

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 8th November, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Water Supplies, as to storage tank, Kalgoorlie	1750
Superannuation and pensions, as to increasing	1750
Railways, (a) as to new cottages, Koojeddah	1750
(b) as to warning signals at crossings	1750
Education, as to basis of teachers' long service leave	1751
Communism, as to Esplanade meetings and State action	1751
Liberal Party, as to requests for rate-payers' lists	1751
Superphosphate, as to obtaining supplies from New Zealand	1751
Meat Supplies Select Committee, extension of time	1752
Motion : Water Supplies, as to extension of comprehensive scheme to Mt. Barker, amendment (points of order, dissent from Speaker's ruling), passed as amended	1758
Bills : Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment, 1r.	1752
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 1r.	1752
Mining Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1752
Vermitt Act Amendment, 3r.	1752
Public Works Act Amendment, 3r.	1752
Noxious Weeds, 3r.	1752
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1), report	1752
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	1752
Loan, £14,368,000, Message	1754
Hire Purchase Agreements Act Amendment, 2r.	1754
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2r.	1756
State Housing Act Amendment, Council's message	1801

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

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Storage Tank, Kalgoorlie.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked the Minister for Water Supply:

(1) What is the water storage capacity of the tank recently erected by the Water Supply Department at the highest point in Lyall-street, Kalgoorlie?

(2) What is the purpose of erecting the tank?

(3) Is he aware that a storage tank was on or close to the present site some years ago and was demolished?

(4) What was the reason for the discontinuance of water storage in such tank and also the reason for its demolition?

(5) What was the total cost in connection with the erection of the present tank?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 25,000 gallons.

(2) To improve the supply of water to a group of residences in the higher parts of Lamington during periods when low pressures prevail.

(3) Yes.

(4) The fall off in water consumption about 20 years ago when mining was less active did not warrant its use. The tank was demolished because of its bad condition.

(5) As the work is incomplete the exact cost is not known, but rough estimate is £250.

SUPERANNUATION AND PENSIONS.

As to Increasing.

Mr. SHEARN asked the Premier:

(1) Having regard to the recent decision of the Federal Arbitration Court in the basic wage case and increasing living costs, does the Government intend to give early favourable consideration to representations already made by those in receipt of State superannuation and 1871 pensions, for an increase?

(2) If not, will he fully state the reason?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) and (2) This matter is receiving consideration.

RAILWAYS.

(a) As to New Cottages, Koojeddah.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Does the Railway Department intend to construct any new railway cottages at Koojeddah?

(2) If so, when is the work likely to commence?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Koojeddah is not included in any current housing programme.

(2) Answered by (1).

(b) As to Warning Signals at Crossings.

Mr. BRADY (without notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware that two level crossing accidents, one at Collie and the other at Midland Junction, have taken place within the last 24 hours?

(2) Will he, in view of the frequent occurrence of level crossing accidents, expedite the installation of warning signals at all railway crossings?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) and (2) The hon. member has drawn my attention to newspaper reports concerning the two accidents in question. I will see that the matter is discussed with the Commissioners of Railways and the Commissioner of Main Roads as early as possible. With regard to the accident at Midland Junction, this took place on a crossing traversed by the Midland Railway Company's rollingstock and that aspect will also have to be taken into consideration.

EDUCATION.

As to Basis of Teachers' Long Service Leave.

Hon. E. NULSEN asked the Minister for Education:

In the event of a teacher being granted long service leave, is this leave granted—

- (1) On the basis of the calendar month—that is, irrespective of whether there are 28 (February in a non-leap year), 29 (February in a leap year), 30 (say April), 31 (say July) days in it?
- (2) On the basis of four weeks per months?
- (3) On the basis of seven days per week?
- (4) On the basis of five days per week?
- (5) In the event of a teacher being paid for one day of any week, how is the one day payment calculated?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes. A grant of three months' leave, however, entitles a teacher to 13 weeks' holiday; six months' leave to 26 weeks' holiday.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Answered by (1).

(4) Answered by (1).

(5) One day's salary is calculated as follows:—

$$\frac{1}{10} \text{ of } \frac{12}{313} \text{ of annual salary rate.}$$

COMMUNISM.

As to Esplanade Meetings and State Action.

Mr. ACKLAND asked the Premier:

(1) Is it a fact that the communist party is still holding regular Sunday afternoon meetings on the Perth Esplanade, under a different name each Sunday?

(2) Is it a fact that a meeting was held on Sunday, the 5th November, at which a communist named Gandini was a speaker?

(3) Is it a fact that Gandini ridiculed the efforts of the Allied troops in the last war, ridiculed the efforts of the Allied troops in Korea who are fighting communists, ridiculed the English people who, he said, were

really troops on an American aircraft carrier, praised the communists who brought about the Russian revolution, and openly advocated revolution in Australia?

(4) Is it a fact that the Commonwealth Government has brought down anti-communist legislation, but has been hamstrung by High Court actions in which the Deputy-Leader of the Labour Party is taking part?

(5) If the answer to question (4) is in the affirmative, what action is the State Government going to take to initiate legislation to effectively deal with the fifth column in our midst?

(6) If shorthand notes are not now being taken at communist meetings, will the State Government arrange for this check to be provided?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) I understand that meetings are being held by organisations associated with the communist party.

(2) Yes.

(3) I have no full report of the meeting, but I understand that utterances of an inflammatory nature along these lines were made.

(4) and (5) As Commonwealth legislation has been passed, no State legislation is contemplated pending the result of the High Court decision.

(6) A Commonwealth organisation deals with subversive activities and reporting of these meetings is a matter for their consideration.

LIBERAL PARTY.

As to Requests for Ratepayers' Lists.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Local Government:

(1) Is he aware that the secretary of the Liberal Party has written to certain local governing authorities for a list of ratepayers?

(2) Would he say whether this information should be supplied?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Attention is drawn to Section 53 of the Road Districts Act which reads:—

The board shall supply a copy of the electoral roll, certified by the secretary or chairman to be a correct copy, to any person requiring the same on payment of a reasonable charge not exceeding five shillings.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

As to Obtaining Supplies from New Zealand.

Mr. HEARMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has the Government made any inquiries in New Zealand with a view to obtaining additional supplies of super?

(2) If not, will he endeavour to have inquiries made as soon as possible?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No, not to my knowledge.

(2) Yes.

MEAT SUPPLIES SELECT COMMITTEE.

Extension of Time.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [4.41]: I move—

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on meat supplies be extended until Wednesday, the 22nd November.

The Committee has practically completed the taking of evidence and it is now a matter of preparing a report. It is possible that the report will be finished before the date specified.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

- 2, Bankruptcy Act Amendment.

Introduced by Hon. E. Nulsen.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Mining Act Amendment.
Returned to the Council with amendments.
- 2, Vermin Act Amendment.
- 3, Public Works Act Amendment.
- 4, Noxious Weeds.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

HON. F. J. S. WISE (Gascoyne) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: The State Transport Co-ordination Act of 1933 was designed to give protection to the State Government railway system, and also to attempt to co-ordinate road transport with the rail services existing and to prevent the exploitation of the State Government railway service. There is no doubt as to the intention of the measure as introduced. In the definition section the word "railway" is stated to mean "any railway belonging to His Majesty in Western Australia which has been or may be declared open for traffic by notice in the 'Government Gazette.'" It is quite clear that the railways affected by the Act could be only those that are State-owned and controlled and, by specific exclusion, could not mean the railway of any private company.

When subsequent amendments were made to the Act, and when the First Schedule was altered a few years ago, the original one being repealed and a new one inserted, certain words were included at the end of the First Schedule referring to any railway. Since that time the State Transport Board has used a section of the Act to enable the Midland Railway Company to be considered to come within the scope of the State Transport Co-ordination Act. I submit that Section 37 has been improperly used by the State Transport Board, which has used it quite distinct and apart from the original intention.

Section 37 refers to existing services which should be taken into consideration before a permit or a license is issued in connection with commercial goods vehicles. I would draw attention to the wording of that section. The whole of that part of the Act in which it falls deals with goods vehicles and it reads—

Before granting or refusing to grant any such license the board shall take into consideration—

- (a) the necessity for the service proposed to be provided and the convenience which would be afforded to the public by the provision of such service;
- (b) the existing transportation service for the carriage of goods upon the routes or within the area proposed to be served in relation to—
 - (i) its present adequacy and possibilities for improvement to meet all reasonable public demands;
 - (ii) the effect upon such existing service of the service proposed to be provided;

That section referred absolutely and entirely to the granting of licenses for commercial goods vehicles, taking into consideration the existing transportation services provided by the State Government, because, as I have indicated, the definition section specifically refers to a railway owned and controlled by the State Government. In its administration, the State Transport Board has interpreted or has used—I submit in a very oblique way—Section 37 to include protection for a private railway company, and it has done so in this manner: that any person from the North or the Eastern Goldfields, or anyone with traffic from the north of Geraldton, wishing to convey perishable goods and having a permit to bring them to Perth, can only by special pleading, and under special circumstances, obtain a permit to carry goods from Perth to Geraldton in the vehicle which is empty in Perth and is due to return home a distance of perhaps 600 or 700 miles from this city.

The result is that, no matter whether it is building materials or any other goods, they must first be railed to Geraldton, the truck running empty by road to Geraldton, where the goods are then picked up from the Midland Railway Co.'s station.

I had a case recently concerning the little township of Shark Bay, which is one of the most isolated in the State, with no aerial landing ground, no regular road transport and no shipping service, because at present the lighters are out of commission. This township is situated at a dead-end and only the fishing works and a few station properties operating there keep the small community together. They transport their fish, a highly perishable commodity, by truck to Perth, with no transport at all serving the community, and they were refused the right to carry certain goods back from Perth to Shark Bay, because of the interpretation of the board in applying Section 37 of the Transport Act to include the Midland Railway Co.

I submit that the Transport Board has no right to give protection to the Midland Railway Co. How ludicrous it is when such a community have first to rail their goods—whether petrol, foodstuffs or anything else required for the fishing industry—from Perth to Geraldton before they can pick up the goods there. The same thing has happened time and time again in connection with trucks travelling the 600 or 700 miles to Carnarvon. It does not make sense, and the law gives no authority, in my view, to the Transport Board to refuse persons permits or to prosecute them if they dare convey goods between Perth and Geraldton, en route to further north or en route to the Goldfields.

I have had communication with the Transport Board in this connection and have received from it some interesting replies dealing with this subject. Further, I asked questions recently in Parliament, seeking examples of the license fees paid by the Midland Railway Co., and asking what that company paid as a license fee for the service it runs for passengers and small parcels by road between Perth and Geraldton. I received some interesting replies in answer to those questions. The reply—I suppose put up by the Transport Board—suggests that the Northern Supply Co., which is the fishing company operating from Perth to Shark Bay, duplicated an existing transport service. That, of course, is simply piffle, because there is no transport service to Shark Bay. The replies suggested that the Midland Railway Co. was already a licensee, but it is not the licensee of a transport service from Perth north of Geraldton.

When I asked further questions as to why the Midland Railway Co. was protected in being granted the sole road service license between Perth and Geraldton, I received the reply that due regard was given to the loss of railway traffic likely to

be suffered by the licensees as a result of their road operations. That is a funny one! The Midland Railway Co. received the license for the road service from Perth to Geraldton at a reduced rate, but it got the only license and got the reduced rate as a result of the loss of railway traffic likely to be suffered through its road operations! That does not make sense when we contemplate the position in the metropolitan area where the Transport Act is used to grant licenses against Government railway activities, and particularly against the profitable ones.

What happened with regard to the railway service between Fremantle and Midland Junction, for example? Is it that licenses are confined to State-owned transport? Of course they are not. They are granted to people who act not only against the railways but also against other forms of Government transport service. An examination of those questions and answers will show that there has been neither logic nor reason in the granting of a license to a private company for a road service simply because it owns a railway running in the same direction. In addition to that, a special rate is charged as a license fee to the Midland Railway Co. It is not paying the same fee as the other passenger services are paying, but is paying a reduced rate.

In answer to further questions, I received the reply—I asked what services were duplicated by the Northern Supply Co. operating from Perth to Shark Bay—that the rail and road transport services operated by the Midland Railway Co. between Geraldton and Perth were being duplicated by the fish transport service operated by Taylor & Davies between Geraldton and Perth. That is sheer nonsense. Taylor & Davies are not duplicating any service, nor are they in any way in competition with the people who are hauling fish from an additional 300 or 400 miles away. It is quite a distinct and separate matter, so there has been evasion on the part of the Transport Board—for what reason I know not—and certainly an absolute desire not to understand the position of people further north who at times have to bring perishables through to Perth owing to delays in the railway service.

Mr. Totterdell: What about backloading?

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Their trucks go back empty. While the whaling station was being built and trucks of eight tons and ten tons capacity happened to be in Perth, it took pleading on my part to get permits for those trucks to load goods in Perth for transport to Carnarvon. But I could get it objected to, so that the goods would have to be put on the Midland railway and picked up by the trucks at Geraldton. It just does not make sense. Furthermore, when the houses that the Government at last decided to build at Carnarvon necessitated materials being

transported, the position was the same. There again the decision was that the materials had to be railed to Geraldton and picked up there by the empty trucks from the north that had been in Perth.

I have a letter from the contractors, Sandwell and Woods, expressing appreciation for the great help given to them with their road transport problems. They point out that the rates permitted for sending the goods by road, enabled faster transport to be made and helped them to reduce their costs. If members will look at what the transport Act has done to benefit the Midland Railway Co. they will have no qualms about supporting this Bill. In many ways the Act has prejudiced the Government Railways and has had quite a reverse effect on the anticipated and intended objective. It has enabled all of these licensees to compete with Government railway activities. But, in addition, it has given to private haulers, such as the Midland Railway Co., opportunities for protection hitherto undreamed of.

Rural members will be able to support my statement when I say that one will find in the Midland Railway Co. service trucks belonging to the Government railway system hauling wheat to the port of Fremantle but, where the Government railways tap wheatgrowing districts with the wheat coming down by road, one will find State-owned tarpaulins by the dozen being used by the Midland Railway Co. Certainly they are hired but I doubt if that company has many of its own. I would like to ask some country members whether road trucks are used to haul wheat from the bins on the Midland Railway.

Mr. Ackland: No, wheat has never been hauled from the bins.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Thousands of tons have been hauled along Government lines. Why is it that that company has special exemption? Why has it no trucks to haul that wheat? As the Attorney General said the other evening: "But they use their own engines." It is to be hoped they do. What is proposed in this very short Bill is specifically to amend Section 37 of the Act to make it quite clear that it refers to railways and existing transport services owned and controlled by the Government, so that the Transport Board will have no opportunity of using Section 37 to govern the issuance of licenses to the Midland Railway Co. The other amendment in the Bill is simply to take out of the first schedule the reference to "railway station" which cuts across the definition of the Act itself. It is a Bill with one principle only, with two small amendments, which are very easy to follow if members will look at the parent Act of 1933-38. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

BILL—LOAN, £14,366,000.

Message.

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

BILL—HIRE PURCHASE AGREEMENTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. F. J. S. WISE (Gascoyne) [5.51] in moving the second reading said: The original legislation governing hire purchase agreements was introduced by the Hon. Sir Charles Latham in 1931. He was then Minister for Lands. It is obvious from the speech he made in introducing the measure that it was intended to control the transactions principally associated with farm machinery and requisites. It will be recalled that in the years 1930 to 1933, which was the period of the Mitchell-Latham Government, the then Deputy Premier, being Minister for Lands, was fully conscious of the plight of the farmers and of the amounts being paid by them for the hire or rental of machinery to be purchased, and because of very many repossession and the limitless interest which would be charged initially and in consequence of repossessions taking place, the original law was introduced.

As time has gone on, although the Hire Purchase Agreements Act of 1931 in the main referred to farming machinery and was brought into existence because of the situation within the farming community, it did apply and still applies to all other forms of goods or chattels on hire purchase, which may be bought on terms and which become subject to the Hire Purchase Agreements Act. It involves the purchase of any chattel, anything upon which a deposit is made and as to which terms are given, and which is really hired to the person until the payments are complete.

Mr. Yates: That will cover a large field, will it not?

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It always has done, but today it is principally associated with such things as sewing machines, refrigerators, washing machines—

Mr. Yates: Furniture.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, furniture. Not so much cars, because I do not know of anyone who can buy a car on a hire purchase agreement today. I think one has first to pay cash to the company selling the car or else some other company handles the finance and then hires the car to the intending purchaser.

Mr. Grayden: That is not always the case.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I do not know of any firm that will do otherwise, unless the risk is a very good one. I know that no firm would sell a car to me on terms.

Mr. Nalder: That position applies to farming machinery also.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, that is so.

Mr. Bovell: I should say the Leader of the Opposition would be a good risk.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I did not ask for terms but I was told very bluntly that cars are not sold upon payment of a deposit and on terms. After using the car which I had and which had travelled over 100,000 miles, I was forced to obtain another one, but the motor firms were not interested in me as a hire-purchase risk. However, I repeat that some other financial company may have been interested.

Mr. Brady: Company directors are pretty hard these days.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: They are sometimes merely figureheads and do not know what is going on.

The Minister for Lands: The Commonwealth Bank is financing such transactions.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have no knowledge of that. The Commonwealth Bank is encouraging trading in all sorts of things to use its money and to have monies on loan but, as to its dealing with hire-purchase agreements, I know nothing. I do know that the State Government is not affected by this Bill because I decided that after asking a question as to the hire-purchase of cars by Government officers. In case you, Sir, are asked to rule this Bill out of order on that point, I wish to make it quite clear that the State Government is not involved. This is a very simple Bill, designed to reduce the interest chargeable as rent on hire-purchase agreements.

The Minister for Lands: You have always adopted the attitude that one has to be very careful with these Bills.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Always. But this measure involves the one principle only; it specifically deals with the interest chargeable on hire-purchase agreements. Before the Act of 1931 was introduced the interest chargeable on such agreements was limitless. There was no specific rate of interest to be charged. Although the Act of 1931 did not mention any particular rate of interest, it did specify that the rate of interest, on the repossession of goods, was 8 per cent. and that was the limit. The reason why that rate was considered to be fair and reasonable was that at that time farmers, in large numbers, did not have sheds or other cover for their machinery. A great deal of their implements became "air-conditioned" and deteriorated considerably, and by the time the farmers were defaulting in payment it required more than the profit on the machine, plus the 8 per cent. interest, to compensate the firm which had sold the machine. However, as the member for Katanning points out, I doubt whether many or any sales are made of farming machinery on hire-purchase agreements these days because, firstly, there appears to be a large number who have the money to pay cash, and

secondly, the competition for these machines is such that the seller is having no difficulty in placing machines of all kinds.

Even at the Dinninup Show the other day the farm machinery section was not as well patronised as it has been in the past, because farmers can pay cash for what they want and have to be chased to arrange for the purchase of tractors or other implements which they need. However, as time has passed, the legislation has applied more to domestic needs and covers articles where the initial profit is certainly not less than 33-1/3 per cent. or 25 per cent. prior to the hire-purchase being arranged. I make the definite statement that many of the refrigerators being sold on the market in Perth today are at a price 100 per cent. above the ex-factory price. The same would apply to many kinds of radios and to numerous household appliances.

There is no limit to the profit because it does not come within the ambit of the Minister for Prices. He has no say whatever in fixing the price or profit on such requisites; and they are requisites. But the point is that the profits are added to the cost before any hire-purchase terms are arranged. Although under the Act there is no limit to the interest chargeable, my purpose in introducing this Bill is to see that justice is done to the people who, initially, in the purchase price, pay the profit, and who should not, after the hiring of the machine, pay more than the bank overdraft rate of interest. Is there anything unfair in that? The bank overdraft rate of interest is the interest rate prescribed in this Bill, 4½ per cent. So, if the firm is working on an overdraft, it is making a profit from the interest paid on the goods or chattels which the person has purchased under the hire-purchase agreement. A profit already having been made, I think it is fair to the whole of the working community, particularly those who are entitled to have all those things in their homes, that they should only pay the one profit and not the profit on interest rate.

The Attorney General: You do not think it would prevent them getting it? Maybe it would be as well if they did, but still—

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The business companies take very few risks. A person has to be a fair risk before he could buy things on terms in any case. They do not want to go into your genealogical tree, although they very nearly do so, but they certainly want to know the name of such buyers and particulars associated with the person and his family, that is, his occupation and all about him. That is all right. My objection is that when a person has in all good faith been accepted as a risk, there should be a rate of 8 per cent. and more—much more at times—charged as interest on top of the price which as a rule includes a substantial profit.

Mr. Totterdell: Would your interest fluctuate with the bank interest?

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think the member for West Perth has put his finger on something which might be better than the specific rate I have in the Bill.

Mr. Totterdell: It may be three or six.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: At the moment I have indicated $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum.

Mr. Bovell: The usual rate is the current rate for the time being.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I would be very pleased if that were altered in Committee as this Bill states that a $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. rate of interest shall be chargeable to purchasers. I admit that certain people are bad risks, but that is the trader's business. It is his business to say whether or not he would sell to certain people. I object to the 100 per cent. risk person having to pay for the person who should not be sold an article at all. For it to be common practice to have a rate unspecified in an Act of this kind to enable firms to give an overdraft for their benefit at a substantial profit is not a fair deal to the community.

Mr. J. Hegney: An anti-exploitation measure.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, and I hope it commends itself to the House. I will be pleased to consider any reasonable amendments in Committee as to the interest rate that should be charged. There is nothing retrospective in the Bill and it cannot affect existing agreements, much as I would like it to. I could not hope to get away with that. It would only affect hire-purchase agreements entered into after the proclamation of the Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Attorney General, debate adjourned.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.20] in moving the second reading said: In 1948 the Deputy Premier introduced a comprehensive Workers' Compensation Act Bill to bring the provisions of that Act more in line with the increased living costs and consequently the increased basic wage. The immediate post-war period having passed, it was right and proper that a measure to liberalise the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act should be implemented and, judging by the spirit in which the House received the measure in 1948, and indeed the amendment in 1949, I feel confident that the amending Bill now before the House will receive the sympathetic consideration of members of this Chamber and I express the hope that no material amendment to the detriment of those whom this Bill is designed to benefit will be passed by another Chamber.

I do not propose to go into full detail on every amendment which the Bill seeks to effect. Suffice to say that such details can be given when the Committee stage is arrived at, and I will be pleased to afford such information to members as is possible at that time. I would, however, refer to some of the main provisions. When the amending or the comprehensive Bill was passed in 1948, the basic wage, if I recollect aright, in February, 1948, was in the vicinity of £5 13s. To be correct, in the metropolitan area it was £5 12s. 9d. and this has continued progressively to increase since that time. But the indications are that before members enjoy their Christmas dinner the basic wage for the metropolitan area will be somewhere in the vicinity of £8 a week. Therefore members will see immediately the necessity for liberalising the weekly and lump sum payments which are set out in the Act.

The first proposal that I submit for the consideration of the House is the definition of the term "worker" to provide that the rate of remuneration of £750 a year shall be increased to £850. The next item which will require consideration by the Chamber is the effecting of insurance cover for workers from the place of employment to their place of residence and, where apprentices are required to attend the Technical School in accordance with the terms of their apprenticeship, it is proposed to cover them while they are legitimately engaged in travelling to and from the Technical School. I do not propose to enter into detail, but the proposal is to effect insurance cover for workers from their place of residence to their place of employment. I know that over a period of years some of those who have been resentful and antagonistic to any proposal designed to increase compensation claims to workers have ridiculed this proposal.

I am not going to relate instances of arguments put up against it. Suffice to say that in the main those who have been strongly opposed—I do not say reasonably opposed—to this provision, are most unreasonable in their approach. We believe that any worker who is engaged in travelling by his ordinary route between his place of residence and place of employment and vice versa, should be covered by insurance. There is a provision in the clause that if a worker is not travelling by his ordinary route or unduly deviates from it, the provision of that particular clause would not operate. The next is rather a minor provision, but I mention it for the benefit of members.

Under the Act certain returns must be submitted by insurers to the Minister giving the names, addresses, occupation and so forth of the employers and these returns have to be submitted monthly. But the board is the statutory authority under the Act, and it is proposed that in a case where certain returns and responsibilities rest with the Minister, appropriate powers shall be vested in the board. There is provision in the Act at present that where an

employer becomes bankrupt, certain rights that the employer had against the insurer shall be transferred to the worker. I propose to simplify that section. Members know how difficult it would be for an injured worker to send his employer bankrupt. We propose to simplify it by transferring these rights to the worker where it is shown that the employer is unable to meet his liabilities.

There was a certain amount of contention over the provision in the Bill introduced by the Deputy Premier in 1948 which, in setting up the Workers' Compensation Board of three members, stipulated that on matters of law the chairman alone was to be the determining authority. It is proposed in this Bill to remove the provision and authorise the board to determine all matters which come within its jurisdiction because in another section of the Act the board may refer any matter of law to the Supreme Court for determination. It is proposed to alter the first schedule with a view to trying to bring payments more into line with present-day costs. I might briefly indicate that on the 2nd February, 1948, the basic wage was £5 12s. 9d. and a 30 per cent. increase on that figure would just equalise the basic wage as it stands today, within 2d. Anticipating what may happen within the next month or so, I would mention for the benefit of the House that on the 9th February, 1949, some months after the Act had been passed, the basic wage in the metropolitan area was £6 4s. 9d., and I do not propose to indicate definitely what the Arbitration Court in this State would give, but suffice to say that 30 per cent. added to £6 4s. 9d. would give £8 2s. 3d.

In the main the amounts set out in the Second Schedule to the Act are increased by approximately 30 per cent. The Bill proposes to increase the amount for the dependants of a deceased worker from £1,000 to £1,400 and to increase the amounts for medical expenses from £100 and £150 respectively to £150 and £200. The amount ordinarily allowed for medical expenses will be £150, but the board, in its discretion, will be empowered to allow up to £200. It is proposed to increase the amount of child allowance in the First Schedule, which now stands at 10s., to 14s., and the amount for a dependant wife from £1 to £1 8s. per week. The maximum weekly payment in the existing schedule for an injured worker is £6 including the amount for the dependant wife. In conformity with the increased cost of living, it is proposed to increase the maximum to £8 per week.

Another proposal is to include in the schedule dealing with artificial limbs, eyes and so forth, a provision for hearing aids. Certain men in trades subject to a lot of noise—I refer to boilermakers and such like—have found their hearing becoming progressively defective, and while they might be able to carry on their ordinary

employment, they are nevertheless suffering a distinct disability. Where medical opinion demonstrates that hearing aids would assist those workers, they should be entitled to receive them. The travelling expenses now provided for an injured worker going from his home to receive medical treatment we propose to increase from 10s. to 14s. per day and the weekly amount from £3 to £4.

The Act contains a provision that, where a worker is under the age of 21 years and reaches his majority while still incapacitated, a review may be made and he may receive increased compensation commensurate with what he would have been likely to be receiving had he not met with the injury. It is proposed to make that provision universal. In these days of rapidly increasing basic wages and rapidly decreasing purchasing power, it is proposed to modify the provision in the Act to give the benefit to all workers who may be incapacitated when an increase in the basic wage is granted.

A new clause is included in the Bill which is of great importance to injured workers. Such a worker, after receiving medical treatment for some time, may be induced to sign an agreement to forego further rights to compensation. I do not intend to quote the number of cases, but there have been cases where a medical board would grant a certain amount of compensation to an injured worker and the appropriate agreement would be completed, and some time later it would be found that the injury had deteriorated but, owing to the fact that the worker had signed away his rights, he would not be entitled to further compensation.

In one case known to me, the insurance company tried to get the man to sign away his rights for £30. He was a station-hand whom I met by accident, and after I had obtained some information from him, I had him examined by one of the leading doctors in Perth, Dr. O'Neill, and threatened to expose the company, and finished up by getting £475 for the man. I am speaking from memory, but I have a vivid recollection of some of these cases. In another case, a young worker lost the major part of the index finger and the company was going to pay him off with £50. He was about to sign an agreement to that effect when his father suggested that he should call at the union office. He was sent to another doctor and, after negotiations, he obtained the £150 provided under the previous Act.

To protect these workers and give them a legitimate chance, I have included a new clause that I hope will be passed without strong opposition. In order that members may have a clear idea of the proposal, I shall read it. It is as follows:—

11A. (a) Notwithstanding any rule of law or anything contained in this Act or any other Act, to the contrary, if at the expiration of a period ascertained in the manner provided in subclause (b) of this clause a worker, who has been partially incapacitated by injury and in respect of whom the liability for weekly payments of compensation has been redeemed by payment of a lump sum as provided for in Clause 10 of this Schedule, is on account of the injury unable to work, then and in any such case, notwithstanding the agreement or order for redemption already entered into or made, the worker may apply to the board for further compensation additional to the lump sum, and if on the hearing of the application the board is satisfied that, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, the lump sum is inadequate compensation, the board may order further compensation by weekly payments or otherwise, but so that the total amount of compensation to the worker, inclusive of any further compensation ordered pursuant to this subclause shall not exceed the sum of one thousand six hundred and fifty pounds.

(b) The period referred to in subclause (a) of this clause shall commence on the date of the agreement or order for redemption as the case may be, and the duration of such period shall be ascertained and calculated by dividing the amount of the lump sum by the amount of the weekly payment, and the quotient (excluding any fraction therein) shall represent the number of weeks to comprise such period.

We believe that if the proposed new clause is included in the Act, it will protect injured workers while, at the same time, all other interests will be protected, inasmuch as it is required that the board must be satisfied that further compensation should be paid and that the worker has been legitimately under-assessed by the medical board for his injuries.

At present, where the worker and the employer agree in writing that the worker should be examined by a medical board, the board may inquire into the worker's condition or fitness for employment. Under the schedule the board may determine any other question incidental or ancillary thereto. We consider that the board should be asked to answer a simple question as to the worker's condition or fitness for employment, and therefore propose the deletion of the reference to incidental or ancillary questions.

As I have stated, the lump sum payments have been increased by approximately 30 per cent. The measure passed in 1948 simply brought the payment into conformity with the then cost of living, but liv-

ing costs have continued to increase since then, and the Bill represents a serious and reasonable effort to bring payments into line with present-day costs. I have no doubt that when these provisions have become law, if the trend continues upward as at present, it will be necessary for the House to give further consideration to the question of granting increased compensation payments in the near future. I hope that the facts I have given will be informative and, as indicated earlier, if members desire further details, I shall be only too happy to supply them in Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Attorney General, debate adjourned.

MOTION—WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Extension of Comprehensive Scheme to Mt. Barker.

Debate resumed from the 25th October on the following motion by Hon. A. R. G. Hawke:—

That this House views with serious concern the action and policy of the Government in agreeing to give preference in the supply of water to Mt. Barker and adjacent towns in the Great Southern District, as against towns and farms in drier areas; and regards as most unfair, unjustifiable and contrary to the best interests of the State as a whole, the Government's decision authorising the making of an agreement between the Treasurer and the Plantagenet, Tambellup and Cranbrook Road Boards, under which the Government has bound succeeding Governments, as well as itself, to supply water to the towns of Broomehill, Tambellup, Cranbrook and Mt. Barker within six years from the 26th May, 1949, irrespective of the greater and more urgent needs of townspeople and farmers in the drier parts of the State.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [5.43]: I have copies of the plan of the comprehensive water scheme showing the steel plate position as at the 27th October, and indicating the mains for which contracts have been let and the mains for which contracts have not yet been let. I should like these copies to be distributed in order that members may study the position for themselves. The member for Northam, in his speech, referred to a number of matters connected with the Government's proposal to provide a water supply for the towns of Tambellup, Broomehill, Cranbrook and Mt. Barker.

Before dealing with the matters raised, it is essential in order that members may fully understand the questions at issue, to review the circumstances which led up to the present position. In 1945, owing

to the Railway Department's dam and water supply at Mt. Barker becoming too saline for use in locomotives, the department conducted an investigation with a view to the development of a new source of supply. The member for the district, who is the Deputy Premier, wrote to the Under Secretary for Public Works suggesting that the opportunity should be taken to combine with the Railway Department and to design a scheme which would also provide a water supply for the town. This proposal was adopted, and on the 21st September, 1945, the then Minister for Works—the member for Northam—approved the expenditure of £300 for surveys and investigations for a water supply at Mt. Barker. These investigations indicated that the original proposals were not practicable.

On the 20th August, 1946, the hon. gentleman approved a further £300 for the continuance of investigations, and on the 18th February, 1947, he approved an additional £10, for the same purpose. These investigations disclosed that all surface and underground supplies, other than those of small volume, were too saline for human use, with the exception of the Bolganup Creek in the Porongorups—a distance of 12 to 14 miles from Mt. Barker. All these facts are recorded on the file and, of course, they were well known to the member for Northam. From his experience as Minister for Water Supply, and more particularly from his knowledge of the difficulty of finding a water supply for Mt. Barker, he was well aware of the fact that a 29-inch rainfall at Mt. Barker had no relation to the finding of a satisfactory supply for the town. In fact, as he knows, the department, under his direction, spent more time and effort in an endeavour to find a satisfactory supply for Mt. Barker, than, perhaps, for any other town in the State.

Gaugings of the Bolganup Creek were taken, and preliminary designs and estimates were prepared. In the meantime two important factors came into the picture, one that the modified comprehensive water supply scheme was approved by the Commonwealth and the State Parliaments; and the other, that the Government decided to proceed with a vigorous land settlement policy in the Albany zone. The first of these factors meant that a pipeline from Wellington Dam would be constructed within a few years to the Pinwerning Reservoir at Katanning, from which point it would be possible to gravitate it to Mt. Barker. The second had still greater significance so far as Mt. Barker was concerned.

Those members of this House who accompanied the Minister for Lands during an inspection of lands being developed for soldier settlement, must have been impressed with the enormous production which will come from the areas, east, west and north of Mt. Barker, including the

Rocky Gully, the Frankland and the South and North Stirling projects. I have heard many members express their confidence in the great land settlement scheme that is taking place in those areas, and they are all agreed that there will be great productivity in that part of the State and, of course, greatly increased population. More than half a million acres is embraced in these three projects alone; that is, more than half a million acres of good country will be brought into production. In addition, on every hand, surrounding Mt. Barker can be seen areas of alienated land, cleared by bulldozers and now being brought into production.

As members know, the town of Mt. Barker sits astride the main Perth-Albany-highway, and coming into it from the west is the Manjimup-Mt. Barker-road, cutting through the Rocky Gully and Frankland areas, the production and trade from which must pass through Mt. Barker. Similarly, this town will be the centre for the South Stirling area in the east. So there can be no doubt whatever that from its geographical situation alone Mt. Barker will become one of the largest towns in the State. I am told that already there is much activity in the district, particularly in regard to housing.

When materials and labour are available I have no doubt that Mt. Barker will make not only growth, but rapid growth. In 1945 the Cranbrook Road Board asked for a water supply for the town, and on the 18th July, 1945, the then Minister—the member for Northam—approved of the expenditure of £150 for survey and investigation, and estimates for a small excavated tank on the bitumen catchment were prepared. This proposal was, at the time, not given a high priority, and it was deferred. At a meeting with the road board at Cranbrook in 1948, attended by the Minister for Water Supply—now the Chief Secretary—and the Director of Works, the Minister gave a definite promise to the road board that when men and material became available he would request the Treasurer to provide the funds for the construction of a water supply for the town.

The towns of Broomehill and Tambellup were included in the water supply scheme originally prepared by the member for Northam who had, therefore, himself strongly urged the provision of a pipeline from Katanning to these towns, a distance of more than 30 miles. As a consequence of the two factors referred to earlier, namely, the adoption by Parliament of the modified comprehensive water supply scheme, and the Government's decision to develop the Albany zone to go with the proposed land settlement project, the Director of Works caused the proposals to supply water to Mt. Barker to be reviewed. To this end he had estimates prepared on the 21st July, 1948, for a pipeline from Katanning to Mt. Barker via

Broomehill, Tambellup and Cranbrook. The estimated cost at that date, including reticulations for the four towns, was £193,000, and the estimated cost for local supplies for each of the towns was £139,500.

I ask members to take particular note of these figures. The Director of Works was particularly concerned that after the town of Mt. Barker had outgrown the available supply from the Bolganup Creek there would be no other local source from which to draw. It therefore appeared to the Director to be sound planning to construct a pipe-line from Katanning to Mt. Barker, particularly as no additional pumping would be required. This pipe-line could serve intermediate country, and its capacity could be increased from time to time as the demands expanded.

In addition, if the Commonwealth Government agreed to regard the Katanning-Mt. Barker pipe-line as an extension of the comprehensive scheme, it would be subject to a subsidy from the Commonwealth on a pound for pound basis, and would thus prove not only a better but also a more economical proposition to the State. So the Director of Works discussed the whole matter with the then Minister, who later called a conference at which the Minister himself was present together with the Deputy Premier and member for the district, and the Director for Works.

Mr. May: The Press was not there, evidently.

The PREMIER: I will have something to say about the Press as I proceed.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What date was this conference?

The PREMIER: On the 13th September, 1948.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Premier had better make sure.

The PREMIER: Yes. I do not think I gave a date.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is so, but I want to know.

The PREMIER: I may be able to give it to the hon. gentleman later. To continue, by direction of the then Minister—now the Chief Secretary—the Director of Works on the 13th September, 1948, set out for the Deputy Premier's information a lengthy review of the two alternatives so that he might ascertain the views of the road boards concerned, particularly those of the Plantagenet or Mt. Barker Board. On the 17th September, 1948, the board decided—

That the future of the district and its probable growth and development would best be served by waiting the additional time necessary to allow a pipeline service to come down the Great Southern to Mt. Barker, provided that the laying of the pipe is commenced and proceeded with immediately after the comprehensive scheme main reaches Katanning.

The Board also considered—

That as the extra delay will considerably inconvenience the ratepayers of Mt. Barker, the Government should be asked, if it agrees to this proposal, to enter into a binding agreement with the board and the other local authorities concerned to carry out such work as soon as the pipeline to Katanning is completed.

That was reported in the "Albany Advertiser" on the 20th September, 1948. On the 29th September, 1948, the Deputy Premier advised the Director of Works of the decision of the Plantagenet Road Board, and requested him to advise the Minister of the position. Then, on the 4th October, 1948, the Director of Works submitted his recommendation to the Minister for Water Supply, and the concluding paragraph of the Director of Works' minute is of considerable interest, having in mind the comments of the member for Northam. I quote from the Director's minute, which states—

Although in 1944 I accepted the position that a pipeline was not a practicable proposal for such a high rainfall district, the later investigations have caused me to change my views. The rapid development in the district has also greatly influenced me. I recognise that five to seven years is a long time, but there are undoubtedly very great advantages to the district, as well as to the towns, in having a water main extending from Katanning to Mt. Barker. It would fit in with the provision of high-tension electricity mains along the same route. From both utilities, the country on each side could be fully developed and utilised.

And he proceeds—

The Plantagenet Road Board (Mt. Barker) has been advised regarding the proposed pipeline and, after having conferred with the Hon. Mr. Watts, has decided to recommend to the ratepayers that they adopt the proposal for a pipeline from Katanning, even though it may not materialise until approximately 1955. The board, however, naturally desires to be assured by a Government undertaking that the work will be proceeded with. I recommend that this undertaking be given, the Government to safeguard itself by including a clause providing for war or other conditions beyond the control of the Government.

So I hope members will note that there is on the file not only a recommendation, but a strong recommendation from the Director of Works that this undertaking should be carried out. On the 18th October, 1948, the Minister for Works and Water Supply submitted the Director's report to me with

a recommendation that I approve of the provision of a pipeline from Katanning to Mt. Barker. On the 2nd November, 1948, I agreed that an undertaking on the lines proposed should be given to the three road boards. Then, on the 7th January, 1949, the Deputy Premier requested the Attorney General to have the necessary undertakings prepared in the terms of the minute of the Director of Works. I quote the relevant paragraph from the Deputy Premier's minute, which states—

I attach the relevant paragraphs of the minute of the Director of Works, the point being that the local authorities desire some definite arrangement which can be produced notwithstanding any change in the directorship or the Government, as they feel that the considerable delay involved as against the lesser delay occasioned by the local water supplies, warrants their receiving some definite guarantee.

Then, on the 20th January, 1949, the Solicitor General minuted the relevant file to the effect that he had advised Mr. Watts that any agreement would not be binding. On the 22nd February, 1949, he minuted the clerk in charge of conveyancing as follows:—

In the very recent case of Robertson and Minister of Pensions (1948) All England Law Records 767, Justice Summing held that the defence of executive necessity only avails the Crown where there is an implied term to that effect, or that is the true meaning of the contract. Please, therefore, draft the contract required by the Hon. Minister hereunder.

The member for Northam made a suggestion—or even went further—that this agreement was an unusual and improper arrangement. As members know, similar arrangements are continually being made with local authorities by the various departments; particularly those controlled by the Ministers in charge of electricity and railways. The numerous agreements signed under seal by the chairman of the Electricity Commission, who is subject to the Minister for Electricity, and by the chairmen of the various local authorities, are binding on all future Governments, and I think that a number of similar agreements can be quoted, many of them involving large expenditures. There was nothing in the action of the Deputy Premier, who is the member for Stirling, other than that normally followed by all members. With the full knowledge and approval of the Minister for Works, he submitted the proposal of the Director of Works for a pipe-line, in lieu of local schemes, to the Plantagenet or Mt. Barker Road Board—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What is that lump in the side of your cheek?

The PREMIER:—and then requested the Attorney General to have a draft agreement drawn up incorporating the undertakings asked for by the road board, which I, as Premier and Treasurer, had already approved. So far as my own action is concerned, the position is quite clear. From the discussions with the Minister concerned, and the Director of Works, I had assured myself firstly that the proposal was a wise one, and secondly that the period of time specified, together with the proviso for an extension of time in case of strikes, war or other matters, would assure completion of all schemes within the comprehensive scheme, and provision of water supplies to other country towns, before this extension was commenced. I will deal with this aspect fully later on. The member for Northam also made great play with what he referred to as the secrecy maintained regarding these proposals. There was no suggestion of secrecy; in fact, I would say that the reverse was the case.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think some of your members on the back benches are going to be ill.

The PREMIER: We shall see about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: All the noise is coming from your back benches.

The PREMIER: All this guffawing is not going to put me off.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is all coming from your side of the House.

The PREMIER: It does not make any difference to me.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: The agreement was not exactly proclaimed to the world.

The PREMIER: Then I shall deal with it now. This file came to me in the same way as do all other files.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Did the then Minister for Water Supply tell the then member for Irwin-Moore?

The PREMIER: As I have already told members, I acted on the advice of the Minister, who in turn was acting on the advice of the Director and, so far as I could see, the whole matter was in order. But I can assure members that the Deputy Premier did not suggest to me, or hint to me in any possible way, that there should be any secrecy about this matter.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: If country members take that, they will take anything.

The PREMIER: I can state only what is a fact and what is the truth and, if members are not prepared to accept the truth, there is not much I can do about it.

Mr. Hill: There was no secrecy down Albany way about it.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Nor at Toodyay!

The PREMIER: I propose to deal with the publicity aspect as I go.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: There was no secrecy at Woodanilling, either.

The PREMIER: I think this secrecy business is just a myth.

The Minister for Lands: Of course it is.

The PREMIER: In the beginning, the proposal to substitute a pipe-line in lieu of local schemes was submitted openly to each of the three authorities concerned, and I hope members will take note of that. The Tambellup Road Board accepted the proposal without demur; the Plantagenet Road Board accepted, but required a guarantee that the pipe-line would be constructed, and the proposal was widely discussed amongst residents of Mt. Barker. The Cranbrook Road Board accepted, but a number of ratepayers protested, asking that the local scheme be carried out. At all these centres the proposal was openly discussed and publicised in the Albany, Mt. Barker and Katanning newspapers.

The Chief Secretary: And at Collie.

The PREMIER: Yes. As an indication that the widest local publicity and discussion occurred, the proceedings in the Cranbrook area may be detailed. On the 15th July, 1949, a special meeting of ratepayers of the central ward was called by the secretary of the road board, who placed notices on the Cranbrook Hall and post office notice boards. The notices stated that the meeting was for the purpose of considering the acceptance or rejection of the agreement, and 24 ratepayers were present at that meeting. On the 25th July, 1949, at a special meeting of the road board called for the purpose of dealing with the agreement, a petition was received requesting that a ratepayers' meeting be called. Then we find, on the 4th August, 1949, that an advertisement was placed in the Mt. Barker paper referring to the petition and notifying ratepayers of a meeting to be held on the 20th August, 1949. In addition, a printed notice was delivered to each individual resident ratepayer advising him of the meeting to consider the agreement.

Then, on the 20th August, 1949, the chairman, seven road board members and 67 ratepayers attended a meeting at which the Director of Works was present. The agreement was read out to the meeting and was then dealt with clause by clause. Numerous amendments were moved and the meeting ran from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. There was no suggestion of secrecy. The main doors of the hall were open and the public came into the back of the hall. A half-column report of the meeting was published in the "Albany Advertiser" of the 19th September, 1949. Yet the hon. member says there was this great secrecy!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: No wonder the member for Mt. Marshall is almost having an apoplectic fit!

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The PREMIER: Before the tea suspension I was explaining that at the meeting held at Cranbrook on the 20th August, 1949, there were 67 ratepayers and seven members of the road board present. On the 24th August, 1949, at its regular meeting, the Cranbrook Road Board resolved that the agreement should be signed. References to the proposal and the agreement were contained in the editions of the "Albany Advertiser" of the 18th August, 1949, of the 12th September, 1949, the 22nd September, 1949, and the 20th October, 1949. On the 19th August, 1949, the then Minister for Works officiated at the ceremony of the laying of the first pipe of the comprehensive water scheme at Yokain, near Collie. On the 20th August, 1949, on page 3 of "The West Australian," under heavy headlines, the Minister was reported as follows—

In his address the Minister stated that when the present scheme was completed the Government proposed that reticulation should be extended to centres further south than Katanning and to areas east of the Great Southern.

So there was the information for the public of Western Australia to read, and it is interesting to note that there was one distinguished visitor there who had no need to read that statement in "The West Australian," because he sat next to the Minister on that occasion. He was the member for Northam. So that hon. member heard these remarks; and there was no secrecy about them.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: No!

The PREMIER: What! At a public function!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Go ahead.

Mr. May: The Premier meant further south than Narrogin.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Yes.

The PREMIER: The member for Northam stressed what he described as the special priority given to this work. I propose to show that three towns concerned have agreed to step out of the queue in which they had a forward position and, as it were, to retire to the extreme rear, awaiting the serving of almost every other town in the State requiring a water supply. The agreement provides for the main to reach Mt. Barker in May, 1955, strikes and lockouts, whether within or without the State of Western Australia, war, civil commotion, acts of God and any other matters and occurrences beyond the control of the Government generally, permitting. I would say that strikes in N.S.W. and the war situation have held up supplies of steel to a degree very seriously impeding the progress of comprehensive water scheme matters. Therefore, so far as the scheme itself is concerned, the period will already have been materially extended. If Mt. Barker has been given the special priority suggested by the hon.

member, it is pertinent to ask over what town or towns would this priority apply? If there is one thing the present Government has done it has been to improve country town water supplies, and I do not think that fact can be denied.

Mr. Yates: Work that has been neglected for years.

The PREMIER: I shall deal with towns within the boundaries of the comprehensive scheme, and the following particulars will prove my point. At Dalwallinu a new dam of 4,000,000 gallon capacity is nearing completion and the reticulation of the town is proceeding. At Pemberton a new water supply system has been completed. At Kalamunda a new water supply is to be provided and the pumps and steel have been ordered. It is anticipated that the system will be completed in 1952. At Perenjori an improved system is to be carried out, within 12 months. At Margaret River a new scheme is being installed and is nearing completion. At Kalgoorlie the construction of an 8,000,000 gallon dam has been completed at No. 8 pumping station and a new 25,000,000 gallon dam is being completed at Kalgoorlie itself.

Mr. Oliver: How will you get the water there?

The PREMIER: We are making every possible effort to increase the height of the weir in order that more water can be provided, and I do not think we could do more in that direction.

Mr. Styants: Are these dams in service yet? Will the water be available this summer?

The PREMIER: The Minister for Water Supply tells me that it is not available yet.

Mr. Styants: But a restriction of 33½ per cent. has been applied to the people on the Goldfields.

The PREMIER: My information is that the construction of an 8,000,000 gallon dam is completed and that they are constructing a 25,000,000 gallon dam at Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Oliver: What about Geraldton?

The PREMIER: I will come to that centre in due course. The Pinjarra scheme is nearing completion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is an honoured place.

Hon. A. H. Panton: But where is Pinjarra?

The PREMIER: Members generally knew all about that; the item was included in the Estimates.

Mr. Oliver: Will that scheme be as magnificent as the hospital?

The PREMIER: I hope so. I want members to know what the Government has done in connection with these matters. With regard to Corrigin, extensions are being made from the Kondinin scheme, which it is anticipated will be completed

in 1953. At Dwellingup the supply is in course of improvement and is nearing completion, while at Morawa a new scheme will be undertaken in five or six weeks' time.

Mr. Hoar: Is this an election speech?

The PREMIER: I am giving members facts.

Mr. Hoar: It has nothing to do with the subject at all.

The PREMIER: It has a great deal, because I am trying to indicate to the House that all these schemes are going on at the present time.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: They are not going on at present, and the Premier knows they are not.

The PREMIER: At Morawa the new scheme will be commenced in five or six weeks' time. At Kojonup a new scheme will be in hand in a few weeks' time and at Port Hedland a new scheme is half completed.

Mr. Rodoreda: Where is that?

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows quite well.

Mr. Rodoreda: Was that started before the Causeway?

The PREMIER: Every effort is being made to get on with that work and he will remember that I agreed to that scheme without calling a Cabinet meeting.

Mr. Rodoreda: I would not know that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was at the meeting and he heard the deafening applause when I made the announcement. In addition to those I have mentioned, at Boddington a new scheme will be completed in 1952 and at Kulin a new scheme is nearly completed, including a 4,000,000 gallon dam and reticulation. At Wittenoom Gorge a new scheme will be completed early in 1951 and at Mingenew a new scheme will be commenced, it is hoped, early in 1951. At Manjimup major improvements are under consideration. At Geraldton improvements are being carried out to the system there and supplies of bore water for the tomato-growing areas are being developed. At Bridgetown an improved supply is being prepared, and at Moora two new bores, double storage capacity and reticulation improvements are in hand.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I have not heard anything about Esperance.

The PREMIER: With regard to Corrigin and the surrounding areas which were excluded by the Commonwealth committee from the approved comprehensive water supply scheme, the Government, because of the proximity of that section to the south-western boundary of the plan, has approved of the extension of the Corrigin main to provide the town with an adequate water supply. Additions have also been

made to many other water systems throughout the State. All these works will be completed not later than 1953.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Weather permitting.

Hon. E. Nulsen: What about Esperance?

The PREMIER: I suggest that the hon. member leaves that matter over until we deal with the Estimates. I may then have something to tell him. The arrangements for the comprehensive water supply scheme provide for its completion by the end of 1953 but, as I said earlier, the shortage of steel plates may extend that period appreciably. Provision is made for all the comprehensive scheme towns to be connected up before Mt. Barker, and before 1955 the improvements to the water supplies for other country towns will also have been completed. Thus I challenge the member for Northam to indicate one town over which Mt. Barker has been given any priority or one that will suffer in any way because of the Government's decision to extend the pipe-line to these towns by 1955.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: They could all suffer.

The PREMIER: They will not.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Every one of them could suffer.

The PREMIER: Only if materials did not come to hand, and we could not help that.

Mr. Hoar: But you have pledged successive Governments to this scheme.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows that in connection with such schemes that have been promised to be carried out, any succeeding Government would feel in honour bound to complete the undertakings.

Mr. Hoar: Why should you have made the agreement regarding Mt. Barker?

The PREMIER: Another statement the member for Northam made was that there would not be sufficient water to provide for Mt. Barker in addition to the Great Southern towns and ultimately to the rural areas. I was very interested to hear him make that statement because we know that for a lengthy time he was Minister for Water Supply. When he made that assertion I thought it could not be lightly passed over and that I would find out just what the position was. I think the hon. member is well aware that an additional 3ft. was built on the top of the Wellington Dam to provide more water to meet the Great Southern requirements. This lift added 1,200,000,000 gallons to the storage. The total consumption of the Great Southern towns would not exceed 180,000,000 gallons per annum.

Thus in six months time the work of raising the Wellington Dam will be commenced and it should be completed in five

years time. At that stage the storage capacity will be increased by approximately 40,000,000,000 gallons, nearly twice that of the Canning Dam. The member for Northam need have no fear regarding the availability of ample water supplies for all the towns and rural areas that may ultimately require to be supplied in the southern portion of the enlarged comprehensive scheme. The balance of the water will be used for irrigation in the Benger-Boyanup Flats, and the hon. member was very concerned in that regard.

The last point made by the hon. member—and it was one which I do not think he intended to press—was that the extension of the pipe-line to a high rainfall town such as Mt. Barker was not justified. He will recall that, while he was Minister, the engineers were unable to locate a suitable supply; and it was pointed out that if the town were to grow, some alternative supply would have to be found. This would come only by making the extension from Katanning. Those members who accompanied the Minister for Lands on the recent tour realise that the towns of Mt. Barker and Albany will very greatly expand over the next decade. I do not think there is the slightest doubt about that. This is what the Director of Works tells me. He says that, taking a long view, there will, in due course, be no alternative but to extend the main to Albany.

Let me give some facts in connection with the planning for the comprehensive scheme mains. This provided for the completion of the Kodj-Kodjin main by the end of 1951. I think that will be easily done. It also provided for the completion of the following:—

Bruce Rock, Narembreen-Kondinin main by August, 1952.

Cunderdin - Minnivale-Wyalkatchem main by August, 1952.

Wellington dam to Brookton and to Katanning by 1954.

Minnivale to Kokardine; and Wyalkatchem to Koorda by the end of 1953.

It also provided for the commencement of the main from Kellerberrin northward about the end of 1951 and the commencement of laying the smaller reticulation mains within the comprehensive scheme area as soon as pipes become available. For these smaller reticulation schemes we will not be dependent upon imported materials, but will have local articles. I would also like to let members know the amount of plate that has been ordered. Here is a summary of the plate contracts that have been let—

Merridin-Bruce Rock Kondinin main	100 per cent.
Kondinin - Minnivale Wyalkatchem main	100 per cent.
Kodj-Kodjin	100 per cent.
Wellington Dam-Nar- rogin main	55 per cent.

Narrogin - Brookton main	40 per cent.
Narrogin - Katanning main	28 per cent.
Katanning-Mt. Barker main	Nil

Mr. Hoar: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I would mention that when I saw the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, in Canberra last June I submitted the following memorandum for consideration of the Federal authorities:—

Since the comprehensive water supply scheme was developed by the State Government and approved by the Commonwealth Government, the Public Works Department has been endeavouring, but without success, to locate water supplies in the Tambellup, Cranbrook, and Mt. Barker areas south of the southern limits of the scheme. In these districts extensive clearing and land settlement are proceeding and the Government relies on these and contiguous areas to absorb a large number of migrants, but provision of water is a first essential. The State Government desires to extend the comprehensive scheme mains from Katanning to as far south as Mt. Barker, a distance of 75 miles. The estimated cost is approximately £260,000 and it is requested that the Commonwealth Government agree to subsidise this extension also on a £ for £ basis.

The hon. gentleman expressed great concern because he said no approach had been made to the Commonwealth Government. Well, the approach has been made! To show how anxious the Government is to get on with the work in regard to the comprehensive water scheme, I would point out that we have endeavoured to import steel from wherever we could get it, both from within the Commonwealth and from outside. What we have imported from outside has cost us a very much larger sum than would the local product; but we have gone ahead because, as I think members will agree, we just could not hold up this great scheme.

There is some question as to whether the Commonwealth will come in with us. It undertook to provide half of the £4,300,000 which was the original estimated cost of the scheme. But surely members are not going to suggest that we should have stopped because we could not get other than imported materials! I have agreed to the importation of materials and I make no apology for having done so. I know that progress is being made with the great Snowy River scheme in the East and with other big public works. If we are to carry the population which the Commonwealth says we must maintain in the interests of the country, it is certain that we cannot do so unless we have water for the people.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Tell us about the Ord River dam while you are getting your breath.

The PREMIER: That is another great scheme.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Tell us about it.

The PREMIER: As the hon. member knows, our activities are very wide-spread when it comes to water conservation. This secrecy business of which the hon. member had so much to say! I do not think members are now so convinced about the secrecy. I have given numerous instances of where reference to this matter was published in local papers and, of course, in "The West Australian" as well. Public meetings were held.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It is a pity you did not tell those fellows about it before they brought it into the House.

The PREMIER: I do not know why they were not told. There were no instructions from me that they should not be. I have given the House that assurance.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is where the brawl started.

The PREMIER: They can speak for themselves.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: No, they can't!

The PREMIER: I repeat that there was not the slightest need for the Government to maintain secrecy.

Mr. Hoar: I will accept your apology, but I do not think they will.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Who is moving the amendment?

The PREMIER: Which amendment?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The one on the paper.

The PREMIER: I am not moving an amendment—not yet.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I was wondering who was.

The PREMIER: The only amendment or motion of which I know is what has been moved by the member for Northam. Let the House remember that I acted on certain advice—the best it was possible to obtain; the most expert advice. I acted on the advice of the Director of Works. He is acknowledged as one of the foremost authorities in Australia on water conservation. He recommended this scheme, under no pressure from me, and under no pressure from anybody else, though the member for Northam will try to make out that pressure was exerted by the Deputy Premier. But this proposal to extend the scheme south of Katanning to Mt. Barker was the idea of the Director of Works and the Director of Works only, and he set out his reason quite plainly, namely, that because of the rapid growth which is going to take place in that part of the State there was no possibility of getting a local

supply and the only means by which water could be provided for those areas was through the comprehensive scheme.

Mr. Hoar: Did the Director of Works recommend that successive Governments should also be responsible?

The PREMIER: The Director of Works, yes! He recommended that the agreement should be signed.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You do not always take notice of the Director of Works.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: No, you don't!

The PREMIER: Yes, I do!

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You did not do so in regard to Co-operative Bulk Handling and the wheat hospital at Fremantle.

The PREMIER: Of course, the hon. member—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Now you are going to hedge!

The PREMIER: The hon. member is getting away from the subject under discussion. Did he always take notice?

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You said you always do.

The PREMIER: So I do.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: There is an instance of where you did not.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You take note, but please yourself.

The PREMIER: Any advice the Director of Works gives me I take note of.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yes, and then please yourself.

The PREMIER: And did not the hon. member do the same? The member for Northam also said there was water at Mt. Barker. The Director of Works tells me that there is not. What is there, is salty. I believe that. Whose advice am I going to take? Whose advice would this House take—that of the member for Northam or that of the Director of Works? We have been told that farmers already are carting water to the district to fill their tanks. I can assure the hon. member there were Cabinet discussions in regard to this matter and Ministers knew all about it.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is good. I am glad you said that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member said he had no objection to these towns getting water supplies provided that practical and reasonable consideration were given to towns in urgent need. That consideration is being given to all towns in Western Australia in dry areas which have urgent needs.

Mr. Oliver: Does that include Kalgoorlie and Boulder?

The PREMIER: Yes. I have told the House already what we are doing there.

Mr. Oliver: You are imposing water restrictions; that is what you are doing.

The PREMIER: The member for Northam referred to me as an astute campaigner.

Mr. Hoar: So you are!

The PREMIER: By jove, I am looking at an astute gentleman opposite me when it comes to political cunning! Perhaps I should not have used the word "cunning." I will withdraw it. Let me say "political astuteness." I can imagine the hon. member when this file was laid on the Table. When the member for Moore was getting hold of it, I can imagine how anxious the member for Northam would have been to grab it with both hands, wondering what was in it and what the member for Moore was after. He thinks the member for Moore is displeased with the Government about something so he gets hold of this file himself and reads it. But he did not read it all. I wish members would have a look at it as well, because there are a few things the member for Northam did not stress and did not even mention. But when we talk about political astuteness—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do not be so vain! You are like a clucky hen.

The PREMIER: I do not know what I am like.

Mr. Hoar: What are you looking coy about?

The PREMIER: I say this to the hon. member: He saw in this a chance not so much of rendering a great service to the dry areas of the State, but a wonderful opportunity—or so he thought—of embarrassing the Government. Of course, that is the whole reason for moving this motion, or the main reason. He thought he had some Government supporters on the spot.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government is permanently embarrassed.

The PREMIER: Hungry for office, he said to himself, "Here is an opportunity to put the boots into the Government, and I will do it!"

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government embarrasses itself all the time.

The PREMIER: The Government will get out of its embarrassment, although I am personally easily embarrassed. This motion, of course, has been moved for party political purposes. There has been nothing dishonest in the Government's actions in regard to this matter. I repeat that we acted on the most expert advice that we could get. We were told, by our Crown Law advisers, that the agreement could be signed. In the case of all great public works in Western Australia in the years since responsible government was first granted to this State, Governments have started such works and other Governments have felt the obligation to finish them.

What does this talk about a binding agreement amount to, after all? When a Government enters into an undertaking to implement some great public work, succeeding Governments feel bound to honour the promises that have been made and bring the work to completion.

Mr. Hoar: The Premier had better be sure about it.

The PREMIER: I have told the hon. member repeatedly that we acted on the advice that Governments seek—expert advice—which was to the effect that the Government could enter into this agreement and, by entering into it, we were not harming the drier areas to which the hon. member has made reference. I hope the House will not agree to the motion and I reiterate that no Government, for very many years, has done more to supply the dry areas of this State with water than has the present one.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [8.2]: I have listened to the Premier with a great deal of interest. I think it is an open secret among members of this House that a number of members, particularly those representing wheatbelt constituencies, have been greatly concerned over the question dealt with by the motion moved by the member for Northam. I have already had an assurance from the Premier that the agreements entered into and the promises made would not be to the disadvantage of the drier areas of the State, but I was interested to hear those assurances given publicly on the floor of the House. I say definitely that I had no knowledge of any concrete plans for the extension of the pipe-line down to Mt. Barker, or knowledge of any agreement such as was on the file, until the file was laid upon the Table of the House.

It is only natural that the interpretation placed on that agreement by people living in the drier areas of the State should be that they were likely to be disadvantaged in favour of the area south of Katanning. One can understand the concern felt by the representatives as well as the residents of the drier areas at the suggestion that a district with a rainfall of up to 30 inches should receive a reticulated water supply before districts with a rainfall of below 15 inches are provided with pipe-lines. That was a policy that I could not possibly support. We know the plans that were prepared by the Government under the Act passed by Parliament in 1947 for the reticulation of certain portions of the agricultural areas as well as the towns on the Great Southern railway as far south as Katanning.

Those plans were explained to the House and the matter received wide publicity, so that everyone knew exactly what was involved. There was no provision in those plans for an extension of the scheme any

great distance southward of Katanning, nor was there any provision in the plans prepared at the time when that Act was passed for the serving of a number of the drier wheatbelt districts. Other members representing such areas can speak for themselves, but the Roe electorate, which I represent, contains a considerable amount of country for the reticulation of which no plans were made under that Act. In many cases the residents of such areas had been opposed to the reticulation of their districts by water piped from the coast.

In other districts the offer had never been made to the residents, but knowing how important is the provision of really adequate water supplies to such districts I have pointed out to the residents of those areas—farmers as well as townspeople—the necessity for reticulation in order that the country may be fully developed. I might add that I do not think any water supply is adequate, in a district with a rainfall of under 15 inches, if it depends entirely on local rain catchment. I have attended a number of meetings in the last few months, the most recent being at Corrigin last Friday, where there was an attendance of 85, of whom 82 voted in favour of a motion for the reticulation of the Corrigin Road Board district by pipe-line from coastal water sources.

In addition the Kulin Road Board, as the representative body in the Kulin area, has carried a resolution asking for the extension of the Wellington Dam scheme to serve the Kulin Road Board district. I received a letter, dated the 2nd November, 1950, reading as follows:—

At the last meeting of the board I was directed to inquire if you have any further information from the Minister for Water Supply regarding this board's request to be connected to the scheme from Wellington Dam. At the moment the water supply position in the Kulin Road Board district cannot be described as other than serious. Surface catchments would not average more than one-third full and unless a summer storm is experienced drastic reductions of stock numbers appear unavoidable within the next month or two. This information was conveyed to the drought relief committee this week. Hoping to be advised of further progress in this matter, yours faithfully, . . . Secretary.

The Lake Grace Road Board, and other representative bodies in that area, have carried resolutions asking for the extension of the amended comprehensive water scheme to serve a large portion of that road board area which extends some distance eastwards from Newdegate and south from Lake Grace down into the Kent Road Board district, comprising the Nyabing area of the Kent Road Board district. Members will realise that that is a big slice of

country which is asking for the extension of the pipe-lines to provide an adequate water supply and much of it is country that is very badly placed in that regard. The position at Lake Grace township is pitiable. There is no reticulation there at all except for—

Mr. Hoar: Do you think they have a prior claim in preference to Mt. Barker?

Mr. PERKINS:—the provision of water to a couple of public buildings from a dam, handy to the townsite, which is inadequate even to supply the three or four buildings concerned. It should be possible for members to understand the concern with which I viewed the question of the extension of the pipe-lines to serve different districts of the State. That is why I think it is necessary to have some regard for priority of need when deciding which part of this work must be done first. The Premier has enumerated various districts that are at present in process of being served.

In some cases the provision being made is adequate but in others—for instance the dam being provided at Kulin—it is in my opinion inadequate from a long range point of view. I am hopeful that some of the schemes that from a long range view may be regarded as inadequate will suffice until we can arrange for the amended comprehensive scheme to be extended to serve those districts. The motion moved by the member for Northam contains a considerable amount about the action of the Government in making provisions for this area south of Katanning, but it does not deal with the matter in the way in which I think it should be approached. I believe this opportunity should be taken to lay down what should be the policy of the Government in providing adequate water supplies for districts similar to those to which I have referred. I move—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This is no surprise.

Mr. Marshall: It is like the abattoirs; you cannot go within a mile of them without smelling them.

Mr. PERKINS: I propose to move an amendment which, in my opinion, deals more adequately with this particular question than does the motion by the member for Northam.

Mr. W. Hegney: You are going to water it down, are you?

Mr. PERKINS: I propose to delete all the words after "House" in the motion moved by the member for Northam and insert words in lieu. If the amendment is carried, the motion would then read as follows:—

That this House considers that those drier portions of the State which it is practicable to serve from the comprehensive water scheme as defined by the 1947 Act should be connected by pipe-line therefrom before the extension from the above scheme is made into the higher rainfall districts south

of Katanning, notwithstanding the agreement made between the Government and the Tambellup, Cranbrook and Plantagenet Road Boards.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You cannot repudiate the Government like that.

Mr. PERKINS: I am not concerned whether this meets with the Government's particular wishes or not.

Mr. Marshall: We know all about that.

Mr. PERKINS: I believe some such amendment is desirable in order to lay down a policy for the future. Of course, in the first instance, it will be necessary for me to move to strike out all the words in the motion after the word "House" and then I will move to insert the other words which I have suggested.

Mr. W. Hegney: Why not add them to the motion?

Mr. PERKINS: If members will consider the amendment carefully they will notice that the first portion refers to the need for those drier portions of the State which it is practicable to serve from the comprehensive water scheme, as defined by the 1947 Act, to be connected by pipe-line therefrom by the extension of the main scheme in the higher rainfall districts south of Katanning. It will be realised that some of the districts to which I have referred did not come within the boundaries of the scheme outlined by the member for Northam in his original comprehensive water scheme, nor in the 1947 Act, but the words which I have proposed refer to the districts which it is practicable to serve. And I believe it is practicable to serve them.

I have discussed that point with officers of the Water Supply Department and from a technical point of view they say it is practicable to serve those districts east of Narrogin and Kulin and a large portion of the Lake Grace Road Board district to some distance east of Newdegate and the Pingrup area. For that reason all that I have asked is that the extension should be made where it is practicable to do so. I think it should also be applicable to the electorates represented by the other wheatbelt members. In the amendment I also state that priority should be given to the extension into such districts before the extension is made to the districts south of Katanning. I do not want to be unfair to any other area; I do not begrudge the districts south of Katanning a reticulated water scheme.

For the development of Western Australia I believe that we should supply water by pipe-line to all districts where it is required, if it is practicable to do so. As I have already stated, there must be some regard to the immediate urgency of the needs of the different districts, and that is why I said that the drier districts should be served first. Of course, it may be that

when work is commenced to supply some of those more distant points it will require perhaps over 100 miles of main pipe-line and possibly, when this work is on the way, a start may then be made to provide these extensions asked for south of Katanning. I have no objection to that being done. Before I knew anything about this motion and, in fact, early in the session, I made a speech to the effect that so far as I was concerned, if work to serve the eastern districts was proceeded with simultaneously with that proceeding to extend the pipe-line in a southerly direction, I would have no objection.

Mr. May: Do you not read the "Albany Advertiser?"

Mr. PERKINS: I do not think anyone should view these questions purely from the parochial angle. We must pay some regard to the overall development of the State and for that reason I am prepared to view this question as broadly as possible. In this amendment there is reference, too, to the agreement between the Government on the one hand and the road boards of Tambellup, Cranbrook and Plantagenet on the other. There appear to be various saving clauses and, possibly, there may be other legal complications which partly nullify the protection which that agreement can give to the districts enumerated.

As a matter of fact, looking at the subject rather closely, one can note that the agreement is between the Government on the one hand and the road boards on the other and, presumably, any breach of the agreement would only render the Government liable for damages to the extent that it causes damages to the road boards themselves by the non-supply of water for road board purposes. Members will realise that the amount of water which a road board would require to draw from the scheme would be very limited, and the amount of damages which a road board could claim from the Government would be infinitesimal.

Mr. Hoar: Are you referring to the members of the road boards?

Mr. PERKINS: No, the road boards themselves as public bodies. I understand the agreement gives no protection to the ratepayers of the road boards or to other residents in the districts concerned.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Is that the way the Deputy Premier has put it over them?

Mr. PERKINS: Therefore, those are the only people who would be caused any amount of damage by the non-fulfilment of this agreement and, as they are not protected by it, in my estimation the damage for which the Government would be liable as a result of the non-fulfilment of the agreement would be negligible.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You mean it is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. PERKINS: I wish to avoid any undue heartburnings in these districts and do not wish to see people being placed in a worse position than those in other districts of the State. I do not wish to see them being placed in any worse position than, say, Kojonup or Pemberton, which centres the Premier has mentioned. Perhaps some arrangement can be made to put in some local supply there which will tide those districts over their immediate difficulty until the pipe-line can eventually be extended to serve them. I can visualise that it will eventually be extended. My amendment is designed to ensure that the more urgent cases will be dealt with first. I do not think there should be any uncertainty about its meaning. The wording is quite clear.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I know the purpose of it.

Mr. PERKINS: I think I have explained fairly fully—

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It has no value.

Mr. PERKINS: —the objects I have in mind. Without further ado, I move an amendment—

That all the words after the word "House" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "considers that those drier portions of the State which it is practicable to serve from the comprehensive water scheme as defined by the 1947 Act should be connected by pipe-line therefrom before the extension from the above scheme is made into the higher rainfall districts south of Katanning, notwithstanding the agreement made between the Government and the Tambellup, Cranbrook and Plantagenet Road Boards."

Point of Order.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The amendment foreshadowed by the member for Roe is not, in my opinion, an amendment to the motion at all. It could be an addendum to it but no chairman of any standing, anywhere in the State, would accept it as an amendment to the motion because it is not in fact an amendment. Therefore, it is necessary for me to ask you, Sir, at this stage, before I speak to the amendment, whether you rule that the amendment foreshadowed is in order. If it is not, the amendment now before the House is, of course, one which should not be further considered, but immediately withdrawn by the member for Roe so that the House might discuss the motion and make a decision for or against it. So, at this stage, I ask your ruling, Sir, whether the amendment put forward by the member for Roe is in order and can be accepted as such.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is certainly not very drastic. It is not a direct negative to the motion, as I view it, and is therefore in order.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

I do that because the motion asks the House to view with serious concern the action and policy of the Government in connection with something which it has already done—something to which it is committed and bound—not only committed and bound by a point of honour because of a written and verbal undertaking it has given to the local authorities concerned, but committed and bound legally because of a binding agreement into which the Government has entered with the road boards concerned in this matter. In addition, if you care to read the motion itself, Mr. Speaker, you will see that it goes on to express an opinion in connection with the very legal agreement which the Government has signed with the road boards. This suggested amendment is by no stretch of imagination an amendment to that motion. It could certainly be an addendum, and I would be prepared to accept it as such and to have it added to the motion. Therefore, if the member for Roe and those associated with him are anxious that this suggested amendment should be made part of an expression by Parliament in connection with this matter, then quite properly it could be moved as an addendum to the motion, and I would agree to that.

Let me now read the amendment. It is to delete all words in the motion after the word "House" which, in effect, rules out the motion altogether, and therefore, it is a most direct and complete negative. It wipes the motion completely out of existence and seeks to substitute for it something entirely different, and I say there is not a chairman of any standing or consequence in Western Australia who would accept that as an amendment to the motion we have now before the House. I am sure that if the member for Roe were chairman of a public meeting at Bruce Rock or some other town in his electorate, and had a motion before him in the terms of that now before the House, and some member at the meeting tried to move this suggested amendment as an amendment to that motion, the member for Roe would undoubtedly rule it out of order.

Mr. Perkins: You have a very short memory of what happened to one of our motions when I was on that side of the House.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I am not concerned with what was done when the member for Roe was on this side of the House. I am concerned with the attempt now being made by the hon. member to wipe completely out of existence a motion by the subterfuge of trying to move an amendment to that motion when it is no amendment at all.

Mr. Perkins: I will remind you in a moment of the ruling of the member for Fremantle when he was Speaker.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: If the member for Roe so pleases, he could give a thousand such examples of what the member for Fremantle, or anybody else, did; but what bearing would that have on the point?

The Minister for Education: Only that he was a good chairman; that is all.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Now we have the Deputy Premier coming in after maintaining a silence on this today and a fortnight ago. I have more than an idea how this amendment came to be drafted.

The Premier: Wrong again! You are off the line.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Premier says I am off the line again, but he does not know what line I am on.

The Premier: I was speaking to the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is all right, then.

The Premier: I know what line you are on.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I have not the slightest doubt that the Premier has figured that this is a good way to avoid the motion. Therefore the Premier had better not have too much to say at this stage; otherwise he will further embarrass his own Government which has been continually embarrassed this year by the Government itself or by individual members of the Government. Therefore I submit very strongly that this is not an amendment to the motion, because it aims to wipe the motion out of existence altogether. Therefore it is in effect, and entirely, a direct negative to the motion.

Mr. W. Hegney: I want a copy of the amendment moved by the member for Roe.

Mr. Perkins: The member for Northam has one.

Mr. Hegney: Every member should have one, and as a member who would like to cast an intelligent vote, I would like a copy of the amendment. Can you, Mr. Speaker, say what it is offhand?

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is as follows:—

Delete all words after "House" and insert in lieu thereof:—"considers that those drier portions of the State which it is practicable to serve from the comprehensive water scheme as defined by the 1947 Act should be connected by pipeline therefrom before the extension from the above scheme is made into the higher rainfall districts south of Katanning, notwithstanding the agreement made between the Government and the Tambellup, Cranbrook and Plantagenet Road Boards."

Mr. Perkins: I am surprised that the member for Northam should move to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Quite

obviously, in dealing with a question like this, it is within the rights of members of the House to vary the wording to any shape or form they prefer, so as long as they deal with the subject-matter with which the motion is dealing.

Mr. Kelly: You have not touched it.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The motion refers to what the Government has done, and you want to move that it does something else.

Mr. Perkins: The amendment deals with the particular policy the Government has pursued on this subject. Why I am surprised at the member for Northam disagreeing with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is that I have rather vivid recollections of what happened on a number of occasions since I have been in this House, when the member for Northam was on this side and I was sitting on the benches opposite. I remember in particular a motion I moved dealing with the policy of the Government regarding State hotels. One of the then Government members moved to delete all words after the first word of my motion with a view to inserting others, and it was carried because of their numbers. The inserted words gave an entirely different meaning to the motion I had before the House. I have no doubt the Leader of the Opposition remembers the occasion quite well.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You would approve of that.

Mr. Perkins: I am not disagreeing with it. We accepted it at that time and we did not move to disagree with the Speaker's ruling. The then Speaker was the present member for Fremantle, and we accepted his ruling at that time and, if it was correct on that occasion, then surely, when a similar procedure is adopted tonight, the ruling must be along the same lines.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I am rather surprised that the member for Roe should quote the instance he did, because it gets him nowhere. In 1946 the member for Roe moved as follows:—

That where a local community desires to take over a hotel to be run by it as a "community hotel," on a co-operative basis, giving good service and using profits for financing local amenities, this House considers that the Government should adopt a policy designed to make possible and further this objective.

I hope you have got that, Mr. Speaker. The amendment to that motion was—

That where a local community desires to take over a hotel to be run by it as a "community hotel" on a co-operative basis, giving good service and using profits for financing local amenities, this House considers that the Government should encourage the ambition.

Mr. Perkins: You get the amendment that the Government moved. You have not got to that portion where it suggested that more State hotels should be established.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is its policy.

Mr. Perkins: I know it is.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I have already quoted what the member for Roe moved.

Mr. Perkins: Find the amendment moved for the Government.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: If the member for Roe is going to quote these things he should have them all ready to prove his case. All I can see here is—

Mr. Speaker: Order: I want the hon. member's case now.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: In my opinion the amendment is quite out of order.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The foreshadowed amendment we are talking about.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: This is what was moved in 1946; that all words after the word "that" in line one be struck out with a view to inserting the following words:—

This House is of the opinion that more State-owned hotels should be established in suitable localities and that controlling legislation should be introduced to safeguard the interests of any community in which the local community organises to take over or has already taken over an hotel with the object of operating it co-operatively for the purpose of rendering efficient service and devoting surplus monies to the expansion of improved conditions for the community.

That all dealt with co-operative societies, or co-operative hotels, the same as did the motion.

Mr. Perkins: State hotels.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It dealt with co-operative hotels and State hotels and related to the subject-matter of the motion of the member for Roe. When he moved it, he moved from a community point of view and the amendment also referred to the community basis. There is nothing wrong with that. I would say the amendment before us is absolutely out of order. The motion says—

That this House views with serious concern the action and policy of the Government in agreeing to give preference in the supply of water to Mt. Barker and adjacent towns in the Great Southern district as against towns and farms in drier areas; and it regards as most unfair, unjustifiable and contrary to the best interests of the State as a whole, the Government's decision authorising the making of an agreement between the Treasurer and the Plantagenet, Tambellup and Cranbrook Road Boards under which the Government has bound succeeding governments as well as itself, to supply

water to the towns of Broomehill, Tambellup, Cranbrook and Mt. Barker within six years from 26th May, 1949, irrespective of the greater and more urgent needs of townspeople and farmers in the dry parts of the State.

This deals with past actions of the Government. The member for Roe now wants to bring in something that it is proposed the Government shall do in future. This has nothing to do with the previous action of the Government. No mention is made of that.

Mr. Ackland: The amendment definitely deals with the agreement.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The motion of the member for Northam will not wipe out the agreement. I repeat that the member for Roe has submitted a proposal as to what the Government should do in future and that is to see that the drier areas are linked up before Mt. Barker. That is an entirely different matter, is not relevant to the motion and I submit that it is quite out of order.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	24

Majority against	1
------------------	------	---

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Oliver
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Shearn
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Snyants
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. May	Mr. Kelly
Mr. McCulloch	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Read
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wild
Mr. Manning	Mr. Yates
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Pair.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Abbott

Question thus negatived.

Debate Resumed.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—on amendment) [8.50]: The intention of the member for Roe is obvious.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He is the rat catcher for the Government.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If ever a Government was deserving of censure, the present Government is in connection with this matter. When the Premier was speaking,

he made two remarks that caused me to take special notice. One was his statement that he always spoke the truth, or words to that effect. He should do some thinking about that statement because, not so long ago, it was demonstrated very clearly that he did not always speak the truth in this House.

The Premier: You are getting back on to plaster, are you not?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I said nothing about plaster.

The Premier: You are obsessed.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: And I am still waiting for the apology that the Premier ought to make. The other point is that he endeavoured to gain strength for his argument from the fact that the Director of Works had made a recommendation to the Government, that the Director was an outstanding man and therefore the Government had every justification for taking notice of him. The Premier ought to remember that he changes about in order to suit the circumstances. Members probably have a very clear recollection of a strong recommendation made by the Director of Works on a certain matter of very great moment to the State, and not only did the Government not take notice of his recommendation, but the then Attorney General, who is no longer a member of the House, sought to disparage the opinion of the Director of Works by drawing a character study of him to indicate that Governments were justified in disregarding advice that he might give. The advice given by the Director of Works on that occasion is to be found in "Hansard," 1947, at page 2272 as follows:—

The Committee is convinced that the right thing to do is to erect the work house and reorganise the railway layout to suit, at a total estimated cost of £270,000, and it strongly recommends the Government accordingly.

If the Director of Works is a man possessing the qualifications that the Premier tonight told us he does—and in that I agree—then the Government had very little justification in 1947 for disregarding his advice. But it did not suit the Government to accept his advice. Despite the qualifications of the Director of Works and his knowledge of that matter and his very strong recommendation to the Government, the advice he tendered was disregarded. That would have been bad enough, but to justify the action of the Government the Attorney General of the day sought to disparage the qualifications of the Director of Works and to claim that there was justification for disregarding his advice. Well, the Premier cannot have it both ways. He now seeks to show that the Government was fortified in its action on this matter because of the advice tendered by the Director of Works.

The Premier: And in this respect, he is one of the highest authorities in the land.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I agree, and so was he on the matter to which I have referred, but his advice on that occasion did not suit the Premier. That is the point. When the advice was tendered by the Director of Works—I rather suspect that on this occasion it was tendered under some duress—

The Premier: You are very suspicious this session.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have very good reason to be suspicious.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I shall prove that it was under duress.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So, when the Director of Works gives advice that suits the Premier, he hastens to adopt it but, when the advice does not suit him, then the Director of Works is not the outstanding man which tonight we are asked to believe he is. With all due deference to the advice we receive from time to time from the Crown Law Department, I am not so certain that this agreement is worth anything. I have to admit that I have not perused it so I am not aware of all the terms it contains, but I am aware that a section of the Country Areas Water Supply Act gives certain statutory rights to local authorities.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking to the amendment?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course I am. I am endeavouring to show that the words should not be struck out, but should remain part of the motion. Section 15 of the Country Areas Water Supply Act provides—

Before undertaking the construction of any waterworks, except such reticulation works as the Governor may by notice in the "Government Gazette" exempt from the operation of this section and the next three following sections, the Minister shall—

Then follows what the Minister shall do. Among other things, he shall cause to be prepared plans, sections, specifications and an estimate of the cost of the proposed waterworks. Section 16 provides—

The plans, sections, specifications and estimates so deposited shall be open to inspection by any person interested at all reasonable times on payment of the prescribed fee.

Section 17 states—

Any local authority or person interested may object in writing to the construction of the proposed water works.

Thus that Act gives a statutory right to persons and local authorities interested to object to a proposed water scheme. If this

so-called agreement, which is supposed to bind the present Government and succeeding Governments, is valid, what becomes of that statutory right? Mr. Speaker, you have had legal training and I ask you could you, by an agreement, deprive persons of rights that have been conferred upon them by statute? Why, a second-year law student in the Terrace could tell you no, and he would be right.

No matter what the legal advice to the contrary may be, one cannot by an agreement take away rights conferred by statute. This statute definitely confers a right upon local authorities and persons interested to object to proposed schemes. I cannot imagine that an agreement could so be drawn as to take away that right which the legislature has given to persons in relation to proposed water schemes. Consequently, it may be that all the trouble that has been taken to secure for certain favoured road boards at the expense of others a priority of treatment will be annulled when it comes to a question of putting the agreement into operation. The Premier brought forward a number of statements to show that because of the investigations which took place when the Labour Government was in office, this Government was justified in concluding an agreement to put in a water scheme to serve the towns mentioned, in priority to other districts. What the Premier said in no way justified that conclusion. Inquiries might be pursued in all parts of the State with a view to proper planning for the putting of a scheme into operation when opportunity offered, but there is nothing in such preliminary inquiry to suggest that any one district should be given priority over any other.

The whole point in this matter, which has justifiably brought censure upon the Government, is that in a sort of underhand way an agreement was concluded which definitely singled out a section of the State from its proper turn. There would be very few people, directors of works or anyone else, who would say that that portion of the State with its generous rainfall, ought to be equipped with a water supply in priority to other districts where the rainfall is much less. The Premier sought to explain that away by saying that there would be enough steel to put in all the water supplies. That is a priceless example of wishful thinking.

Mr. Kelly: It is something worth remembering when it comes to the establishment of water supplies.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: One need only examine the history with regard to the projects in operation in this State to know what the position is. Take the maddening pace at which the Causeway is being constructed! We have had statements from time to time about the marvellous progress being made—I think there was one this morning just to keep the matter alive. But

this work has been in progress for years, and, on present indications, will be in progress for many years to come before it is completed.

The Premier: Have you any bright ideas about it?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes.

The Premier: Let us hear them.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No, I am dealing with the motion. The Speaker will not let me get off on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Melville is speaking to the amendment.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The motion, really.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Premier is desirous of keeping us away from the matters involved in the amendment; and that is what he attempted to do himself.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is so. He avoided them.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Fortunately, so long as we keep within Standing Orders, we can please ourselves with regard to the matters with which we are dealing. The Premier has been batting on a sticky wicket on several occasions this session, and he is certainly on a very sticky wicket now. His attempt to show that there will be ample material to meet the needs of all the water supplies, authorised and yet to be authorised, apparently was not very successful. The Premier knows in his heart, I feel, that there is no possibility, if an attempt is made to adhere to the agreement, of providing for all the other water supplies, which ought to be established in priority to this one and before this is undertaken. But any argument will suit his purpose so long as he can make a show of dealing with the case that has been put up.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Any subterfuge suits the Premier at this stage.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have no doubt that the steps he took on a former occasion—still fresh in our memories—have been taken with regard to this motion, and that the numbers are secure. The Premier knows that before he rises in his place to debate it.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He was not so sure at the Liberal Party luncheon on Monday.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is quite a happy position for a Premier to be in, so far as the vote of the House is concerned, when this Government has done something which justifies censure, but I would think, not very fortunate when he reflects upon the reasons for his Government being in its present predicament. He might survive the vote of the House, but a few more victories such as this and the one he had last week would not leave the Government in a very sound position. It appears that the Government blunders out of one morass into another; and succeeds in extricating itself by a margin of only one vote each time. That will not go on indefin-

itely. The attempt by the member for Roe to draw off criticism in this way is, I think, a valiant one on his part to save the Government of which he is a member.

The Premier: Or a supporter, which?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: To call him a supporter is probably more correct, although he has an office under the Government.

Mr. Perkins: An office under the House, not the Government.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Under the House directly, and under the Government indirectly. The member for Roe will find that if the Government changes, so will the opinion of the House alter with regard to his position.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It might change before then.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So we can understand his anxiety to provide a means by which criticism might be diverted, if possible, and the existence of the Government continued. But, of course, the member for Roe will have to stand up to this in his electorate, and then it will not be so easy.

The Premier: Threatening; intimidation; come over with us quickly!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is nothing like the argument the Premier must have used to the member for Beverley the other evening. If I were the Premier I would not press the matter of intimidation too far, or he might hear something.

The Premier: What did I say to the member for Beverley?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Would the Premier like to know what he said to me? "You can rely on me. This matter stinks." The Premier must have used some pretty strong persuasion to make a man, who declared himself in that way, vote in the opposite direction. I have no doubt that the same strong pressure has been exerted in connection with this motion, too. So, the result of the vote is a foregone conclusion.

Mr. Perkins: There is not much wrong with the amendment from the point of view of the wheatbelt constituencies.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think it will satisfy the wheatbelt constituencies. I think they believe what the original motion stated.

Mr. Perkins: Do not you think the amendment is a lot more concrete?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No.

Mr. Marshall: If you think the wheat producers are going to be fooled by your amendment, you are mistaken.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They will put up Harry Seward against you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is where the trouble will occur. It will not matter much what takes place here, or what appears in the paper. What will matter is what the people in the country areas, which are adversely affected by the agreement, will

think of the attitude of their representatives when the subject is brought up for discussion. There is no intimidation or threat in that. It is just a statement of opinion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The amendment of the member for Roe is squibbing the issue.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is so. The amendment squibs the issue. It enables men who might be a bit weak in facing up to the real issue to get out of it in this way. While that objective might be achieved here, it will be of little avail in the electorates. Those discerning members who have regard for the effect of these matters on their constituencies will appreciate that quite well. This will fool nobody. It might result in a certain decision being arrived at in this House.

Mr. Kelly: It possibly fools the mover.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In the ultimate, it will fool nobody. By now the people generally have a pretty good idea as to what happened. I was amused to hear the Premier dilating on the amount of publicity which had been given to the subject. I venture to say that there were not three members of this House who knew anything about the matter until it was raised by the member for Moore. We are public men who read the papers fairly regularly, and carefully—not only "The West Australian" but the provincial papers as well—and I am of the opinion that very few of us had any knowledge of this agreement. One would imagine, after listening to the Premier, however, that it was shouted from the housetops. It is strange that so few people knew about it. I do not think the reporters of "The West Australian" knew about it, and they are pretty good when it comes to getting news.

Mr. Hill: It was their own fault if they did not.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The fault of the reporters?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Was it their fault or their misfortune?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: They loafed on the job according to the member for Albany.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is a remarkable thing that they should slip in this respect when they show such perspicacity in other directions.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: They knew a couple of days ago about the amendment which is now before the House. It was in the paper.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think the Premier really believed what he said when he stated here tonight that considerable publicity had been given to the matter.

The Premier: He believed every word of it, and proved it to you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Premier did not prove it to me. He made certain statements but did not prove what he said any more than he proved his statement the other night. I do not think he proved what he said to too many; and he certainly did not prove it to one or two members on the Government cross-benches if the guffaws which followed his statement were any indication.

The Premier: I thought they came from over there.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Premier is wrong again.

The Premier: The loudest came from over there.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They came from the supporters of the Government, because even though they have shown they can swallow quite a lot they were unable to swallow that one. I trust that the House will not agree to the amendment, but will subsequently agree to the motion.

MR. HOAR (Warren—on amendment) [9.15]: I am anxious to find out before a vote is taken, just what is in the mind of the member for Roe—

Mr. Oliver: Nothing.

Mr. HOAR: —in moving this amendment. The motion reads "That this House views with serious concern the action and policy of the Government, etc." Does not the member for Roe view with serious concern the policy of the Government in connection with this water scheme?

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He did a week ago but he is afraid to say so publicly.

Mr. HOAR: If he does, why does he want to move any amendment to this motion?

Mr. Perkins: To make it better.

Mr. HOAR: It will not be any better and it is just an evasion of a man's responsibility to the State.

Mr. May: Just a loophole.

Mr. HOAR: I put the Premier in that category also because he, as head of a Government, is faced with what can be considered a censure motion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Has the Government any head?

The Premier: Too much for you.

Mr. HOAR: Rather than face the consequences, and put it to a debate and vote in this House he is prepared to go round in a lobbying sort of fashion. "The West Australian" hinted yesterday that there was not much need for the Government to worry because it had the vote in the bag, or something to that effect. It means that the Government is not prepared to accept the result of the motion as moved and debated. The Government is so scared of its own skin on this occasion that it takes any method open to it to defeat the original

motion on the notice paper. The member for Roe is just as furious with the Government on this question as is any member on this side of the House. He said so, and he repeats it in his amendment. If he was not feeling that way, there would be no need for him to move an amendment. The very fact that he has seen fit to move it, for the opinions he holds in connection with this matter, is in itself a vote of censure by that hon. member on the Government. That is the way I look on the amendment; it is a vote of censure on the Government, although it is not as strongly worded as is the motion.

There are other members in this House, besides the member for Roe, who have been seriously concerned over the Government's action on this question of tying itself to an obligation to provide water for certain towns outside the comprehensive water scheme. Several Government members did not know the line it was intended to take in this matter. If they had known I am certain they would have sought an earlier means to express their criticism—not in the House to make it public but in the party rooms. It is a matter of great concern that the Government was willing to take this action, unknown to them in any way at all. Consequently, those members representing the drier areas, faced with a reasonable motion such as this, had to decide whether they were going to support this Government, of which they disapprove, or come to light with a certain amount of courage and vote against it.

There is no question or doubt about what "The West Australian" meant when it hinted yesterday that the Government had secured its necessary majority to defeat the motion. That was not discovered by debate and the Government is seeking this backdoor method of avoiding an adverse vote in this House. If a vote were taken it would probably bring discredit on the Government and force it to go to the country. This must be the queerest Government the State has ever seen. It is always getting into hot water over something and particularly with its own supporters.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is a very unhappy Government.

Mr. HOAR: It cannot reach unanimity on anything of a State-wide nature, even inside its own party rooms. Consequently, how can the Government expect to carry on in a proper manner? This is a most important matter. It not only guarantees this water supply scheme outside the comprehensive one, but also pledges other Governments to follow suit and honour the obligations of this Government, of whose actions we disapprove. Therefore, the whole matter is not conducive to obtaining any sort of support from any man in this Chamber; or any man who is prepared to take this vote on its merits. Consequently, I would like to ask the member for Roe, if he intends to reply, what are his reasons for striking out these words

and substituting others, knowing that he disapproves of the Government's actions in the same way as I do. That being so why is he not prepared, and others like him, to vote against the Government by supporting this motion?

The Premier: A most courageous man!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Much more courageous than the Premier who put the Director of Works into the ring in connection with this matter.

MR. ACKLAND (Moore—on amendment) [9.21]: Since the night that the papers dealing with this subject were laid on the Table of the House I did not think that I could have any feeling of sympathy towards any member of Cabinet in this matter. But, I must admit that this afternoon, and this evening, when the Premier was speaking to the motion, I had a real feeling of sympathy for him because of the hard job he had in front of him. It has been said that the member for Roe—and I align myself with him in this matter—was trying to evade the issue by his amendment. If members read the motion moved by the member for Northam they will see that there is nothing of a constructive or definite nature in it. It has been framed with one object in view and that is to bring about the defeat of this Government.

Mr. Kelly: You thought it should be brought about, too.

Mr. ACKLAND: There is nothing else in it, but if members read the amendment, they will find that it is all constructive and it calls upon the Government to do certain things.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is not the amendment moved by the member for Roe.

Mr. ACKLAND: The original motion has just the opposite effect. I do not think the member for Northam has any concern whatever with what is happening in the drier parts of the State.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is a lie and I ask that it be withdrawn immediately.

The Minister for Lands: Why should he withdraw it?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I say it is a deliberate lie on the part of the member for Moore and I ask that he withdraw it.

The Minister for Education: It is an expression of opinion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I am not concerned about that. I say that the remark of the member for Moore is a deliberate lie.

Mr. ACKLAND: It is not a lie and it was not my intention that it should be thought a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member prepared to withdraw the remark which is considered offensive by the member for Northam?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is a lie.

Mr. ACKLAND: It was not meant to be offensive and I had no idea that the hon. member was as thin-skinned as he is; but that being so, I am prepared to withdraw it.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is a lie.

The Premier: You have said that half a dozen times already.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: And I will say it again.

Mr. ACKLAND: There are some members of this House who are willing to make many sweeping statements and they get away with them.

Mr. Oliver: You make them, too.

Mr. ACKLAND: Perhaps I do.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: But he apologises the next day.

Mr. ACKLAND: I believe that the primary object of the member for Northam was to embarrass the Government—

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is another lie.

Mr. ACKLAND: —and not to assist the people in country districts.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is another lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry the word "lie" has crept into the argument. We do not use the word "lie" in the Chamber these days; we use the word "untruth."

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Then the member for Moore is telling an untruth.

Mr. ACKLAND: There is nothing constructive in the motion moved by the member for Northam and I want something for the people in my district. I was a critic—and still am a critic—of the Government in the action it took with reference to extending the water scheme—

Hon. A. H. Panton: What a critic you are.

Mr. ACKLAND: —to Mt. Barker.

Mr. Kelly: What has the Government promised you?

Mr. ACKLAND: I will tell the hon. member all about that in a minute. If the House supports the motion, it must be considered as a vote of no confidence in the Government.

Mr. W. Hegney: What is wrong with that?

Mr. ACKLAND: If we support the amendment it is an instruction to the Government that it should do certain things and do those things where they are most necessary. That is my reason for supporting the amendment rather than the motion. We also have to take into consideration the result to Western Australia if we have a change of Government. We have had this Government for three years—

The Premier: This is not a laughing matter.

Mr. ACKLAND: —and for 14 consecutive years previously we had a Labour administration. If one gives consideration to what those Governments did not do during that period one would be taking a serious obligation on one's self by agreeing to the motion.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is a lovely thing for a farmer to say. Go back to 1914 and 1915 and work on from there, and see what the Labour Governments did for the farmers.

Mr. ACKLAND: We would return to the conditions—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Fancy a farmer like you talking like that!

Mr. ACKLAND: —which existed before 1947.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Like 1930 to 1933.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ACKLAND: I have a vivid recollection—

Hon. A. H. Panton: So have we.

Mr. ACKLAND: —of what happened in my own electorate. I would like to tell members what happened at the Mogumber native settlement and I would like the member for Kimberley—he is always talking about what happened at a sheep station in his area—to see Mogumber at the moment.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: They would not stand you there!

Mr. ACKLAND: It is a credit.

Mr. Oliver: That has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. ACKLAND: This is intended to be a vote of no confidence.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you what have the natives at Mogumber to do with the motion before the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was supporting the amendment. If he is going to use various devices to strengthen his argument he must make them short and indulge in what are called passing references. They are the only possible methods he can employ when he deals with such a subject. He may make passing references to a certain matter but he must not spend too much time on it.

Mr. ACKLAND: I would not have been as long as this had it not been for all the interjections from the other side of the House. I would have passed from the unsatisfactory conditions that existed at Mogumber long ago if I had been given the opportunity. Then I have to give consideration to what has happened in regard to education in my electorate, the shocking conditions that existed there and the different conditions that exist today.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You ought to talk about education.

Mr. ACKLAND: That was the position.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It was an anti-Labour Government that closed the Training College.

The Premier: And who was it that reduced old-age pensions?

Hon. A. H. Panton: What next will we be blamed for?

Mr. ACKLAND: One member asked why was I so anxious to support the Government. I am giving some good reasons. For instance, there is the position of the railway system after 20 years of Labour Government control. The system was in a shocking condition. That fact was mentioned in the report of the Royal Commission that investigated the railways some time back.

Mr. McCulloch: What is the position today?

Mr. ACKLAND: The system is not in the condition that we would like it to be. However, as the Speaker said, it is necessary for me to make only passing references to these matters as we found them under a Labour Administration, and I cannot go into further particulars.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You are the great individualist!

Mr. ACKLAND: An article appeared in "The West Australian" about the period I referred to in which the statement was made that it could be asserted without exaggeration that, with the exception of a few isolated instances, the ordinary deficiencies were not observable in the railway running-sheds. There was also mention of the fact that nowhere else in the world could such conditions be found as those associated with our railway system. The rollingstock was completely run down.

Hon. A. H. Panton: If you had done as much work during the war years as the railways did, you would have been run down too.

Mr. ACKLAND: Those facts have been taken into consideration.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Not on your life!

Mr. ACKLAND: Of the 422 engines controlled by the Railway Department, only 134 were reported to be of any economic use owing to age. Such was the state of the railway system when the present Government took over from the Labour Administration.

Point of Order.

Mr. Needham: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether this is an Address-in-reply debate or whether we are discussing an amendment to a motion before the House. The member for Moore is bringing in everything under the sun and dealing with them instead of discussing the amendment. May I ask you to keep him in order and confine him to the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Moore is discussing the amendment and he is referring to various matters, as far as I can follow him, to give reasons why if the amendment were not agreed to the Government would go out.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Of course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making certain references and I have ruled that he cannot deal with such matters except by way of passing references as they are somewhat apart from the motion itself.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you whether you would worry if the Government were thrown out of office.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Moore will proceed.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. ACKLAND: During the balance of my remarks, I will endeavour not to give offence to members opposite. I shall take further opportunity in the future to deal with some of these matters, such as the supply of water to drier areas, at greater length.

Point of Order.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ackland: Gosh! What have I done now!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I would like some guidance from you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the amendment was to delete certain words from the motion. The member for Moore is now trying to read into the amendment something about providing water for drier areas. I would like guidance from you as to the actual wording of the amendment before the House.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is to strike out all the words after the words "That this House." The member for Moore will proceed.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. ACKLAND: What I desire to say I can give utterance to later on when the House has agreed to the deletion of the words contained in the motion.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: But not yet.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Not tonight.

The Premier: That will not worry me.

Mr. ACKLAND: My remarks deal with subjects that Opposition members seem to regard as unpalatable. However, I shall content myself with supporting the amendment.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment) [9.35]: I oppose the amendment. I desire to read to the House the words which by the amendment are proposed to be deleted from the motion. Those words are—

views with serious concern the action and policy of the Government in agreeing to give preference in the supply of water to Mt. Barker and adjacent towns in the Great Southern District, as against towns and farms in drier areas; and regards as most unfair, unjustifiable and contrary to the best interests of the State as a whole, the Government's decision authorising the making of an agreement between the Treasurer and the Plantagenet, Tambellup and Cranbrook Road Boards, under which the Government has bound succeeding Governments, as well as itself, to supply water to the towns of Broomehill, Tambellup, Cranbrook and Mt. Barker within six years from 26th May, 1949, irrespective of the greater and more urgent needs of townspeople and farmers in the drier parts of the State.

Mr. Bovell: And will you not admit that that motion was designed to embarrass the Government?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is quite refreshing to hear such a pointed interjection from the member for Vasse. It seems to indicate that he is thinking much harder tonight than he has ever before thought since he has been a member of the House.

Mr. Bovell: The member for Northam is riding his usual hobby-horse of personalities. He referred to the Premier by way of interjection saying that he had told an untruth. I will not say the word he used, but he accused the Premier of being something that begins with an "I."

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: A very good speech!

Hon. A. H. Pantou: Get up and address Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bovell: My objection is to what the member for Northam called the Premier.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: With his second interjection the member for Vasse falls from grace.

Mr. Bovell: I do not mind falling from grace in your eyes.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is good.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Let us get hostile about it!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I should suggest to the member for Vasse that he should be prepared to judge the motion on its merits.

Mr. Bovell: The point I make is that I was disappointed in your reference to the Premier.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not concerned whether the member for Vasse is disappointed with me. In fact, I might be more happy if he were.

The Minister for Lands: And he is not the only one.

Mr. Bovell: At any rate, I have the right to express my opinion.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have not said the hon. member should not do so.

Mr. Bovell: I say your interjection regarding the Premier was unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Northam should address the Chair. This is developing into a duet.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I was afraid it was going to be a trio, Mr. Speaker! I draw the attention of the member for Vasse to the fact that if he wishes properly to discharge his parliamentary duties he will judge the motion on its merits.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: He should get up and speak like a little man.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He should not say what he considers might be the reason for a member moving a motion in the form he chooses.

Mr. Bovell: I have judged you on what you said about the Premier.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the member for Vasse is not prepared to judge the motion on its merits, that is unfortunate for the House and for the State as a whole. There is no reason at all or logical need for the words proposed to be struck out, to be eliminated from the motion.

Mr. Perkins: Unless we can find better ones to replace them.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The member for Roe has been struggling for a fortnight to find better ones and has not succeeded. All he has indicated so far has been by way of subterfuge.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is certainly so.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The amendment he foreshadowed indicated very clearly that the member for Roe is not prepared to stand up for or against the motion.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is the point.

Mr. Perkins: And that is your opinion.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is proved by the hon. member's action.

Mr. Perkins: That is your opinion, too.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the member for Roe were prepared to stand up to the motion one way or the other, he would have done so.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He is not allowed to do that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Whether he is for the motion or against it is a matter for his own consideration. Rather than stand up to the motion one way or the other, he has sought to evade the issue by moving an amendment which is in effect not an amendment at all. What he has proposed can be regarded only as an addendum to the motion.

Mr. Kelly: It is a compromise with his own conscience.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: There can be no doubt whatever that the policy of the Government to date in connection with water supplies is to give preference to Mt. Barker and adjacent towns. There is no doubt in the world about that. This evening the Premier sought to express his disapproval of the motion by quoting figures and dates taken from a departmental file dealing with the comprehensive water supply scheme. What did those figures and dates prove?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Nothing.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is right.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: They proved nothing at all. They represented what the Deputy Premier would describe, in his own classical style, as a mere statement on a Government file. That is all. They are not worth a snap of the fingers, in a practical sense, as compared with undertakings that the Government has given local authorities in the Mt. Barker areas. It is all very well for the member for Roe to think that if he succeeds with his present amendment to delete words from the motion and then carries his foreshadowed amendment, he will make it impossible for the Government to give preference to Mt. Barker, Tambellup, Broomehill and other places over townships in the drier areas of the State. Surely the member for Roe is not so foolish or inexperienced as to believe that the passing of his foreshadowed amendment will in some mysterious fashion be of more concrete value than the legal agreement which the local authorities in the Mt. Barker district already hold from the Government.

Mr. Marshall: That is all.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Does the member for Roe think that? Of course he does not! We know him too well to think he would be so foolish as to believe that. He knows that his foreshadowed amendment, if supported by a majority of members of this House, will not be worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. Perkins: You are doing a lot of thinking for me tonight.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not doing any thinking for the hon. member at all.

Mr. Hutchinson: What concrete value has your motion?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It has the concrete value that it gives the House an opportunity of passing judgment upon actual decisions and policy to which the Government is already committed.

Mr. Hutchinson: It is not your intention to embarrass the Government?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not concerned with embarrassing or not embarrassing the Government, but I am concerned with giving the members of this House an opportunity to say whether, in

their judgment, the Government has done the right thing in this matter; and it is a bit discouraging to find that the new members of the Liberal Party in this House, who were hailed as being something in the nature of a find, something in the nature of a sensational political find, are not prepared to look at the motion on its merits.

Hon. A. H. Panton: They are like a lot of our mines; they do not go down very deep.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: They are not prepared to look at the motion on its merits at all, or to say whether they agree or disagree with the policy and decisions of the Government in connection with this matter.

The Minister for Lands: They will let you know, when the vote is taken.

Hon. A. H. Panton: We know! Do not tell us that. You have a nicely disciplined party. We appreciate that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The difference between the motion and the foreshadowed amendment of the member for Roe is that the motion gives members an opportunity of making a decision as to what they think of the water supply policy to which the Government is irrevocably committed. Make no mistake about that! We can pass in this House all the motions which anyone thinks about, calling upon the Government to give the drier areas preference. But all those motions together, even if there were a million of them, would not be worth the paper they were written on, not one-millionth part of the paper they were written on, compared with the legal agreement which the local authorities in the Mt. Barker districts hold.

It seems to me that the existence of this legal agreement is a fact which has not filtered into the minds of some Country Party members of this House. They do not seem to realise that local authorities in certain Great Southern districts have succeeded in getting from the Government binding legal agreements which irrevocably commit the Government to extend the pipe-line to Mt. Barker, after it reaches Katanning, and to complete the installation of water supplies schemes by the 26th May, 1955, in the towns of Mt. Barker, Tambellup, Broomehill, Cranbrook and, I think, one other. That is the trump card which the Deputy Premier, as member for those areas, holds as compared with the members for Roe, Moore, Avon Valley and Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Ackland: Does your motion give the places you are talking about priority over Mt. Barker? The amendment certainly does.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The pathetic interjection from the member for Moore—

Mr. Marshall: Tragic!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —compels me to tell of an incident which happened at the cricket match between the parliamentary team and the parliamentary staff team on Monday of this week; and after listening to the interjection by the member for Moore, I am inclined to agree with what the 12-year-old schoolboy said. I was scoring at this match—this will take only a minute, and is by way of illustration—

Mr. SPEAKER: A passing reference!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, it is by way of a passing reference. A schoolboy came along after school and sat down on the form. Two of my comrades in the parliamentary cricket team were batting and members of the staff were toiling courageously but unsuccessfully to get them out. The boy said, "Who is playing cricket, Mister?" I said, "It is a parliamentary team playing against a team of parliamentary staff men." The boy said, "Parliament will win." I asked, "How do you work that out, son?" and he said, "The staff men would not dare to beat the members." I said, "You do not seem to have much of an opinion of Parliament." He said, "Oh no, I think it needs a shave," suggesting, I thought—though I did not check up—that Parliament has whiskers on it.

Mr. Hutchinson: If I might make a passing reference, I think the hon. member did much better as a bowler in that match than he is doing at present.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I wish almost abjectly to express my appreciation to the hon. member for his patronising compliment, backhanded or whatever type it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is the deletion of certain words.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is most refreshing to find the member for Cottesloe taking a slight interest in the proceedings—

Mr. Hutchinson: It is difficult for him to hold that slight interest while you are continuing.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —and to find that his interest has grown to such great proportions.

The Minister for Lands: What about getting on with the amendment?

The Premier: There has been enough burlesque.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It seems impossible, Mr. Speaker, for me to satisfy all these members on the Government benches. I would do my best to satisfy them one at a time, but I cannot possibly satisfy them three at a time, especially when one of them is the Minister for Lands.

Mr. Manning: Let us give the water away and stick to cricket!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I can understand the member for Harvey being anxious to give the water away! I am sure he has

just had the courage to express an opinion which is in the mind of every Minister. I am sure they would love to give the water away in favour of cricket; and I am sure that the member for Roe, in the amendment he has foreshadowed, is trying to give the water away for them, too. However, as I was saying, the difference between the position of the Deputy Premier, as member for the Mt. Barker district, and the members for drier areas is that the Deputy Premier holds the trump card in the form of a legal agreement—

The Minister for Lands: That is the bait!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —which binds the Government hand and foot to install a water supply scheme at Mt. Barker and adjacent areas before the 26th May, 1955.

Mr. Perkins: You think so.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Would you doubt its validity?

Mr. Perkins: I doubt its effect.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is a frightful reflection on the Government! Does the member for Roe seriously think the Government makes an agreement with public organisations with a view to misleading them, to pacify them until an election is over? What do members for the drier districts hold compared with the trump card, with the two handfuls of trump cards, which the Deputy Premier holds? What have they got that is worth anything? What has the member for Roe got?

Mr. Marshall: An amendment!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What has the member for Roe got in connection with the water supply for his towns in the dry areas of the State? What have the members for Moore and Avon Valley got and what has our friend from Mt. Marshall got that is of any value?

Mr. Cornell: I am playing cut-throat.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Well, it was indeed a bit refreshing in the experience of the House this session to find the member for Mt. Marshall voting against the Government in the division we had in this House an hour or so ago.

The Minister for Lands: That is the bait. You are using the right bait!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not concerned whether I am using any bait at all. I would hate to think what bait it would be necessary to use to catch the Minister for Lands.

The Minister for Lands: Crayfish!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It would have had to be dead for years.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You put your neck out there!

The Minister for Lands: I am always sticking it out.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Members to whom I have just referred have nothing of any value at all. All they have is what

the Deputy Premier classically described as an undertaking on a mere memorandum on a departmental file.

Mr. Perkins: I am trying to get a resolution of this House passed to help us a bit.

Member: What good will it do?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That is all they hold, and that is of as much value compared with a strictly binding legal document as nothing is compared to a million pounds. That is where members on the cross-benches on the Government side of the House stand in comparison with the Deputy Premier. I congratulated him, when I moved this motion, on his magnificent manoeuvring in this matter, as member for the district, and I congratulate him again. I think he is deserving of the highest praise for the results he achieved for the district he represents in Parliament. But I had no praise then, nor have I now any praise, for the methods he used. So the member for Roe and those who will support him on this amendment are going to try to override the effect of a strict legal argument by a pious motion carried in this House. And the member for Moore falls for that!

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: No, he does not! No fear, he doesn't!

Mr. Ackland: You would be surprised.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Perhaps I would. Perhaps the member for Moore does not fall for it. Perhaps he realises it is a move of some kind by the member for Roe to avoid the embarrassment which the member for Roe and the member for Moore would experience if they were faced with the alternative of voting against the motion.

Hon. A. H. Panton: After bouncing the ball themselves, too!

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They were playing softball.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: This foreshadowed amendment will be valueless; it will have no value whatever. The member for Roe tried to tell us that the legal agreement which the Plantagenet and adjacent road boards have with the Government is not of much value to them. He told the House that if the Government does not carry out the agreement, even though in a position to do so, which I thought a terrible suggestion to make, the road boards have not much remedy legally. He told us that all the road boards could do would be to sue the Government for damages but only for the damages which the road boards themselves directly suffered as a result of water not being available to them on the due date for road board, and only road board, purposes. Is that the sort of agreement the Premier, the Deputy Premier and other members of the Government have put over these road boards?

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is that what they think in Mt. Barker?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I might take the opportunity of sending a copy of the appropriate portion of the "Hansard" proof of the speech of the member for Roe to the road boards concerned. I am sure it would be most illuminating to have the comments of those road boards on what the member for Roe has placed before us as being the legal rights of the local authorities concerned. They would feel that the Government had put a mighty tough one over them if the legal reading of the agreements, as given by the member for Roe, were correct, but of course it is not correct. It is most misleading. Those road boards have entered into this agreement not only on their own behalf, but also on behalf of their ratepayers.

Mr. Perkins: I suggest you have another look at that point.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not having another look at it and I am sure that if the Government follows the recklessly dangerous—if not dishonest—path suggested to it by the member for Roe, it will find itself in mighty trouble with at least one of the road boards in the Mt. Barker district.

Mr. Perkins: I suggested that the legal position of the road boards might induce them to accept some local scheme to tide them over until the pipe-line can be put through.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am sure the suggestion just made by the member for Roe will cause the Deputy Premier to giggle mightily, inside himself. Does the member for Roe seriously think at all on this matter? If so, does he seriously think that those local authorities who hold the binding agreements from the Government for an extension of the comprehensive scheme from Katanning to Mt. Barker and other towns are now likely to accept local schemes? Surely he has not reached that mental stage.

Mr. Perkins: It sounds to me as though the member for Northam needs to have another look at this, judging from his speech.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I can tell the member for Roe that the local authorities in those areas will not accept local schemes. The Premier told the House that it is impossible to put in a local scheme at Mt. Barker. What does the hon. member think would be the reaction of the road board of that centre to a suggestion that the Government might now put in a local scheme? Of course, the whole thing is fantastic and has been put forward by the member for Roe at this stage only in an effort to fool other members into supporting the amendment he has foreshadowed. I was particularly interested when the Premier sought to show that the Government's actions and policy throughout this matter had been of the highest possible order and entirely justifi-

fied. It was strange to see how he pushed the Director of Works into the ring all the time and told us that that gentleman had recommended this, that and something else. In effect, he gave the House to understand that the Director of Works was responsible for initiating the whole of this policy regarding the extension of the pipe-line from Katanning to Mt. Barker and the other centres concerned. He said the Director of Works had recommended, without any pressure from any Minister or from the Government, that the Government should enter into the agreement—which it eventually did enter into—with the Plantagenet and other road boards. I will quote from the file portion of a minute from the Deputy Premier to the Director of Works on the 29th September, 1948. It reads as follows:—

I am particularly interested in and would press for the suggestion of the board—

That is the Plantagenet Road Board—

—regarding some definite agreement if its proposal is acceded to. The delay which will be involved renders it, I think, very necessary that the board should have some assurance greater than that which would appear from a mere memorandum on the file.

It is obvious that the Director of Works did not initiate the idea of a legal agreement between the Government and the road boards concerned. He might finally have put up a recommendation about the matter, but only after the Deputy Premier had pressed him to do that, on behalf of the Plantagenet Road Board. It is useless for the Premier to try to lead members to believe that the Director of Works was responsible for initiating the idea of the legal agreement to be entered into in this connection.

The Premier: The local authorities asked for the legal agreement and the Director of Works recommended that it should be entered into.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have just quoted the appropriate portion of a minute sent by the Deputy Premier to the Director of Works in this regard, and there is therefore no doubt that the Deputy Premier was responsible for influencing the Director of Works in this matter. If the Deputy Premier thought it was the proper thing to do, he was, of course, entitled to try to have it done, but for Heaven's sake do not let the Government try to pool the Director of Works deeply in this matter.

The Premier: We are not trying to pool him at all.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier this evening pooled the Director of Works in many directions, and in some directions without any justification at all. Let the Government stand up and justify its ac-

tions and policy without pooling—deeply or too deeply—high standing public servants of this State.

The Premier: Is quoting their opinions from the file pooling them?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, in the circumstances in which the Premier did it, because he did not go back to the beginning of the business. Had he done so he would have seen for himself—as I have no doubt he did—that the Deputy Premier, in a memorandum sent to the Director of Works himself, not through the Minister for Works, pressed for the suggestion of the Plantagenet Road Board for a legal agreement between that board and the Government to be given effect. There is no doubt about that. I come now to the portion of the motion which the amendment of the member for Roe seeks to strike out. It has to do with the question of making the agreement and the decision of the Government to bind not only itself but also succeeding Governments as well in that agreement. I have already said clearly that the Government had no right to make an agreement in this matter. There was no necessity for it to do so, and that is a vital consideration when dealing with this question. Where was the necessity for the Government to bind itself, by means of a legal agreement, to do the things that it proposed to do?

Mr. Hill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is not the hon. member's speech tedious repetition?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will watch that point from now on.

Mr. Marshall: You, of all people, should talk about tedious repetition.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I can appreciate how unpalatable mentally, and perhaps also physically, what I am saying must be to the member for Albany. Why did the Government enter into this agreement with these road boards?

Mr. Marshall: If the Government could do all the work in the period it would not have wanted to enter into an agreement.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Could not the Premier have sent a letter to each of the road boards? Could not the Minister for Works at that time have sent each road board a letter stating that the Government proposed and intended to do certain things and to complete them by a certain date if circumstances permitted? Could not the Government trust itself? Would not the word of the Government, set down in correspondence between it and the local authorities, have been considered sufficient? Evidently the Government could not trust itself in the matter, or else the local authorities were not prepared to accept the written word of the Government, and therefore the legal agreements came into existence. The Government took amazing action in going even

further than that and committed not only itself but also any succeeding Government. It did that presumably because the Deputy Premier, in another memorandum sent by him to the Premier, said that there might be a change in the directorship of works or in the Government.

That was a nice reflection on any future Director of Works and any future Government. In any event, the Deputy Premier was determined that no future Government would have opportunity of overlooking the decisions and policy of his Government in regard to these proposed extensions from Katanning to Mt. Barker. He therefore sought to hobble any future Government in its consideration of water supply needs and problems in this State by binding it in the legal agreement that was made. I will deal next with the question of secrecy. The Premier said that there were thousands of other agreements similar to this one, but if members listened carefully to him they will recall that he did not quote even one. The Premier said there was no secrecy and that the secrecy idea was just a myth. He told the House that there was some publication in the Narrogin, Albany and Mt. Barker papers, as well as one or two others.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They do not circulate in Mukinbudin.

The Premier: But they circulate in Parliament House.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Is it not strange that the representatives in those towns of "The West Australian" did not send to head office reports of those proceedings?

Mr. Hill: Would "The West Australian" have published the reports if they had been sent in?

The Minister for Education: How does the hon. member know they were not sent in?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I do not know whether or not they were sent in.

The Minister for Education: That is what I thought.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If they were sent in, then "The West Australian" suppressed them. Could the Deputy Premier help us?

The Minister for Education: "Suppressed" would not be the right word. There are many reports that are not published.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: This was a very important decision made by the Government, affecting not only the people in the Great Southern areas but also tens of thousands of others in drier parts of the State, and the fact that the Government had created a precedent by agreeing to bind itself and future governments legally in this regard was a matter of great public importance. Of course "The West Australian" would have published the material

at the time if it had been made available to it. Surely members have noticed how "The West Australian" gave great publicity to the matter as soon as the member for Moore had the papers tabled. If I remember rightly, the day after the papers were tabled "The West Australian" gave the matter great publicity upon its editorial page. So what is the use of the Deputy Premier trying to camouflage the position about the secrecy of the matter by saying that "The West Australian" representatives in Albany, Mt. Barker and adjacent places probably sent up the reports which were not published?

Point of Order.

The Minister for Education: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything of the kind and the remark is offensive to me. I said, "How did the hon. member know that these reports were not sent up?" and he said he did not know and I was quite satisfied. I think the statement by the hon. member should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member withdraw?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Will the Deputy Premier repeat that to which he takes objection?

The Minister for Education: The inference was that I knew the report had been sent up and that it had not been published by "The West Australian."

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I made no such statement and it ill becomes the Deputy Premier to try to mislead the House and you, Sir, by saying I made that statement.

The Minister for Education: That was the general impression.

Debate Resumed.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know the Deputy Premier's methods too well and he cannot put that over me. If I said anything offensive I would be only too happy to withdraw my remarks, but the Deputy Premier cannot say that I said something I did not say or even suggested. The point is that great secrecy did develop around this matter. Is it not astonishing to the very greatest possible degree that the member for Roe, the member for Moore, the member for Mt. Marshall, the member for Avon Valley and other members similarly situated, including the present Minister for Works, did not know about the matter despite the fact that the agreement between the Government and the local road boards was signed on the 26th May, 1949? These members, whose districts I have just mentioned, did not know about the matter by the end of March, 1950, nearly 12 months later.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They did not know about it on the 25th March, at any rate.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Presumably, the present Minister for Works was the first of them to discover the position when he

became Minister for Works. I do not know how the member for Moore came to get on the scent finally, but he did—

Hon. A. H. Panton: He got off it, too.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —and he asked that the papers be tabled and they were tabled. How long do members think that was after the agreement was made between the Government and the local authorities? It was the best part of 18 months!

The Premier: And yet public meetings had been held and Press reports published.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We have already discussed that and we know of—

The Premier: That was part of the great secrecy plan.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —the medium of publicity which any Minister or Government uses when it is required to give an important matter to the public of Western Australia. They do not use the Mt. Barker "Sentinel" if that is the name of the paper down there. They use "The West Australian," the "Daily News," or "The Sunday Times."

The Premier: Interesting items of local news are sent by the local newspaper and this was an interesting item. I do not know why it was not published.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: This was more than an interesting item. It was a State-rocking item of great importance. It was a matter which, if given State-wide publicity soon after the agreement was made on the 26th May, 1949, would have stirred this State to its very foundations and would have cut the Country Party to pieces as a parliamentary organisation in this State. There is not a shadow of doubt in the world about that!

Mr. Marshall: It will be cut to pieces, yet. It has been rapidly losing prestige for years and it is just about annihilated.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier in his speech tells us that the Crown Law Department had told the Government that it could sign the suggested agreement. Did the Premier tell us that in justification for what the Government did? That was the way he put it up to the House this evening, Mr. Speaker. The Crown Law Department told the Government that it could sign the agreement!

The Premier: I said that the Government was acting on the advice of its advisers, both from the Crown Law Department and those associated with the extension of the scheme.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier said that the Crown Law Department told the Government that it could sign the agreement. Of course the Government could sign the agreement! The Government could sign any agreement!

The Premier: Not any agreement.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It could.

The Premier: But it would not.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not talking about what the Government would do or would not do. The fact that the Crown Law Department told the Government that it could sign the agreement had relation only and completely to the legality of the action which the Government proposed to commit. It cannot climb out of its embarrassment and difficulty by saying that the Crown Law Department advised that it could sign the agreement. The Government has to take full and absolute responsibility for its action in signing that agreement. That is what it has to do. The Government cannot find a way out by telling the public that the Crown Law Department told it that it could sign the agreement. It did sign the agreement, absolutely on its own decision. The Crown Law Department was not asked whether it thought the agreement was the right and correct thing for the Government to enter into with local authorities. All the Crown Law Department could do and did do was to advise the Government that it would be a legal action for the Government to sign such an agreement.

The Premier: I was advised that it would not be to the detriment of any other section of the community, and I took that advice.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am sure that advice did not come from the Crown Law Department. The Premier cannot be sure that the signing of the agreement and the carrying out of the agreement will not operate to the detriment of the people of parts of the State other than the areas around Mt. Barker.

The Premier: I am assured that will not happen.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Of course the Premier is assured. He gave us figures, etc., but they are of no value compared with the legal agreement that binds the Government.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Or does the Government think it is not very binding?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Government will have no possible chance of completing all the water supply programme in the times mentioned, as outlined by the Premier tonight. He knows only too well the physical limitations upon his Government and upon every other Government. He knows of the physical limitations on private companies and private individuals. Surely, in view of his experience during the last four years as Premier, he does not think that all the existing physical limitations are going to be brushed away in the next four or five years, particularly in view of the defence requirements of the nation, which are absorbing an increasing quantity of plant and personnel.

The Premier: I said that has already happened.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier might have said that has already happened. I point out to him the very great difficulty he is going to be up against as months and years go by with the water supply position in Western Australia. He is going to have hanging over him all that time the legal argument with respect to water supply to Mr. Barker, Cranbrook, and the other towns concerned. That is going to be there all the time. Does the Premier think he can forget about it, if the quantity of material and labour available is not sufficient to carry out all the other water supplies he told us about this evening? The Premier will have to forget some of these other places in order to stand up to his legal commitments in Mt. Barker, Broomehill, Tambellup, etc., and the sooner he comes to realise what is involved in the agreement, which he signed on behalf of the Government with these local authorities, the better for all concerned.

I would have much more admiration for the Premier, as Premier, and for his Government, if they were to tell those members on the cross-benches of the Country Party that the Government is undoubtedly bound hand and foot, in a legal sense, to Mt. Barker and the other local authorities, and consequently will have to give priority to these places so long as the supply of labour, plant, machinery and materials, including steel, is sufficient to enable the proposed water supply undertakings of the Government to be carried out. That is the position the Premier will be forced into before the 26th May, 1955. Therefore I would suggest that he give the matter a great deal of further consideration. He might even consider approaching the local authorities concerned, either at this or some later stage, for the purpose of trying to get them to agree to a variation of the agreement. In my opinion, that will be the only solution of this problem for the Government, unless it is prepared and determined to give preference to the water supplies of Mt. Barker, Tambellup and other places as against the drier parts of Western Australia. I oppose the amendment.

HON. F. J. S. WISE (Gascoyne—on amendment) [10.28]: I intend to speak at some length on the motion itself, but I rise to speak for a few moments, quite dispassionately I hope, on the amendment and its purpose. Before doing so, however, I would like to allay the worries and fears of the Premier from which he is obviously suffering, because he has never looked so unhappy and worried during his term as Premier as he has looked during this debate, in contemplation of what he had to do to bring about the moving of this amendment. I want him to know that although, by his own desire and decree he has made this a censure motion, it is not regarded as such by this side of the House. Whether it is a matter of guilty feeling by members of the Government who

would endeavour by the means they have adopted to whip up the support of recalcitrant members, I cannot say, but as the Attorney General required a pair this evening, I granted him a live pair. Would that have happened had we regarded this as a censure motion?

The Premier: A pair is always granted to a Minister attending a conference.

HON. F. J. S. WISE: I do not want to be sidetracked by statements about the merits or demerits of the Minister's leaving his place in the House tonight or tomorrow night. That is outside the question. I approach this question dispassionately. In analysing the reason for the amendment, we have only to go back a few weeks subsequent to the tabling of the papers. Those papers on being tabled were quickly seized upon by members representing four or five constituencies—members who occupy seats on the Government cross-benches. The papers were studied; they were almost slept with. It was not possible to get hold of them for very many days in order to have a careful look at them. When I did get them, much to the consternation of the Premier when he heard that I had them—which he will not deny—I made certain extracts from them because of the unfortunate story they told.

What was the reaction of members on the Government cross-benches? They were vehement in their criticism of the Government, openly vehement, not here, but in the street, in public places, not where Parliament protected them and where I would always honour anything they said, but in the street, prepared to discuss their shocked state of mind at the way they had been deceived many months before the election, because otherwise it would have caused a serious rift in the Government ranks. They stated quite openly that they would have to consider their position and their relationship to the Government. Will any one of them deny that?

But they have been appeased. How have they been appeased? They have been appeased as a result of their requests and their threats of action being given the fullest consideration as against the interests of Mt. Barker, as this very amendment discloses. They have been appeased by promises that they will not suffer, that their districts will not be at a loss because of the undertaking the Government has given.

Where is the member for Avon Valley who himself was prepared to move to take action against the Government. Where is he? We know where he will be when the vote is taken, because he has been promised something. What happened at the Ministerial conference to which those members were summoned, or maybe the Minister was summoned by them to discuss what was to be done for them? Is it not a fact, is it not common knowledge, that for many days one member was satis-

fied and another was dissatisfied? Then came the point when there was only one odd man out, still unhappy, but his attitude tonight shows that he also has been appeased.

How has it been done? It was done either at the crucial conference or since by promising something much more definite, I submit, than the Mt. Barker people have in spite of the agreement. Does the House think that those four members were satisfied with the priority intended in the comprehensive water scheme, in connection with which the present Chief Secretary wrote and said that there was no chance whatever of increasing its perimeter? Prior to that I think he knew nothing of what was going on.

The Chief Secretary: Yes, he did.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The indications are that the file went direct from the Premier to the Director of Works. There is a certain minute that passed between those two gentlemen. What is the use of this pretence and these mock heroics on the part of the Premier in his well-prepared utterances this evening? It is of no use at this stage attempting to camouflage the position by having an amendment moved that is subterfuge of the worst kind. Let those members who agreed with every word of the motion but a month ago, and in their hearts agree with it now, have an opportunity to speak if their party discipline will permit them!

The Press this morning forecast exactly what would happen in the party room today, and told us what had happened on other days. Let those members speak for themselves! Where is the member for Avon Valley? What is he going to say? We know how he will vote, and I have no objection to that. Why should not he vote with his Government? But why should he not have the right to say what he thinks and what he said privately as well as what he said openly in the streets?

What was the reaction of the member for Moore when he saw those papers? Did not he, with his high moral attitude, taking unction to his soul for his conscience keeping him awake over such matters, say that he would have to consider his position and his relation to the Government? Did not he say so publicly? Probably he has got a new conscience since then, but I am sure we shall never have a new awakening so far as the position he occupies is concerned. He cannot pretend to members here. What he says in the House and what is recorded in cold print might mislead his electors, but it does not mislead us. Why do not those members give their reactions to the Government's attitude and actions in this matter? Then we would have either some applause for what has been done or some respect for the Government that has done it. But in the existing circumstances, we cannot.

This amendment will not mean, as the member for Roe pointed out, the cancelling of the agreement. That has been dealt with by the member for Northam. It cannot mean that the agreement signed, sealed and endorsed by the Premier himself can take second place to what has been promised the four members in the proposals which have appeased them and of which we as yet know nothing. But all of them in turn have been promised and have accepted the promise that they will not be left out. But they were left out.

Consequently, let us have this matter shorn of all humbug and pretence. Let us have a vote on the motion, if members are courageous enough to vote on it! There is no need for the Government to resign, as the Premier is alleged to have said he would in the event of an adverse vote. We are not worried about that, but we are concerned at the methods employed and the results that have accrued from those methods. Let us defeat this amendment so that members opposite can express themselves, as they indicated they would, whether to the discomfiture of the Government and the Premier himself or not. Let us face up to it.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn—on amendment) [10.41]: I had an open and impartial mind on this issue; but, since I have heard the debate, I have no hesitation in extending my congratulations to the Deputy Premier, not so much for his securing the agreement on behalf of the people in Mt. Barker and the adjacent districts, but for his ability and his force of character in being able to sandbag the three Reds or recalcitrant members of the Country Party.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They are not even pink!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Not only on this occasion have I noticed that when the scene was rather obscure and the position rather unfavourable to the Deputy Premier and his co-Ministers, and when private members opposite have been disaffected and there were all the elements of a split in the respective parties, the Deputy Premier, by his undoubted ability and his capacity to subdue some of those private members, has been responsible for at least maintaining some sort of unity in the Government ranks. That is the conclusion I have reached, and I have noticed that on different occasions the member for Moore—and I speak in no personal sense—has demonstrated that he would almost be prepared to turn the Government out at a moment's notice; but when the climax has been reached he has always backed down.

Mr. May: He twisted on himself!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Although he has the size of a young giant, I would say that his courage is about two mouse-power.

Mr. Ackland: You would be a good judge, would you not?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am an impartial judge. The Deputy Premier holds a high and honourable office and is able to keep some of the members of his party in the hollow of his hand. There is a saying that you cannot have honey without the flies. The Premier put up a very strong argument on a very weak case. He did his utmost to justify the action of the Government in entering into the agreement; and the member for Moore, who previously was prepared to let the Government know where it got off, has been well and truly subdued by the leaders of the coalition forces. To endeavour to justify his action, he set himself out on an extraneous course in trying to vilify the previous Government. Instead of his dealing with the amendment or the motion before the Chair, you, Mr. Speaker, liberally allowed him to go a fair distance beyond the Standing Orders.

With regard to the Standing Orders, I noticed that when you were on the floor of the House, Sir, you observed them as much as I do. The member for Moore skated very lightly over the terms of the motion, dealt with the native position and made a passing reference to education and to railways and many other things, endeavouring, though very weakly, to criticise the previous Government for its administration of those railways. But just to my right hand, by accident, comes this from the Merredin "Mercury," under date Thursday, the 26th October, 1950, three and a half years after the present Government took office. It is a heading and it reads, "Railways. The same old policy in the same old way." I have not copies of other papers from country areas, but I suppose that something of a similar nature would be found therein.

The member for Moore endeavoured to justify the action of the Government, and also the amendment. I am open to correction, but I have no doubt that the amendment was not compiled by the member for Roe on his own initiative.

Mr. Perkins: You are a long way off the beam there.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I give the hon. member the requisite marks for it, but I would say the hand of the Deputy Premier is in the amendment.

Mr. Perkins: You are a long way off the beam.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I may be; but not so far as the member for Roe might think. The member for Roe very lightly said that the motion is designed to embarrass the Government.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The hand of the Deputy Premier moves in a mysterious way its wonder to perform.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: He did not say that the amendment was designed to embarrass the Opposition. You, Mr. Speaker,

have ruled the amendment in order. I differ from you; but that has gone by the board. The amendment, however, seeks to implement something in the future. All that the member for Northam has done is to draw the attention of the House to something which is considered to be irregular and which has already been done. Those are the terms of the motion which it is proposed to destroy. There is no need, as the Premier indicated, to regard this as a no-confidence motion; though, in order to scare some of the young Liberal members, the wily member for Moore tried to make out that it would be treated as such, and indicated that if there were a change of Government it would be a calamity for Western Australia. What would happen, he asked, if there were a change of Government?

Mr. Manning: A calamity!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: In making a passing reference, I would say that the present Government would not be where it is but for the way it manipulated the redistribution of seats a few years ago, minimising the representation of people in the far-flung portions of the State. I have no doubt that there are some members of the Country Party who thought the redistribution would favour them.

Mr. Griffith: You have to blame the majority of electors for the Government you have.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: If the hon. member looked up the statistics, he might alter his opinion. To proceed to the terms of the original motion! All that the member for Northam seeks to do is to have carried the following:—

That this House views with serious concern the action and policy of the Government in agreeing to give preference in the supply of water to Mt. Barker and adjacent towns in the Great Southern district, as against towns and farms in drier areas; and regards as most unfair, unjustifiable and contrary to the best interests of the State as a whole, the Government's decision authorising the making of an agreement between the Treasurer and the Plantagenet, Tambellup and Cranbrook road boards, under which the Government has bound succeeding governments, as well as itself.

Do not the members for Moore and Roe and the changeable member for Avon Valley agree with the terms of that motion?

Mr. Perkins: The amendment is better.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: With my limited knowledge of the Standing Orders I would say that the amendment would be a suitable addendum to the motion. I do not know that there would be any great objection to the member for Roe, if he wants

to express his entire opinion, tagging on his amendment as an addendum to the motion. The three members must have been gravely disaffected because quite recently the Director of Works was dragged into the argument and had to act more or less as a peacemaker.

Certain Ministers made suggestions to some members representing the drier areas, and what agreement they came to I do not know. Without being disparaging at all, I would again give the Deputy Premier a pat on the back for putting it all over the three members. As a result of his efforts we find this innocuous amendment, but I am not going to be side-stepped by it. I hope the motion of the member for Northam will be carried and that the member for Roe will be prepared to move his amendment in the form of an addendum. I trust the amendment will be defeated. Incidentally I think the member for Roe is trying to embarrass the Independents, too. I believe the Independents are in full accord with the terms of the motion moved by the member for Northam, and I have no doubt that in the final analysis they will support it.

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

Ayes	25
Noes	22
Majority for	3

Ayes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Owen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Read
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Needham
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Oliver
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panten
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. May	Mr. Wise
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. J. Hegney
------------	---------------

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are in the middle of an item.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [10.56]: I move—

That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

I have already spoken at length on the matter.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	25
Majority against	3

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Needham
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Oliver
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panten
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. May	Mr. Wise
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Owen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Read
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Abbott
---------------	------------

Motion thus negated.

MR. OLIVER (Boulder—on amendment) [11.0]: I oppose the amendment. It seems to me that throughout the whole of this debate we have been discussing what have been termed the wetter and drier areas. I am concerning myself now with the proposition put forward by the member for Roe, who seems to have the idea that before any consideration should be given to the southern portions of the South-West Land Division the areas round Merredin, Wyalkatchem and Kellerberrin should receive preferential treatment.

Mr. Perkins: No-one has mentioned preferential treatment anywhere.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member's amendment suggested that they should get preferential treatment. He may not have said that, but suggested that they should get service before Mt. Barker and certain other towns that have been mentioned. The proposition put forward by the member for Roe is simply to take more water from the existing Goldfields Water Supply. I thank the Premier for his kindness in providing members with copies of

a map of the area concerned, as otherwise I would not have had the position so plainly before me. One finds, on consulting this map, that contracts have been let to put in a pipe-line from Merredin to Kondinin, another from Cunderdin to Minnivale and on to Wyalkatchem, and the proposal then is to take the pipes up to Koorda and other places.

It is proposed to supply all those towns with water from the existing Goldfields Water Supply. This matter has been raised in the House on previous occasions by means of questions. The Goldfields are already rationed as regards water, so what is to be the result of any further drain on that supply? Nothing has been said about duplicating the existing pipe-lines, so apparently all the extra water is to be drained from the present pipes, with the result that the Goldfields will get even less water than is available now. I have previously stated and now repeat that this scheme was built for the Goldfields and it is the Goldfields Water Supply. Developments along the pipe-line at Bullfinch, Southern Cross and Coolgardie demand more and not less water. Kalgoorlie is just as big a town today as it was when the scheme was first put through and the development of Coolgardie warrants more water being supplied to that centre.

We all know what is happening at Bullfinch where a town is being built and where the improvements will require more water. Mines there are going into production, and yet it is now proposed to take even more water from the present inadequate supplies. I do not know what the Government intends in this matter, but the Minister for Water Supply has already stated in the Press and in this House that owing to the inadequacy of supplies of water, Kalgoorlie has to be rationed. People there have been told to cut their consumption of water, yet it is now proposed to take even more from the pipe-line.

Mr. Perkins: If there was a change of Government would you advocate the scrapping of the schemes outlined on that map?

Mr. OLIVER: I would advocate that the Government, before taking more water from the Goldfields pipe-line, should consider duplicating the pipes at least as far as Merredin. When Kalgoorlie was short of water last year I went to the pumping station at Mundaring and watched operations there. The engineer-in-charge told me that a full bore of water was leaving Mundaring every second of the day and night, but that the pipes just could not take enough to water all the stock on the farms on the way to Merredin and Southern Cross and still supply sufficient for Kalgoorlie. Someone had to go short and obviously those nearer to the source got the best deal. That is what has been going on, yet it is now proposed to make

the position worse by drawing more water from that supply before it gets to Southern Cross. The only result of that will be seriously to impair the production of gold on the Golden Mile, as well as at Coolgardie, Southern Cross and other gold producing towns along the pipe-line.

There is no possibility of getting water in those areas other than from the pipe-line, as there is no subterranean water and no possibility of obtaining supplies in any other way. I think that what is proposed is being put forward deliberately. The supply of water originally intended for the Goldfields is now being filched to supply agricultural areas. My reply to the interjection of the member for Roe is that before the Government proceeds with this scheme, it should seriously consider duplicating the pipe-line at least to Merredin in order to relieve the pull on what must be admitted to be the Goldfields Water Supply, which was paid for many years ago by the Goldfields people. It is not right that those people should now have to go short of water in order that the stock for 50 miles along each side of the line may be supplied. Those agricultural areas are getting the first pull on available water supplies, irrespective of the needs of the Goldfields. I register my emphatic protest at what is happening and at what it is suggested should be done.

MR. CORNELL (Mt. Marshall—on amendment) [10.8]: I feel I should have something to say on this motion. I regret that I missed the opportunity earlier in the debate, but, though I attempted several times to rise to my feet, I was beaten by a short head. I feel, nevertheless, that I must express my thoughts in this matter because this agreement, involving as it does preferential treatment for the Great Southern road boards, sticks in my gizzard a bit. During the Peninsula War the Duke of Wellington on one occasion reviewed his troops in Spain and afterwards said, "I do not know whether my troops will frighten the enemy but, by God, they frighten me!" I venture to say that the same thoughts played through the mind of the present Minister for Works when he looked through the file and saw this notorious agreement.

The Minister for Works: He did not say a word.

Mr. CORNELL: In asking that the relevant file be tabled, the member for Moore lifted a corner of the iron curtain and let the public generally into what was previously a close Cabinet secret.

Mr. Oliver: There is the proof of what we have said.

Mr. CORNELL: I thank the member for Melville for the expression, "He exposed to the fierce light of public scrutiny this notorious agreement." The agreement, despite the Premier's assertions to the con-

trary, was kept a pretty close secret and, had it been discovered prior to the last election, certain members of the Country Party would have been forced to replot their courses.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CORNELL: It was not discovered until quite recently, although we all know it was suspected that those areas south of Katanning were to receive some preferential treatment. However, when the agreement was subsequently unearthed, it hit members of the Country Party, or some of them, across the face like a wet fish.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: It smelt a bit!

Mr. CORNELL: To use the words in the "Pied Piper of Hamelin," "The muttering grew to a grumbling and the grumbling grew to a mighty rumbling." So there has been feverish haste by the Government to placate certain members of the drier areas and to assure them that the agreement does not really mean what it says. However, two points do arise. If the agreement is valid—the members for Melville and Roe cast considerable doubts on its validity or its effectiveness, and I am half with them—then the Leader of the Country Party, I am afraid, has sold out on his mates. If the agreement is phoney, then the Leader of the Country Party has sold a pup to his electors.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Hear, hear!

Mr. May: It is crook, whichever way you take it.

Mr. CORNELL: I regret to say that the member for Melville has stolen a little of my thunder in this regard but, having jotted down a note on my pad, I feel I must go on with it.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It will bear repetition.

Mr. CORNELL: The Premier has played a good deal of cricket in his day, but I bet that he has never batted on a stickier wicket than he did this evening. The 9st. 5lb. that "Comic Court" carried yesterday was nothing to the weight the Premier was carrying tonight!

Mr. Oliver: Who was on his back? The Deputy Premier?

Mr. CORNELL: At the rate he was going, one would have thought that I was riding him. I feel, as the member for Northam said, that the Director of Works was thrown into the ring, but I am not perfectly satisfied with the attitude of that very high official in this matter. Some two or three months ago, the Director accompanied the Minister for Works through the Mt. Marshall electorate, and the majority of requests received by the Minister for deputations were from settlers in areas not at present served by any water scheme. The request was to push the water out to them even though it went beyond the perimeter of the present comprehensive scheme. The reply of the Min-

ister for Works, in all instances, was that as these men were outside the present perimeter, it was impossible to extend it to that area. He said that in any case an approach would have to be made to the Commonwealth Government for a £ for £ subsidy to meet the cost of these extensions. That was accepted in good faith.

The Director of Works was present on all these occasions, but he did not, at any stage of the game, indicate that this Mt. Barker agreement had been entered into, and would do precisely what these people were asking for, namely, extend water outside the perimeter without any question of Commonwealth assistance. At that stage, I do not think the Minister for Works was aware of this agreement, because he was quite honest in his approach. But I do not think his Director played ball, because it was his bounden duty to acquaint the Minister that the agreement with the Great Southern road boards did exist, and that it cut across what was declared policy insofar as the comprehensive water scheme was concerned.

The Premier went to some pains to explain that this was not a secret agreement, and he stated that it had appeared in the "Albany Herald," the "Mt. Barker Times," and several other obscure provincial newspapers published in that area. I might mention that it was probably published in the "Nullagine News" and the "Whim Creek Courier," but neither of those papers has a particularly large circulation. He stated that these negotiations received publicity, but that is not exactly what happened. The meetings held at Mt. Barker, Cranbrook and Tambellup, and attended by the Director of Works to consider and discuss this matter, all received publicity, but the actual signing of the agreement and the fact that the agreement had been signed, sealed, delivered and duly executed, received no mention whatever.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Who spilt the beans?

Mr. CORNELL: There was certainly no mention in "The West Australian" and, as far as I am aware, Cabinet usually gallops into print with anything of a nature calculated to be of news value. For instance, the intention to set up a board for the registration of physiotherapists, was rushed into print as though it was something marvellous and had been recently discovered. But there was no mention of an expenditure involving a quarter of a million pounds—not one word or one syllable about it in "The West Australian." Even the Government doxology published recently, called "The Fact Man," did not contain one word about it. I have studied it from cover to cover, and I did not find any reference to a scheme involving an expenditure of a quarter of a million pounds, and approved by the Government.

Mr. Fox: What was the publicity man doing?

Mr. CORNELL: He may have been under instructions. The Premier stated that the matter was considered by Cabinet. There was nothing on the file to indicate that it was. There are a couple of cryptic notes to say that Cabinet had approved of it, but there is nothing, to my knowledge, to say that the matter had gone to Cabinet and had been considered. Even some Ministers who should have been at the Cabinet meeting do not know anything about it, and their recollections of the matter are most obscure. I am not too certain that the matter ever did go to Cabinet. It has been said, time and time again, that any party, if it wants to exist must have the allegiance of the rank and file. With that I quite agree, but I would say that loyalty must start at the top. It is two-way traffic; it is reciprocal, and I cannot say that I think the Deputy Premier played cricket with his team in this matter. In fact, I will go so far as to say that his actions have been politically dishonest.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Now were we justified?

Mr. CORNELL: The member for Melville, in putting up a case recently, stated that the Deputy Premier had violated his oath of office. With that accusation I did not agree but, if subsequent acts of this nature come to light, then it will constrain me to lean a little towards what the member for Melville said. In England, and even in the rough-and-tumble tactics of the Commonwealth Parliament, Ministers have been asked to toss in their offices for less than this. However, I find that the Deputy Premier is not averse to sacrificing some of his men to secure a political objective.

Mr. Oliver: Rafferty's rules!

Mr. CORNELL: However, he has a keen mortuary sense and, when his men are liquidated, he sees that they are given the usual funeral trappings of a decent burial.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Does not the Premier think that the Deputy Premier should be here to listen to this?

The Premier: Members leave the Chamber at times.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: But the Deputy Premier is within the Chamber.

Mr. CORNELL: As I have already remarked, Commonwealth assistance will not be forthcoming in respect of this undertaking. Even after the agreement was signed I think there was a minute on the file stating that an approach would be made shortly to the Commonwealth Government to find the necessary subsidy on a £ for £ basis to finance this undertaking. The Government, having committed itself, will probably go to the Prime Minister and say, "Look here, Bob, you are up for a quarter of a million on this, will you come into it with us on a 50-50 basis?" and if Bob has any commonsense he will be like the girl in Pygmalion and say, "Not b—likely."

As I have already said the Premier made mention of the publicity which this agreement had received. He mentioned an Albany newspaper and he was ably abetted, I noticed, by my friend the member for Albany, who can always be sure of popping up at the right time. However, I have here an editorial from the "Narrogin Observer." It is rather long but I feel that I ought to read it for the edification of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is about water, is it?

Mr. CORNELL: Oh, definitely! It is headed—

"A Startling Report."

and it then continues—

It must have startled quite a number of those who have been pressing for a comprehensive water scheme to learn, vide "The West Australian" of Thursday, that an agreement had allegedly—

Like hell!

—been entered into by the Premier to extend the scheme to encompass areas in the lower Great Southern following the completion of the pipe-line from Wellington Dam to Narrogin.

This proposed extension is outside the perimeter of the original proposal which was to embrace Narrogin, Wagin, Pingelly and Katanning. We know of no previous suggestion that the Mt. Barker and Cranbrook areas were to come within the scope of the scheme, nor that the more staggering proposal to proceed with this extension was to be of first priority immediately the pipe-line had reached Narrogin.

The agreement is alleged to have been entered into between the Premier on the one hand and the Plantagenet, Tambellup and Cranbrook Road Boards on the other. It is rather significant that these districts are within the representation of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Watts), and it is passing strange that his Country Party colleagues were not apparently cognisant of the arrangement.

The editor of the "Narrogin Observer" and I, are at one in that regard. Continuing—

If the pipe-line is to be first extended southward so that the agreement may be honoured, it is altogether contrary to the understanding which originally formed the basis of the scheme, and certainly in direct opposition to those who during the past 30 years have been extremely active in their endeavours to bring it to fruition.

This journal has previously expressed its doubts regarding the setup of the Composite Government and this latest indication of lack of loyalty

within its ranks merely strengthens the conviction that the interests of the constituents of Country Party members would be better served if the latter occupied the cross benches.

The allegation that an agreement had been entered into by the Premier as far back as May 26, 1949, without Cabinet approval is obviously a matter that requires explanation. If there is no cohesion of policy between the Liberal and Country Party Ministers as one might naturally infer from this disclosure, then it might readily be assumed that there is a likelihood of other overt decisions having been made which are likely to place C.P. members in a similar invidious position from which they may find it difficult to extricate themselves in the eyes of their constituents.

Coming on top of the savage attack recently launched by the Labour Party in respect of the State Alunite works at Chandler, in which very serious charges were directed at the Government, it may be assumed that the alleged action of the Premier in coming to an agreement which stultifies the original plan laid down in respect of the water scheme is likely to give rise to public uneasiness.

The quicker both matters are cleared up the better it will be for all parties. The temper of residents in the Great Southern area is such that any deviation from the original plan of the Comprehensive Water Scheme is particularly susceptible at this juncture to violent reaction against the Government and will inevitably have strong influence in moulding the future policy of its Country Party members.

Ever since the last election suspicion has prevailed regarding the reason for the removal of Mr. Doney from the position of Minister for Water Supplies in favour of Mr. Brand, a Liberal Party member. This has not been allayed by the apparent reluctance of Mr. Brand to visit Pingelly and Narrogin when proposals have been made with the object of discussing with him certain features of the scheme which circumstances appeared to warrant.

Probably there was no real reason why the attendance of Mr. Brand at Narrogin could be expected, seeing that the pipe-line from the Wellington Dam is being laid according to schedule. At the same time a visit from him would have been appreciated for various reasons. Probably he may see fit sooner or later to make the venture, seeing that the people of this locality are quite tame and amenable to reason.

This does not absolve him from the charge of apathetic interest in the welfare of the Pingelly people, whose situation from a water standpoint is and has been for years far more lamentable than our own. It is on their account more particularly that we feel constrained to express alarm because of the disclosure made by "The West Australian," apart from that which in all probability will exercise the minds of the constituents of Mr. Ackland, Country Party member for Moore.

They as well as the people of the Great Southern, whose interest in the Comprehensive Water Scheme was asserted long before it was ever mentioned that other centres below Katanning were afflicted with water shortage, will certainly view the possibility of the agreement allegedly entered into by the Premier as being implemented to their disadvantage and outside the original proposal, with strong feelings of dismay and anger.

We suggest that no time be lost in allaying suspicion as to this intention which is broadly hinted by the report in "The West Australian," otherwise it would be reasonable to expect some action on the part of the Country Party representatives, including the Deputy Premier (Mr. Watts), to suggest that they possess some influence within the sphere of Cabinet decisions.

Another question that has been raised is whether the then Minister for Works, Hon. V. Doney, knew what was going on. Personally, I do not think he did. I feel quite sure that he was by-passed and that the negotiations on the file travelled between the Deputy Premier and the Director of Works. The ex-Minister for Works, Hon. V. Doney, admitted that he had never read the agreement so it is quite obvious to me that he appears to have been by-passed in this matter.

The question, too, of senior public servants being appointed as chairmen of these so-called regional development councils also raises its head. Mr. Dumas is chairman of the Lower Great Southern Regional Council, and it is only human nature that a man holding a position as chairman of such a council should show favouritism to the area in which he is interested. I am quite sure that he was more favourably disposed towards this proposition because of the position he held as chairman of that council. However, to me—and I must speak critically—the ex-Minister for Works appears to have shown lamentable unconcern in this matter. There is a story told about a practitioner of the Supreme Court of New Zealand named Jellicoe.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Not Jelly?

Mr. CORNELL: He was a remote relation of the celebrated Admiral of the same name and one day he was involved in a nautical case before the court and was subject to rather rigorous cross-questioning by the judge. At last, in despair, he said,

"Good God, sir, I am the lawyer, not the admiral," and the judge replied, "Well, I was beginning to wonder. You are so often at sea." I feel in this matter the ex-Minister for Works has been so often at sea. I am very concerned about the dry areas in the Mt. Marshall electorate because, as I have already said, I have here a letter from the Minister for Works written on the 6th November, the penultimate paragraph of which reads:—

In view of the policy of the department to concentrate on the speeding up of the comprehensive scheme, it is considered that these outer areas must, unfortunately, wait until further progress has been made with the scheme works and until the pipe position becomes much easier.

In the concluding paragraph the Minister says—

In the meantime I shall look into the possibility of obtaining Commonwealth financial assistance for extensions outside the boundaries of the comprehensive water supply area.

That letter is signed by the present Minister for Works and dated the 6th November, so the Government is still trying to ride one horse in different directions.

The Premier: Do not you think we are making every effort to meet the needs of your electorate?

Mr. CORNELL: My point is that the Premier trots out this matter about Commonwealth assistance. He went into Mt. Barker without any question of Commonwealth assistance.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Commonwealth would not contribute to something you have already agreed to.

Mr. CORNELL: I would like to give as an example the case of the chairman of the Mukinbudin road board who in four and a half months carried 34,000 gallons for himself and 92,000 gallons for his neighbours. He emptied a catchment of a quarter of a million gallons and he did so by himself. I doubt whether any man in the Great Southern has had to cart water to that extent. This figure is of course, rather staggering even by wheat-belt standards, but it is an example of what has been going on. The Mt. Barker scheme does not contemplate serving agricultural areas at all. It is purely for the towns, and Mr. Dumas said it was not proposed to rate the farm land traversed by the pipe-line from Katanning to Mt. Barker. I have on several occasions advocated the setting up of a parliamentary public works committee and I feel sure had this committee been in existence this commitment, involving as it does, a quarter of a million pounds, would never have been entered into. I also feel sure that the picture of still life on the Causeway would have been more animated.

In conclusion I would like to say that I went on a four-day visit to Koorda, Mollerin, Wialki, Beacon and Bonnie Rock

areas. There is no reticulated water supply of any description there and all hands requested me, for God's sake, to be careful of the water. The result is that for four days I did not have a bath and, as the weather was warm, I was beginning to smell, but the aroma that surrounded me was a bunch of violets compared with the odour this agreement leaves in my nostrils.

MR. McCULLOCH (Hannans—on amendment) [11.34]: I am going to oppose this amendment which I think is merely a pious one. The member for Roe has not told us the source of the amendment and what he is going to have in his particular scheme for Mundaring.

Mr. Perkins: Mundaring to Merredin.

Mr. McCULLOCH: The hon. member knows as well as I do that Mundaring Weir at the present time is a long way down from what it can hold, and next year the position will be much worse. On the Goldfields at the present time we are being deprived of 33 per cent. of the normal supplies of water in this month of November, and through the months of last year we suffered a similar disability so far as water is concerned. If this amendment is carried it is going to make the position much more difficult on the Goldfields and the member for Roe knows that quite well. We know that last summer the men employed at No. 8 pumping station could not get work and were transferred from that station back to No. 4 at Merredin.

The amendment moved by the member for Roe and entered into by the Government, proposes a single line from Mundaring to Merredin. At the present time they are cut off from Merredin and for a pumping station to go in there would not help at all. It would not help the member for Roe. The only possibility I see of getting water to serve all these purposes would be to have another catchment. The Mundaring Weir is fully occupied now in supplying the Goldfields people, and the people en route to the Goldfields. Personally I think the amendment of the member for Roe, has no meaning and is like legislation passed in the last session of Parliament for a flat rate to be applied. It has never been applied and I feel certain that it will never be applied as the result of this amendment. It is merely a subterfuge to get away from the motion put forward by the member for Northam. The hon. member is not game to vote either way and he has therefore used this amendment as a way out.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	25
Majority against				3

Ayes.

Mr. Brady
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Fox
Mr. Graham
Mr. Guthrie
Mr. Hawke
Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Hoar
Mr. Marshall
Mr. May
Mr. McCulloch

Mr. Needham
Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Oliver
Mr. Panton
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Sewell
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Wise
Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland
Mr. Brand
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Cornell
Mr. Doney
Mr. Graydon
Mr. Griffith
Mr. Hearman
Mr. Hill
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Mann
Mr. Manning
Mr. McLarty

Mr. Nalder
Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Owen
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Read
Mr. Shearn
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. Yates
Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.

Mr. J. Hegney

Noes.

Mr. Abbott

Motion thus negatived.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment) [11.42]: Judging by the attitude of the Government towards motions for the adjournment of the debate, one would think that today was a day on which Government business was taking precedence. The fact is that this is private members' day.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: And this is your business.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: This is the last day on which private members' business will take precedence over Government business.

The Premier: How long do you want this to go on? You have had it going for five hours now.

Mr. Marshall: As long as it suits us. Have we no rights?

The Premier: You exercise your rights pretty freely.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the Premier is unhappy about this debate—

Mr. Marshall: Which he certainly is.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —he could adopt the same ruthless and brutal methods he adopted last session. He could apply the gag and turn himself into a petty Hitler, which is the role he filled last session.

The Premier: There are times when the gag would be justified for the good of the country.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: There are times when more than the gag would be justified, particularly after what has just been said by the member for Mt. Marshall, in the shape of an effective weapon to be applied to the Government. After the speech by the member for Mt. Marshall, the biggest and strongest broom should be used to sweep this Government into permanent oblivion.

Take the attitude of the Government to the amendment to insert certain words in lieu of the words struck out. Apparently it has no views on the amendment. The Premier does not even show his own members the respect due to them by giving them a lead, but he and other Ministers sit there silent. No Minister rises to say whether the Government supports or opposes the amendment.

Mr. Marshall: They drafted it.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Nor does any Minister seek to move a further amendment or addendum to it. What sort of a spineless attitude is that for the Government to adopt? The Government was tremendously anxious to have the motion defeated. It came at all sorts of devices and methods to attain that objective. Now, after the member for Roe has submitted his amendment which implicates the Government very seriously, neither the Premier nor any other Minister rises to state the views of the Government on the amendment.

Has the Government no views? Does not any Minister propose to express an opinion on the amendment? I intend to read it to show how very deeply it implicates the Government. No Minister can with any decency or respect support the amendment. But before reading it, let me point out that the Government has committed itself by means of a binding legal agreement to install water supplies in the towns of Mt. Barker, Tambellup and so on and to complete the installation on or before the 26th May, 1955. Let members listen to the amendment which will become the motion—

That this House considers that those drier portions of the State which it is practicable to serve from a comprehensive water scheme as defined by the 1947 Act should be connected by a pipe-line therefrom before the extension from the above scheme is made into the higher rainfall districts south of Katanning.

Notwithstanding the agreement made between the Government and the Cranbrook, Tambellup and Plantagenet Road Boards—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Government is going to support the amendment.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —the Government has no views on this new motion now before the House. No member of the Government rises to express the views of the Government. Therefore the only conclusion members can draw is that the Government has no views. Evidently Ministers are completely and deliriously happy at the knowledge that the original motion has been wiped out. The Government is satisfied with that, and is not concerned with anything else that happened in connection with the matter.

If Ministers sit silently by and allow this proposal to be carried, or even if they stand up and support it, they will be committing

a most dishonourable political act, and they will, in an underground and indirect sort of way, either be betraying the local authorities to whom they have bound themselves by legal agreement or be allowing the member for Roe and other members responsible with him for bringing the amendment before the House to obtain, by the carrying of the motion, an assurance for which there will be no shred of justification.

Fancy members of the Government, who have bound themselves by legal agreement to the road boards of Mt. Barker and the adjacent areas to complete the installation of town water schemes there on or before the 26th May, 1955, allowing a matter of this kind to go through with their silent support and approval or even their oral support and approval! Fancy allowing an amendment to pass stating that the drier portions of the State which it is practicable to serve from the comprehensive water scheme should be connected by pipeline therefrom before the extension of the scheme is made into the higher rainfall districts south of Katanning! Were that the whole matter it would be bad enough, if the Government were to support it silently or otherwise. However, when we read the last portion of the amendment, we can only be astounded that members of the Government have nothing to say about it and are apparently giving it their silent approval. Let me read the last portion—

Notwithstanding the agreement—

This binding legal agreement!—

—made between the Government and the Tambellup, Cranbrook and Plantagenet Road Boards.

What possible respect, or shred of respect could any member of this House or any member of the public have for a Government which has already bound itself by a legal agreement with the local governing authorities concerned completely to establish water schemes in certain towns, if that Government now allows this amendment to go through? If carried, it will in effect be a direction from this House to the Government to give absolute priority in the future to the development of the comprehensive water supply scheme to those drier portions of the State within the scheme as against the areas south of Katanning, which are the areas covered by the legal agreement with which the Government has bound itself to the appropriate local authorities.

If the members of the Government do not oppose this amendment tooth and nail, especially the last portion, they surrender any claim they might still have to the respect of the members of this House and the respect of any member of the public. Beyond any shadow of doubt, this completely, or almost completely, reverses the policy to which the Government has committed itself in the legal agreement. The

Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot in the first instance bind itself by legal agreement to people in the Mt. Barker areas to complete the installation of town water schemes in those areas and to give that work a very high priority, which the Government has already promised to do in writing to those local authorities, and then tonight come here and silently approve, and allow to pass this amendment which proposes that the drier portions of the State within the proposed comprehensive water scheme shall have a priority over the Mt. Barker areas, notwithstanding the binding legal agreement which the Government made with the Mt. Barker local authorities as far back as May, 1949. Therefore if the member for Roe thinks that he has helped and saved the Government in connection with this matter by having the original motion defeated, he is wrong, for he has in effect put it in a much worse position by having brought forward this new matter. The Government's dilemma in connection with it is much greater than the dilemma in which it found itself in connection with the original motion. If the original motion moved by me had been carried, the Government would certainly have been censured; but it would not have been called upon by this House to reverse its policy. It would still have been able to carry on the administrative work of the State if it had pleased the Government to do so. However, if this amendment is carried, the Government has no option but to accept it as an absolute instruction to reverse the policy to which it is committed in the form of a legal agreement.

Mr. Marshall: And take the risk of legal action for failure to do the other job.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Members of the Government might have been consoling themselves up till now that this amendment, which the joint parties constituting the Government approved this week as being a marvellous let-out for the Government, is an amazing means of saving the Government and apparently putting in a good light with their electors the members for Roe, Moore, Avon Valley and Mt. Marshall respectively. They might have been doing that until now by believing or by saying that this is only a pious motion after all; that it cannot have any possible effect upon the Government; that the Government can sit silently by and allow the amended motion to go through, making up its mind at the same time—if it had not already made up its mind earlier this week—that no notice need be taken of it.

The Government could continue its happy or unhappy way of abiding by the legal agreement to which it has sacredly committed itself in relation to the proposed water scheme for Mt. Barker and towns adjacent. However, the debates upon this matter have been such as to surround

it with tremendous importance, so much so that it is now an outstandingly vital matter in the affairs of Western Australia. Therefore, in my opinion, the Government cannot and dare not allow the amendment silently to pass and then carry on its work in future as if it had never seen the light of day.

As a matter of fact, the speech of the member for Mt. Marshall alone has, of itself, been sufficient to charge this whole matter with the greatest possible public importance. Therefore the Government, if it has any sense of responsibility at all—even a shred of sense of responsibility—must regard the matter as being of the greatest possible significance. What political hypocrites members of the Government would be if they were to allow this to go through either with their silent support or their verbal support. If the members of the Government have any sense of public decency and public responsibility; if they have any regard for the legal agreements into which they have entered with the local authorities in the Mt. Barker district, they should be opposing this motion tooth and nail, more especially the last few words of it, which give an instruction to the Government that it must, if necessary, wipe out for years to come the provision of water schemes to Mt. Barker and the surrounding areas, notwithstanding the fact that the Government has sacredly committed itself to putting those schemes into operation by virtue of the legal agreement into which the Government has entered with the local authorities concerned.

So there is a very urgent and important obligation on the Premier at this stage to express the view of the Government on this motion. The Government is in a much worse position than when my motion was before the House. It has either to oppose this amended motion and try to have it defeated, if it is going to stand up to its legal obligations to the Mt. Barker local authorities, or it has to sit silently by and allow it to go through by default, as it were.

I was disgusted as I sat here waiting for the Premier or one of his Ministers to speak on the motion, and none of them made a move. They were all prepared to sit silently and allow the House to carry the new motion which, if put into effect, as it should be because it is a clear-cut instruction to the Government on a vital matter, would have sold completely the local authorities who have sacredly entered into the agreement with the Government. Therefore the Premier, or some member of his Government, is in duty bound to speak on the matter. If they measure up to their duty in any way at all, they are bound to oppose it, particularly the last portion. It is all very well for the Premier to hope that the motion will be carried without much debate in order that

the proceedings for the day might be completed and the House adjourned—that might be all very well from the point of view of our own personal convenience and comfort—but there has been raised an issue of the greatest possible importance. It raises the issue of whether the Government, which has entered into this binding, legal agreement, is going to allow members of the House to carry a motion which, in effect is a direct negative of the agreement to which I have referred.

So the member for Roe has done the Government an extremely bad and dangerous turn, and if he was encouraged to do it by the Government, or by any member of the Government, then whoever encouraged him has done the Government a bad and dangerous turn. The amended motion meets my views; make no mistake about that. I am in favour of it. When my motion was being debated and the member for Roe foreshadowed this motion as an amendment, I said I would be prepared to accept it as an addition to my motion, so there is no doubt at all about where I stand in connection with it. But there is only one position in which the Government should stand in relation to it, and that is to remain loyal to the legal commitments into which it has entered, and by which it is bound hand and foot, with the local authorities in the Mt. Barker area. If the Government silently, or even verbally, deserts those local authorities by supporting the motion, it will in fact betray them, and they will be sold out by the Government for the sake of saving itself from the political embarrassment it might have suffered had my motion been carried.

Had the Government used any foresight or judgment at all, it would have allowed my motion to be the one to test the issue. It would have defeated that motion instead of encouraging this dangerous subterfuge as a means of avoiding the responsibility of voting "yes" or "no" on my motion. It seems to me that the Government is now in a very dangerous situation. It might be saved politically, it might have sufficient supporters in this House, with the aid of its two party members on this side, to be able to defeat any motion of criticism, condemnation or censure which we may move from time to time, but it is not carrying out its essential duty to the people merely by doing that. It saves itself, keeps itself in office, and is able to carry on with the administrative work of government, but if it allows the motion to go through without great protest and opposition, then it will be committing, in my opinion, one of the most treacherous political acts that I have ever known or heard of. If the Government does oppose the motion, as it is in duty bound to do, I think it will be carried with only about seven members of the House voting against it, they being the Ministers of the Government. They have upon them a tremendous and most urgent

duty to oppose the motion because it instructs the Government to reverse absolutely a policy to which it is committed in relation to the areas south of Katanning.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION

(Hon. A. F. Watts—*Stirling*—on amendment) [12.7]: I wish to make it plain, in dealing with the amendment, which will now become the motion, that in what I am about to say I am not speaking on behalf of the Government, because I feel it is necessary to make some observations of a personal nature. I know of no arrangement within the Government to support or oppose the proposition which is now before the House. I propose to express my views upon it. So far as the first part of the phraseology is concerned, I have no great objection to it. My objection commences when it seeks to proclaim that the work in the drier areas referred to shall be done before that in the southern areas, and where it seeks to say, "Notwithstanding the agreement." It is quite obvious that I would have no objection if, in lieu of the word "before," there were the words "in equal priority with" because at no time—and I say this with a full sense of responsibility—did I ever conceive—nor do I know—that the work which was to be done at Mt. Barker, or in the Mt. Barker district, would be in priority to the other work which has been discussed, but would have been subsequent to the completion of that work.

I have fully understood all the time that no pipe-line could be laid to Mt. Barker until one had reached Katanning, and that it was not proposed that any pipe-line should reach Katanning before the conclusion of the work in the other portions of the comprehensive scheme. And that, I think, is borne out by the facts as to the letting of contracts for pipes—facts which were given to the House by the Premier tonight. The great bulk of the Premier's other remarks I also endorse, and particularly when he indicated that the contracts for the Narrogin to Brookton section were, I think, 50 per cent. let; the Narrogin southwards to Katanning, 28 per cent. let and in consequence, as the others in the northern districts were 100 per cent. let, the order of priority to which I have referred was being closely adhered to.

If there was to be any delay in the carrying out of the work in the northern areas, by reason of failure of supplies caused by the circumstances already enumerated, and which would be covered under the general heading of being outside the control of the Government, then necessarily the time which was to be occupied before the work south of Katanning could start would have to be extended to the same degree as the time within which the work to the north of that area and on the north and eastern Goldfields line, within the whole area of the comprehensive scheme, would be completed.

That must be crystal clear to everybody—that if an act of God or a strike or whatever it may be delays one section, it must also delay other sections, and it would be impossible to have commenced the work south of Katanning until the pipe-line had reached Katanning. That was well known to me as I have contemplated at least 1953, and now probably 1954 in this regard, whereas the other works, which I understand are following closely the schedules laid down, were to be finished before that time. I say that for no reason other than to indicate to the House and the country that I could not conceive and do not now conceive that the acceptance of the proposal by the Director of Works—which I will mention in a moment—could by any stretch of the imagination have been said to interfere seriously to the detriment of the work that was being done in other sections of the comprehensive water scheme authorised by Parliament.

Let me traverse for a few moments the circumstances of this matter. The Premier has already given the facts as to the salinity of sources of supply in the Mt. Barker district. Everyone knows that water of a salinity of 150 grains or thereabouts to the gallon is unsuitable for human consumption or for any other domestic purpose. I had never sought a pipe-line to Mt. Barker from the time when I was told that it was not considered in 1943 as being desirable, when I asked the question in this House while sitting on the other side. I had—as I was perfectly entitled to do—sought to have investigations made into another source of supply which, to put it shortly, and as the Premier has said, had proved futile with one exception. That was the proposed Bolganup scheme about 14 miles out.

I was pressing for an estimate of costs so that a decision could be obtained on that scheme, when I was advised by the then Minister for Works, the present Chief Secretary, that it was desirable that he and the Director of Works and I should confer, and the Minister for Works and the Director came to my office. Then, for the first time, I heard the suggestion about this pipe-line and the reasons for it. The Minister for Works was good enough to say that the Director would give me a full report on the subject, because I said it would have to be discussed with the local authorities. The Director of Works provided that, and the discussion took place, as is well known to this House.

I need not repeat all that the Premier has said, because it is founded strictly on fact, but I say that at no time, as far as I am concerned, was there any persuasion or pressure brought to bear on the Director of Works, except the despatch to him of a minute asking that the request of the Plantagenet Road Board for an undertaking or agreement should be carried out, and pressing on their behalf for its acceptance. That was done with the full knowledge and understanding

of the Minister for Works. In order to satisfy the member for Northam that that conference did take place in my office I will refer to page 157 of the file where the Director of Works made reference to it in a minute to me. On the 13th of December he addressed to me a letter, which reads—

Following the recent conference with the hon. Minister for Works and yourself I submit particulars of proposals for water supply—

That proves conclusively the accuracy of my statement that the conference took place. In the course of his remarks the member for Northam accused me of manoeuvring in this matter. I have been accused of many things—

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is nothing to what you will be accused of if you last long enough in politics.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I was about to say that it might not be the sum total, yet. I assure the House that by normal procedure and with the concurrence of the Minister for Works, by direct representation to the Director I took no action in this matter which the member for Northam or any other responsible member of this House would not have taken. There is no question about that. There was no need for me to do otherwise. I had received what I conceived to be advice of a nature that had to be taken into account. The proposition alternatively was to spend about £100,000 on a scheme which in a decade would be a washout, according to the point of view of the Director.

The Premier: More than £100,000.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, probably more than £100,000, if present-day costs are taken into consideration, but the then figure was at least that sum, and I had seen the fate of local schemes in the Katanning district, where in earlier times there was always said to be ample rainfall for the catchment of water, on which local authorities and Governments had over a period of years spent about £150,000, but which had produced nothing but futility and so, in the face of the advice that the prospects were that the same thing would occur at Mt. Barker, I was certainly not reluctant to take up the question in the normal way of seeing whether the Director's point of view could be accepted. Later on on the file, by way of answer to those who say that the Minister for Works knew nothing about this matter—which, of course, is not correct—there is a minute to the Premier by the Minister for Works and Water Supply as follows:—

1. I draw your attention to the three page report of the Director of Works upon the matter of a reliable

water supply for Mt. Barker and for other centres on the railway track north from Mt. Barker to Broomehill.

2. The report resolves itself into a question of whether the proposed scheme should be based upon Bolganup Creek or upon the Katanning end of the projected Comprehensive Water Supply.

3. The water supply position at Mt. Barker is now, and has been for many years, the subject of strong complaints—a condition that must worsen substantially when the anticipated big and early increase in Mt. Barker's population materialises.

An exhaustive examination of the position, both as to ultimate cost and reliability and sufficiency of supply, indicates that if the Government is to take a long view, which means to adopt the method that is capable of—

- (i) supplying ample good water at the outset and
- (ii) meeting later demands for heavy additional industrial and private consumption at little additional cost,

then, in my judgment, the southward extension of the comprehensive water supply should be agreed to. Accordingly I approve of the recommendation of the Minister.

(Sgd.) Victor Doney,
Minister for Works and Water Supply.

So I leave the matter at that and pass on for a moment to the observations of the member for Mt. Hawthorn, in which, as the member for Roe was good enough to inform him by interjection, he was a long way off the beam. If there is one thing I have refrained from doing, and which members on the cross-benches of this side of the House who are concerned in this matter will agree, it has been to approach them in regard to this matter, in any way, as to what action they should take. I have refrained from doing it as they very well know. I do not take any credit for that; it is not a matter of credit or discredit but is simply an answer to the member for Mt. Hawthorn and a statement of fact.

I have not been conscious at any time that I was likely to do any detriment to any other portion of the State. I would not willingly do that, and I think I have said enough to indicate that so far as my actions in the matter are concerned they are within the normal ambit of a member acting in the interests of his district and at the request of the local authority concerned, whose requests I must put forward and do so through the normal channels in every way. So far as I am concerned I leave the matter at that. It is unnecessary for me to say any more.

I did not wish to enter into this controversy on one side or the other, but I simply wanted to say that so far as the motion now before the House is concerned there are two parts of it I cannot support.

I would be happy to agree to the words "in equal priority" in lieu of the word "before." The position, in regard to the agreement is that, so far as I am concerned, it was entered into in good faith and it must stand or fall by its internal validity. I think it is valid. If it is not, then of course there is a consequence. While I do not object in the slightest to the tenor of the amended motion in the earlier parts, I feel I must express the fact that I cannot feel, as an individual, that I can support the retention of those two words.

HON. F. J. S. WISE (Gascoyne—on amendment) [12.25]: The Deputy Premier has obviously spoken for himself. He has made it clear that he is expressing personal views but I would advise both the Deputy Premier and the Premier that it is not as easy as that. I want to know the Premier's intention when the House divides on this motion, because the latter portion of it entirely disregards the claims of Mt. Barker as expressed originally by the Government to the road boards concerned, and as expressed in the agreement. I would remind the Premier of a letter sent by him on the 10th November, 1949, to the secretary of the Lower Great Southern Regional Council. So, the Premier is involved just as is the Deputy Premier in the agreement. It is not sufficient for the Deputy Premier to say that certain works must take priority over others according to the availability of pipes necessary for such works. That is simply fundamental to any project developed, but the Government has gone further than that; it has pledged itself by agreement and letter that these works from Katanning south shall take priority over all of those recently promised to appease certain members. This letter is signed by the Premier and reads as follows:—

Dear Sir,

I desire to thank your Council for the sentiments expressed in your letter of the 19th October on the subject of the comprehensive water scheme.

Every possible step, including the importation of a large quantity of steel plate for the manufacture of pipes, is now being taken to accelerate completion of the first section of the main from Wellington dam, the understanding being that upon arrival at Katanning, the further extension to Mt. Barker will take place.

What does the member for Moore think about that?

The project has been given a high priority by the Government.

(Sgd.) Ross McLarty, Premier.

Mr. W. Hegney: Laugh that off!

HON. F. J. S. WISE: The Premier has therefore committed himself by agreement and letter to an extension of the comprehensive scheme immediately it arrives at Katanning, precautions having been taken to secure the importation of steel plate for the manufacture of pipes for the express purpose of accelerating completion of this section to enable it to continue onwards to Mt. Barker. How does that measure up with this motion? The motion directs the Government to exclude this agreement with Mt. Barker; it is a direction to the Government to say that notwithstanding such agreement the first proposals to be handled will be those to the drier parts of the State. That is what it means, so let us see how the Government votes on this matter and let us see how it is going to let Mt. Barker down. We will be able to see just how much earnestness there was in the statement of the Deputy Premier and his attitude to the Mt. Barker people.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray—on amendment) [12.28]: A number of accusations have been made against the Government tonight and one is that it framed this amendment. I can assure members that if the Government had framed this amendment it is not the type that I would have drawn up.

Mr. Kelly: That was just a red herring.

The PREMIER: I do not know about that. I think it was said with all sincerity but I certainly did not frame the amendment, and I would be very surprised if any Minister had any hand in framing it. I know that it is not possible to defeat the amendment at this stage, but I would do so if I could.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: We will give you a chance.

The PREMIER: I have already indicated to the House just what we are doing to carry out our obligations on the comprehensive water scheme. What I said was stated in good faith. There is no question about it. We are under a certain obligation in regard to the carrying out and completion of the comprehensive water scheme and we are standing up to those obligations. As I said previously, the extension from Katanning to Mt. Barker will not take place until the work in the comprehensive scheme areas has been completed. All this steel that we are importing—and we are importing as much as we possibly can—is with the idea of completing this scheme.

We are certainly not building up a secret stockpile in order that we may get on with the scheme at Mt. Barker to the detriment of the comprehensive scheme. Fears which have been expressed as to certain of the drier areas are groundless. Many of the feeder pipes which will be required in those areas and in other areas where the comprehensive scheme will reach will

be manufactured locally, and will not have to be imported from oversea. So the fact that the extension of the comprehensive water scheme will go to Mt. Barker will not prevent the manufacture of feeder mains from being completed or laid in those areas where the extension of the comprehensive water scheme is already taking place.

As to those other areas which are not included in the comprehensive scheme, I have told the House, and I tell it again, that we will get on with that scheme as rapidly as possible because, there again, it is mostly local material that is required and we are doing all we can to encourage its production. So I cannot accept this amendment. I regret that the member for Roe has seen the necessity to move it. I have told members as bluntly as possible that the Government is standing up to its obligations all round and I was hoping that they would take my word for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	21
Majority for	5

Ayes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Owen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Graham	Mr. Read
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Rowell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wise
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Oliver
Mr. Doney	Mr. Pantton
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Manning	Mr. Wild
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Yates
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Nalder	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

BILL—STATE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it insisted on its amendment.

House adjourned at 12.38 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 9th November, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Chairmen (Temporary) of Committees	1801
Questions : Albany Harbour, as to cargo handling capacity	1801
Pyrites, as to sulphur production for superphosphate	1802
Mandurah boat slip, as to construction and use	1802
The Kauri Timber Company Limited Agreement Bill, Select Committee, as to powers	1802
Bills : Railway (Port Hedland-Marble Bar) Discontinuance, 1r.	1802
Railway (Upper Darling Range) Discontinuance, 1r.	1802
Commonwealth Jubilee Observance, 1r.	1802
Child Welfare Act Amendment, 1r.	1802
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 1r.	1802
War Service Land Settlement (Notification of Transactions) Act Continuance, 1r.	1802
Bees Act Amendment, 1r.	1802
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 3), 1r.	1802
Reserve Funds (Local Authorities), 3r.	1802
Prices Control Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r., passed	1802
Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment and Continuance, reports	1803
Vermis Act Amendment, 2r.	1803
Noxious Weeds, 2r.	1804
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1), 1r.	1806
Bush Fires Act Amendment, Com.	1807

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

CHAIRMEN (TEMPORARY) OF COMMITTEES.

On motion by the Minister for Transport (without notice), resolved:

That in accordance with Standing Order 31A, Hon. G. Fraser, Hon. W. J. Mann and Hon. A. L. Loton be elected as Deputy Chairmen of Committees during the current session.

QUESTIONS.

ALBANY HARBOUR.

As to Cargo Handling Capacity.

Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is the Minister aware that a statement attributed to him appeared in the issue of the "Albany Advertiser" of the 19th October to the effect that he had stated the capacity of handling cargo at Albany was only 80 tons per day?