Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 9th November, 1955.

CONTENTS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Acts Amendment (Libraries) Bill.

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) Sheet Piling Scheme at Carnarvon.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) On whose recommendation is the sheet piling being done on the Gascoyne River at Carnarvon?

(2) Has the scheme the support of Government engineers, from the angle of conserving sufficient water for the gardens and plantations?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Director of Works, in collaboration with the State Government Geologist.

(2) In view of the extent of the industry already dependent on water for irrigation and the limited knowledge of the behaviour of the water movement underground, the work was recommended as an expenditure of "venture capital" to obtain further knowledge other than that which could be obtained by boring. It may prove possible to conserve a limited quantity of water.

(b) Dam at Rocky Pool.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has any further investigation of survey been made with respect to a dam at Rocky Pool?

(2) What is the estimated cost of providing water from a dam at Rocky Pool?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) No estimate has been made, but the work would be very expensive for the limited water that could be conserved. Some hundreds of thousands of pounds could be involved.

(c) Mr. Wedge's Claims.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has any investigation been made by departmental engineers into claims by Mr. Wedge, of Dandaragan, that an abundance of fresh water exists at Wedge Island and on the coast west of Moora?

(2) If not, when is it intended to accept Mr. Wedge's offer to lead a party to the site?

(3) If he cannot be present himself, will he arrange for the Director of Works and hydraulic engineers to meet Mr. Wedge with a view to presenting an authoritative report?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Late in the summer.

(3) The inspection will be made by responsible technical officers of the Hydraulic Engineer's Branch. A discussion has taken place between Mr. Wedge and a departmental officer.

(d) Plan for Midland and Wongan Areas.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Has any work been done on the plan to provide a comprehensive water scheme for the Midland and Wongan areas?

The MINISTER replied:

Possible headworks at Gingin are under active investigation.

EDUCATION.

(a) Canning Vale School, Extra Accommodation.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is he aware that a further intake of approximately 20 children is anticipated at Canning Vale School in 1956?

(2) If so, what consideration has been given to providing extra accommodation?

(3) Will such accommodation be on the existing area, or is a new area contemplated; and, if so, where?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The present enrolment is 70 and the anticipated total enrolment in 1956 is 73.

(2) It is listed for an extra classroom.

(3) On the existing site. Consideration is being given to extending the area of the present site.

(b) Dalkeith School, Additional Classrooms.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Minister for Education:

(1) What is the present position regarding addition of extra classrooms for the Dalkeith school?

(2) If finance is not available, would the department consider a contract on terms?

The MINISTER replied:

A contract has been let for the erection of two extra classrooms. The completion date is expected to be the 17th June, 1956.

(c) Roleystone School, Commencement and Completion.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Education.

(1) When will work commence on the new school at Roleystone?

(2) How many classrooms will be provided?

(3) When is it anticipated that the school will be completed and ready for occupation?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) A contract has been let.

(2) Three.

(3) The 4th February, 1956.

LAKE MONGER.

Midge Plague.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is research continuing into the problem of combating the "midge" menace at Lake Monger?

(2) Has a scientific asessment been made of the value of the "bomb" used experimentally last year?

(3) What active steps are being taken by the department and/or the Perth City Council to reduce the plague this year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Perth City Council is conducting research work and also biological investigation is in progress.

(2) Yes: no value.

(3) The Perth City Council is continuing the fogging operations used last year.

CITY OF PERTH RATING.

Appeal Board's Authority.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

In dismissing an appeal under the City of Perth Rating Appeal Act the board stated: "The board is entitled generally to receive comparable useful valuations of properties within the municipality and in particular of properties within a reasonable vicinity of the property in respect of which an appeal is lodged"—

(1) Can he explain under which section of the Act or under what regulation the restriction to "within a reasonable vicinity" occurs?

(2) Is "useful valuation" defined in the legislation?

(3) If neither of these points is covered by legislation has the board exceeded the powers conferred by the Act?

(4) If so, can corrective action be taken by the Government?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied:

(1) No. Part XXIII, Division 2, of the Municipal Corporations Act refers to but does not define how valuations are to be made. Comparison with other valuations made by the council is made material by Act No. 61 of 1954 which amended the City of Perth (Ratings Appeal) Act.

(2) No.

(3) While the points referred to in the question are not expressly mentioned in relevant legislation, they are thought to be material to the matter of making valuations.

(4) See answer to No. (3). Even if the board had exceeded its powers, no corrective action could be enforced by the Government.

BANNED COMICS.

Disposal of Stocks.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has he had reports of the working of the law under which "comics" are banned in Queensland and other States?

(2) Are stocks of banned comics in States having control legislation destroyed when banned?

(3) Is there a danger of the comics banned in other States being sold in Western Australia?

(4) If so, can steps be taken to prevent this?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) It is not known whether stocks are destroyed, but distribution of banned comics is prohibited in those States.

(3) Yes; but this is lessened by the fact that publishers have lost the larger part of their circulation and would find it financially unattractive to circulate in this State.

(4) Reports and legislation from other States have been considered and legislation is being drafted and will be submitted next session.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL BENEFITS.

Status of a Company.

Mr. NIMMO asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is a company known as Australian Hospital and Medical Benefits Ltd. operating in Western Australia?

(2) Is this company registered under the National Health Act, 1953?

(3) If it is not so registered, can it lawfully carry on the business of providing hospital and medical benefits in this State?

(4) If it can lawfully do so, is it considered that the company is fully capable of carrying out its obligations to subscribers?

(5) If he does not know whether or not this company is capable of carrying out such obligations, will he cause full inquiry to be made and advise the House as soon as possible?

(6) If the company is not capable of carrying out the obligations, or if the result of inquiry indicates that it is not so, will he take urgent action to protect the public?

(7) Has he seen the company's benefit prospectus; and if so, does he consider it properly sets out the available benefits?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) Yes.

(4) No information.

(5) If there is any evidence indicating that an inquiry is necessary, consideration will be given to this.

(6) Answered by No. (5).

(7) The company's benefit prospectus has not been seen.

BUNBURY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) Work on Approaches to New Berths.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

When will a replacement for the dredge "Governor" arrive in Bunbury to complete the cleaning up of several shallow patches to the approaches to the new berths in the Bunbury harbour?

The MINISTER replied:

No date for recommencing dredging operations can be given at present. The matter is under review.

(b) Erection of Transit Shed.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) When will the erection of the transit shed in the Bunbury port area commence?

(2) When will it be completed?

(3) What will be the estimated cost of the completed job?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) In about two weeks' time.

(2) In 1956-57, if funds are available.

(3) Estimated cost is £38,000. An amount of £12,000 has been included on the 1955-56 Estimates.

(c) Housing Commission and War Service Homes.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many Housing Commission and war service homes, within the Municipality of Bunbury—

(a) have been completed since the beginning of this financial year;

(b) are at present in the course of being erected;

(c) are to be completed by the end of the present financial year?

(2) Are there any homes completed in the Municipality of Bunbury that have not yet been allocated to tenants?

(3) When will the first house of the 50 promised during the Bunbury by-election be commenced, and how many will be completed in Bunbury prior to the end of June, 1956?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) Eighteen.
(b) Twenty-nine.
(c) Estimated 80.
(2) No.
(3) Some have already been commenced and it is anticipated that all will be completed.

RAILWAY BUSES.

Installation of Ash-Trays.

Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of increased bush fire risk due to seasonal conditions in country districts, will he give an undertaking that ash-trays will be installed in all railway road buses operating in rural areas?

The MINISTER replied:

Ash-trays are standard equipment in railway buses, but a check will be made and any missing ash-trays will be replaced.

FREMANTLE YOUTH CENTRE.

Date of Framing of Agreement.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Education:

When was the Crown Law Department requested to draw up the John Curtin High School agreement between the parties involved in the matter of the £8,000 that was raised for the specific purpose of building a community youth centre in Fremantle?

The MINISTER replied:

The 11th August, 1955.

WILLIAM DAMPIER'S HOUSE.

Erection in Western Australia.

Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

(1) Has he read the report in "The West Australian" of the 7th November, 1955, on the birthplace of William Dampier—"Hymerford House"—in Somerset?

(2) Does he know whether the house mentioned has been established as the birthplace of William Dampier?

(3) If so, will the Government give consideration to negotiating for purchase of the home with a view to its re-erection in Western Australia on a basis similar to the Captain Cook cottage in Melbourne?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) Inquiries will be made through the Agent General.

HOUSING.

(a) Building in the New Year.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is it correct that builders now working for the State Housing Commission are being advised that no further work can be expected after the New Year, owing to lack of funds?

(2) If "Yes" is the answer to No. (1), how many builders have been advised to this effect?

(3) How many contractors have had their services dispensed with since the 1st July, 1955?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Housing) replied:

No builders are working for the State Housing Commission as such, so there is no question of services being dispensed with, but tenders are called and contracts let. However, owing to a reduction in the pre-cutting programme, about 170 builders of these homes have been informed that there will be no further such jobs for them at the termination of their then existing contracts and some 120 have been so affected. They could still tender for work which is being advertised.

(b) Orders for Pre-cut Houses.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What orders are now on hand for pre-cut houses with—
(a) State Saw Mills;
(b) Bunning Bros. Pty. Ltd.;
(c) Douglas Jones Pty.;
(d) Melville Joinery Co.?

(2) How many houses are to be supplied by each of the afore-mentioned firms to the State Housing Commission between the 1st January and the 30th June, 1956?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Housing) replied:

(1) (a) Seventy-six.
(b) Sixty-six.
(c) Forty-three.
(d) Forty-two.
(2) Not known at this stage.

PERTH TO BUNBURY.

Improvement of Road.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware of the bad condition of certain sections of the main Perth-Bunbury road?

(2) If so—

(a) what immediate and future action is being taken to remedy same;

(b) what sections of this highway are receiving priority;

(c) what funds have been and are to be spent on this highway in this financial year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Work is in progress near the 78 mile and between the 28 mile and the 40 mile. Provision has been made for improvement to other sections between the 15 mile and the 84 mile.

(b) Kelmscott-Armadale section, Mundijong - North Dandalup section, Coolup section and Wagerup section.

(c) Moneys available for expenditure on construction this financial year total £142,000, of which £20,000 has been spent to the 31st October. In addition, £21,300 has been provided for maintenance and of this £6,200 has been spent to the 31st October.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Road Trucks Purchased, Cost, etc.

Mr. NALDER asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many road trucks equipped to carry—

(a) sheep;

(b) cattle;

have been purchased by the W.A.G.R.?

(2) From what districts do they operate?

(3) What was the cost of the trucks?

(4) What was the cost of the material to equip the trucks?

(5) How many trips have been made?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No road truck designed primarily for the carriage of livestock has been purchased. A detachable superstructure has been obtained which can be fitted to an ordinary road vehicle when required for the carriage of either sheep or cattle.

(2) Narrogin.

(3) Answered by No. (1).

(4) Approximately £235.

(5) Two.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Hospitals Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Health.

2, Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Treasurer.

BILL—FERTILISERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2)—REPORT.

1, Education Act Amendment.

2, Traffic Act Amendment.

Adopted.

MOTION—PENSIONS AND SUPERANNUATION.

Expert Committee of Investigation.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville) [7.47]: I move—

> That in the opinion of the House, an expert committee should be appointed by the Government to inquire into the incidence of the various pensions and superannuation payments made by the Government; to examine the relationship between them, and report upon the effect of the pensions upon the standard of living of the recipients, and to recommend any alterations and/or improvements considered necessary and desirable.

In moving the motion, I do not wish to delay the House very long because I feel sure this is a matter with which practically every member has had some experience. The problem of dealing with the affairs of old age is one which is reaching a stage of being considered a science. I would give it its name if I could pronounce it, but I find it a bit difficult either to pronounce or spell it; but it has a name.

This problem stems largely from the improvements made in medical science because those improvements have, in the last 15 years, extended our expectation of life by about 20 years. The result is that nearly everyone can anticipate living, or has a reasonable expectation of living, for anything from 10 to 15 years or more beyond retiring age which, in Government employment, is set down in various Acts as being, for all practical purposes, optional at 60 and compulsory at 65; and it is five years less for female employees.

With the reasonably certain knowledge that there will be a period left to them after they have completed their normal working life, the majority of people are actively concerned with the income they are going to have after they cease working. This applies not only to Government employees, but to private employees. All good employers, and other employers who are businesslike, have in recent years made a practice of establishing some form of superannuation, death benefit, retirement fund, or something similar, for their employees.

The Government, or the State, was one of the earliest employers in this field. The first provision I can find on our statute

book is that of 1860 when the Police Benefit Fund Act was originally passed. It will be remembered that a small amendment to that Act was passed this session. So since 1860, which is 95 years ago, the State of Western Australia has been in the business of providing retiring allowances, superannuation and pensions for its employees. Since that time, a number of Acts and amending Acts have been passed to provide for the different groups, some of whom are employees and some who are not employees in the actual sense of the word but are regarded as the responsibility of the Government.

From the index to our statutes I discovered the following Acts dealing with pensions or superannuation in some form or other:—Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance, Guarantee and Endowment (Local Governing Bodies Employees) Funds Act, No. 58 of 1947 and which was amended in 1949 and 1950; the Superannuation (Public Servants) Act, No. 35 Vict., 7 of 1871—that is one Act with which every member has had some experience—which was amended in 1885, 1937, 1947 and 1951; the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act, No. 34 of 1938, the principal superannuation Act which was amended in 1939, 1945, consolidated and amended in 1947, consolidated again in Vol. 5 of the Reprinted Acts and further amended in 1950 and 1951.

Next there is one with which we are directly concerned, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, which was passed in 1948 and amended in 1950, 1951, 1953 and 1954. Then we have the Pensions Supplementation Act, No. 78 of 1953 and the Pensioners Barracks Act of 1863, the Pensioners Benevolent Society Act of 1873 and the Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act, No. 18 of 1923, which was amended in 1936, 1938 and 1943. The next is the Police Benefit Fund Act, of which I have already spoken, No. 30 of 1860 and which was amended in 1884, 1912, 1939 and again this session.

Then we have the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act, No. 27 of 1943, which was amended in 1944, 1947, 1948, 1949 and 1950 and consolidated in Vol. 5 of the Reprinted Acts and further amended in 1951; the Government Employees Pensions Act of 1948, which was amended in 1951; the Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act, No. 35 of 1950, which was amended in 1953; the Mine Workers' Relief Act, No. 37 of 1932, which was amended in 1933 and 1934 and consolidated in 1935 and further amended in 1940, 1943 and 1953 and the Mine Workers' Relief (Payments Authorisation) Act, No. 5 of 1940.

That is a fairly considerable list and shows, to some degree, the complexity of the problem. Every one of those Acts and amendments affects in some way all the people to whom we as a Parliament are responsible. The variation in these Acts and amendments is considerable. In fact, it is hardly necessary to go beyond reading that list to demonstrate that there is a need for some simplification of the whole problem. Practically every one of those Acts deals with a slightly different problem and most of the problems are dealt with in different ways.

The type of provision made varies; the type of contribution required from the prospective pensioner varies and there are a number of variations in the methods of payments and the contributions payable to widows and children. For instance, under the 1871 Act the pension resides solely in the pensioner, and, in the event of his death, ceases completely. The majority of other pensions continue, at a reduced rate, in the hands of the widow if the pensioner passes on first. We are aware, of course, of the conditions under which our own Parliamentary Superannuation Act affects the varying rates of a pensioner or his widow.

All these variations lead to a degree of anomaly. Occasions arise where people who have become eligible for a pension under one scheme find themselves in conversation with someone who is eligible under another scheme. Possibly both those people have worked side by side in earlier years, may be in the same department, and they find on a comparison that while one is drawing a certain rate, the other, who has done similar work and had a similar history, but who is drawing a pension under some other Act, is receiving a lesser amount.

Sometimes these variations are considerable and therefore a feeling of unfairness is engendered between the two persons. As most of us are aware, that frequently results in an approach to the local member to see if something can be done. Generally we find that something cannot be done because the various funds are administered liberally by those who are responsible for them. I do not think that there is any question that where a benefit of the doubt can be given to a pensioner—in many cases the pensioner was in an occupation similar to the person responsible for the fund—every sympathy is extended.

However, rules are rules and laws are laws; they must be obeyed, and so there are considerable anomalies. I feel sure that an inquiry of the type envisaged by this motion will display in some detail the types of anomaly that exist; some that possibly could exist and the acute variations that lie between the different recipients.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What type of person would you suggest for this expert committee?

Mr. JOHNSON: I intended to deal with that later on.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: All right.

Mr. JOHNSON: However, it is now a reasonable time to deal with the point. I did not move for the appointment of a select committee for two reasons. One, of

course, is that a select committee would die with the prorogation of Parliament and I doubt whether the time is sufficient for the type of inquiry required. The other is that, under any circumstances, I think a select committee, consisting of members of this House, is not a suitable form of inquiry.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Nothing ever comes of its report.

Mr. JOHNSON: I feel that the inquiry should be made by someone with specialised training; someone who is neutral or divorced from the direct result. As an example, there is Mr. Justice Walker, recently retired and who, I believe, has sat, in his legal capacity, on a large number of inquiries in relation to civil servants and who recently conducted an inquiry for the Tasmanian Government. That is just an example of the type of person I had in mind. I believe one of the magistrates rose from a background with a connection in the Civil Service with the superannuation fund before he qualified as a magistrate. I do not doubt that there are others in the Crown Law jurisdiction who have the type of training that could examine the mass of figures concerned, together with their implications.

For my part, I rather fancy the body charged with the inquiry should consist of three individuals, though one might be preferable; it depends, of course, on the person. I think that, whether he is a member of the committee of inquiry, or whether he is assisting the inquiry in the position of secretary or something like that, one of the persons concerned would need to be a fairly highly qualified accountant. Similarly, I feel there should be a direct representative of the recipients, or potential recipients, of State pensions directly concerned. In that respect, I feel a representative appointed, selected or suggested by the Civil Service Association might be a suitable person; as would someone who is already a recipient, possibly one under the 1871 Act.

The terms of the motion are very wide and I think that an expression of opinion from all sides of the House as to the most useful way of dealing with the situation would receive consideration. The people concerned have not actually been a phase I have taken into consideration at all. I have just put these general ideas forward as suggestions. However, I have quite clearly in my mind that one group of persons whom I feel should not be directly connected with the inquiry are practising politicians. I do not think they are a suitable group to conduct an inquiry of this nature because we are, in effect, in a fairly practical form, the employer directly concerned in this matter.

Secondly, we are directly concerned as to the possibilities of the political repercussions of a finding one way or another. Accordingly, and in order to keep this on a correct plane—that is, a neutral one—the method of finding where the collar rubs or where the shoe pinches should definitely be kept as neutral as possible. That is the major reason, I feel, why politicians should be out. It is very hard for a politician ever to be completely neutral.

The Premier: There are two or three of them neutral at present.

Mr. JOHNSON: To return to the line of thought I was pursuing, the 1871 Act gave to civil servants a pension as a right. It was a non-contributory pension which was given to them as a right and as portion of the terms of their employment. It was regarded as a deferred part of their income. The pension was given in relation to the length of service to the Government and the salary at time of retirement. That has led to some serious anomalies which I cannot see a way of overcoming under the present legal framework. Those who retired some time ago received pensions in relation to the salary on which they retired, and the majority of them were reasonably senior men. Most of them retired on what were then good pensions. Following the inflationary spiral, however, those amounts have been reduced in real value and, although some amendments have been made in the interim, they have not been made at a rate relative to the inflationary trend.

The result is that there has been a very real reduction in the value of the pensions concerned. Those who have retired recently under the same Act have had their pensions assessed in relation to their current salaries. The result is that their pensions have been far more in keeping with their salaries on retiring and with current costs. As an example, we have from the Education Department still living one of our earlier directors who retired on what was then a magnificent pension. It was a truly magnificent pension in those days, and amounted to £719 8s. This man retired from the very senior position of Director of Education.

That is a pension well earned and well warranted after long and useful service to the State. Younger people in the same service, including persons who are not as well qualified and whose service has been in the lower ranks of the same department and who have not achieved the same eminence or the same relative salary, have more recently retired on higher monetary pensions under the same Act. Statistically, that is sound, and I imagine that actuarially it is correct—that is, if one can speak actuarially of a fund that is non-contributory. There is no doubt in my mind, however, that it is a form of injustice.

That anomaly is one that I feel could be most usefully examined, and recommendations might be brought forward to adjust this quite obvious anomaly. It

exists in a greater or lesser degree according to the length of service before the pensioner retired, and the eminence of his position at the time of retirement. I think we are in pretty general agreement that if at the time of his retirement a man has deserved so well of the State that he is given a pension as of right as a result of that service, that particular relative pension should be his for as long as he needs it.

The same problem, of course, obtains in private firms. I am aware that people in the bank in which I used to work who had been managers are drawing lower pensions than people who retired from non-managerial posts more recently. The unfairness is considerable. I know of folk from other banks who, after being retired for some years from positions such as managers, have found it necessary to take employment in the later years of their life—in the seventies and so on—to keep up their standard of living. I do not suggest that the problem is one solely for the State, but I do suggest that it exists also in the State, and we can usefully examine the incidence of this problem and see if there is not some way in which it can be adjusted.

I feel I should make nothing more than a passing reference to the Parliamentary Superannuation Act. The benefits under it are well known and the problems under it have been recently discussed. I would, however, like to revive the recollection of members on that point because I fancy a similar problem to that which I have put forward was in the minds of those dealing with that Act when it was brought forward. To illustrate a little further the complexity of the problem, I would like to give some of the conditions concerning various pensions and so on.

Under the coal mine workers' pension scheme, which is a pension to provide for coal-mine workers, in effect compulsory retirement at 60 is a requisite and the employee pays in at a flat rate of 6s. a week. The Government subsidises the fund and the employers put in an amount of £1 2s. per week which, by the way, is included in the cost of coal, most of which is bought by Government authorities. So, in effect, the Government is providing the whole of the cost. This pension pays a benefit on a flat rate up to £19 per fortnight but it is dependent to a degree on Commonwealth social services.

It is one, with two or three different types of funds, in which the amount paid by the State is reduced, if it would otherwise reduce the amount payable to the pensioner by the Commonwealth social service fund. The same condition relates to the 1938 Act and it is of interest to note that it is not uncommon in that the problem is the same in practically each of the States. The State employees' social service associations of the several States at a conference in Melbourne only last month passed a resolution which reads as follows:—

> Conference is of the opinion that where a social service pension is reduced as a result of an increase in State superannuation pension, the Federal Government should reimburse the particular State Government the amount of such decrease.

That is a fairly involved resolution although it is an accurate statement of the position. Its involvedness is part of the reason for this particular motion I have moved. The problem is one which, when I first contemplated moving along these lines, I thought I knew a good deal about, but the deeper I go into it the more involved it becomes, the less certain am I on any particular portion of this matter, and the less able to make a statement which cannot be qualified by somebody who has more detailed knowledge of this or that particular fund.

I have consulted various people who know a great deal about this matter. In discussion with the chairman of the Superannuation Board I discovered that he did not feel competent to advise me in detail of some of the other funds which have a content of Government money. For instance, there is the fund under the Miners' Phthisis Act, which is administered solely by the Mines Department. It is regarded by the recipients, to some extent, as a pension, but it is, in fact, a type of workers' compensation payment.

There is the Railway Endowment and Death Benefit Fund—a contributory fund participation which is almost mandatory as a condition of employment in the Railway Department, provided that an employee is not covered under any other superannuation scheme—for which the Government, through the Railways Commission, provides all the running cost, so that all the money available is for the use of the fund. The State Electricity Commission has a semi-private scheme. The Fire Brigades Board has a scheme of its own. Local authorities have a pool method of dealing with superannuation of their employees, which I understand is admistered through the department by one of the mutual companies, and has very little of Government content in it. But it is overseen, if I might use the word, by the department.

Mr. Court: Do you intend to include that in your motion?

Mr. JOHNSON: I imagine that inquiry should cover the various funds which are touched by departmental control. Quite recently, since the Lotteries Commission has been made a permanent authority, a proposed scheme of superannuation is being created. There might be one or two others that I have not mentioned. I am

not suggesting that I can produce even a hint as to the ideal solution to all these problems. It does occur to me that it is not impossible to reduce the number of these funds, and thus reduce the administrative cost of running them. It should be possible to crystallise the value of pensions paid in some manner so that they fluctuate according to the value of money. Possibly that would require a greater degree of Government underwriting. It might prove to be advisable on close investigation to set up a superannuation scheme to which people, who are not Government employees, can contribute in order to reduce the multiplicity of superannuation schemes provided by the smaller employers.

It would not be a bad idea if some form of interchange of superannuation schemes could be organised so that an employee leaving one form of service in which there was superannuation could go into another form of employment and at the same time transfer his rights under the scheme. That is a thought of which I am aware because I know that in some forms of employment the benefits of superannuation, pension rights and so on, are used as a method of preventing the free flow of employees from one firm to another.

Employees who rise after years of service in one firm may find that their services can be more usefully employed and more highly remunerated in another firm. They have to give very serious consideration to a change of employment because of the amount of their own contributions which lie in the superannuation scheme to which they belong. They have to give consideration to whether it is more desirable financially to remain in a lower remunerated job with a certainty of a pension to which they possibly have contributed half and the employer half, or risk leaving and getting what they can out of the superannuation.

In most cases they would receive only the amount they had paid in, sometimes with interest and sometimes without, but generally without any portion of the employer's contribution, and so transfer to another form of employment which may require a considerable amount to be deposited in the superannuation scheme, or where there is no superannuation scheme at all. In that respect the mobility of labour is seriously affected. It is most desirable to provide some form of fund, with or without complete legislative protection, whereby people who are in the habit of moving from one fund to another can receive protection.

That is a problem which can be looked at, if not examined closely. Furthermore, there is a great number of workers in non-pension scheme employment who may desire to join a superannuation scheme in a general way. I know that most of these can cover themselves by different forms of insurance, but there are some employees who prefer contributing to a superannuation scheme.

Mr. Court: Would that come within the ambit of your motion in its present form?

Mr. JOHNSON: I am not quite sure as to whether it would or would not. That problem is certainly too big to be more than glanced at by the type of inquiry I have in mind. It is a problem which could be stated by such an inquiry for more detailed examination, if in the statement there was sufficient reason to make it worth while to be considered. This is a matter which I have had in mind in a nebulous form for quite a long time. I do feel that it could be clarified a little in the outskirts of this particular inquiry.

Mr. Court: I notice your motion refers to the payment under the several schemes, not so much the composition of the funds, including the method of creation. Do you mean there should be a general inquiry into all the funds and their background?

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes. The reference to payment involves, at least in my mind, a reference to the actuarial soundness of the fund from which payment is made, to payments which are desirable, and to payments which are actually possible. The recommendations as to alterations and improvements must naturally contain a reference to changes that are actually possibly, as well as to matters that are desirable. I feel that I have shown clearly how complex the problem is, because if I have demonstrated nothing else I feel sure I have demonstrated the fact that this problem rambles all over the place.

It is not a single problem but a whole group of problems. They affect several groups of people in several ways. At the border between the various groups there are groups of anomalies, some of which could possibly be corrected fairly simply, while others might prove to be completely intractable. I recommend to the House that it should give the matter serious consideration. I recommend to the House that out of the experience of all members in relation to these pension problems, there is no real necessity to go into the details of the problems relative to each fund.

I think everybody is aware of one or two of these problems. An inquiry of a pretty general type should be able to produce useful recommendations. I trust that, after the completion of the debate on the motion, the Government will set up the inquiry in a form that will prove useful and, when the recommendations come forward, will give consideration to its direct financial responsibility and to the proper maintenance of those who have served the State in a capacity which entitles them to a pension.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

BILL—FREE ENTERPRISE PROTECTION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th October.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [8.30]: This Bill deals with a very important development in our economy. The economic system, which is generally known as the capitalist system as developed by the western world and which, of course, is the economic system that practically all English-speaking countries use and live under, has provided a higher standard of living than has any other economic system.

We know how the various nations of the world live and the way the people are governed. While we can respect the ideas of those countries and while, perhaps, their development suits the particular needs of their people, there can be no argument that the system developed in the western world has provided a far higher standard of living and made for far greater progress than has been evidenced in other countries of the world.

Mr. Andrew: Then why did people have to go without so much during the thirties?

Mr. PERKINS: I suggest that the hon. member should visit some of those other countries. He might go to the Far East or to Russia, two countries which have another type of economic set-up, and if he returned and told me that the standard of living for the average person there is as high as it is in Australia, I would be indeed surprised.

Mr. Andrew: You have not answered my question.

Mr. PERKINS: I suggest that the hon. member should make his own speech.

Mr. Andrew: You cannot answer it.

Mr. PERKINS: The reason for our higher standard of living is that the system under which we work affords the maximum scope for the development of individual initiative. It secures for the individual whatever additional industry he puts into his particular job; it also provides a suitable reward for the greater concentration of energy which he is prepared to put into his business. It all adds up to this, that it has provided for the high standard of living that we in Australia enjoy.

We know that under any economic system difficulties will arise from time to time, and the member for Stirling has introduced this Bill to deal with some of the difficulties evident in our economy. These are problems that have received the attention of various people over the years, and the fact that they have not been solved indicates that they are not simple problems. I think members will agree that the essence of the proper functioning of the capitalist system as we know it is free competition.

If we reach a stage where a restriction of competition occurs, there is a danger that either the particular industry will not function at its maximum efficiency, or that there might be exploitation of the users of the goods produced in that industry. Of course, the aim of all of us is to ensure that reasonable competition prevails in industry. We hear it suggested, very vigorously at times, by members of the Labour Party that members on this side of the House are more particularly interested in big business.

Mr. Andrew: Is it not true?

Mr. PERKINS: If the hon. member thinks for a moment, he will realise just how stupid that question is. It must be evident to anyone who studies the position that no party deliberately aims at committing political hari-kari. If members on the Government side think at all, they must realise that the people who are in the forefront of returning members to this side of the House are the small businessmen.

Members on the Government side must appreciate that, as industrial concerns expand to the point where they become very large businesses indeed and employ hundreds and perhaps thousands of hands, there must be developed a situation where only a limited number of people are at the top of that industrial machine and are likely to vote for members on this side of politics, while the number of people upon whom members on the Government side traditionally rely for support multiplies. So it is well to scotch that idea which one hears put forward, very vigorously at times, because it is manifestly absurd.

In considering the proposal of the member for Stirling, we may take it for granted that those of us who are strongly supported by the small businessmen are looking for ways and means to maintain that free competition in industry, which we traditionally rely upon to keep our economic system in a healthy state. Some very thoughtful speeches have been made on this Bill. The sponsor of the measure evidently carried out considerable research before he had the Bill drafted. The member for Nedlands has also gone to considerable trouble in obtaining reports as to what is happening overseas. I do not want to cover much of that ground again.

Members could profitably re-read those speeches and, if possible, take a more detailed look at the report prepared by the president of the Board of Trade in Great Britain on monopolies and restrictive practices. There is a lot of matter in that report which gives rather more detailed information than that which most of us possess about what has been happening in other parts of the world where efforts have been made to ensure this free competition. Most of us know of, and the member for Nedlands spent some time in

dealing with, the American legislation. Most of us know that the United States has been experimenting with anti-trust legislation since the latter part of last century.

Mr. Brady: He did not mention anything about the Standard Oil Company's activities.

Mr. PERKINS: The hon. member can read the report. It is a very complex question indeed because, although the United States of America has experimented more with this legislation than has any other country, I should not like to say that it has met with a very great measure of success. At one time and another there has been a good deal of experimental legislation in Great Britain, and the commission in Great Britain has been designed to make further inquiries as to what is happening in trade and commerce, and also as to how this type of legislation has been operating in other parts of the world.

Regarding this subject, I have tried to read as much as possible on it. I repeat that I do not wish to traverse the ground covered by the member for Stirling or the member for Nedlands, but in making some research, it struck me that possibly the experimental legislation in Sweden has been more successful than any of the expedients that have been tried elsewhere. I have known for a long time that the Scandinavian countries have been very progressive, and have had considerable success in achieving a good distribution of wealth, as well as maintaining a very progressive industry and the economy generally.

I have been fortunate in obtaining from the State Librarian a copy of the report of the British Counsellor at Stockholm to the British Board of Trade. His name is Howe, and we can take it for granted that this is an authoritative publication and something upon which we can place complete reliance. I understand that these publications are prepared by the British Counsellors in various foreign countries for the information of traders who desire to do business with those countries. They have to be accurate and factual as otherwise they would mislead the people who rely on them for that vital commercial information.

A further reason why I think we might pay some attention to the experience in Sweden is that it is a country with a population of similar size to our own. In 1953, at the time of this publication, the population in Sweden was between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 people and the Government of that country — as far as I know it is still composed of the same parties— was a coalition of Social Democrats and Agrarians. The Ministry was composed of nine Social Democrats, four Agrarians and two Independents and the general policy of that Government will, I think, be outlined as I read some extracts from this report prepared for the British Board of Trade.

One quotation which I wish to make relates to the standard of living and is as follows:—

> A few recently published facts and figures may serve to indicate that her standard of living is among the highest in the world and that her share in world trade is out of all proportion to the size of her population.

I think it is necessary to take note of that because obviously, if we are going to use the experience of any other country, it should be that of one which is achieving a high standard of living, which I take it all of us are aiming at

Mr. Ackland: They are receiving the highest wages in Europe and have the biggest production per head.

Mr. PERKINS: I have some precise information on the point mentioned by the member for Moore, in a quotation of incomes related back from the kroner to Australian currency at the current rate of exchange. These figures show that 60 per cent. of the income earners in Sweden earn an income ranging from £350 per year to £875 per year.

Mr. Court: Is that in Australian currency?

Mr. PERKINS: Yes, but I do not think we should pay too much attention to the actual level of the income because obviously that does not necessarily indicate the standard of living as the prices of commodities vary so much in different countries, and that has a bearing on the matter. I am endeavouring to indicate the good spread of the income throughout the population. I repeat that 60 per cent. of the wage earners earn from £350 to £875 per year while 90 per cent. earn from nil to £875 per year. That leaves only 10 per cent. in the brackets over £875 per annum. I am not trying to use those figures to indicate what the standard of living is. My previous quotation is the main one in that regard and the figures I am now quoting are to indicate the spread of income.

It is evident that the effect of the type of economy and government that they have in Sweden is a very good spreading of the national income throughout the population of that country. Returning to the comments in this report by the British Counsellor at Stockholm on the methods used in Sweden to achieve the measure of free competition, which the member for Stirling is aiming at, I make the following quotation:—

> Supervision of Restrictive Practices: Up to 1953 the supervision and control of monopolies and restrictive practices has been based mainly on the principle of publicity and on the right of free entry into any line of business. A law passed in June, 1925, gave the

Government power to investigate monopolies and similar business associations, but very few investigations were ever carried out. This law was superseded in 1946 by a new law concerning the supervision of restrictive practices, under which a supervisory authority, known as the Monopoly Investigation Bureau, was set up with power to enforce the public registration of all cartel agreements and other agreements restricting competition.

The bureau is also empowered to conduct special comprehensive investigations into restrictive practices in individual branches of the economy. In such cases the bureau may investigate conditions prevailing before the enactment of the law and may subpoena the books and correspondence of the firms in the branch concerned. A third form of public control is that of the legislation concerning unfair competition. This legislation is of a very special character and is directed only against clearly immoral business practices such as unfair advertising, undue disclosure of trade secrets, bribery and unfair use of trade marks and similar marks of identification. The purpose of the law is to guarantee the maintenance of a minimum level of business honesty and decency and is not in itself directed against monopolistic tendencies.

The 1946 law on the supervision of restrictive practices is based on the tenet widely held in Sweden, as in other countries, that the existence of restrictive practices does not in itself warrant intervention by the authorities and only if such practices are abused or are established as being harmful to the community are counter measures in any form justified. The above-mentioned law does not, in fact, empower the Monopoly Investigation Bureau to recommend or decide on intervention and reliance is placed entirely on publicity as a means of countering the injurious effects of restrictive practices.

The possible necessity of intervention in serious cases is, however, provided for, the King-in-Council being given special power for this purpose. Among the more drastic counter measures mentioned in the law are the formation of a competing Government enterprise and complete State control of a monopolised branch of industry. Up to the 1st January, 1953, 823 cartel agreements and similar agreements restricting competition have been registered with the Monopoly Investigation Bureau. Six hundred and thirteen of the agreements or about 75 per cent. of the total are between entrepreneurs in the same branch of manufacturing or distribution.

Horizontal agreements; Most of them, 406, concern industrial production. The wholesale trade is affected by 43 horizontal agreements, the retail trade by 39, small crafts by 68 and agriculture by 29. Two hundred and ten agreements or 25 per cent. of the total registered are vertical agreements between entrepreneurs operating in various stages of production or distribution. Most of the agreements are between parties belonging to two different stages, for example industrial and wholesale, while a few extend over three stages. Of the vertical agreements 134 concern industry, 112 the wholesale trade, 101 retailers, 39 handicrafts and 34 agriculture. Taking both horizontal and vertical agreements together, 66 per cent. concern industry, 19 per cent. the wholesale trade, 17 per cent. the retail trade, 13 per cent. craftsmanship and eight per cent. agriculture.

Without any obligation to do so entrepreneurs have reported to the Bureau the dissolution of their cartels or in some cases amendments to them. Statistics prepared by the bureau indicate that of the 823 cartels registered up to the 1st January, 1953, 286 or about 35 per cent. were reported no longer existing at the time of registration or as having been dissolved subsequently. Of the total number of industrial cartels registered 180, or about 35 per cent., have been dissolved. Fifty four per cent. of the agreements affecting the wholesale trade have been annulled, while the percentages for the retail trade, handicrafts and agriculture are 36 per cent., 62 per cent. and 19 per cent.

The majority of the amendments reported have been in favour of freer competition. The results hitherto achieved by the publicity methods aided by a voluntary house cleaning campaign initiated by the private business world in 1950 are regarded by the authorities as satisfactory, but the investigations of the special commission on restrictive practices appointed in 1946 revealed the desirability of further legislation in this field.

Based partly on recommendations by the commission and following consultations between the Government and representatives of trade and industry a new law was passed in the summer of 1953. This law prohibits resale price maintenance and certain kinds of price quotation cartels and provides for the establishment of a business freedom council to investigate and seek through negotiation between the parties concerned the removal of harmful effects of restrictive practises. The new law enters into force on the 1st of January, 1954, except for the

> prohibition on the resale price maintenance and price quotation cartels which do not become effective until the 1st July, 1954.

That is the end of the quotation. I think members will agree that it is a very interesting account of the methods adopted in Sweden to deal with this problem. If they followed the quotation carefully, I think members will have noted that the emphasis has been on inquiry and report rather than on actual restrictive legislation. In other words, Sweden has been relying on the publicity and informed public opinion to keep business in that country on a sound basis. I would like to have more knowledge about how that system works in practice. From what I have quoted to the House it is evident that Sweden has had considerable success and whilst no one suggests that business conditions in any country of the world are by any means perfect, it is profitable to ascertain how the other fellow is getting on and whether he is gaining any success with some new move or learn from any of the blunders that he has made. So much for the actual section dealing with the detailed examination in Sweden of some of the difficulties we have been considering.

I understand the other more positive approach in Sweden is through the co-operative movement. As is well known, I and other members are particularly interested in the co-operative movement as a means of bringing about a better distribution of wealth, and also as a means to make people themselves endeavour to achieve this object. Support for the co-operative movement is not peculiar to any particular party. I understand that the members of the party on the other side of the House support this movement as a principle.

From what I have read of the position in Sweden, this is borne out by some of the quotations I could read to the House—although I intend to read only one. J. W. Ames, in a work published in 1952 entitled "Co-Operative Sweden Today", had this to say—

> A further point of considerable interest which has been discovered by the Swedish Movement during its long fight with monopoly is that if the Movement has a productive capacity for a certain commodity which is equal to between 10 and 20 per cent. of the total national sales volume of this particular commodity, then this is usually sufficient to allow the Movement to secure a decisive influence over the price applied in all parts of the country.
>
> The above experiences show beyond doubt the great importance and the consequences of co-operative production on Sweden's economy.

The opinion of that author is borne out by some of the statements made by the British Commercial Counsellor at Stockholm, which are printed in the British Board of Trade publication from which I have quoted extensively this evening. Of course, it is not surprising to learn that in a country such as Sweden the co-operative movement has been a factor in bringing about this necessary competition in its business world.

We have seen the great part the co-operative movement plays in certain sections of business life within our own commercial community. For instance, in the life assurance field I would say that the overwhelming percentage of this business in Western Australia is carried out by the mutual life companies; in other words, by companies that are truly co-operative. The owners of those companies and those that profit from their activities are the policy-holders. Another good example in Australia, which perhaps does not operate to the same extent in this State as in others, are the co-operative housing societies. I understand the achievements of those societies and the benefits that accrue to their members have been extremely spectacular.

Coming nearer home and dealing particularly with the farming community, we have seen how successful some of the co-operative bodies have been here, the largest one, of course, being Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., in which the member for Moore is particularly interested. The point I have been trying to make in the last few minutes is that whatever we do to bring about this competition in our business world and whatever we do to maintain the good health of our economy, we need to use a variety of factors. If we can make the minimum use of actual restriction and the maximum use of publicity to encourage people to help themselves, we will have a far greater measure of success.

The subject is in the experimental stage and obviously we have a great deal to learn. Members of this House could gain in knowledge by having a closer look at the question. I am not enamoured with the Minister's approach to the Bill. In fact, I was most amazed at his approach to it and the actual proposals that he suggested to put what he calls "teeth" into it. I will be extremely surprised, Mr. Speaker, if he is able to get you to agree to accept some of the proposals that he has in mind as coming within the scope of the Bill. Obviously, if he wants to go as far as he has suggested, he should bring down a Government measure to achieve his objective. However, be that as it may, I have no doubt that there will be more discussion on those particular points.

As far as the provisions of the Bill are concerned, I think the measure, as presented to the House, contains some serious

deficiencies, but I notice that the member for Stirling intends to move certain amendments in Committee to clauses which I understand have been causing some concern to the business community. Obviously, it is very undesirable to allow scope for the common informer in legislation of this kind. However, I understand that the member for Stirling proposes to cover that point with an amendment.

Further, it was an evident omission, when the Bill was introduced, that no provision was made that cartels or agreements, or whatever we might term them, which do not seek to harm the public in any shape or form, should not be penalised. There again, I understand the member for Stirling intends to cover that phase. The proposed legislation is extremely experimental. Its consideration has drifted on now towards the end of the session and obviously there is not much time to canvass properly all the ideas which members may have on the form which it will finally take.

As we are now close to the end of the parliamentary proceedings, it may not be possible to finalise the legislation this session. That may be a good thing if only for the purpose of giving us extra time to study how such legislation works in other parts of the world. I for one would like to study more thoroughly how the position works in Sweden. From the information I have gained so far, I think that country possibly has the most satisfactory answer to the problem of any such system I have been able to read about.

Publicity, properly handled, can be a powerful force in the community in these modern times. I believe that if the terms of some of the restrictive type of agreements made between firms which may be acting to the detriment of the public were brought to the light of day, or even if it were suggested that they be brought to the light of day, it would prove to be very beneficial indeed. If the sort of legislation which is in force in Britain and Sweden were operating in Western Australia, and if it were possible to publicise the excessive profits made by some companies, I am sure that the ultimate effect would be that the firms in question would very smartly get back to a reasonable basis of trading or else would face severe competition from some other concern which could see a very profitable use for its capital.

I believe that would be the effect where firms have had a virtual monopoly of the production of a commodity, where they have exploited the position, and where the ultimate effect has been that they have brought in outside competition which must put them in a much more unfavourable position than if they had been prepared to treat the public more reasonably during the period when they had an unfair advantage because of their privileged position.

So I hope it will be possible to have further investigations made. That is necessary, whether the legislation is passed or not, because it is rarely that, when we bring down experimental legislation, we can, in the first instance, put it in such a form that it adequately fits the situation we are trying to deal with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Hearman: I move—

That the hon. member's time be extended.

Motion put and passed.

Mr. PERKINS: I hope that those further investigations will be made, because I feel sure that if they are, we will be able to get the type of legislation which suits the position in Western Australia.

Mr. Court: From the published reports of the Swedish experience, it would appear that they have achieved the greatest success with the least administrative cost. You would need to inquire for yourself to make sure.

Mr. PERKINS: That is another point. It is a subject on which I am afraid I have not much information. The publication from which I have quoted is designed to inform the British businessman of the kind of conditions with which he would have to comply if he wanted to trade in Sweden and it gives an unbiassed picture of the situation from that point of view. But obviously there will be some administrative angles which would not be covered in that type of publication. It may be that there is more information in the commission's report from which the member for Nedlands quoted rather extensively. In the time I have had to go through it, I have not been able to sort that out.

This is a very important question indeed. It is one in which all members are interested, and those of us who think that no other economic system that is in sight at present can give the same high standard of living as the capitalist system, as developed by the western world, is able to give, have a real interest in seeing that any of the difficulties arising under that system are ironed out as quickly as possible. Obviously, a system that relies on the maximum freedom of competition cannot contemplate with any equanimity monopolies or restrictive agreements which defeat that end.

I hope that this subject can be followed up, and, although it is perhaps a bit late this session to carry it through to its final conclusion, I think it is a subject we will hear a great deal more about in this Chamber. I hope to be able to follow it up myself, and I suggest that other members gain whatever information they can concerning the developments that are taking place elsewhere.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood) [9.20]: In common with other members who have spoken on this Bill, I think I would be in sympathy with anybody who was endeavouring to prevent what might be termed business malpractices and undesirable agreements between firms or groups of firms.

Mr. Oldfield: Then why did you not support the Retailing of Motor Spirits Bill?

Mr. HEARMAN: I would be in favour of the measure; but I think there are considerable difficulties in this matter, which are also recognised by the sponsor of the Bill, who has not attempted to define exactly what a malpractice or an undesirable agreement is. He has made the oblique approach of endeavouring to outlaw the associations that would make these arrangements and, in doing so, has introduced certain complications. There is a dragnet clause in the Bill which more or less outlaws any association that attempts to influence the supply, demand or price of any commodity.

To talk about influencing supply, demand or price is to be pretty well all-embracing. It would outlaw not only undesirable associations—that is to say, associations that make bad agreements or arrangements—but also those that make good arrangements. We can very broadly classify all these business associations into three types. There are those who make good arrangements, which are generally in the best interests of the public. I do not think anybody would wish to disband them. Then there are others that are definitely prejudicial, and with them I would have no sympathy. There is a third category which has some good and some bad points. In that category it is hard to say which outweighs which, and whether there is more good or bad.

Mr. Oldfield: Into what category would you put the oil companies?

Mr. HEARMAN: The particular effect on those good associations that this Bill could have has obviously exercised the attention of the sponsor of the Bill, and he has made some effort to meet it. To illustrate the particular difficulty, and to be rather parochial, in my electorate I have been asked quite a number of questions as to the effect this legislation would have on the supply of fruit cases.

For the benefit of the House, I would point out that some years ago the Fruitgrowers' Association asked the importing firms to get together and form an association to endeavour to increase the supply of cases. This they did quite satisfactorily and successfully. They formed an association which puts up certain money and enters into contracts with sawmillers; and this year I understand they will be involved to the extent of £100,000 by Christmas. Obviously, the intention is to influence the supply. I am quite certain that the sponsor of the Bill had no wish to interfere in any way with that association, because it has done a good job. But it has led to certain side effects with which all fruitgrowers are not in complete accord; so much so that at this year's annual conference of the association there was a motion—which, incidentally, emanated from my electorate—that the matter be discussed, because there are certain aspects of this agreement for the distribution of fruit cases to which certain growers object.

There has been a tendency, growers say, for importing firms, which have complete control of the distribution of fruit cases, to utilise that control to ensure that the packing sheds are well supplied, and people who wish to pack in their own orchards have difficulty in getting supplies. I believe there is some substance in that contention. There are instances in which growers have asked for cases and have been told they cannot be supplied, but that if they took their fruit to the central packing shed, it could be packed for them. That may not be part of the agreement between the firms—I do not think it is—but it is a definite side effect of this method of distribution. Whether it is in the public interest or not could be argued.

But I think we could say—in fact, I would be safe in saying—that if this Bill passes into law, even with some of the amendments envisaged, it will lead to litigation. There would be certain fruit growers who would be prepared to take on that case distribution association, and I would not like to say what the effect of that litigation would be. I cannot say whether they would be able to prove that the activities of the association were in the public interest or not. But I do think it might have this effect, that, because there was this threat of litigation, some firms would be very reluctant to continue the arrangement. That is so because once they got implicated in any one season, they would be involved to the extent of thousands of pounds, and it would be difficult to pull out and meet their legal obligation. If they continued, they would perhaps have the threat of a fine held over them.

I would like to hear the sponsor of the Bill discuss that aspect when he replies to the debate, because it interests me, and it is an illustration of how those agreements can start quite well but eventually develop what some people consider to be undesirable features. I would not like to say what, with the amendments, the effect of the Bill would be. I have endeavoured to get a legal opinion, but it seems to be conflicting. I would find difficulty in agreeing to a Bill of the effect of which, on a matter of such importance, I was not certain. I would like some assurance from the sponsor of the Bill in regard to that particular matter.

The Bill does endeavour to deal with combines; and another point on which I would like further information concerns

just to what extent it would affect an international combine. The Leader of the Country Party, when introducing the measure, pointed out that it was not his intention to deal with any existing practices, so presumably we have no undesirable practices here that he would stop. It seems to me that the history of the cartel agreements hinges on firms of an international character, with head offices overseas. I am not quite clear how the Bill would affect them—whether it would prevent some of the big shows from making their arrangements to apply in this State or not. I doubt very much whether, under State legislation, we could prevent international firms trading here from making their normal trade arrangements in this State.

There is another unfortunate aspect of the Bill. I realise this is beyond the scope of the Bill though, as the member for Roe pointed out, it seems difficult to say just what is beyond the scope of the Bill. I have in mind the question of whether it gives any protection to private enterprise from socialistic competition, which might be considered by some people to be of an unfair nature.

When speaking on the Estimates, I mentioned the activities of the Rural & Industries Bank in certain respects. I do not know whether the Government thinks that that is a fair form of competition or not. If we accept the Government's postulation—which I do not—that it does not happen, I would like to know whether the Government would be prepared to consider agreeing to amendments that would prevent competition of an unfair nature from Government enterprises. I know this is a very broad question, but none the less I still feel it constitutes the biggest single threat to private enterprise, and it is a matter on which we should hear something from the Government. I must say that the Government's attitude, as indicated by its actions and the speeches of the Ministers, is peculiar, to say the least of it. I have never known of a case before where the Government has introduced a Message from the Governor for the purposes of a private member's Bill. This is rather unprecedented.

Hon. A. F. Watts: It is almost like conferring a knighthood on me.

Mr. HEARMAN: I do not know. Possibly the Leader of the Country Party might expect that, if it were not for the belief of the Government that honours of that nature should not be bestowed. The Government's attitude is extremely peculiar. We have a socialist Government which believes in socialism, but apparently it proposes to set up a commissioner for the protection of free enterprise. If that attitude is not peculiar, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. Brady: You do not know the Government's interpretation of socialism.

Mr. HEARMAN: Judging from the interjections made by the hon. member and others, I do not think the Government is very keen on free enterprise.

Hon. D. Brand: A lot of people in the Eastern States would like to know that, too.

Mr. Brady: It is in print if you would like to read it.

Mr. HEARMAN: I have read it, and that is why I think the attitude of the Government in seeking to appoint a commissioner for the protection of free enterprise is extremely interesting. Its platform indicates that it would do away with free enterprise to a great extent. The best description we can give of the Government's attitude in this matter is that it is Gilbertian. Most of us know something of the comic operas of Gilbert & Sullivan, and this rather puts me in mind of the song the people of Titipu sang when they came up against some difficulty as the result of a certain decree by the Mikado. The song went like this—

Our great Mikado, virtuous man,
When he to rule our land began,
Resolved to try
A plan whereby
Young men might best be steadied.

So he decreed, in words succinct,
That all who flirted, leered, or winked
(Unless connubially linked),
Should forthwith be beheaded.

This stern decree, you'll understand,
Caused great dismay throughout the land;
For young and old
And shy and bold
Were equally affected.

The youth who winked a roving eye,
Or breathed a non-connubial sigh,
Was thereupon condemned to die—
He usually objected.

And so we straight let out on bail
A convict from the county jail,
Whose head was next,
On some pretext,
Condemned to be mown off,
And made *him* Headsman, for we said,
"Who's next to be decapited
Cannot cut off another's head
Until he's cut his own off."

If anyone can discriminate between the sentiment expressed there and that expressed by the Government in appointing a commissioner for free enterprise, I will be extremely interested to hear him.

Mr. Court: It is a pity that those words cannot be incorporated in "Hansard" complete with Sullivan's music.

Mr. HEARMAN: Perhaps. I have not the knowledge of music that the hon. member has, but it seems to me that the most apt description of the Government's attitude on this Bill is to say that it is Gilbertian. That might be a kind way of putting it, of course, but I think it is a complete parallel.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It lacks only the tune.

Mr. Lapham: You lack the knowledge of socialism.

Mr. HEARMAN: It is interesting to hear the hon. member say that we lack a knowledge of socialism. It would be a good thing if the member for North Perth and others on that side of the House would explain to us how they can reconcile a commissioner for the protection of free enterprise with their socialistic platform. We have heard quite a bit about not knowing what socialism is, and so on, but a lot of us have been in politics for quite a while, and we have our ideas of what it is. We have listened to a lot of speeches from the Government side and from the hustings, and there must be something wrong with those speeches if we do not know what socialism is. If members on the Government side of the House really believe that free enterprise should be protected, and that it is preferable to a socialistic way of life, or that it is completely compatible with their policy, then let them get up and explain themselves.

Mr. O'Brien: I would like to hear the hon. member explain or say whether he will vote for the Retailing of Motor Spirits Bill.

Mr. HEARMAN: Now we have someone helping the member for Maylands. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I shall be quite happy to explain my vote on that measure, but the member for Murchison can see my predicament.

Hon. A. F. Watts: The Speaker shakes his head.

Mr. HEARMAN: I will be quite prepared to discuss it with the hon. member at any time. Before I get any more interjections, I had better sit down.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; Hon. A. F. Watts in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 17, page 2, the words "or services, to the detriment of the public or any section of the public," be inserted.

The Bill, as it stands, refers exclusively to goods, but it is considered that it should include services as well.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 19, page 2, the following words be inserted—
>
> > "or services, to the detriment of the public or any section of the public" and the following interpretation:—
> >
> > > "Commissioner" means the person appointed to the office of Commissioner for the Protection of Free Enterprise.

Point of Order.

Hon. A. F. Watts: On a point of order, Sir, I seek your ruling whether this amendment, which is a double-barrelled one, is in order. I refer more particularly to the proposed definition of "commissioner". The point is important at this stage because if the amendment is out of order, then a considerable portion of the subsequent amendments that the Minister has in mind cannot be moved for the reason that they either make reference to the commissioner or define his duties. It is, therefore, essential at this stage to determine whether the amendment to insert the definition of "commissioner" is in order. I submit it is not. I submit that the amendment, and the two related matters to which I have referred, are outside the scope of the Bill as introduced and read a second time. I also submit that the amendments are of such magnitude, when we take the consequential amendments into consideration, too, that they should be moved as a separate Bill. On these two grounds, or either one of them, I ask you, Sir, to rule this amendment out of order.

The Chairman: I rule that the objection raised by the member for Stirling is sound inasmuch as the latter part of the Minister's amendment is not within the scope of the Bill.

The Minister for Labour: Mr. Chairman, would I be in order in having the first part of the amendment put to the Committee, with the exclusion of the interpretation of "commissioner"?

The Chairman: Yes.

Committee Resumed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 19, page 2, the words "or services, to the detriment of the public or any section of the public" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. BRADY: Before we leave the point, I would like to draw members' attention to Standing Order No. 264. I might be out of order in raising the point, but I want to be clear about it. I have the impression that a member can move to insert another clause in a Bill provided that the

Title is altered in such a way as to include the provision. As I understand it, the Minister's idea is to include the interpretation of "commissioner" in order to make the Bill workable, and I think he would be in order. Therefore, I think it is the duty of the Chairman to rule that the Minister is in order. Standing Order No. 264 reads—

> No clause shall be inserted in any such draft foreign to the title of the Bill, and if any such clause be afterwards introduced, the title shall be altered accordingly.

I think the Minister's proposal should be inserted.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Move to disagree with the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that I have already ruled that the second part of the Minister's amendment is out of order because it does not lie within the scope of the Bill. There is no indication on the notice paper in regard to altering the Title of the measure and therefore if the hon. member does not agree with my ruling he will have to move to disagree with it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Go on!

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the clause stand as amended.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—This Act not to apply to certain associations:

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 36, page 2, the words "or services or the creating or maintaining a monopoly of any goods or services" be inserted.

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

Clause 6—Illegal undertakings and acts:

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "who" in line 2, page 3, the words "after the coming into operation of this Act" be inserted.

It was suggested, quite erroneously I think, during the early discussions on the Bill, that it was so worded that there was some prospect of retrospectivity. The provisions of the Criminal Code would prevent that because a man cannot be prosecuted for doing something which was not an offence at the time he did it. However, I am prepared to make it quite plain in the Bill rather than to have to rely upon other statutes.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I think that amendment will obviate the necessity for my moving two amendments, which appear on the notice paper, in regard to this clause.

Hon. A. F. Watts: It does.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 9, page 3, the words ", or the supply or engagement of any service" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That before the word "for" in line 13, page 3, the words "or to supply to or engage from any other person, any service" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 20, page 3, the words "or services" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "goods" in line 26, page 3, the words "or services" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I move—

> That the following proviso be added:—
>
> > Provided that it shall be a defence to a proceeding for an offence under this section, if the party alleged to have contravened this section proves that the matter or thing alleged to have been done in contravention of this section was not to the detriment of the public.

It is quite unnecessary to enlarge on the reasons for the proviso at this stage.

Mr. HEARMAN: This is the proposed amendment to which I referred briefly a few minutes ago. I want to know what the effect of this proviso will be in the circumstances I cited. There are some growers who like to pack their fruit in their own sheds and there are others who prefer to pack it in sheds owned by the exporting firms. When cases are in short supply, those growers who wish to pack their own fruit have difficulty in obtaining cases, while others who pack in sheds belonging to firms, seem to have no trouble. It is a knotty problem.

I am not going to attempt to suggest what might happen. If the proviso is agreed to, I think there will be litigation. It is a fact that preference is shown by

supplying cases to the sheds, while other growers are unable to obtain them. This seems to be a problem that could be solved by proper methods of distribution. The decision is in the lap of the gods. It might ultimately rest with the local magistrate or whoever hears the case. I would like to know where I stand in regard to this proviso.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: The hon. member need have no fear about the proviso because, with the new clause I propose to move, I anticipate that no prosecution would be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General, or a person authorised in writing by him. In that circumstance, dealing with the particular case the hon. member mentioned, there would not be the slightest chance of the Attorney General or any other person authorising a prosecution.

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

Clause 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Penalties:

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "liable" in line 34, page 3, the words "without prejudice to any other provision of this Act," be inserted.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I am going to oppose this amendment with all the vigour at my command. If it is inserted in the measure, it will mean that we are accepting some of the principles involved in the Minister's major amendments further on. It is quite clear from your preliminary ruling, Sir, that a lot of those amendments will be ruled out. In fact, I would say they are ruled out now because they cannot be gone on with as they make reference to the commissioner who is not defined. There are other amendments not, in my opinion, likely to be included in that category and they might, we will assume, slip into the measure. I will not have a bar of them.

The amendment presumes that some of them are going into the Act because it provides that the penalties I propose shall be inflicted, but without prejudice to any other provisions of this Act. There are some provisions which, if the amendment were carried, would be in the Act and which are entirely distasteful to me by way of penalties. I am sure they would be equally distasteful to a majority of members of this Committee, and also to a majority of the people of the country. I will not make the slightest concession to their inclusion in the measure. I oppose this amendment for all I am worth.

Amendment put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Because of your ruling Mr. Chairman, it will not be competent for me to move a number of amendments that are now on the notice paper. With your permission, Sir, I move an amendment—

> That on page 4 the following be inserted to stand as Subclause (4):—
>
> > Where any person is convicted of an offence against this Act, the court convicting him may, in addition to any punishment provided for the offence, require him to enter into recognizances, with or without sureties, that he will commit no further offence against this Act.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: There may be little or no objection to the amendment although it is unusual for it to be inserted in a measure of this nature, because, as I understand the situation, the court is already entitled to take such action. Almost every day we hear of bonds and recognizances being entered into in connection with first offences, by order of the magistrate. They are not related to first offences if the magistrate or judge deems that to be the proper course. It is the law of the country now and I do not see why it should be put in the Act. I oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	22
A tie	0

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Heal	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Brand	Mr. North
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Manning	Mr. Wild
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Yates
Mr. Nalder	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the ayes.

Amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1. University Medical School, Teaching Hospitals.
2. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment.

Without amendment.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th October.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [10.14]: This Bill has been introduced with the object of giving the Licensing Court the power to grant a liquor licence for the Perth Airport. It appears to be a very simple measure. I have made inquiries among the people in my electorate who are in close proximity to the airport, and among those engaged in the selling of liquor, but I did not find any opposition against the measure, that is, as far as the principal hotel is concerned. As the Bill provides that liquor cannot be sold or taken away in bottles, the business of a gallon licensee would not be affected.

Other inquiries were made from the civilian viewpoint. Many of the people I discussed this Bill with are not favourable regarding it. Whilst on the surface it appears to be reasonable, on analysis it is seen that there is not a great deal of justification for granting a licence at the airport because the facilities are to be provided for the benefit of oversea air passengers. It is well known that they can get liquor on the aircraft before landing, and if they partake of meals at the airport they can obtain wine with them. Many oversea air passengers are accustomed to drinking wine with their meals and they can do this at Perth Airport.

There is no doubt that if the facilities are granted it will be very hard to police them. The Bill provides that visitors or friends in company of air passengers can avail themselves of the facilities, and the airport officials can do likewise. In discussion with many people, they informed me that they were not favourably disposed towards the idea of passengers being able to get liquor before they board an aircraft. Some people with liquor in them become a nuisance on an aircraft. I am informed that the personnel at the airport are not favourably disposed towards this proposition. At present, after work they go to the nearest hotel, the Ascot Inn.

Another objection was that this would be the thin edge of the wedge to establish a hotel in that locality to provide additional entertainment. While the Bill ostensibly proposes to provide facilities for the benefit of aircraft passengers and a few other people, it is considered by some people to be a means of obtaining further entertainment. I do not know if these words were put in for a purpose or not, but they are in a salient clause. They are, "the granting of a licence to the applicant is necessary or desirable for the refreshment, entertainment and convenience of aircraft passengers and of persons utilising or visiting the airport." It is contended by some people in the vicinity of the airport that this clause could be extended to provide entertainment totally outside the purpose mentioned in this Bill.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Those people are defined in the Bill.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: If it were confined to overseas passengers and the persons mentioned in the Bill, it would be very difficult to police and would be liable to extend to proportions beyond what appears on the surface. It is true that at airports in other parts of the world such licences exist, but I understand that there is a big difference between the alcoholic content of liquor sold in England and on the Continent and that sold here. There are times when some of our own countrymen get a few drinks in and can be very annoying to other people, and this annoyance would apply particularly to those in charge of aircraft.

Why have not such licences been established in other parts of Australia, especially New South Wales, where more aircraft would be using the airport? Sydney is the terminal for overseas aircraft.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There is not the same necessity for licensed premises at a terminal airport.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: It is a large airport, and there are no licensed premises there or at other Australian airports. Of course, that is no reason why we should not be the first to introduce the innovation, but it would be interesting to know why licences have not been granted at other airports, particularly at the big airport in New South Wales.

I understand that aircraft passengers have refreshments in the form of wine supplied to them. The member for Toodyay should be interested in what I am told is a fact that instead of our wine being supplied, most of it is Penfold's or wine produced outside the State. I have been informed that plenty of wine is available to passengers when they have their meals, so they are not altogether denied such refreshment as the hon. member seemed to imply. The only difference would be that if we had licensed premises at the airport, beer would be available.

A period of time, 30 minutes before the arrival of an aircraft, is specified in the Bill. If this proposal is for the benefit of air passengers only, as the hon. member seemed to convey, why should the bar be open half an hour before the arrival of the aircraft? If the hon. member had restricted the time to the actual arrival of the aircraft, there would have been greater justification for his proposal.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is consistent with the provision for railway refreshment rooms.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I cannot see that there is any analogy between the two because the Bill deals specifically with aircraft passengers from overseas. Seeing that they can obtain liquor on the aircraft before landing and with their meals, the licensed

premises could be open for the benefit of those at the airport and not necessarily for the overseas passengers. There may be some merit in the proposal, but I think that if a licence is to be granted, it should be for the benefit of all passengers using aircraft and should not be confined to overseas passengers. I cannot see that there is any real justification for the measure and so I shall not support the second reading.

MR. WILD (Dale) [10.26]: I am very pleased that the member for Cottesloe introduced the Bill because it is about time we in Western Australia realised that visitors to this State can be of very great benefit. When it comes to the facilities provided for them, we are absolutely archaic. The member for Middle Swan has recently returned from a trip overseas, and I was astonished to hear his opposition to this proposal. It represents one of the small ways in which we can show visitors that we are prepared to provide a service for them.

Surely we must rely upon the good sense of our people not to do some of the things that the hon. member envisaged! He implied that owing to the alcoholic content of our beer being higher than that in England, we shall have passengers boarding aircraft while under the influence of liquor. Many members of this House have travelled by air to and from the Eastern States as much as I have, and I wonder how many passengers they have seen boarding an aircraft in the condition suggested by the hon. member.

Liquor is available to people in the hotels, and they can go straight from the hotels to the airport and board the plane. I can say that I have not anywhere seen an air passenger under the influence of liquor. The main point to be considered is whether we are prepared to do everything possible for the people who are coming to our State, even if it is to stay for a matter of a few hours only. Wherever one may go in England or on the Continent, one finds that the tourist is a person who is well looked after.

I think the member for Middle Swan visited some of the places where I have been. When one leaves England for France by boat, what is the last thing seen on leaving and the first thing seen on arriving at the other side? They do not have licences; anyone is permitted to sell liquor, and right on the quays on both sides, one sees small places where this type of entertainment is available. Therefore I think it would be a retrograde step if, while desirous of encouraging tourists to come to this State, we decided to deny them an opportunity of having, if they so desire, a quiet drink with their fellow-passengers about to go on to the East, to South Africa, or elsewhere, or having a drink with their business confreres who have gone to the airport to see them on their way through.

This is a commendable step by the member for Cottesloe. We should give a lot more attention to the tourist trade in this State than we do. With all respect to our Tourist Bureau, I think we are sadly lacking in what we are prepared to do for the people who come to Western Australia. Many countries are entirely dependent upon their tourist traffic. It behoves us to do what we possibly can for the people who come to this State because when they come here they bring money and that, in turn, means that they are providing work for our people, which is something that we need. So we should do everything we can to see that their stay in Western Australia is made as pleasant as possible.

I am prepared to discount entirely the suggestion that because we have a licence to operate for half an hour before the plane arrives, and for six hours while it is here, and up to half an hour after it leaves, there will be any difference in the condition of the passengers, or the people who go out there to see the passengers. So I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill and I hope the House will be reasonable in respect to it. Let us not be persuaded by any interests that may think that another little bit of liquor is no good. The paramount question we have to decide is: Are we going to try to bring our practice into line with what applies in practically every other country in the world.

Mr. SEWELL: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	22
A tie	0

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Styants
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lapham	Mr. May
	(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Bovell	Mr. North
Mr. Brand	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Manning	Mr. Wild
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Yates
Mr. Nalder	Mr. Cornell
	(Teller.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my vote with the ayes, and declare the motion carried.

Motion thus passed.

House adjourned at 10.36 p.m.