

tained in this Bill. Comparing the present position, Federal and State, and taking the present distribution, we find that the metropolitan seats comprise 13—I have included Swan as one of the metropolitan seats; northern seats comprise 4; country seats 20; goldfields central seats 4, and outer goldfields seats 9. If those seats were re-allocated under the present system of Federal distribution, we would have 26 seats in the metropolitan division, one in the northern, 19 in the country, two in the goldfields central, and two in the outer goldfields. On the other hand, by co-ordinating the State and Federal systems we could have a method of representation to apply to both State and Federal in this way: We could have two metropolitan divisions containing four metropolitan provinces and those four metropolitan provinces would contain 20 Assembly seats. We could have two country divisions containing four country provinces and 20 Assembly districts, whereas the goldfields pastoral division, comprising practically five-sixths of the State, would have two pastoral provinces and 10 Assembly districts. Although that would work out quite satisfactorily as far as the divisions are concerned and would enable the 50 Assembly districts to be brought into line with the existing five Federal divisions, I do not think the proposal would meet with the approval of the people of Western Australia at the present time. Still, that seems to be the only practicable basis on which to eliminate the duplication of subdivisions, which will cause a lot of confusion. I was hoping that the Bill would be held up until we got the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill from another place, and I am glad the Chief Secretary adopted that course. We now have that Bill before us, and we can see the principle of redistribution proposed by the Government. When the Chief Secretary replies to the debate on this Bill, I should like him to indicate how the new distribution will fit in with this proposal for joint rolls.

The Chief Secretary: I have no idea.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Perhaps the Minister could show how the difficulties under this Bill, instanced by Mr. Cornell and Mr. Harris, could be overcome with the basis of representation proposed in the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill. It appears to me that those obstacles are insurmountable under the drafting of the Bill now be-

fore us. I should like to hear the Chief Secretary on that point when he replies.

On motion by Hon. G. Fraser, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 15th November, 1928.

Question: State Saw Mills Bill	PA01
Motion: Standing Orders	1858
Bills: Road Closure (Queen-street) 2B., Com. Report	1856
Electoral Act Amendment, 2B.	1850
Water Boards Act Amendment, Com.	1851

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

QUESTION—STATE SAW MILLS.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (for Hon. A. Lovekin) asked the Chief Secretary: At what date did the honourable association and understanding between the State saw mills and the timber trading companies cease to have effect?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: For some years past the State Saw Mills Department have not taken any part in the business of the employers' organisations.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 30th October of the debate on the following motion by Hon. J. R. Brown:—

That it be referred to the Standing Orders Committee to consider the desirability of submitting new Standing Orders to enable a Select Committee to be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into, and reporting on, any regulation laid on the Table of the House, and to consider and report as to any other amendments to the Standing Orders which they deem desirable.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	16
—					
Majority against	12
—					

AYES.

Hon. G. Fraser	{	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. E. H. Gray		Hon. J. R. Brown (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew		Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. T. Franklin		Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. W. T. Glasheen		Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall		Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley		Hon. C. H. Wittencoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes		Hon. Sir E. Wittencoom
Hon. G. A. Kempton		Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain		Hon. E. Rose
↑		(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

**BILL—ROAD CLOSURE
(QUEEN-STREET.)**

Second Reading.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.39] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill it is necessary to have in order to rectify an error made by the Fremantle Municipal Council some time ago when they repurchased land and made a street from Queen-street to Cantonment-street, really a short continuation of the existing Queen-street from Adelaide-street to Cantonment-street. The council did not realise that it was necessary to get the sanction of Parliament before they could sell any portion of repurchased land that had been declared a public highway. After the blocks were purchased it was found that there was an elbow at the Adelaide-street end and another elbow in Cantonment-street. In order to improve the alignment, a piece of land was purchased on the Adelaide-street corner to straighten that portion of the street, and the opposite corner in Cantonment-street was sold. A building is now in course of construction on it. When application was made to the Registrar of Titles it was found that the sanction of Parliament would have to be obtained before parting with any of that new highway. The Bill has been introduced, to

secure the sanction of Parliament to rectify the position.

Hon. E. Rose: Have you got a plan?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, it is a very short street and a plan is scarcely necessary. Mr. Holmes will know the place well. In order to relieve the congestion in the streets, it was deemed advisable to extend Queen-street to Cantonment-street, and a line of shops and offices has been erected on both sides of this short street.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittencoom: Whereabouts is this land for sale; is it on the north or south of the street?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is on the south side.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You speak of an elbow. I cannot follow you in that.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The council purchased certain blocks going from Adelaide-street to Cantonment-street and declared a public highway. On the Adelaide-street corner there was an elbow and on the opposite side, in Cantonment-street, there was another. The council purchased a piece of land in Adelaide-street so as to make that side of the street perfectly straight. To do that they had to sell a small portion of the repurchased land. That has been sold, I understand, to the Fremantle Building Society, and offices are being erected on the block. The council should have taken steps to purchase the land and make the street straight before declaring a public highway.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do the Fremantle council support this?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: They requested me to introduce the Bill. The whole business is being held up, and nothing can be done until the title goes through. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [4.43]: I am not clear about this. Had there been a plan, it would have helped us to understand the position. I know Adelaide-street, and I know Queen-street a little. I am not clear where this land to be sold is, or what the alterations are: whether it is north or south of Adelaide-street. Mr. Gray said it was on the south side. Does that mean that it is closing up the whole street south of Adelaide-street?

Hon. E. H. Gray: No.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.44]: I understand this is a matter of urgency and that the portion of land it is desired to sell is very small. When these blocks were purchased by the Fremantle Municipal Council with the idea of making a street through from Adelaide-street to Cantonment-street, it was not realised that the boundaries of those blocks were not in a straight line. It was not until the street had been made and permission had been given to build, that the council realised there was no power to transfer. The Bill is required to straighten out the transaction for the disposal of the surplus piece of land. From my own knowledge I can assure members that the proposal is quite in order, although I agree it would have been far more satisfactory had a plan been made available. On the score of urgency I ask the House to accept the assurance given by Mr. Gray and myself and agree to the second reading.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.46]: I also can assure members that they have nothing to fear in passing the Bill. The Fremantle council went to some trouble and expense to secure land in order to make the new street. As the Honorary Minister has stated, owing to the blocks not running true from one street to the other, it was found when the road was made that there was a little elbow on each side of the street. The difficulty on the one side was overcome by the purchase of additional land, but it was impossible to overcome the difficulty on the other side because the elbow jutted on to the road.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It will not necessitate the destruction of any building?

Hon. G. FRASER: No; it is necessary to permit of a building in course of erection being continued. It is a matter of urgency because the building has been commenced.

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—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban [4.50]: The clauses of this Bill are much better understood by certain members of the House than by me because of their wide experience of such matters. The only point upon which I desire to speak is the importance of the measure in view of the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill that is now before the House and the alterations that may be made in the boundaries of the various districts. It would have been wiser to defer consideration of this Bill until we knew exactly how the proposed redistribution of seats would affect it. Mr. Seddon yesterday entered into some detail and that was one of the points he made. While it may not be possible at the present juncture to adopt a joint roll for the Commonwealth and the State, it may be possible under the redistribution. I desire more information as to how this measure will be affected by the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill. Mr. Harris and Mr. Seddon may be regarded almost as specialists on this question, and I candidly admit that I am guided largely by their opinions. The fact that the Bill affecting the boundaries of the electorates will be discussed in the course of a few days leads me to suggest that it would be wise to hold over this measure for the time being.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [4.52]: I oppose the Bill on the ground that until such time as Federal and State boundaries coincide it is useless to consider such a measure. In my district we have Boulder, Hannans and Brown Hill-Ivanhoe for the State, but for Federal purposes they are altogether different. I do not see why confusion should be made worse than it is at present by carrying a Bill for joint electoral rolls. If the Federal divisions coincided with the State boundaries, I would agree to joint rolls, but until such time as the boundaries do coincide I shall oppose such a measure. The confusion under existing conditions is bad enough, as those people responsible for getting electors on the roll are aware. I may mention that in Boulder Vivian-street is the State boundary, whereas Hopkins-

street is the Federal boundary, and I do not see how that difficulty could be overcome. It would be necessary to fill in two different claim cards for the same Federal division, one by people living on one side of the street and another by people living on the opposite side of the street. I am also averse to handing over any more departments of the State to the Federal Government.

On motion by Hon. W. T. Glasheen, debate adjourned.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Water supply in agricultural and other areas by means of tanks, etc.:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That the 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" be struck out, with a view to inserting "In every case where the Public Works Department has expended or may hereafter expend money in providing a water supply in agricultural areas."

The clause as drafted will apply throughout the State to wells on main roads that may have been provided years ago for the use of the travelling public, and to wells on stock routes. I do not think that is the intention of the Government, but we should take no risk. The intention should be clearly stated so that the measure will apply to agricultural districts only.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Will not your amendment cut out all the wells and dams put down in the agricultural areas?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: No.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Solicitor-General points out that Mr. Hamersley could accomplish his object by striking out the words "or other" so that the clause would specify "agricultural areas." I am not entirely in favour of that because, in the near future, it may be necessary to provide a water supply for a new mining centre, and the Government would not have power to do it under the measure, which would have to

be amended. All we are concerned about at present is the agricultural areas.

Hon. V. Hamersley: If you provided waterworks in a mining centre you could not charge on the acreage basis.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The charge in towns would be levied on the annual value, not on the acreage basis.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I understood the Minister proposed to move for the deletion of the words "or other."

The Chief Secretary: I suggested that they might be deleted.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Have the agricultural areas ever been defined? We are extending them every week and I should like to know what the definition of agricultural areas is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not necessary to define every word in a Bill. The ordinary commonsense meaning is to be given to "agricultural area" and "mining area."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Bill requires careful examination; otherwise its passage may result in additional taxation being imposed. The Government might put up a standpipe in a district and then levy a charge of 2d. per acre on every settler, whether he wanted the water or not. A settler with a flock of sheep who was located close to a standpipe could easily use up the whole supply, whereupon the settler coming along with a cart would not be able to obtain any water.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I agree that the term "agricultural area" should be defined, especially as it is also used in electoral legislation. Could it be said that the Kalgoorlie district, for instance, is not agricultural? Certainly it is agricultural towards Esperance.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Government would not undertake to provide a water supply unless it was required, whether in an agricultural or in a mining area, since considerable capital expenditure would be involved. The Government would not be so foolish as to embark upon the establishment of a supply unless there was a population requiring it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There are two classes of settlers—the one who tries to help himself, and the other who wants the Government to do everything for him, the latter class being preponderant to-day. Some settlers provide their own water, and

their neighbours could do the same if they cared to go to the expense. However, they want the Government to do it for them, and then the former class would be penalised. The areas in which water supplies have been provided should be defined in the Bill; and if those areas are to be added to, it will only mean an amending Bill of one clause from year to year. Under the measure as it stands, there might be unreasonably heavy rating, as future Governments will be looking for revenue in all directions.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The various representatives of the agricultural industry in this Chamber should know whether the Bill is required or not, and I would be glad of an expression of their opinions. The Government will not establish additional water supplies unless the revenue is likely to cover interest and maintenance. There have been abundant requests from agricultural areas for water supplies, and therefore the Bill is necessary.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Part of the Bill is necessary, but part of it is impracticable. Legislation for supplying dry areas with water is certainly necessary and also welcome. However, Clause 2 contains matters which will not work out in practice. The average size of tank excavated by the Government in agricultural areas is about 2,000 cubic yards. In a few cases the size runs up to 5,000 yards. The average contract price for the excavation of a tank of 2,000 yards is 2s. 6d. per yard, which means a total cost of £250 for excavation. The people resident around the dam site are to be rated, then, to provide interest and sinking fund on an expenditure of £250. The interest would be about £12 per annum, and the sinking fund a similar amount. Thus the total annual obligation on the district for that particular dam would be £25. To rate the residents within a radius of seven or eight miles for such an amount would be ridiculous. Collection would cost more than the amount of the rates. In the case of a well, the capital expenditure might be as low as £50, in respect of which rating would be still more impracticable. There are water schemes and water schemes. A scheme with a standpipe, as described by the Chief Secretary, would cost at least £5000, and the limitation of the Bill to schemes of that size or larger would make the measure practical. Anyone holding the view that a farm having a tank and a stand-

pipe on some portion of its area is adequately supplied with water does not know much about the subject. Every farm must be subdivided, and in order to be carried on in a practical way must have a water supply in almost every paddock. I believe the Chief Secretary said no one would be allowed to reticulate from a standpipe into different paddocks. The argument as to a farm with a tank, therefore, will not bear investigation. As regards serving a fair-sized community the Bill is all right, but to apply it to dams and wells for small communities is beyond the bounds of the practical.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How much water would a 2,000-yard dam hold?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask hon. members to confine their remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I intended my remarks as an indication to the Chief Secretary of the views of an agricultural member.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: My object in moving the amendment is to lessen the scope of the clause, because I consider it altogether too wide. As it is, the provisions could be applied to every small dam that had been put down, merely because some water was supplied. My amendment implies something quite different. The inclusion of the words "a water supply in agricultural areas" must surely mean the provision of supplies sufficient to be reticulated for the requirements of the people of a district. In the past the Public Works Department has spent money in putting in dams that have never held water. It would be unfair to regard the district where such a dam had been put down as a water area, merely because the department had spent money on the dam. If that were so, the people of the area concerned could be rated at 3d. per acre. The Minister can accept the assurance of country members that we recognise the Government require additional powers to overcome difficulties that have arisen because some people have not paid in accordance with the agreements entered into. This question has been discussed for many years, and the only difficulty is to define the proper way of levying the charge upon those who should pay the tax, which not at the same time burdening those who should not have to shoulder any such impost.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I thought I made it clear, when moving the second reading of the Bill and subsequently when speaking on the clause, that the Government did not intend to levy rates in respect of water supplies such as those to which Mr. Glasheen has referred. Shortly after I took office I had an application from a constituent of mine in the Dalwallinu district, with regard to a water supply. At that time the Agricultural Bank made advances for the purpose of constructing tanks of 1,000 cubic yards capacity. Subsequently an amendment was made to the regulations and the bank was able to advance money to each settler for the construction of a 2,000-cubic yard tank.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: I referred to tanks put down by the Government.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would be ridiculous for the Government to levy a rate in respect of dams such as Mr. Glasheen referred to. What the Government have in view is such work as may be entailed when it is necessary to line tanks, to cover them, or to connect them up with windmills and overhead tanks.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: It does not say that in the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Surely it will not be argued that the Government should make themselves ridiculous and contemptible in the eyes of the public by putting down a 2,000-cubic yard tank and then rate the people of the district served to meet interest, sinking fund and maintenance charges that, at the rate of 8 per cent. on £250, would amount to £20 per annum! I have not had time to make any calculations but it seems to me that a 2,000-cubic yard tank would hold about 350,000 gallons when full.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: You will not find one in a hundred that holds that quantity!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: How many settlers have that supply on their farms, and how many head of stock would that quantity of water provide for?

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: The point is that under the clause you could rate that district.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Of course, we could rate the district for a hole in the ground!

Hon. H. STEWART: In view of the Chief Secretary's remarks, the only logical

deduction to be drawn is that he should have no objection to the amendment. I understood the Minister to say he would move an amendment that would affect the application of the Bill to old works.

The Chief Secretary: I will move that later on.

Hon. H. STEWART: The object of the amendment is to make the Bill apply as the Minister says the Government desire it to operate. The Minister has pointed out that the Government do not want to make use of the measure for revenue production from small works, and all we desire to do is to alter the clause so that it will not be left open to any such construction. If it were provided that the clause should not apply unless a certain amount of money had been spent on the water supply, it would do away with the possibility of confusion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I gathered from the remarks of the Chief Secretary that water supplies had been provided in some areas, and that some of the users of the water had failed to pay in accordance with the agreement entered into, hence the reason for making the measure retrospective. I think it would be more simple if the Bill were made to apply to defined areas where that difficulty had arisen. If the Government subsequently desired to extend the provisions of the measure to other districts, it would merely involve a small amendment later on. Instead of giving the Government the right to levy a rate of 3d. in the pound, as suggested in the Bill, why should we not limit that right to given areas where difficulties have arisen?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Where people have agreed to pay, but have neglected to fulfil their obligations.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If those people asked for water supplies, the Government should be in a position to make them pay.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment I propose to move will exempt land from rating in respect of costs prior to the 1st January, 1925. That is when I introduced the legislation dealing with rock catchments and other means of providing water supplies.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have already stated the words I propose to insert in lieu of those struck out, but I wish to add to the

amendment I have indicated so as to provide that the water supply shall be of a sufficient capacity to meet the reasonable requirements of ratepayers within the area to be rated. That being so, I move the following amendment:—

That the words "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" be inserted in lieu of those struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A tank or dam may be of sufficient capacity in a normal season to meet requirements, but suppose we have a drought like that of 1914? Then I do not think it would matter. Who would finance the scheme in such circumstances? Who would determine whether the tank was of sufficient capacity? How would it be known what were the reasonable requirements of the settler?

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

Ayes	11
Noes	9
					—
Majority for	2
					—

AYES.

Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. C. H. Wittencoom
Hon. Sir W. Latblain	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. Sir E. Wittencoom
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest that before we finally pass the Bill hon. members should reconsider the question raised by the amendment we have just carried. So far as I can see, it means that none of the schemes can possibly be put in hand.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Can we at this stage cut out the closing words of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: No, it will be necessary to recommit the Bill to do that.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) "prescribed" be struck out, and after "distance" the words "of five miles" be inserted.

The paragraph will then read, "A water area may be stated to comprise all land within a distance of five miles from such water works." A person living quite close to a standpipe may come along with his stock and use up all the water. Another man eight or ten miles out might have to wait a considerable time. We should therefore define the distance. The word "prescribed" means nothing; the distance may be five miles or it may be 25 miles.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Does the hon. member require this amendment after the amendment just passed by the Committee which compels the Government to provide a scheme of "sufficient capacity"? Surely then a limit of five miles is not wanted.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: According to the statement of the Chief Secretary the reticulation may go a distance of five miles, and the water carried ever beyond that distance from a particular stand pipe or the source of supply.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is evidently desired by Mr. Hamersley that no one shall be supplied with water except those who are within five miles of the source of supply. He proposes to restrict the area to five miles and it will be an obligation on the Government to serve only those within that radius. Unless actually prohibited, those outside that radius could take any quantity of water and pay no rates. The result would be that those within the five miles would be penalised for the administration of the scheme which was being participated in by those 10 or 15 miles away.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Instead of making it general, we should define the areas to be supplied. There is no equity in making the man within a radius of five miles pay rates while the man five miles and one yard away can come in and get as much water as he likes for nothing. We should define the areas in the Bill, and if necessary, extend those areas from time to time. If the Minister will look into that aspect, he will agree that it is a right course to follow.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: The amendment will endeavour to do what Mr. Holmes suggests the Leader of the House should do, that is, define the area as being within

a radius of five miles from the source of supply.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What supply?

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: Water supplies are what we are dealing with. The Chief Secretary has pointed out that those who live beyond the five-mile radius will be able to come and draw water. How are we going to define the area, unless we make it a radius of 25 miles, which would be absurd.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Even then the same thing would apply.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: That is so. Mr. Hamersley wishes to define it as a radius of five miles, but he has no consideration whatever for the men beyond the 5-mile radius. The whole thing is in an absolute muddle and it will take some time to frame amendments that will make the scheme a workable one. Defining the areas will not get us over the difficulty.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Without the amendment, the areas will be prescribed by regulation.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is done in the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: That is quite a different thing. It has been claimed that settlers who have their own supplies should be exempt.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are not exempt in the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: All settlers in a given district pay practically the same money to the Crown for their land. Thousands of them have not any water at all on their blocks, whereas here and there we find a man lucky enough to have a soak on his property. Such a man should have no objection to paying something towards the cost of a scheme to serve all in the community.

Hon. H. Stewart: What is the good of one soak on a farm?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That will come later. At present we are dealing with an amendment to paragraph (a).

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The Bill, I understand, deals with certain supplies that have been put in in the agricultural areas. Such schemes appear to be too expensive to reticulate, as is done in the city or towns, for the Bill refers to supplies with standpipes. Consequently, the source of supply is the standpipes, and I wish to define an area of a 5-mile radius so that if it is desired to

embrace another area, the department must set up another standpipe to rope in another lot of settlers.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And you think that five miles is a reasonable distance over which to cart water.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That is my idea. There should be some distance beyond which another standpipe must be set up to serve the requirements of the people.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What size are these standpipes?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not know. These schemes are fairly small.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Would the pipeline be big enough to stand tapping indefinitely?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Some people, no doubt, would not hesitate to tap it wherever it is convenient to them.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The amendment does not make the position clear. Paragraph (a) states distinctly "from such waterworks." That is where the water is supplied from. The standpipe may be five miles away from the waterworks. It cannot be said that the standpipe is the waterworks.

Hon. H. STEWART: As I understand, Mr. Holmes would like to see the existing schemes mentioned in the Bill, and let the Government collect their revenue. In the dry areas, those schemes are very necessary. The Government have rendered a valuable service by going on with this work, which the previous Government failed to do. We do not want the Government to be deprived of their just revenue from the work. I see no objection to Mr. Holmes's proposal, but Mr. Hamersley's amendment to insert a definite mileage is unnecessary. We have a sufficient safeguard in knowing that the work is to be of sufficient capacity to supply certain settlers, who shall be rated. To endeavour to fix a mileage is to strain after something we cannot embody in the Bill. I sympathise with Mr. Hamersley's intention, but he has to remember that in a time of stress settlers will come 30 miles for water, even if they have no legal right to it; and if the water is there, no person in authority would be able to refuse it. We all realise the value of the work done by the Government and we do not want to be obstructionists, but still we should see to it that the legislation

passed is not so loose that at some time or other trouble will occur in consequence of it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Stephenson asked how the area was to be defined. I think the area is defined already. All the schemes and areas have distinctive names, and so all we have to do is to include those names in the Bill. I congratulate the Government upon having gone to trouble and expense in providing those settlers with water. Although not an agricultural member, I do sincerely congratulate the Government upon what they have done in this respect. Also I want to see them paid for what they have done, but not for what they may do in the future. Since the areas are already named, it will be a simple matter to make the Bill apply to them.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to stand as paragraph (v):—"That where land is included in a rateable area which belongs to an owner who has at his own expense provided a sufficient water supply for his own exclusive use on such land he shall be exempt from rates."

The Leader of the House, I know, takes strong exception to the principle in the amendment. But in many districts people have spent large sums of money in providing their own water supplies, and so have been the means of opening up the locality. Others, coming in later, have not attempted to provide their own supplies, but have waited for the Government to come along. We require to encourage the settlers to go on doing the work that has been done in the past. I have in mind half a dozen settlers who have spent enormous sums in providing private water supplies. In many instances, those private supplies have been made available to new settlers while those new settlers were getting established. Yet those new settlers, instead of installing their own supplies, have entered into agreements with the Government for a Government scheme; and so those who have put in their own supplies at their own expense are now to be rated to provide water for those who waited for the Government scheme. Some differential treatment should be given to those who have provided their own schemes. They should be exempt, and

so get a consideration that will be an inducement to others to put in their own supplies. Wherever schemes are provided the supply will not be too great, and those settlers who provide sufficient water for their own use will be relieving the Government schemes.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I support the amendment, but I cannot say I am in agreement with Mr. Hamersley's contention that a settler distant from a water supply and rated for it would be discouraged from putting in a supply of his own. The rate would not be much and, if he failed to put in his own supply, he would probably lose £500 in water carting. While a resident of the city might provide a supply of his own by tapping underground water or expending £20 on a galvanised iron tank, when a man starts to equip a farm a water supply would cost him probably £1,500 or more.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Oh, oh!

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I am on the job and I could not put mine in for less than £2,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the amendment. At one stage the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies was inclined to view it sympathetically, but he soon recognised that to accept it would be violating a generally recognised principle. In all the States of Australia, once a Government scheme is provided, the people of the cities and towns are taxed regardless of whether they possess supplies of their own. Some private supplies appear to be capable of giving ample water, but in dry seasons they fail to meet requirements. The fact of a Government scheme being provided for a large number of settlers must tend to increase the value of a holding on which provision has already been made. A district that has a bad name in the matter of water supply is not likely to meet with any attention from people wishing to acquire land, but the very fact of having a scheme would tend to increase the land values of settlers who have supplies as well of settlers who have not. The principle contained in the amendment cannot be recognised by the department.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Because there are brigands in other parts is no reason why there should be brigands all round. The men out back are ready to do their fair

share and fall into line wherever possible, but it is only just that special consideration should be given in instances such as I have mentioned.

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

Ayes 12
Noes 7

Majority for 5

AYES.

Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. E. Ross
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. H. Wittencoom
Hon. A. Lovelock	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. G. A. Kempton

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir E. Wittencoom
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. E. H. Gray

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—
“(vi) That land shall not be rateable in respect of the cost of works constructed prior to the first day of January, 1925.”

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

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 6.14 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 20th November, 1928.

Assent to Bills	Page
Question: Railway project, Kalgarin	1867
Bills: Harbours and Jetties, 1a.	1867
Road Closure (Queen Street), 3a.	1867
Water Boards Act Amendment, Report ..	1867
Land Tax and Income Tax, Com. Report ..	1868
Quarry Railway Extension, 1a.	1876
Feeding Stalls, Assembly's message ..	1876
Railways Discontinuance, Assembly's request, 1a.	1876
for Conference	1876
Electoral Districts Act Amendment, 2a.	1876
Group Settlement Act Amendment, Com.	1881

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the under-mentioned Bills:—

- 1, Pearling Act Amendment.
- 2, Dried Fruits Act Amendment.
- 3, Navigation Act Amendment.
- 4, Fertilisers.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, KALGARIN.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL (for Hon. W. T. Glasheen) asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What is the cause of the delay of the Government in bringing down a Bill to authorise the construction of a railway to serve the Kalgarin settlers? 2, Will such a Bill be introduced before the close of the present session?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, and 2. The matter is receiving consideration.

BILL—HARBOURS AND JETTIES.

Introduced by the Honorary Minister and read a first time.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE, (QUEEN STREET.)

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.