prevent a break of continuity in farming operations in that district?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: No. The trustees have recommended that no further mallee land, south of Salmon Gums should be made available for selection until the present settlement has been established. The usual bank policy will apply as far as existing settlers are concerned.

BILL—GROUP SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [4.35]: I quite realise the difficulties that confront any Government in bringing down a Bill to alter the boundaries of the electorates or the provinces. In the first place they have to see to it that no elector is unduly harassed by the decisions arrived at. It would be quite easy to cut up some boundaries in such a way as to make it difficult for the electors to reach their respective polling places. Again, the Government have to consider what criticism they are likely to get from the party opposed to them in the House, and to endeavour so to frame the Bill that it will meet with the favour of those in Opposition. They have also to see that their own supporters are not unduly harassed, and to do what they can to keep their own ranks intact. The Government in bringing forward this measure have not studied their own side. One member said that in cutting out certain seats they were doing it for their own benefit. There are five seats that probably will be cut out under the Bill, five seats on the goldfields, and we have three Cabinet Ministers in those constituencies. One member declared that Kalgoorlie was over-represented, seeing that there were 8,000 electors on the roll and four members to represent those electors. It was pointed out that some time ago they had 16,000 electors and that there had been no reduction in the number of seats. But that member does not know, indeed none of us knows what the commissioners may do. They may alter those boundaries, and one

of the Minister's seats may go. It is quite on the cards that Hannans will be cut out. We have to wait to see what will happen. Mr. Harris pointed out that the Bill introduced by the Mitchell Government in 1922-23 would have cut out four seats on the goldfields. If the same proportion of electors obtained to-day as obtained then, the Mitchell Bill would cut out six goldfields seats, instead of five as proposed in the present Bill. This Bill was introduced in another place, where it found favour with the Opposition, who had very little to say about it. It did not there meet with anything like the criticism it has met with in this Chamber. Mr. Hamersley cried out because there was not more representation proposed for the agricultural areas. But the agricultural areas have not grown in the least since the last redistribution of seats.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They have grown to the extent of an additional 20,000 electors.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I am speaking of the area; the area has not grown at all. The empty spaces may have been filled up, which makes it easier for the electors to get to the poll, for they have not the same big blank areas to go over. It makes it much better for them.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You might as well argue that the area of Western Australia has not been extended.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Mr. Hamersley also declared that the man in the agricultural area should have greater voting power than the man in the city. He does not believe in the principle of one vote one value. But we do. We believe that a man's a man for all that, and that wherever he is he should have the same voting strength as another. Take the man in the back country: his father or his grandfather pioneered the district and made a comfortable home, and now the son or the grandson is reaping the benefit, and has a fine holding. But we never have occasion to suspect that he is an anonymous donor, nor do we see his name heading a charitable list. Instead of that, he has closed his bowels of compassion against his fellow-man. On the other hand, the man in the city may have earned and handled more money than the man in the agricultural area has ever seen. Being a bit of a philanthropist, this city man spends his money. Because sometimes he may spend it in riotous living, Mr. Hamersley would have us believe he is a waster, a rotter and of no use to the

State, because he is not a producer. But he is a revenue builder; and that is what counts. So long as the Treasury coffers are well filled, nobody cares where the money comes from. This man has the money. He may spend it foolishly, but for all that he is building up the State's revenue. This one vote different values is a principle we cannot stand for. I am surprised at Mr. Hamersley putting up such a thing. It is not a good proposal to put up that one man shall have a whole vote and another only half a vote. The next point for consideration is the personnel of the commission. The first member is to be a judge of the Supreme Court. I object to the appointment of a judge to the position, because when he is taken from the judicial bench he is just as silly as any other man. He knows nothing about anything. He is lost. What is the good of putting on the commission a judge who has other things to think about, condemning somebody to death or giving Mrs. So-and-So a divorce? What is the use of putting such a man on this commission to determine the boundaries of the electorates? I was sorry to read in this morning's paper the announcement of the retirement of Mr. Cooke, the Chief Electoral Officer. I think Mr. Cooke would be one of the best men we could get for that position. The Government are going to retire him, but I hope that if he is to retire it will be found possible to appoint him under the Bill; for having been relieved of his official duties he would be able to give the whole of his time to his work as a commissioner. I do not know whether the Government or Mr. Shapcott is retiring Mr. Cooke, but at all events he is listed for early retirement. I hope the Government will see fit to continue Mr. Cooke in office for another six months as the only way of getting over this business. The next man would, I believe, be the Surveyor General. I do not know what qualifications Mr. Camm has for the position. He may be used to the back country; if so, he would be all right. The third man on the Commission should be a good bushman. It would be a fallacy to put a judge upon it. He knows nothing about the matter. I would keep judges well out of the business, for they would only make a mess of it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You have not a high opinion of judges.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: They are all right in their own sphere, just as the hon. member is as a lawyer.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You mean as a man of the world.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: The hon. member himself is practising shop in this Chamber all the time. I do not like it. I hope the Bill will pass; if not the blame must lie at the door of the Council.

On motion by Hon. C. B. Williams, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Licensing Act Amendment.

2, Stamp Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SUPER-ANNUATION FUND.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. J. T. Franklin in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Extension of power to make by-laws:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I congratulate Mr. Franklin upon his return by such an overwhelming majority to the mayoral seat of the city of Perth. Thanks are due to Mr. Harris, Mr. Fraser and others for suggesting that an inquiry should be held into this Bill. The result of the deliberations of the select committee will show that this course was a wise one. As it stands the Bill is based upon the Federal superannuation scheme. Mr. Taylor, the City Treasurer, and Mr. Bennett, the Government Actuary, both said so. All Federal employees must participate in that scheme. Provision is made for them to take up units of pension, each of which is £26 a year. The minimum that can be taken up by an employee is two units, which carries a pension of £52 a year. Payments are made in accordance with the salary received, and contributions are made towards these units according to the age of the employee at the time he begins payment. A person receiving £130 a year must take up 2½ units of pension. A person receiving £156 up to £208 must take up three units. From £208 to £260 he must take up four units, until he reaches £330 when he must take up 16 units. If an employee is 40 years of age at the time of his coming

in he will pay 7s. 1d. per fortnight for each unit. If he is getting the basic wage, £221, he must subscribe for four units, and pay 7s. 1d. plus three times 6s. 6d. a fortnight. No employee of the City Council on the basic wage could pay so much into a superannuation fund. In the Federal service the employees receive automatic increases which cover the additional contributions they are compelled to make. In the municipal service there are no automatic increases, and it would be impossible for an employee on the basic wage to make these payments. The Federal scheme provides also for a pension of half the amount to the wife after the employee's death, and a pension to each child of £13 a year up to the age of 16. The contributions for the three insurances are necessarily heavy, and could only be paid by a few of the City Council employees as can be seen by the return of the ages, occupations and emoluments of those officers. The select committee discovered that there were other superannuation schemes which might be exploited by the municipality. There are those of Melbourne and Adelaide and there are some in England. These might better be brought into line with Perth than the Federal scheme, which is a compulsory one. The select committee thought it wise to allow the framers of the scheme a free hand in framing their own regulations. They were unanimous on the point that these superannuation schemes were both good and advantageous. If we could promote such a scheme for the employees of the City Council, it would be a good thing to do so, but when doing that we should so frame the conditions that they may be participated in by a large majority of the employees. It is proposed to amend the Bill by eliminating from it the special conditions which apply to the Federal scheme, and to give an absolutely free hand to frame regulations and bring them before the council and the House afterwards. From the evidence taken by the select committee, it appears that inclusive of the day to day workers, there are some 800 employees, but of those only 170 are what are called salaried staff. I never could see where the wages man ended and the salaried man began, but it seems to me that the dustman is of equal service to the ratepayers as the clerk who keeps the ledgers. Therefore, the dustman should participate in the scheme equally with the clerk on the ledgers. For that

reason the select committee thought the promoters should have the fullest latitude so that they should be able, if it was so desired, to bring in as many of the employees as possible, exclusive of the casual employees. Witnesses were asked by the select committee how the employees on wages from £200 to £300 a year were to make the required contributions to the pensions fund. It was admitted that many could not afford to make those payments, and it was suggested in one set of circumstances that the moral right which the employees contended for, namely, one month's pay for every year of service, should be appropriated for the payment of the contributions, and in that way relieve the employee from having to make the payment. In connection with another class of employee it was suggested that no matter what their ages were they should be taken into the pensions scheme as at the age of 30. It occurred to the select committee that if those conditions prevailed someone would have to pay, and the council would have to pay the pensions out of the money collected from the ratepayers. We were informed that if that scheme were carried out straight away it would involve an expenditure of £37,000.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That is in respect of the 170 employees.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. The select committee considered that that was a substantial sum to call upon the council to find, and it would have to be made good by the ratepayers. Whilst the select committee desired to bring about the superannuation scheme, and whilst they were anxious to give the fullest facilities to frame a suitable scheme and to provide that the council might allocate part of its revenue to that scheme, the committee also thought that all the employees should have a voice in it and not only the 170. Therefore it is intended that the scheme shall be approved by a majority of all the employees. It is provided also that the scheme must be carried by a two-thirds majority of the council, because the ratepayers are involved, and it is proposed also that if the regulations are objected to by the ratepayers there shall be the same procedure as applies to loans, when a poll can be demanded, and finally the regulations in the usual course must be laid on the Table of this House and on the Table of another place. The select committee put in a stipulation that no regulation shall have any

force or effect until it has been on the Table of the House 14 days. One of the provisions of the Bill as it was brought before the House was that an employee might hand over his insurance policy and then become entitled to a pension. If the regulations have been disallowed and his policy has been handed over and the contract met, that contract for the pension will hold good notwithstanding that the regulations have been disallowed. I move—

That Clause 2 be struck out with the view of inserting other words.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: First of all I wish to thank the hon. member for his complimentary references to the Mayoral election of yesterday. I wish to inform the Committee that at the present time consideration is being given by the City Council to the recommendations of the select committee, and next week I shall be prepared to go on with the Bill. I ask, therefore, that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

BILL—QUARRY RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 22nd November.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.17]: I moved the adjournment of the debate in order to have an opportunity to ascertain whether the interests of people having land in the immediate vicinity of the railway were being conserved. On going through the Bill I find they are conserved. The Government have inserted a clause authorising access to be given to the sidings on the railway on terms to be mutually agreed upon or determined by arbitration. I was moved to look into this matter because the University has a considerable amount of endowment land in the vicinity of the proposed line. I understand that a considerable time ago the University authorities were anxious to obtain a siding so that anybody who leased endowment land might have facilities in the shape of access to a siding for carrying on their business. At that time, apparently, the Works Department or the Railway Department—I do not know which was to blame—was not particularly sympathetic towards the claims of

the University authorities, who were unable to obtain what they wished. However, other times, other methods. Those at present controlling the departments have conceded our wishes and the Bill makes provision for the owners of land in the vicinity. In the circumstances, I support the second reading.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.19]: Any-one acquainted with the locality will raise no objection to the extension of this railway. It is really what one might term a dead-end railway. It will run to portion of the river behind Cottesloe Beach, commonly known as Billy Goat Farm.

Hon. J. Cornell: A classical name.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. It is right away in the backblocks of Cottesloe Beach or North Fremantle. I believe it is actually in the North Fremantle municipality, but it lies close to the border of Cottesloe Beach. The only objection I have is, not to the extension of the line, but to the building of a factory on the river foreshore. I am sorry indeed that any more factories are to be erected there, but we have no control in the matter. The land has been purchased by a company whose intention it is to build a factory, and we cannot prevent it. Seeing the company have gone that far, we must give them railway facilities. No doubt it will be of benefit to the State to have such a factory here, and my only regret is that it is being built on that site. Having first-hand knowledge of the locality, I raise no objection to the extension of the line.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to amendment No. 3, made by the Council, but had disagreed to amendments Nos. 1 and 2, now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair: the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2. Delete the first three lines and insert in lieu thereof the following:— "In every case where the Public Works Department has expended or may hereafter expend money in providing a water supply of sufficient capacity to supply the reasonable requirements of the ratepayers within the area to be rated in agricultural areas."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

It is doubtful if the Water Supply Department would undertake to provide water under restrictions of this kind. What are the reasonable requirements of ratepayers? Who is to determine them, and who is to decide whether a scheme is of sufficient capacity? If any objection were raised to the imposition of a rate, those points would probably be taken to court.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I cannot follow the argument of the Chief Secretary. The requirements of the people in country districts are very much greater than those of people in a municipality. Country people require large quantities of water for stock and, if an individual is to be taxed, he should know that proper provision will be made. Unless there is some guarantee that the supply will be large enough to meet settlers' requirements, it would be unfair to subject them to the rating. The other day a man told me he was in the habit of getting up at 4.30 a.m. to go to one of the standpipes. Unless he went early, there was little chance of getting a supply.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I understand some of the residents of Perth rise at three or four in the morning to get a bath.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: People who have to pay heavy rates should have some say in the matter.

The Chief Secretary: Where is that man?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In a district well inland. The man went out at 6 o'clock one morning and had to wait for two hours before he could get a supply. If he is to be rated on an acreage basis, he should first be assured of a sufficient supply. The charge to be put upon men with 3,000 or 4,000 acres will be fairly severe. We know the cost some of these schemes work out at. Pipes are laid down starting with a diameter of 3 inches, going down to 2 inches and 1 inch, and then increasing again to 2

inches. That has been done by the Government.

The Honorary Minister: Can you give an instance?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I cannot give a definite instance without looking the matter up.

The Honorary Minister: I should be glad if the hon. member would give one instance.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There are many. While plenty of water should be available only a trickle comes along because of the variations in diameter of the piping. There ought to be assurance of an adequate supply before a charge is imposed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The amendment is reasonable. Sometimes it happens that the supply of water is not nearly sufficient for all the settlers, though all of them are rated. Thus some settlers are rated for water that is not there. The amendment merely asks that the Government should supply a reasonable quantity of water.

Hon. G. Fraser: "Reasonable" admits of many interpretations.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Under the Bill as it stands, people are to pay rates without any chance of obtaining supplies of water.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am surprised at some of the arguments put forward. If it were a case of a well being sunk, or even the construction of an ordinary tank, the interest and sinking fund involved would be so small that, spread over anything like a large area, the rating would be infinitesimal.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: I raised the point myself, and the Chief Secretary said it did not apply.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Bill refers to the establishment of water supplies that will be of far more value than the ordinary well or tank. Mr. Hamersley suggests that the Government will attempt to run water from a small tank to settlers miles away. The hon. member's suggestion is ridiculous.

Hon. V. Hamersley: You do not know what you are talking about.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I asked the hon. member to give one instance of pipes of different diameters, and he said he would have to look up particulars. I could understand what the hon. member has described with regard to pipes being done by a cocky who does not know any better, but not by an engineer.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: No cocky would be so silly as that.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The Honorary Minister should go to Yorkrakine and make inquiries.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I again ask the hon. member for a specific instance. The Bill deals with water supplies on a much larger scale and of a much more permanent character than suggested by Mr. Hamersley and Mr. Baxter. Too much notice should not be taken of their arguments.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: Mr. Hamersley's statements regarding the laying of pipes surprise me. The amendment refers to sufficient quantities of water, and the varying diameters of pipes have no bearing on that aspect. The farmers are not responsible for the laying of the pipes, and the matter should be inquired into at once. Probably it could be righted speedily. Obviously it is impossible to get 2 inches of water through a one inch pipe.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have been asked for the authority for my statements, and I will quote a letter regarding the Bullfinch supply. That supply comes off the Coolgardie water scheme main. The subject has been inquired into previously, and I do not know but that in some instances the mistake has been rectified.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Is the same thing going on now?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Of course it is. Is there not enough trouble with the Main Roads Board? When inland towns want water supplies, settlers along the route who have their own supplies, and who have never turned on a tap, are caught and charged rates. This Bill will effect something of the same nature. I have here a letter from Mr. Brear, of Yilgarn, stating that the Yilgarn Road Board are arranging a deputation on the subject but that before the deputation is finalised it might be well if some mention were made in the House of the requirements of the district. The letter continues—

The present water supply is absolutely inadequate for the requirements of the district. The standpipe at Bullfinch is rushed in the early hours of the morning, and much time is wasted by the settlers in waiting to get their tanks filled.

Mr. Brear mentions that he left his farm at half-past five one morning and has his tank under the standpipe by seven o'clock, but that he was still there when the children

were going to school at 9 o'clock. The letter concludes—

You will see from this fact that although the tap was turned full on, it took some two hours to fill the tank.

If that is what can happen under this magnificent scheme, we are justified in asking that some safeguard should be furnished for the settlers. Those who come from miles around will have to pay their rates and waste time in getting water.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am astonished at the attitude of the Honorary Minister. If the motion moved by the Chief Secretary is carried, the Bill will be made to apply, or will be capable of being made to apply, to any wells and tanks of any size whatever. That is clear, for no specific size of those works is mentioned. And it must be remembered that there have been sunk by the Public Works Department hundreds of wells that have proved rank duffers. In one district alone eleven such wells were put down. I am surprised at the Minister taking up the attitude that a well or tank has to be of a certain capacity.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The whole misunderstanding has been due to the wording of the Bill. How ridiculous it would be to apply the provision to small tanks and wells. The Chief Secretary has said that it was never intended to apply it to them. If it were so, then any small supply that might be lifted into a tank by a windmill would present all the anomalies mentioned by Mr. Hamersley. But it was never intended to apply the measure to small supplies. What it will be applied to are the more ambitious schemes, where water is gravitated from a rock catchment into a reservoir and thence conducted away by pipes. The whole misunderstanding has been due to the wording of the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am growing tired of impressing hon. members that the Bill does not apply to small tanks and wells. What the Government propose is to construct large water supplies capable of meeting the requirements of settlers in a district, many of whom to-day are carting water for 20 miles and bringing it by train at a cost of £2 per 1,000 gallons. From what Mr. Hamersley has told us this afternoon, we can realise what will happen if the amendment is insisted upon and eventually passed.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Apparently the country members do not want the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would look like that. It will relieve the financial problems of the Government if the Bill is not passed. We do not want to force it on the agricultural community. Only last week I gave alarming figures as to the amount spent on agricultural water supplies, and I then explained that requests for more were still coming in. Judged from previous experience, if the amendment be insisted upon and passed, a water area will be constituted and then there will be the protest that the supply is not capable of meeting the reasonable requirements of the settlers, and that protest will be fortified by all sorts of evidence. In those circumstances it is not to be expected that the Government will spend hundreds of thousands of pounds in providing supplies, unless the interests of the taxpayer are safeguarded.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you say the Bill could not be applied to small wells or tanks?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It could be, but what Government would make it apply? It is a ridiculous suggestion.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If we were to strike out those words which have been inserted in Clause 2, it would mean restoring the very words that were objected to. I believe the Chief Secretary when he says it is not intended to include the small water supplies.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Well, why not put that in the Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the words that were inserted here and objected to in another place be struck out, we immediately reinsert the very words that gave rise to all the previous controversy. Any assurance the Chief Secretary may give us would not protect the unfortunate settler. If the Government or a board found they were in need of money, and had the power to impose a rate in respect of the supply of water, they would impose that rate. The Chief Secretary's assurance would not have the force of law, and would not afford the protection the amendment would give. So we should have some safeguard. If it were possible to provide for the reasonable requirements of the persons rated, it would be a good thing, but I can see the difficulty explained by the Chief Secretary. So I suggest for

his consideration that we leave in the clause as amended, but also amend the wording by inserting the words "in constructing works" before the words "providing a water supply." We shall then dispose of the controversial words "sufficient capacity to supply the reasonable requirements of the ratepayers."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am inclined to agree with the previous speaker. The words to which I object are those inserted by Mr. Hamersley "of sufficient capacity to supply the reasonable requirements of the ratepayers."

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that the effect of agreeing to the Chief Secretary's motion will be to reinstate the following words.—"Whenever wells, tanks, and other similar waterworks have been or may hereafter be provided by the Department of Public Works in agricultural or other areas."

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 29th November, 1928.

	Page
Question: Land south of Norseman	2105
Leave of absence	2106
Bills: Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 2), 1s.	2106
Licensing Act Amendment, 3s.	2108
Stamp Act Amendment, 3s.	2106
Hospital Fund, Com.	2106
Group Settlement Act Amendment, returned	2106
Lake Grace-Karlzarin Railway, 2s.	2106
Town Planning and Development, Com.	2138
Loan Estimates, 1928-29	2108

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

QUESTION—LAND SOUTH OF NORSEMAN.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH (for Mr. Thomson) asked the Minister for Lands: In view of the Press statement that the Trustees of the Agricultural Bank have re-