general advancement of horse-racing, and in charity, I would ask the Government to adopt my suggestion as to the commencement of the Act, to accept the amendments tabled by the member for the Swan, and for the rest to be content with the main proposal of the Bill—the tax on totalisator receipts.

On motion by MR. MITCHELL, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

AS TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): Owing to the absence of the Premier, who is preparing his Estimates, I move that the House do now adjourn. On Tuesday evening next the Premier will deliver his Budget Speech.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH: Before the motion is passed, I should like to ask the Minister whether he wishes to give any farther notice concerning the Budget Speech?

THE MINISTER: That notice will come in the form of a Message from His Excellency the Governor.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 17 minutes to 5 o'clock, until the next Tuesday afternoon.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 12th December, 1905.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4·30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Public Works Department, return *re* rented Government offices. 2, Public Works Department, Roads Act 1902, by-laws of the Mourambine Road Board. 3, Report of the Acclimatisation Committee of Western Australia for 1904-5.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, NORTH DANDALUP.

HON. E. McLARTY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has the Government definitely decided to construct a railway from the South-Western line, near North Dandalup, into the timber forest? 2, If so, is it intended to be the first section of a line to Marradong? 3, Why was the original survey direct from Pinjarra railway station to Marradong through the timber forest abandoned?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, No decision has yet been come to. 3, The survey was not abandoned, but was completed.

BILL—FISHERIES.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Bill recommitted for amendments.

Clause 30—Power to arrest offenders:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following paragraph be added:—

> Any such person who escapes or attempts to escape from an inspector before or after arrest shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

This addition would make it an offence for any person to escape or attempt to escape from arrest.

Question passed, the paragraph added.

Clause as amended agreed to.

New Clause—Granting of license discretionary:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following be added as Clause 15:—

> The granting or refusal of a boat license or fisherman's license shall be in the discretion of the officer appointed to issue licenses. But if any person shall think himself aggrieved by the refusal of a licence, he may appeal to the Minister, who may, if he thinks fit, direct the license to be issued.

The object of the new clause was to remedy an omission in the Act, so that the officer authorised to issue licenses might use his discretion. For instance,

a person of well-known bad character might for a sum of 10s. acquire as it were an occupation, so as to put himself outside the pale of the Vagrancy Act. To prevent that being done, it was proposed that the officer authorised to grant licenses should be able to exercise his discretion as to the fitness of the applicant in each case for such license; but in order that no hardship might result, the latter part of the clause provided that an appeal might be made to the Minister against the officer's refusal to grant a license.

Question passed, the clause added.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interests of assured protected in certain cases:

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister): In the debate on the second reading, he promised to comply with a request to make provision whereby any moneys payable on an endowment policy should not have the protection of this measure until after a certain term of years. He had since had an opportunity of looking over the legislation on this subject in other Australian States and New Zealand, and he proposed now to modify the provision which had been suggested, and instead of fixing the term at 15 years he proposed that the time should be ten years in this State, this being a medium between the 15 years which had been suggested and the seven years provided in New Zealand. The effect of this proviso would be that a person taking out an endowment policy and paying a large premium on it for one, two, or three years should not be able to claim, after bankruptcy, any benefit from that policy unless it had been in existence at least 10 years. He thought this would provide all the safeguards which members seemed to desire when the matter was previously under discussion.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Lost policies:

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD moved that in line 2 of Subclause 3, the word "fifty" be struck out and "one hundred" inserted in lieu. Most of the policies for under £100 were what were termed industrial policies, and in the case of such small policies the persons should not be put to the expense of advertising.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 5, 6—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the last previous sitting.

Clause 12—Council may enter into bond for securing duty on goods in Customs warehouse:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE moved that the following be added to Subclause 1:—

> And also may enter into and execute any such bond or undertaking as may be required by the Commissioner of Railways for the purpose of securing to such Commissioner the payment of freight on all goods consigned in bond to such licensed warehouse and in respect of which the freight has not been prepaid.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was inclined to accept the amendment, as it would give the Government more revenue. He did not know whether the Kalgoorlie Council would adopt this method of financing.

HON. G. RANDELL: The amendment was a good one. In connection with the sending of goods by rail, if the freight was not prepaid the person who received the goods had to pay an increased rate.

HON. C. SOMMERS: The Kalgoorlie Council had informed him that the clause suited their requirements.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 13—Power to dissolve municipalities:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the following proviso be added to the clause:

> Provided that, unless the said municipality and the said road district shall have agreed to such dissolution, notice of the Governor's intention to dissolve the said municipality shall be inserted in at least three issues of the *Government Gazette* and of some newspaper circulating in the said municipality, the first

of such notices to be given at least two months before the Governor dissolves the municipality.

This was necessary to safeguard the public. There were obligations in regard to management, land, assets, and debts which ought to be considered, and it was fair the public should have notice.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no objection to the amendment if the member would consent to one month instead of three months. It was inadvisable to continue—as the Government would be bound to—a disgraceful and discreditable state of affairs in some cases, because it was only in these circumstances that the Government thought of abolishing municipalities. Provision was made in the clause in connection with assets and liabilities. One of the reasons for abolishing a municipality was that it could not set in order its assets and liabilities.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: One month was rather a short time. The Minister's object was to put an end to disgraceful proceedings in municipalities?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Great latitude should be given to such municipalities; for in many cases the ratepayers would ultimately find a remedy. Make the term of notice two months.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY accepted the suggestion. But what was the exact object of the amendment? If the Governor-in-Council gave two months' notice of an intention to dissolve a municipality, he had made up his mind to dissolve it. Was the amendment to give him an opportunity of altering his mind?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Certainly.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment might give a municipality an opportunity of reformation, though it was doubtful whether such municipalities as the clause aimed at would be capable of reforming themselves.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If the Governor-in-Council notified his intention to dissolve a municipality, the ratepayers could take action by calling for the resignation of the councillors who misbehaved themselves. These might resign, thus removing the need for action by the Governor.

Amendment as amended put and passed.

New Clause—Amendment of Section 167:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following stand as Clause 4:—

Section one hundred and sixty-seven of the principal Act is hereby amended by adding a section as follows:—

Amendment of Section 167 (29A.)—To restrict or regulate the riding of horses on the seashore within or abutting on the boundary of the municipality, and for the purpose of any such by-law the sea-shore shall be deemed to be within the municipality.

In some seaport towns horse-trainers and jockeys exercised horses on portions of the beach practically reserved for ladies' bathing, thus causing considerable inconvenience; hence the need for giving municipalities power to deal with offenders.

Question passed, the clause added.

New Clause—Amendment of Section 324:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following stand as Clause 7:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in section three hundred and twenty-four of the principal Act—(*a.*) any land belonging to the Metropolitan Waterworks Board or any public body created by statute shall be deemed rateable property while the same is leased or occupied for any private purpose; and (*b.*) any land used or occupied for any of the purposes mentioned in subsections three and four of the said section shall be deemed to be rateable property if such property is held under lease from any owner except the Crown: Provided that where any land which but for this section would not be rateable property is, at the commencement of this Act, held under any lease then unexpired, such land shall not become rateable land until the period for which such lease has been made has expired, or until the lessee has a right to determine the same, whichever first happens.

As to Subclause (*a.*), the intention of the parent Act in exempting from rating lands held by the Government, was to exempt those lands while unoccupied, or while being used for Government purposes only. But certain lands vested in, say, the Railway Department, were let for private purposes; and the lessees escaped rating. Surely this was never contemplated by the Act, and the exemption should not continue. The new clause would amend the section, so that lands belonging to the Metropolitan Waterworks Board or to any public body created by statute should be exempt from

rating, provided such lands were not leased to private persons. Subclause (*b.*) dealt with exemptions under Subsections 3 and 4 of the parent Act, namely land used for hospitals, public schools, libraries, and charitable institutions. The object of the amendment was to make such lands liable to be rated if leased by private persons. Victoria had found it expedient to make a similar provision. The proviso to the new clause would protect existing rights and existing agreements; in other words, lands now under lease would be protected until the leases expired or were determined.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: But under Subclause (*b.*) property would be exempt if rented from month to month, and not leased.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Hardly. The term did not affect the nature of the tenure.

HON. G. RANDELL: What was the meaning of "except the Crown?" Had not Crown lessees to pay rates?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The subclause referred to those properties affected by Subclauses 3 and 4 of Section 324. Such properties were, by virtue of the purposes for which the land was held, exempt from taxation; but by subclause (*b.*) such lands would be rateable if let to private persons.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Surely under Subclause (*b.*) a property rented, but not leased, from the Railway Department would be exempt from rating.

HON. M. L. MOSS: To remove all doubt he moved—

That the words "or rented" be inserted after "leased," in the last line of Subclause (*b.*).

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

New Clause—Notice under Section 358 to be served on registered proprietor, etc.:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following stand as Clause 9:

A copy of the notice required by section three hundred and fifty-eight of the principal Act to be published in the *Government Gazette* shall be served upon the registered proprietor under the Transfer of Land Act 1893, and upon every person appearing by the register book to have any interest in the land or charge thereon as lessee, mortgagee, annuitant, caveator, or otherwise, or if the land is not under the Transfer of Land Act 1893, upon any person appearing by the register of deeds to be the owner of the land or to have any interest therein as aforesaid. A notice under this section shall be deemed to have been duly served if sent through the post by prepaid registered letter addressed to the proprietor, owner, or other person as aforesaid, at his address appearing in the register book or register of deeds, as the case may be.

On the second reading Mr. Haynes had brought under notice the extremely hard case of a lady who was deprived of her property, apparently without due notice of rates being served on her. To obviate this the amendment was drafted. Members would see that the clause went far enough. It would ensure that no such happenings as alluded to by Mr. Haynes would occur in the future, and that the owners of lands and persons interested in it would have ample opportunity to ascertain that land was about to be sold for the nonpayment of rates.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: This was practically an amendment of the Transfer of Land Act dealt with last Parliament and put into the Municipalities Act; but the clause of the original Act should be farther amended by allowing three years to lapse before the land of persons absent from the country should be sold. Also an amendment should be made to provide that notice of sale should be published in newspapers circulating in the district.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member could move in that direction on recommittal.

Question passed, the clause added.

New Clause—amendment of Section 359:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following be added as Clause 10:—

Section three hundred and fifty-nine of the principal Act is amended by adding after the word "Act," in line fourteen, the following words:—"and shall not require production of the certificate of title, but shall, if necessary, make such orders and publish such advertisements as are provided for in the case of dealings with land when the certificate of title is lost or not produced."

This was intended to protect persons buying land sold for the nonpayment of rates. The stand had been taken that no new certificate of title could be issued unless the old certificate was produced; but in many instances, persons whose land was sold for nonpayment of rates left the State, and presumably took their certi-

ficates of title with them or lost them. The clause authorised issue of new certificates in lieu of those taken away or lost.

HON. C. SOMMERS: This should be more safeguarded. We should require the production of the old certificate before the issue of a new certificate, but where it was impossible to produce an old certificate, by all means the formality of advertising should be proceeded with.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was the invariable practice to ask for the old certificate. If it could not be produced, the procedure laid down in the amendment would be followed.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It was supposed that the present law was sufficient, but the Full Court had decided otherwise. Our law for the sale of land for the nonpayment of rates was on the same footing as the law in other States, where transfers were accepted without the production of the certificate of title; and in hundreds of cases titles had been conferred on purchasers at such sales. In regard to land seized under writs of execution, people never dreamt of attempting to produce the certificate of title. What possible chance would the judgment creditor have of doing so? All that was done was the production of the certificate of transfer signed by the sheriff. There must be hundreds of certificates of title never produced. A certificate of title in the hands of the registered proprietor was merely a duplicate of the title; and the title was that contained in the registry book. Before dealing, cautious people made searches; and if there was any duplicate in anybody's hands, that duplicate was marked on the registry book as cancelled, and the reasons were stated. The Commissioner of Titles had taken the stand which the Full Court upheld; and this amendment was to give persons who legitimately purchased land sold for nonpayment of rates, the opportunity of getting a perfect title. With regard to transfers the Registrar of Titles would adopt the following procedure:—Notice would appear in the local newspapers that certain land had been sold for nonpayment of rates, and that unless the certificate was forthcoming within a specified time a new certificate would be issued. If the procedure of selling land for nonpayment of rates was to continue, we must make it perfect. He agreed it was a serious thing to sell a man's land for nonpayment of rates, but it was grossly unfair that whilst the great bulk of persons holding land in a municipality contributed to the upkeep of roads in the municipality, defaulting ratepayers should derive benefit in that direction, and that there should be no means of getting at them. Perhaps if the period were extended to two years or possibly three if members so wished, that would be sufficient. At the present time there was no power to charge interest for overdue rates. There ought to be some drastic method if a man would not pay up by getting at the land in that way.

HON. J. M. DREW hoped the amendment would be carried. It was absolutely necessary some provision of this description should be made. There was a case in Geraldton where land was sold for nonpayment of rates, and the owner, who lived at Singapore, refused to give up the certificate of title, and there was no machinery to compel him to do so.

HON. W. PATRICK was also in favour of the amendment. He knew many instances in Australia where land was sold for nonpayment of rates. The period then was about two years, and they charged 10 per cent. interest on overdue rates. A writ having been issued and the land sold, the Supreme Court ordered the Master to issue a new certificate of title, and the previous certificate of title ceased to exist.

HON. G. RANDELL: It was a very serious matter to sell a man's land for rates. He did not think the time was of so much consequence, but what was of more importance was that due and proper notice should be given. [THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was, he thought, provided for by the previous new clause.] As long as that was done, he did not think any harm would occur. It was undesirable that a person should have property and pay no rates.

HON. W. MALEY suggested that the words "if necessary" should be struck out of the new clause. It was very desirable that notice usually published should be published. An instance occurred in South Australia where, owing to the looseness with which things were done, one or more forgeries were perpetrated with certificates of title. [Inter-

jection by HON. M. L. MOSS.] If a new title were to be issued for a number of various purposes, it would give a larger opening than existed at the present for fraud. If the words "if necessary" were struck out, more effect would be given to the amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The words "if necessary" were essential. They were inserted to meet cases where a title was not produced. Where a title was produced it would not be necessary to take certain steps referred to in the new clause.

HON. W. MALEY: "If necessary" had no meaning in the law courts of the State. He had proved that.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The matter was in the discretion of the Registrar of Titles.

HON. W. MALEY: Then the hon. gentleman had better say so in the clause.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY scarcely thought so, because this was an instruction to the Registrar of Titles to investigate the case and find out whether it was necessary to take proceedings.

Question passed, the clause added.

New Clause—Amendment of 2 Edw. VII., No. 39, s. 7:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following be added as Clause 11:—

> Section seven of the Municipal Institutions Amendment Act 1902 (No. 3) is hereby amended by striking out the words "within the municipality," and inserting "by the council."

This section dealt with the amendment of Section 169 of the principal Act, which was the Licensing Act, and provided that a municipality might issue licenses for certain purposes. It had been found that a certain amount of ambiguity had been created by the use of the words "within the municipality." When the Bill was before the House Mr. Moss instanced this by the fact of a person having a cart and plying for hire in one municipality and being licensed in another. The object of this new clause was to make the meaning of the section very much plainer. It was proposed to strike out the words "within the municipality" and insert "by the council."

HON. M. L. MOSS: Under the old Act of 1876 a license was operative in all parts of the State. When the Act of 1902 was passed it was intended that where a cart was used for the purpose of business and in a particular municipality the license fee should be paid in that municipality. By the way the clause was drawn in 1902 one had to take his license out within a municipality, but it was operative all over the State. A carrier who took out a license in North Fremantle carried on business from Monday till Saturday, and when prosecuted he said "I am licensed within this municipality, because my license operates all over the State."

HON. J. A. THOMSON could not support the amendment if it would apply to a business man who was delivering goods, say, about Perth and Fremantle. If he would have to take out a license for each municipal district in which he delivered goods, such a provision would not be fair; indeed it would be monstrous.

HON. M. L. MOSS: If a person using a horse and cart delivering goods used the roads in two adjoining municipalities, for instance, he would have to take out a license for each municipality.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: There should be no necessity for this provision, because the councils received compensation in cases where a man using a horse and cart made use of the roads in more than one municipality; for while one man would take out a license and do most of his work in one municipality, using another municipality occasionally, another man using a horse and cart would take out a license in another municipality and use the first one occasionally; so there would be really no loss to the councils, who would receive compensation on the whole.

HON. W. PATRICK knew a case that was even more oppressive than any yet mentioned. Coaches ran from Day Dawn to Peak Hill, and the Peak Hill council demanded a license fee; the Nannine council did the same, while the practice was for the coaches to take out their license in Cue. Finally, they agreed that one license should be sufficient in all these cases. If this amendment were made as proposed, it would be possible to make a coach proprietor pay a license fee in every municipality through which he passed. That would be very objectionable.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There appeared to be some feeling against this amendment; therefore he thought it would be better to deal with this question by amending the Cart and Carriage Licensing Act, so as to apply in a more definite way to such cases as were contemplated in bringing forward the present amendment. As members appeared to be opposed to the amendment, he would withdraw it.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

MOUNT LAWLEY AGREEMENT.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill, which comes to us from another place and was introduced last session, has for its principal object the ratification of an agreement made between the proprietors of the land known as Mt. Lawley Estate, and the Minister for Public Works as administrator of the Metropolitan Water Supply under the powers of the late board; and I will sketch briefly the circumstances which led up to the agreement being made. It appears that some time back the proprietors of Mt. Lawley Estate, a large portion of it having passed into the hands of purchasers of blocks, wished to add to the attractiveness of their property by providing a sufficient water supply, and they agreed with the Metropolitan Waterworks Board, which has since been superseded, to reticulate the estate with a water service. The board not having in its possession sufficient funds for the purpose agreed with the proprietors of the estate that the proprietors should lend to the Waterworks Board a sum of money amounting to £1,071 for the purpose of this reticulation. The board availed themselves of the offer, and it was agreed that when the board should be in the position of receiving 10 per cent. profit on the amount of money expended in the reticulation service, the amount advanced by the proprietors of the estate should be repaid by the board. This agreement has since been held, and I think rightly so, to be absolutely illegal, and the proprietors would have no recourse against the Waterworks Board for repayment of money so advanced; but the work having been faithfully carried out, the residents on the estate having reaped the advantage of a water supply, and the condition as to the board being in receipt of 10 per cent. profit from the money so invested being soon reached, the proprietors of the estate made an appeal for the repayment of the money, and the board on their part made an appeal to the Government for farther funds. Those funds were not forthcoming, and in consequence of the advice received the whole transaction was treated as illegal. The next step was that the Metropolitan Waterworks Board passed out of existence, and for the time being the control of the water service was vested in the Minister for Public Works. The Minister at that date was Mr. W. D. Johnson, who met the proprietors and made an alternative proposition, which was a fairly good one from a business point of view. He proposed to repay the sum of £500 in cash, and that he would carry out additional works to the value of £832, thus paying back to the proprietors of the estate the amount originally lent and expended in the work of reticulating the estate. It is to ratify that agreement, which will be found in the schedule of the Bill, that this measure is introduced. Mr. Lynch was the Minister who signed the agreement as the successor of Mr. Johnson. The other clauses of the Bill are of a machinery character, found necessary from experience in the working of the Metropolitan Waterworks Supply, and opportunity is taken to embrace them in the Bill as amendments to the Act for the purpose which I have defined. Clause 4 proposes to add to the regulation clauses of the Act of 1889 certain powers not there provided, and to give a better definition of the intention of the Act for regulating the rent and fixing the scale of charges for water supplied. Clause 5 is for dealing with persons who are committing or permitting any breach or neglect of any of the provisions of the Waterworks Act of 1889, the Act of 1896 or amendments, or the by-laws made thereunder. Clause 6, which is very necessary, provides that the board may

levy a minimum rate to be prescribed by by-laws, in cases where the annual rent for water would not exceed £1 a year. The reason is fairly obvious, as the cost of laying on the water to such premises would exceed and absorb the annual rate for two or two and a-half years. Clause 7 is another machinery clause, defining the term "Minister." As I have said, the principal object of the Bill is to ratify the the agreement, and which I think is a very good business arrangement, as the proprietors of the estate will get back part of the money in work performed and part in cash at a future time. The Minister has undertaken that the work which is promised as part of this agreement shall be carried out as quickly as possible after this measure is passed.

HON. R. F. SHOLL (North): This is a Bill to confirm an arrangement made with Messrs. Copley and Robinson, proprietors of Mt. Lawley Estate; but Clause 3 of the Bill will allow the Government to do the same kind of thing with other proprietors, over and over again. In my opinion, the Bill is not a good one, and we know the water supplied at present is very bad.

HON. J. A. THOMSON (Central): I do not object to the principal object of the Bill, but like Mr. Sholl I rather object to Clause 3. It must be borne in mind that ratepayers in Perth have to pay a certain rate for the water service, whether they use the water on their premises or not, and some ratepayers who own large properties use very little water, yet are rated at £60, £70, or £100 per annum for the water service. Clause 3 of the Bill will give power to the Minister administering the water service to make arrangements with persons in the future for reticulating their private estates, and the persons occupying sections of land in a private estate, for instance, will not be charged in the same way that ratepayers in Perth are charged, whether they used the water or not. They will be charged only for such water as they use when supplied by meter. That will put such persons in a better position than are the ratepayers of Perth at the present time, and that is what I object to.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is not the object of the Bill.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: The people of Mount Lawley Estate are charged for for the water they use, and if they do not use the water, they are not charged for it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This is a clause for construction work.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: I understand the Waterworks Board extend the system, and do not make people pay for the water as we pay in the city of Perth. They only pay for the water they use. The people are not rated, but are charged by the meter. I would like to get off by paying per meter, even if I had to pay 2s. per thousand gallons. It is generally mooted that we will have to supplement our supply altogether. I endorse that. We ought to have had that long ago. I am against the suggestion to augment the supply of Perth by going beyond the present catchment area. It is a business proposition to say that the Government of the State should undertake to bring water to supply the wants of the metropolitan area and Fremantle, perhaps by tapping some other supply. We have hundreds of millions of gallons running to waste every winter.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Thousands of millions.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Yes; more than that. We have the financial statement of the Coolgardie Water Scheme before us, and we find that although they are doing better every year, still they are £80,000 behind paying their way. If the water that is running to waste were tapped, we do not require to construct any other weir for years perhaps; but we want to put the pipes into the present supply and bring the water to Perth. If people were only to pay 6d. per 1,000 gallons in Perth for the water, it would make the Coolgardie Water Scheme a payable concern, and we should have in Perth the best water supply in the whole of Australia. Because there is no doubt that the water from the Coolgardie water catchment area is superior to any water that is to-day obtained in Australia. Why should we as business people talk about buying up somebody else's land, because that is what it amounts to, when we have water running past us that only requires to be tapped? I think the Bill is necessary to carry out the agreement which has been entered into in all good faith.

HON. W. MALEY: I would like also to refer to the same clause as that referred to by Mr. Thomson. It appears to me the clause places a good deal of power in the hands of the board or the Minister to make arrangements for the reticulation of private estates. I take it that the intention of the clause is that the board may enter into a contract with the owner of a large estate for the reticulation of the estate; to allow the owner of the estate to make a profit on the water in retailing it. That is the construction one may put on the clause. It is open to that construction. It depends on the agreement that may from time to time be entered into by the board with private estates. The clause is open enough for anything. What the intention is I do not know. If the clause is allowed to pass as it stands, it will be open to abuse. The reticulation of the great metropolitan area, in view of the greater Perth which we are about to have, would be interfered with or impaired by any tin-pot contracts that may be entered into with the owners of little or big estates. We should have one great system of reticulation for this great metropolitan area; and there should be a system of mains to convey the water, and these mains must go in certain directions as the engineers may determine. And I fear, if we are to approach the reticulation of the suburbs in anything but a broad spirit and after mature consideration and on a well-devised scheme, if we have not this scheme, we had better let the matter alone for the present. I hope Clause 3 will receive careful consideration, either with a view to its elimination or an amendment of it, so that the taxpayers' money will not be wasted over a scheme that will not dovetail together when the final decision is arrived at.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 8 minutes past 6 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 12th December, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2·30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Regulations under "The Public Service Act, 1904. 2, Amounts paid by Government to Legal Practitioners—Return to order of the House, dated 6th December. 3, Papers relating to the remission of the sentence passed upon Son Hermann in connection with gambling at the Democratic Club. 4, Papers relating to an alleged breach of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act by W. Detmold, Ltd.

By the MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: 1, Agricultural Bank Annual Report for 1904-5.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: 1, By-laws passed by the Mourambine Roads Board.

QUESTION—CANCER TREATMENT, DAVIS SYSTEM.

MR. GULL asked the Minister for Commerce: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a paragraph in the *West Australian* of 8th December, under the heading "The Treatment of Cancer"? 2, If so, will he cause inquiries to be made with a view to ascertaining the genuineness or otherwise of the claims of Dr. Davis, in the interests of cancer patients in this State?

THE MINISTER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. Through the Principal Medical Officer I have made inquiry of Professor Allen, of Melbourne. At the medical congress held this year in Hobart, Professor Allen read a paper on cancer and its treatment. He, I understand, is *au fait* with this subject. The Principal