metropolitan area. But now it is necessary to wait a couple of generations until the forests grow again.

On the farming properties with timber growing on them, the farmers, if they can make a few hundred or a few thousand pounds from royalties, are not much concerned about the timber position in 50 years' time; but our natural heritage has been sacrificed for them. Bit by bit it will disappear and that will be the end of it.

Mr. Court: But when they sell that timber they are relieving the State forests of something.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: That is so, but when it is gone it is gone for ever.

Mr. Court: But that is part of your forestry plan.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: No, the plan is for perpetual forests on a rotational basis.

Mr. Court: That is for your State forests, but as you cut these private lands, two things are achieved—one, you save the demand on the State forests; and two, these lands come into agricultural production.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Yes. We are making the best of a bad job; but it is criminal that the land was ever permitted to be used for other than forestry purposes because sooner or later it will be entirely lost to forestry; and there are other areas which are eminently suitable for the various forms of agriculture. It is obvious that so much farming land is being retained in its timbered condition that it is a better timber proposition than a farming proposition.

Mr. Court: Not necessarily. There are other reasons why a farmer keeps some of his land timbered.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Yes, a little for protection and for firewood, fencing and a few things like that, but that is not what I am discussing.

Mr. Court: He often has to bide his time for capital to develop the property.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Over a period of from 50 to 100 years?

Mr. Court: They are exceptional cases.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: No, they are not. Because of this discussion, I will approach the Forests Department to see whether we can get some fair samples in order to show the hon. member what I mean.

Mr. Roberts: When you mentioned about transposing privately owned areas, in the forest areas, from an aerial photograph you will not be able to tell the areas of bushland that have been developed for pasture purposes. A lot of undergrowth has been cleared from beneath the trees.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: It is obvious the member for Bunbury has never seen an aerial photograph. It is almost possible to count the number of leaves on a tree.

Mr. Roberts: You will not see the pasture land underneath the trees.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Yes, without any difficulty.

Mr. Wild: Will the Minister have a look at the proposition I put up to him about gravel in the Armadale district, because the remarks he made tonight, I am sure, do not apply to that district. There is other gravel there which is of a very low grade.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: An undertaking was given by the Conservator of Forests, although it is not his job, to indicate many places where gravel could be obtained; and he has done that very thing for quite a number of local authorities.

Mr. Wild: If you get him to point out—

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Would the hon. member make his approaches other than during this debate?

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Forests, £347,409—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 22nd October, 1957.

CONTENTS.

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

QUESTION.

RAILWAYS.

Details of Revenue, etc., Fremantle-Kalgoorlie and Eastern States.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) What would be the income and expenditure in respect of railway operation from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie on each of the following sections for the years ended the 30th June, 1955, 1956, 1957—

(a) Section Fremantle to Northam;

(b) Section Northam to Merredin;

(c) Section Merredin to Kalgoorlie?

(2) What proportion of total railway traffic passes between Western Australia and the Eastern States?

The MINISTER replied:

	1954–55.	1955–56.	1956–57.
	£	£	£
(1) Fremantle - Northam (suburban excepted) :			
Earnings	2,388,514	2,385,553	2,695,147
Expenditure	1,899,797	2,034,693	2,385,780
East Northam-Merredin :			
Earnings	927,765	989,333	1,097,899
Expenditure	867,611	1,002,285	1,093,678
Merredin - Kambalie (Merredin excluded) :			
Earnings	1,146,266	1,265,685	1,238,017
Expenditure	1,414,901	1,655,071	1,839,843
(2) Journeys	·49%	·45%	·39%
Tonnage	1·40%	1·77%	1·91%

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Bush Fires Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

2, Marketing of Potatoes Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILLS (2)—REPORT.

1, Chiropodists.

2, Local Government.

Adopted.

BILL—CHURCH OF ENGLAND SCHOOL LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Minister for Railways in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Section 5 repealed and re-enacted with amendments.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I move an amendment—

That the word "moneys" in line 30, page 2, be struck out and the words "proceeds, moneys, rents, issues and profits" inserted in lieu.

It was promised in another place that this amendment would be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by the Minister for Railways, clause further consequentially amended by—

Striking out the word "moneys" in line 32, page 2, and inserting the words "proceeds, moneys, rents, issues, profits and interest" in lieu;

striking out the word "moneys" in line 10, page 6, and inserting the words "proceeds, moneys, rents, issues, profits and interest" in lieu;

striking out the word "moneys" in line 14, page 6, and inserting the words "proceeds, moneys, rents, issues, profits and interest" in lieu.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ROMAN CATHOLIC VICARIATE OF THE KIMBERLEYS PROPERTY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [4.45]: My object in securing the adjournment of the debate was simply to give members an opportunity to look at this Bill in case any of them might wish to comment on it. The measure seems to be perfectly straight-forward, its purpose being to deal with the administration of the property belonging to the Roman Catholic church. I have no objection to the Bill and support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £18,000,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North—in reply) [4.49]: There were some queries raised by Mr. Simpson and Dr. Hislop and I shall deal with them now. Mr. Simpson criticised the Government, stating that expenditure in the metropolitan area was being undertaken at the expense of the country areas.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Are you replying to the debate?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes.

Hon. L. A. Logan: I secured the adjournment of the debate, Mr. President, and I did not hear you call the Order of the Day.

The PRESIDENT: I called Order of the Day No. 7 and the Minister rose in reply.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Perhaps when we are considering Clause 2 Mr. Logan could make any remarks he wishes to make. Mr. Simpson asserted that the Government was spending far too much money in the metropolitan area, to the detriment of country districts. That statement should not be allowed to pass unchallenged, because the Government has never neglected the country areas, and I propose to read some figures of expenditure on various items that will illustrate that the policy of the Government is to distribute its expenditure as evenly as possible, and to see that country areas get their fair share.

In 1956-57, the amount of money received for petrol tax funds was £6,031,987. Of that sum, £5,265,813, or 87.8 per cent., was spent on country roads.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You could not help it. The Federal Act provided for that.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There has been criticism in connection with the Narrows bridge.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You carried out the requirements of the Act.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No; more than was laid down under the Act.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You cannot spend it in the metropolitan area.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I propose to show that although the Act does provide for percentages to be spent in certain areas, that percentage has been exceeded in country areas, so far as main roads funds are concerned, and that the city has not received the proportion which it could fairly claim under the Act. However, it has not suffered in that respect, because there are other funds available for city roads. Of the amount collected, £5,265,813 was spent on country roads and £732,320, or only 12.2 per cent. was spent in the metropolitan area. Of that amount, £427,310 was spent on the Narrows bridge works.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: How much?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The amount was £427,310 from the 1956-57 main roads petrol moneys. Of the 1957-58 petrol tax payments, £432,000 will be allocated to the Narrows bridge and £31,000 to the duplication of Canning bridge. In 1956-57, £108,786 has been spent on the Albany harbour, and £33,000 has been allocated this year for the completion of No. 2 berth. Last year, £50,000 was spent on Geraldton harbour in providing a special fendering system. Provision has been made this year for £9,000 to be spent on removal of a viaduct and breakwater repairs at Geraldton, and £12,500 for the completion of fishing boat berth, etc. An amount of £83,000 has been set aside this year for jetty improvements and dredging at Bunbury, and £82,000 is being provided for additions and improvements to North-West jetties.

The expenditure on the comprehensive water supply scheme—including Commonwealth subsidy—was £1,033,138 in 1956-57, and the expenditure proposed for this year is £1,120,000. The 1956-57 expenditure on Goldfields water supply was £305,993, and in 1957-58 it will be £380,500. The amount spent on buildings was £107,172 and £138,302 on engineering during 1956-57 in the North-West district. The Kimberleys were also allocated £300,000 for this purpose in 1957-58. Last year, £383,325 was spent on country water supplies and £235,432 on country drainage and irrigation. Of this last amount, £167,511 was spent on Wellington Dam and £258,000 will be used this year on raising the dam. During 1957-58, £355,000 will be spent on the Cunderdin-Minnivale main, and £468,000 on the Narrogin-Katanning main.

Other water supply expenditure includes £58,000 on the Yorkrakine spur and £62,000 on a main southward from Merredin to the West Narembeen tank, £20,000 at Kwolyin, and £18,000 on the South Doodlakine and South Tammin extensions. An amount of £318,500 has been provided for enlargements, renovations and improvements etc., to the Goldfields water supply. The amount of £237,000 has been set aside for country towns water supplies, the main expenditure being Lake Grace £50,000; Albany £37,000 and Geraldton £33,000. An amount of £60,000 will be spent on the Collie main channel enlargement.

The State Electricity Commission has spent enormous sums of money in country areas. The first unit of the Bunbury power station has been brought into operation and the construction of the next two 30,000 kilowatt sets is proceeding satisfactorily. A considerable amount of railway loan fund expenditure is in country areas. We know that there are very large sums of railway expenditure in country areas, particularly on track rehabilitation. There are many other examples which could be quoted.

If time allowed and figures could be thoroughly examined, it would be found that the assertion of Mr. Simpson is not correct and that the expenditure in the city has not been to the detriment of country areas. Mr. Simpson also wanted to know how the amount of £7,000,000 deficit in railway finances might be brought about in this financial year. It is estimated that on top of depreciation, amounting to more than £1¼ million and interest approaching £2,250,000, the balance of the amount will be made up of the difference between revenue and operating expenses.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Are not interest and depreciation higher than in previous years?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, according to the amount of loan funds expended and the value of the new plant to be put into operation. I would expect them to be somewhat higher this year. The exact amounts have not yet been checked, but for the 12 months ended June, 1957, the depreciation came to £1,335,457 and the interest bill was £2,116,719. So, as the hon. member said, these amounts will be higher in the current financial year because the loan funds have been increased by some £4,000,000 and a lot of new plant has been brought into use, and this will necessarily raise the depreciation account. The balance will be the difference between revenue and operating expenditure. Members will appreciate this point because the railways are operating on 1953 freights but with 1957 costs. The gap, therefore, is somewhat large.

Members will recall that Dr. Hislop sought some information in connection with the north switch road from the Narrows bridge. It will be remembered that he raised the same matter in his address in September, 1956, and it was then pointed out in reply that the development of the switch road across the city, connecting the Narrows with the proposed Yanchep highway and the north-western suburbs would be the second stage of development after the bridge over the Narrows was built. In the first stage it is expected to intercept a large proportion of the city-bound traffic from the Narrows and Mounts Bay-rd. in the large parking area to be provided on the foreshore reclamation.

With a view to ascertaining the probable traffic demand on the western switch road and obtaining figures for its rate of growth, the Main Roads Department has this year undertaken a continuous traffic count on the Canning Highway and an origin and destination survey for the city, the results of which are now being analysed. The results of this analysis will indicate the degree of urgency for the construction of the switch road. The hon. member has been misinformed as to a revised alignment of the switch road. The plans now being prepared in the Main Roads Department still adhere substantially to the alignment recommended in the Stephenson plan along the line of George-st.

Again, Dr. Hislop was informed in September, 1956, that when considering the alternatives of the George-st. and Milligan-st. alignments for the western switch road, it was necessary to be clear as to the functions of this road. The switch road is part of an inner ring or girdle road comprising Riverside Drive, the switch road and an improved Roe-st.; and its function is to permit traffic to flow freely around the city centre without having to pass through the more congested streets of the centre.

Thus it must be provided with adequate entry and exit points, properly designed as to traffic capacity, but not so many that the free flow of traffic is too much impeded. It must also bound the commercial and business centre of the city on the west and must connect readily with the proposed Yanchep highway and the north-western suburbs. For these reasons the proposed Milligan-st. line is not satisfactory.

Traffic studies have been made in respect to peak hour movement generated between the city centre and the various suburbs, and these will be amplified when the origin and destination analysis is completed. The preliminary figures obtained show very clearly that the western switch road cannot be taken across the city without grade separations; and once this requirement is accepted, it is clear that the Milligan-st. line will require resumptions at least as costly as those on the George-st. line, to say nothing of the increased construction costs due to the greater length of the Yanchep highway.

The further point should be made that because of the ground levels, satisfactory grade separation for a highway on the Milligan-st. line can be obtained only by provision of much steeper grades between Hay-st. and Murray-st. than are acceptable for a major road of this type. In short, comprehensive consideration has been given already to the alternative Milligan-st. line, and it has been considered much less satisfactory than the proposed George-st. line.

The Government has not changed its mind in regard to the provision of the western switch road and a route to the north-western suburbs. As indicated, it has proceeded further with traffic engineering surveys directed toward an economic design and a programming of the project. A great deal of preliminary work has also been done on the drawing board in respect of the geometric design of the structures required.

Before the scheme can be implemented, it is necessary to obtain the City Council's concurrence and agreement as to its responsibility and financial share in the project. In the technical stages of planning, there is co-operation between officers of the City Council and of the Main Roads Department. I think what I have said will answer the query that the hon. member raised.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [5.10]: As one who supported the measure in the first place, I feel it incumbent on me to say something on this Bill, which seeks to take away the time limit and make the legislation permanent. When the Bill was first introduced, I expressed the opinion that upon the personnel of the board would depend the success of starting-price bookmaking operations. Up to the present I have had no cause to change my opinion, and I still believe that the functions of the board are principally concerned with ensuring that starting-price bookmaking is a success.

We have been told that all is not well, and that certain things are happening within the board or among the bookmakers themselves. I do not intend to make that same accusation, because I have not any knowledge that such is the position. The suggestion has also been made that about four operators control starting-price bookmaking. In this connection I would say that probably four operators control the greatest amount of money; but because they control the finance, it does not necessarily mean that other people are dummying for them. It must be remembered that small operators outback, who are not financial enough to carry all the burden themselves, naturally lay off with another bookmaker.

So we have the position that a bookmaker who operates, perhaps, in one of our larger country towns, will ring up another bookmaker in the town and lay off with him. If the second bookmaker thinks it looks red hot, and he cannot carry it, he will lay the bet off with one of the larger operators in the city. This sort of thing went on before starting-price bookmaking was made legal.

In Geraldton we used to have something like 20 touts or operators around the back alleyways. Sometimes they took a risk themselves—not very often—and that was when the poor old punter, if he had a win, got caught, because the fellow could not pay him. But as there was nothing legal about the transaction he could not collect. In turn, the majority of these s.p. operators used to pay whatever they collected into the pocket of the larger operators in the town; and those fellows, if they did not have sufficient finance to carry the baby, laid off with the bigger man in the city.

That is the reason why the business came back to the four big operators here; and I think that will continue to happen until such time as the operators in both the country towns and the city build up sufficient reserves to carry their own risks. If they do that they will be able—but not altogether—to keep away from the big men.

To me it seems unfortunate that the smaller men in the country have for the purpose of getting information, to lay off to a certain extent with the operators in the city. Unless they do pass a certain amount of business through to the big operators, the information which they require for the conduct of their businesses is not forthcoming.

I know one operator who, for 12 months, kept laying off with a city bookmaker; and he found that he was not getting anywhere. He decided, therefore, to take a risk and to carry all the money that was laid with him. He finished up well and truly in front; but had he had a bad run at that time he could have finished up on the wrong side of the ledger.

Dr. Hislop said that he is satisfied that gambling is inherent not only in Australians but also in many other people of the world. I do not think many people realise just how much gambling goes on throughout this State, let alone the rest of Australia. If one likes to snoop around different places and different organisations one will realise, the same as I have done, that the amount of betting carried on in Western Australia is colossal.

It occurs throughout all walks of life, among all types, and with many different forms of gambling. So by bringing s.p. bookmaking into the open I think we have done a good job. In saying that, I do not want it to be thought that I am wholeheartedly behind s.p. bookmaking. I believe—and I said this at the time the legislation was introduced—that other than telephone betting, we could stop all forms of s.p. bookmaking.

I know it has been said that that is impossible. But had the Government of the day, or any Government, been willing to tackle the problem; and had it been willing to gaol the scouts and touts—those who were taking the burden off the shoulders of the big shots who were working behind doors and who were not game to come out in the open—it would not have been long before we would have forced the big operators to accept the risks themselves. By that means, they would have had to take the risk of going behind bars or going out of existence.

However, the difficulty is in regard to telephone betting. Because the postal department comes under the control of the Commonwealth Government, the Government of Western Australia has no control over it; and I would say that at least 50 per cent. of the s.p. betting carried on

today is done per medium of the telephone. Of course, the difficulty is how to control it.

There is one aspect of s.p. betting about which I am not very happy; and I refer to the functions of Tates Press. This organisation has the blessing of the board, and it is the source of information in regard to starting prices for all races; its information is disseminated throughout all the bookmakers in Western Australia. However, the small man has to pay the same price as the big man for this information; and in my opinion, that is wrong. Even the smallest bookmaker cannot get his information from any source other than through Tates Press; and for that service he has to pay at least £28 to £30 per month.

Hon. H. K. Watson: What was the position before the Act came into operation?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Tates Press operated then; that organisation has always disseminated the information throughout Western Australia. However, I do not know what the bookmakers paid for the information in those days. Today it costs the small bookmaker £28 to £30 a month. Not long ago three or four of the smaller bookmakers bucked about this proposition and refused to pay £7 or £8 a week for the information which they were getting, and they obtained it from other bookmakers in their area, who, in their turn, were obtaining it from Tates. But the three or four men involved almost lost their licences; so it looks as though the organisation is a pretty strong one.

I had to go to the three bookmakers concerned and warn them that if they were found giving this information to the other bookmakers in their area they would run the risk of losing their licences also. I did not ask which bookmaker was giving information, because I thought that was wrong; but I warned them what was likely to happen. I do not know who owns or controls the organisation. But it is certainly a big business; and in my opinion, its charges, for the information given, are rather high.

It was suggested in an editorial in this morning's issue of "The West Australian" that the amount of tax paid by bookmakers is not sufficient. The writer, in his wisdom, contended that the s.p. bookmakers should pay 13½ per cent., the same as is paid by the totalisator people. If one analyses that statement one realises just how ridiculous it is.

The Minister for Railways: Totalisator people do not have to pay any rent.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It was a silly statement coming from a leader writer of the leading paper in Western Australia. How could these people pay 13½ per cent. on their gross revenue before they even started to pay tax? These bookmakers are running businesses; and to say that they could pay 13½ per cent. on their gross turnover is just too silly. These newspaper people ought to be realistic about things.

We have all read reports regarding the totalisator system. Mr. Stratton made a report in regard to it; and there was one remark I would like to mention. He said that if people want to bet, they should go to the courses to do it. How does he expect anybody outside a radius of 20 miles from the course, to be able to go to the course to bet? Then in the next breath he says that totalisators should be installed. He cannot expect people to go to the course to do their betting if totalisators are built outside the course. I am afraid the thinking of people like that is rather strange. He also said in his report that the prospect of s.p. betting carrying on was not very bright.

I also noticed, in the report of a Victorian committee, that the same thing was said. The statement was—

> The survival there seems doubtful.

I would like to know on whose authority that statement was made. That was information given to the Government, and it seemed to me that the writer was treading on rather dangerous ground. People saying such things should give further consideration to their statements.

Recently, when I was in South Australia, I was the guest of a local race club, and one of the committee men lectured me about the evils of s.p. bookmaking. He tried to tell me that it would not last. But the fact that it failed in South Australia is no reason why it should fail here. Had that South Australian committeeman seen the conditions that obtained in this State prior to the passing of this Act, I think he would have agreed that the only thing to do was to take the action that we took in an endeavour to clean up some of the anomalies that existed. I will go so far as to say that in Geraldton conditions are 100 per cent. better than they were before.

Hon. G. E. Jeffery: They are 1,000 per cent. better.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They are 100 per cent. better; and we have to keep things that way. I told the bookmakers themselves, at the luncheon to which I was invited, that the position rested with them; and it was up to them if they wanted bookmaking to remain legal. The responsibility is theirs to do the job properly.

At the same time, the Betting Control Board also has a responsibility. Immediately the board starts any shenanigan individual bookmakers are inclined to try to do the same thing. I only hope that the board will continue to hold the same strong views it has had up to now.

One or two suggestions have been made that the position is not all that it might be. I will go so far as to say that there

are one or two things about which I am not satisfied. I will not go into any detail because I do not know the facts; but I give a warning to the board, and to the s.p. bookmakers, that if they do not keep the game clean they will not get my vote to continue the legislation after a certain period.

In Committee I intend to support an amendment which will have the effect of bringing this legislation before Parliament at a future date. That will be a warning to the board, and to the s.p. bookmakers, that if they do not keep the game clean the matter of legalised bookmaking can be brought up for discussion. With those remarks I support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North—in reply) [5.28]: I think Mr. Logan's remarks were very pertinent, and they certainly covered the situation as it exists today. I agree with very much of what he said. Mr. Murray, in his speech, referred to my statement that the operations of the Act had been most successful; and that there was not the slightest doubt that from all angles a continuance of the legislation will mean betting will be kept under the strictest vigilance and control.

He said that my statement was not in accordance with his views. However, when I said that everybody appeared to be satisfied, I had not heard the opinion of the hon. member; and I shall now qualify the statement by saying that at least Mr. Murray, and "The West Australian," are two who do not agree with it. The hon. member raised considerable doubt about the correctness of the statement, but gave no reason for his doubt.

As everyone knows, one of the prime reasons for creating the Betting Control Act was to eliminate the unsavoury system of illegal street and shop betting which was increasing over the years, and which was carried on in shops, hotels, streets, lanes, parks, etc., with little or no restraint regarding young persons, or those in a drunken condition. No one can truthfully say that betting control has not practically eliminated that disgraceful state of affairs.

With regard to prosecutions it is not to be wondered at that in the first year of betting control, following years of uncontrolled betting, a comparatively large number of persons who were forbidden by the Act to bet or enter betting premises would endeavour to do so. It is just as logical to conclude that later, when control was properly established, there would be a lesser number of persons attempting to breach the Act.

It is to the credit of the licensed bookmakers themselves, as well as the vigilance of the police and the control exercised by the board that the provisions of the Act have been so well adhered to. It is very much to the advantage of bookmakers that they conduct their premises as they are required to do.

Through his inspection of various premises Mr. Murray doubted the genuineness of the reduction in the number of offences. Which premises has he visited and what was the nature of the offences he allegedly saw committed? He did not assist the administration by bringing such matters to their notice, which he could have done confidentially.

It is a practical impossibility for the police to see every breach of the Betting Control Act that is committed, any more than they can be present to see every breach of the Traffic Act or the Licensing Act or the Criminal Code or any other Act. Mr. Murray acknowledged that the bookmakers co-operated in policing the Act in the early period of the Act's history.

He went on to make the astounding statement that because the number of prosecutions were considerably lowered in the second year of operations—undoubtedly because of the successful control and conduct of betting premises—this was due to those who are entrusted with the control of prosecutions having developed a feeling that conditions are much the same as when illegal betting was rife in the State and thereby were not interested.

How can it reasonably be alleged that conditions are the same as formerly? Obviously they are not; and, again, what grounds are there for saying that those in authority are not interested? Mr. Murray has merely expressed his opinion, but he has not given any reasons to support it. I suggest that the facts prove the contrary.

It is not surprising to find the greater number of prosecutions are of juveniles or under-age persons. Before the Act, betting in premises, and obstruction of traffic in thoroughfares aggravated by betting were the offences committed. Under the Act, betting is lawful, but certain classes of persons are prohibited from entering betting premises. The largest class of these consists of under-age persons. Obviously a proportion of that class who were used to betting previously would endeavour to continue even when the Act forbade them, until it became obvious that it would not pay to pursue their attempts. Hence the proportionately large number of charges against juveniles in the first year compared with the second year.

The assertion of Mr. Murray that where the juvenile remains on premises or bets on premises, the bookmaker is equally liable to prosecution, could easily be misconstrued. In some cases they could be

equally liable, but in possibly the majority of cases the bookmaker would not be liable.

A person under 21 commits an offence if he bets or tries to obtain a bet in registered premises. A bookmaker, however, commits an offence if he knowingly bets with a person apparently under 21 years of age, or permits a person under 21 years to enter his premises. In the first case, the only qualification is that the person is in fact under 21 years. If in such a case the person was so obviously under age the bookmaker or his employee would be equally liable in so far as he could not plead that the lad appeared to be 21 years of age.

In cases where it would be difficult to decide whether a person was under or over 21—and there are many from 18 to 21 who by reason of their physique and the nature of their employment, especially if dressed in working clothes, are in that category—a bookmaker or his employees would not be liable. The law is reasonable in that regard. The youth who looks 21 years of age, but is not, knows that he is committing an offence in such circumstances; whereas the bookmaker or his employee—perhaps in well-patronised premises and during a busy period—has to guess whether a particular person is under or over 21 years. Similar provisions are contained in the Licensing Act, but a licensee or his servant is not prosecuted on every occasion when a person who is under 21 is supplied with liquor; only, in fact, when the latter is apparently under 21 years of age.

It was explained by Mr. Murray how police obtain prosecutions. He is emphatic that it is not the result of police visits to betting premises. In that regard, he can just as emphatically be disagreed with, in most cases. In the metropolitan area the plainclothes police frequently visit betting premises and in the country such duty is carried out by uniformed police.

It is obvious again that some offences are committed when the police are not in the vicinity, for they cannot always be watching betting premises. At such times, if juveniles enter betting premises and attempt to make bets and they are discovered by the vigilance of the bookmaker, it is to the bookmaker's credit that he co-operates with the police and assists in maintaining the law.

Is he not also justified in disclosing an offence committed by another person on his premises, rather than allow it to continue and take the risk of being charged with being a party to the same offence, especially when, as well as being subject to a monetary penalty, he may place his licence in jeopardy? The board has power under Regulation 58 to suspend or cancel a licence if the conduct thereof justifies that course being taken.

It was further stated by Mr. Murray—

> It is well known that the majority of prosecutions against juveniles resulted from information given by bookmakers to the police.

He did not state by whom it is well known.

But although the reference to police and bookmakers appears to be made in a spirit of reflection on them, the hon. member pointed out that, "That was not so bad." What was bad, he said, was that a youth had a winning bet in registered betting premises and before he had time to collect his winnings, the police were informed. It was not the bookmaker who had accepted the bet and who had informed the police who was charged, but the youth in question.

If there is any fault to find in that statement it is with the police failing in their duty by not prosecuting the bookmaker as well as the youth. However, if the youth was not apparently under 21 years of age and the bookmaker did not knowingly bet with an under-aged person, then the bookmaker did not commit an offence and the police were not remiss in their duty.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Did the youth go to the police station at Roe-st. to report the fact that he had committed the offence?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have not got the details. The hon. member proceeded to say—

> When he was convicted of the charge his solicitor endeavoured to get a refund of the stake; but because there is no provision in the Act for that to be done and because the bet was illegal, the court did not order the refund of the stake. The money was not handed over to the Crown; it remained in the bookmaker's pocket.

If this is a factual case, the solicitor for the defendent did not sufficiently pursue his client's interests. Even without the authority of the court, had he quoted in court, or acted independently under, Regulation 113 there would not have been any complaint. The regulation states—

> No bookmaker shall refuse or neglect to repay to the bettor immediately on demand any money received by the bookmaker in connection with any bet which is made contrary to the Act or regulations.

There was, in fact, no cause for complaint. The solicitor was at fault; not the law.

The hon. member wound up his reference to juveniles by stating—

> These are the types of thing that go on under this legislation. The statement of the Minister or the Government that everything is working well is very much open to doubt, very much indeed.

The hon. member has given one example only of his cause for complaint and that is shown to be a complete wash-out; hence my statement is not disproved.

The hon. member raised what he termed another "serious matter"—that of the establishment of betting premises alongside hotels. He made it clear that the Government did not give any undertaking that bookmakers' premises would not be established alongside hotels. He instanced a member of the Government who quoted the report of the Commissioner of Police of another State.

That report gives no specific indication as to whether betting premises are near to, or far from hotels. It may, however, be deduced therefrom that betting premises were so far from hotels that it would not be practicable to patronise both places and that hotels were deserted for the betting premises; whereas prior to the advent of betting premises, the same persons spent their time in the hotels drinking, especially on Saturday afternoons. The State and district referred to are not disclosed.

There is only one other State of this continent where registered or licensed betting premises were ever established—that is South Australia. I understand that in that State when premises were first established they were placed at some distance from hotels. This resulted in considerable illegal betting being carried on in or near hotels. To overcome this difficulty additional licences were granted for premises near the hotels which eventually resulted in chaos. Eventually all licences for betting premises in that State were withdrawn with the exception of those at Port Pirie, where I believe, seven licensed premises are still in existence.

Had a policy been adopted here to the extent of keeping betting premises and hotels sufficiently far apart to prevent the clientele of one from frequenting the other, I doubt whether the implementation of the Act would have been practicable; and if it had, its success would have been more doubtful. Unquestionably, illegal betting would have developed in the vicinity of hotels.

The main reason for doubting its practicability is that to have set up betting premises sufficiently far from hotels to prevent patronage to both, very few, if any, of the former could have been granted in the cities of Perth and Fremantle, and at such country centres as Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Bunbury, Collie, Albany, Northam, Norseman, Geraldton, and perhaps other places.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Some licences were granted next to hotels, and others were refused.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is so. Such a decision would have doomed the Act before it started.

Whilst liquor drinking and betting are accepted in the community it would be impossible to keep them apart to any great extent. No attempt is made to do so on racecourses. The prohibitions contained in the Act and regulations regarding liquor in betting premises, provided they continue to be strongly enforced, are sufficient to ensure that no danger will arise from the proximity of some betting premises to hotels. Their positions range from being side by side to a distance of two miles apart.

The next question raised by Mr. Murray was as to the use of "dummying." If the board can obtain sufficient proof at any time that a registered premises bookmaker or racecourse bookmaker is "dummying" another licence whether on-course or off-course, I have no doubt it will immediately cancel that bookmaker's licence. Some cases have been suspected and have been investigated by the police, but no proof has been available to support a charge, or for the board to take action. The board cannot take such a serious course as to cancel a licence merely on suspicion. It would be interesting to know how the hon. member convinces himself that there was a large number of shops registered purely and simply as dummies of bookmakers operating other registered premises.

In answer to parliamentary questions, the board disclosed that 57 licences were voluntarily surrendered and four were cancelled in a period of two years. In this regard the hon. member stated—

> An examination of the position of some of those 57 operators who voluntarily surrendered their licences indicates that a large number were doing reasonably well. They were not situated in places where there was no business as a result of which they said, "We are not going to carry on because it does not pay." They were in quite reasonably good business undertakings but they voluntarily surrendered their licences for an exorbitant sum for goodwill—the goodwill of the business.

As it has not been officially disclosed who the bookmakers were; where they operated: and how well they were doing, it is difficult to accept the statement.

The board legally has no power to control payment for goodwill, but it has been made quite clear to all concerned that it will take whatever indirect means are available to prevent trafficking in licences or other improper practices.

As an example, a few months ago the board strongly suspected that a licensee was a dummy for another person. The licensee desired to "dispose of his business." The chairman of the board made a thorough investigation of his financial books, which were kept by a public accountant. They created a grave suspicion in the chairman's mind, but proof sufficient to

prefer a charge was not available. However, that, with confidential information obtained—which could not be used to suppose a case—resulted in the prevention of an undercover amount of £3,000 or more being paid for the benefit of the person who was believed to be the true owner of the business.

Two other cases recently occurred where the consideration for the purchase of retiring bookmakers' business chattels was reduced by approximately £250 and £600 respectively by reason of the board's supervision.

When the hon. member makes the following statement—

> I venture to suggest that nine-tenths of those who voluntarily surrendered their licences in this last year surrendered at the behest of one or other of four people and that a dummy has gone into every shop under the classification for no other purpose than to divert the suggestion raised last year and to give a better spread to the income of those operators.

I suggest he is going beyond the bounds of reason and fair play without giving an atom of proof of its correctness. I say that, because it is a direct reflection on the board as well as on four un-named persons.

He expressed the thought that the board could call for applications for bookmakers to operate premises which had been previously surrendered. The board has no authority to call for applications for licences; nor can it demand that particular premises be appropriated to betting purposes or a particular tenant. The procedure followed is a sensible one and gives effect to the primary purpose of the Act.

His further remarks on the point appear to suggest that the board should grant licences for particular premises to a person without his possessing the right to occupy them. The idea is ludicrous; but there is one feature about the occupation of premises for betting which is scandalous to a degree—that is the extortionate demands made by landlords for rental. In most cases when it becomes known that premises are required for betting, the rentals demanded are as much as four or five times greater than could be obtained in respect of any other kind of business.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Don't you think they would be offered?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Not always.

Hon. A. R. Jones: I think that the bookmakers might offer a good bit.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There could be some of those; but the board points out that it knows that where the premises are registered the rentals are rather high—in fact they are very high in some cases. I have not the details, but I have heard of complaints; and I understand there are some bookmakers who have gone out of business because they could not meet both the rentals and the overheads attached to the business, and the tax. I understand that there were one or two in the suburbs who went out for that reason.

The hon. member's reference to payment of £60,000 for goodwill after a year's operations is regarded by the Betting Control Board as just plain nonsense. This last shot was at the board itself. I feel certain that he cannot be serious when he suggests that the board can function without any paid staff because it does not prosecute. Apparently he considers there is nothing else to do, and is not aware that the board deals with on-course as well as off-course bookmakers' licences and employees (including transfer), the latter numbering over 1,000; and betting disputes between bookmakers and bettors; fixes the starting-price of horses at all race meetings; and attends to correspondence and to the many relevant duties in the administration of an Act, including the keeping of essential records.

It is considered that the Act is administered in an economical manner and that the board is not over-staffed. The statement that the staff neither toil nor spin and that their jobs are sinecures can only be attributed to a lack of knowledge of the true position.

During the busiest part of the year—that is, prior to the annual renewal of licences—the secretary and his staff have worked many nights and also week-ends. At other times they are able to carry out their duties in the normal hours.

The five members of the staff are the secretary, starting-price officer—whose work is mostly carried out on racecourses—record clerk (male), senior typist, and receptionist-typist. If the work could be done with less staff the chairman would not hesitate to recommend accordingly. It is considered that the board's activities are carried out on economical lines.

In regard to the question of the board not prosecuting and the hon. member's reference to its not indicating to the police where a prosecution is desirable or necessary, it is pointed out that the board has no investigation officer, and as it was intended from the beginning that the police would supervise betting shops so far as the penal provisions of the Act are concerned, the remarks of the hon. member are misplaced.

Notwithstanding that arrangement, the full-time members of the board visit as many betting premises as practicable on inspection. It would be quite out of place for the police, after they had prepared a brief for prosecution, to submit it to the board to decide whether or not there was a case to answer. The police decide such matters for themselves; and if the issue is an intricate one which necessitates legal advice, they obtain it from the Crown Law

Department. To say that the board could not care less about its duties and functions is a mis-statement. I think the points raised have been adequately covered, and I feel that I can only say again that the conditions under which betting is now carried on are a vast improvement on those which obtained under illegal betting as we knew it for many years. If all sections of the community do not agree with legal betting, I feel that all will agree that the present system is a vast improvement on conditions that prevailed before the measure was passed.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Minister for Railways in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 35 amended:

Hon. J. MURRAY: First let me apologise to the Committee for not having placed my amendment on the notice paper. I anticipated that other members would have something to say on the measure, and therefore did not expect it to reach the Committee stage today. Without further reply to the Minister's remarks, I move an amendment—

> That all words after the word "words" in line 4, page 2, be struck out and the words "'fifty-seven' in line 3 the words 'sixty'" be inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment, which has as its objective the limitation of the legislation. Its acceptance would mean that the Act would have to be brought before Parliament again in 1960.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is wrong with that?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The only thing wrong with it is that Parliament can unnecessarily consider legislation. Where a measure is of a temporary character, it is usual to impose a limitation on its operation in order that it may be reconsidered by Parliament from time to time. Such legislation might no longer be required after a certain period.

I admit that in the legislation under consideration there are some loose ends that require tying up, but I feel that there is no good reason to insist that it be brought back to Parliament periodically. Should conditions deteriorate or circumstances alter, and it be found that the legislation is not living up to the reputation it has earned itself over the last two years, any member could at any time have further consideration given to it either by way of an amending Bill or a motion.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am one of those who are ashamed that this legislation is on the statute book. It is one of the most unfair measures of which I know. It taxes people who are weak in their intellect. Money raised for the benefit of this State should be raised from all of us, but under this Bill it is raised from a section of the community. Because men have a weakness for betting and attempt to get money from some source other than by earning it, Parliament has legislated in this way; but I am ashamed to think that we raise revenue in such a manner.

The Minister made a lengthy speech in reply to the debate—a much longer one than he delivered in introducing the measure. He said that the police would supervise the legislation. As a matter of fact, there has been laxity with regard to police control in this State in two directions; and nobody here will deny what I am saying.

For instance, the Licensing Act has not been implemented correctly by the police in years gone by. In that regard, nobody will say I am not speaking the truth. I often wondered why licensing was not controlled as it should have been by the Police Force.

The second practice that was not properly controlled was the illicit gambling that took place before this measure was passed. It was a well-organised system of revenue collection. The fines amounted to £200 per week and gradually rose to £400 per week and then £800 per week, as reference to the Press of those days will show.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Where was it collected from?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Mostly from the metropolitan area, I would think.

Hon. L. A. Logan: More from the Geraldton district than anywhere else.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It was spread all over the State, but the weekly collections were constant.

The Minister for Railways: They did not prosecute people on the racecourse.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Racecourse betting was legal at one time and there is doubt whether that particular legislation was ever repealed.

The Minister for Railways: Do you consider people who bet to be weak?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not go to racecourses to bet but to see the races, meet congenial people and join in the excitement.

Hon. E. M. Davies: What about the fashion parade?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Such things probably fascinated the hon. member in his younger days. I believe many families suffer through the husbands'

betting. I hope the measure will have a short life and that the Government of the day, when the legislation ceases, will deal with the matter properly.

Hon. J. MURRAY: I thought the reasons for the amendment were obvious. The Minister harped on the fact that any private member could introduce a Bill to amend the legislation—

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: What chance would such a Bill have?

Hon. J. MURRAY: None, in view of the Government's majority in another place. If the legislation is made permanent we can only amend it, and not repeal it, so I think it should not be continued beyond 1960. I am not satisfied with the Minister's statement that Section 13 of the Act gives the board and the police sufficient power to obtain evidence to prevent dummying in regard to registered premises, because the practice continues. Either they cannot get the evidence or they do not want it. I am not satisfied that the board is all it is cracked up to be, or that the Act is sound; and I want the legislation brought up for review, periodically, so that both the board and the bookmakers will know they are on probation.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I feel that to continue the legislation to 1960 is to give it too long a life. It was agreed that the Act should be given two years' trial, so that it could be repealed at the end of that time, if necessary. I do not say it should be repealed, but I am not satisfied that all is well. I do not think any private member would be successful with a measure to amend the Act, and I feel that we would be up against monetary strength if we sought to repeal it in the future. I think the Act should be extended to 12 months only; and then, as has been said, those concerned would know they were still on probation. At the end of that time members like Mr. Murray, who have a greater understanding of the business than I have, might be able to move amendments that would be of considerable advantage. I support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am surprised at the remarks of Sir Charles Latham and Mr. Murray. I repeat that any member could bring down a Bill to amend the Act, or could bring any matter to notice, by way of motion, or through other avenues. The remarks of Sir Charles Latham and Mr. Murray, as I interpret them, were to the effect that no private member would have any success in raising the question during the life of the present Government. Could Mr. Murray's reference to "no longer than 1960" be taken as meaning that were there a change of Government the legislation would be thrown out?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I was only asking; and I wondered why there should be any suspicion that the present Government would not stand up to its responsibilities. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: Early in my parliamentary experience I learnt that all experimental legislation should have a continuance provision, and I am surprised that the Minister should try to gain political kudos out of this. In the light of the Betting Control Board's comments on how hard it was to determine whether there had been improper practices, I think the Act should be reviewed in 1960; and if that is agreed to, we will have opportunity then of doing whatever may be necessary. The betting monopoly that is being created could have tremendous political repercussions in another place, and this Chamber should retain for all time the right to review this legislation.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was one of those who opposed the placing of this measure on the statute book; and, although I agree that the Act has resulted in a more satisfactory state of affairs than existed previously, I think it should be presented to Parliament every couple of years for review, at all events for some years to come. One measure that was deliberated on repeatedly by Parliament for a number of years before it became permanent was the charities legislation. The present and previous Governments introduced Bills which brought that legislation before Parliament for debate on numerous occasions.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When using the word "charities" I referred to the Lotteries Act introduced in about 1932 or 1933. The Government of the day brought down amending Bills to give that Act further life. In 1950 or 1951 it was continued for three years; and last year, or the year before, this legislation was made permanent. So after nearly 20 years of operation a Bill that became an Act without any doubtful ramifications received treatment each year by Parliament and was concluded on a satisfactory basis.

There is no reason why this Act should not be looked at again in 1960. It is unfair for the Minister for Railways to say that the words, "and no longer" suggest that a Government would not introduce continuing legislation. Practically every Bill that comes before us and which deals with a limitation of time carries with it the words "and no longer."

The Minister for Railways: I just inquired.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The inquiry was unwarranted. Nobody need have any fear, least of all the people employed in the industry, if Parliament is able to look

at this matter again in 1960. The Minister for Railways said that a private member in doing so would depend entirely on the attitude of the Government of the day. I support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The point I wished to make was that if a private member introduced a Bill to amend the Act it would be brought to the notice of the Government.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE.

In Committee.

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Minister for Railways in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and citation:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "Australia" in line 5, page 2, the words "Division 2.—The Public Service Commissioner" be inserted.

This is a critical amendment because it deals with the principle of substituting a single commissioner for the board of three proposed in the Bill, and allotting him the duties outlined in the South Australian Act. This was fully explained by Mr. Jones and myself. He would have behind him a board consisting of part-time members who would act as a board of appeal in regard to classifications, reclassifications, allowances, interpretations and anomalies.

Though this varies in principle from the proposed Bill, it does not affect the machinery that governs the relations of the members of the Public Service and the administrative head in regard to protecting their rights and privileges. It merely seeks to continue a system that has, in the main, proved satisfactory, with provision for a board in which is vested certain duties, and which will be just as efficient and more economical and satisfactory so far as the members of the Civil Service Association are concerned.

A single commissioner would be more likely to adopt a consistent line in administering his department. He is called on to deal with certain aspects of employment of a body of public servants, but his is not as responsible a job as that of, say, the Director of Education who, as a single director, administers a department that employs over 6,000 teachers.

It would be better for the Government of the day to have a single commissioner to deal with when critical situations arise than to have a board of three which might prove difficult. A single commissioner would be more co-operative, and the great variety of questions that would arise would not impinge on public policy. The rights and privileges of those concerned would be protected, and I think it would be an improvement on the system proposed in the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This is the vital amendment which, if accepted, will upset the whole principle in the Bill. It seeks to replace the three commissioners provided for in the Bill with one commissioner. For this reason I oppose the amendment. The reason that the Government has suggested a board of three is that the Public Service has grown considerably, and each year the duties of the Public Service Commissioner are becoming increasingly complicated. There are various awards, and there are departments which are being extended.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That has been going on for a long while.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We as a Government wonder if there is justification for the growth of some of these departments. We feel that a single commissioner cannot adequately cope with the duties now required of him.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Reconcile that with the Railways Commission.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is a different proposition altogether. These commissioners will deal with one function; that is the function of wages and conditions. The Railways Commission dealt with these things, plus purchasing and other matters.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The responsibility is greater with the railways.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Whereas the Railways Commission had some interference from different Governments, in this case the Government will look to the Public Service Board for guidance. The Public Service Commissioner has the job of recommending to Governments what the salaries of a number of Government officers will be, including magistrates and judges.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Judges do not come into it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Government considers that the job is beyond the capacity of one man, and it is not possible for him to do justice to the amount of work now thrust on to the Public Service Commissioner's office. For those reasons we say that three commissioners can do a far better job because they can divide their functions and specialise on certain parts of the responsibilities. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I am going to support the amendment. Quite apart from the fact that I feel three commissioners cannot work satisfactorily together, I think it is a big step indeed for us to consider that all of a sudden one man finds the job is too much for him and

that he has to have the call of two other men. We must not forget that the commissioner has a staff, and his secretary may have an assistant-secretary, etc. Whatever work the commissioner is called upon to do, it does not mean that he has to undertake it personally. If he wants extra staff to attend to detail and to make reports for his official analysis, it is competent for him to ask for that extra staff.

It is ridiculous to ask me to accept the line of argument that the job has, all of a sudden, become too big for the commissioner to do, particularly as he has been doing it for many years. The number of civil servants under his jurisdiction has not grown to any great extent during the last few years. It is only about 4,500 now, and I venture to say that about 10 years ago it would have been about 3,500. We are being asked to thrust something on the public which to my mind would not work. We have had one illustration of what has happened with three commissioners. I think the proposal put forward by Mr. Simpson is worthy of consideration, and I ask members to support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is hard to reconcile the views of members on this occasion with those expressed when we increased the number of the commissioners of the Rural and Industries Bank. I have no recollection of the same argument being advanced on that occasion. That Bill was agreed to by this Chamber and was thought to be a good thing by those who spoke to it. The number of commissioners of the Rural and Industries Bank has been increased on two occasions for the reason that the amount of work became too great for the existing commissioners of the bank.

We believe the same thing applies in relation to the Public Service Commissioner. We consider it is preferable to spread the responsibilities into certain spheres, after which the chairman of the board would decide what would happen and what would not happen. I appeal to the Committee to take the points of view of the Government and the Civil Service Association into consideration.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I might have considered this Bill if the chairman had had some overriding rights, or if assistant commissioners had been appointed. I think the same mistake—from a reading of the report—is being made here as caused the trouble in the railways. We are being asked to appoint three commissioners with equal authority; therefore if there is a clash of personalities, two members can vote against the third even though he be the chairman. If there is going to be a board of this sort at all, there must be someone with more power than the others.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I think the Minister enumerated some of the duties of the commissioners and included the duties of judges and others.

The Minister for Railways: Recommendations for salary.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I do not think they apply, because Clause 8 says definitely that the Act does not apply to the Governor, judges, Ministers of the Crown, and so on; it gives a list of those to whom the Act does not apply.

In regard to the statement that the service might grow, actually it has grown very little over the years. I should say that with the appointment of three commissioners, there might be a tendency for it to grow to a greater extent than in the past, because one of the commissioners would be there to represent the interests of the Civil Service Association.

In regard to the appointment of three commissioners, there is quite a difference of opinion in the association. The ruling body controls a considerable number of people, some of whom are in the metropolitan area and others stationed in different parts of the State; and it is difficult at an annual meeting to get more than a few to attend. It can be said that probably a very small percentage of the total number actually attend that meeting and vote on the motions decided.

I do not think there can be any question of the matter of economy. With the suggested set-up, there would probably be three officers and three office staffs; and there would be a necessity for secretaries, typists and so on. There would also be a tendency to duplicate decisions; and there could easily be a possibility of men not agreeing, particularly if they happened to be an awkward type; and this would make trouble inside the administration. If there is any dissension among those who control a body, it soon filters down through that body, with a very bad effect.

On the score of economy and efficiency, I should say that a single commissioner would be preferable to a board of three. A single commissioner works quite effectively in South Australia with its bigger population and probably a larger body of civil servants. The duties which a commissioner in this State is called upon to perform could be carried out with perhaps an advisory board at the back of him to lay down matters of policy and to be there as a board of appeal in case any decisions made by the commissioner are appealed against. I submit that the idea of a single commissioner in place of a board of three is very desirable.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Minister mentioned the Rural and Industries Bank Bill, which provided for five commissioners. I have had a look at Hansard; and, as I said by interjection, the Minister did not use the same arguments then as now. We increased the number of the Rural & Industries Bank commissioners for the specific purpose quoted in the Minister's speech—that Mr. Byfield, the Treasury

representative, and the chairman were due to retire. The Minister said it would be an undesirable state of affairs to leave the bank with one experienced man on the board and he asked the House to add a further two commissioners.

That was entirely different from what was contained in the question dealing with the Public Service Commissioner. The Public Service Commissioner has a different form of duty to carry out from that undertaken by the commissioners of the R. and I. Bank. They have to be persons versed in banking and commerce. I do not think the example stands up to the Minister's argument.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There is no argument about similar circumstances. One knows that banking has nothing to with the Public Service. The important point then was that this Chamber did not criticise the addition of the two.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes, it did.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The bank commission was enlarged from three to five. If the Government then put forward the submission that it was necessary to increase the commission because there would be only one member of the three-man commission left with experience, there is all the more reason now why there should be three new members because not one of them will have had experience as a commissioner.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where will you get the three members from?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It will be an entirely new commission. I want to correct any misunderstanding that Mr. Simpson may have if he thinks that I am of the opinion that judges come under this measure. I know they do not. All Governments refer requests from judges, magistrates or heads of departments who do not come under the Act, to the Public Service Commissioner for guidance in connection with variations in salary. That has always been so. I feel that the Committee should agree to the Bill as it stands.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	10
Majority for	4

Ayes.

Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott (*Teller.*)

Noes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. R. F. Hutchison (*Teller.*)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. J. M. Thomson	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. D. Teahan

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Interpretations:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That in line 6, page 5, the following definition be inserted:—
>
> "Commissioner" means the Public Service Commissioner for the time being in office under this Act.

This is consequential.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: In view of the Committee's decision on the previous amendment, this one becomes necessary.

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

Clauses 8 to 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Offices on the board:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That before the words "The offices" in line 27, page 8, the words "subject to the provisions of Section thirteen of this Act" be inserted.

Section 13 is the subject of a proposed new clause which appears at the end of the amendments on the notice paper. This new clause provides for a fourth, part-time, member to be appointed to cover the position where the commissioner has made a decision, and to avoid the possibility of the commissioner himself forming part of the tribunal to listen to an appeal against a decision he has made.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That the word "elected" in line 32, page 8, be struck out, and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

In suggesting this alteration, we have in mind the system that now applies to the State Electricity Commission where the body concerned in this case—the Public Service—submits a panel of three names to the Government which chooses one to be the selected member.

In the opinion of many, an elected member is the most desirable one to have to represent the association; he may be the most popular and get the most votes. But in the opinion of a large body of the association, or in the opinion of the Government, another representative would be more suitable for the job. As it seems to be in the interests of both employees and the Government to have the best man available, and as this system has proved to

be quite successful with the Electricity Commission, I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I hope the Committee will not agree to this amendment. Surely the association has the right to elect the person to represent it.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: It has the right to elect three.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No. If we strike out the word "elected" and insert in lieu the word "selected," who will do the selecting?

Hon. C. H. Simpson: The Government.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Surely it is fair and reasonable that we should leave it to the Public Service Association to elect its own representative. I hope the hon. member will not press this amendment.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I think this change is rather important. Even the Premier admitted that the most popular man is not necessarily the best man for a particular job; and so I think the amendment is most desirable. Having the example of the State Electricity Commission before us, I think we should adhere to the same system.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	10
Majority for	3

Ayes.

Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. MacKinnon	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	*(Teller.)*

Noes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. G. E. Jeffery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
	(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. J. M. Thomson	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. D. Teahan

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13—Appointments to offices:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The four amendments I have on the notice paper are all consequential on the decision just made. I move an amendment—

> That the word "elected" in line 20, page 9, be struck out, and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That the word "elected" in line 23, page 9, be struck out and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I would like the hon. member to explain the difference between election and selection by secret ballot.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I do not think there would be any material difference. The association is asked to submit a panel of three names; and presumably the three men would figure in the ballot, and from that ballot one would be chosen. As far as I can see, nothing is laid down in regard to the procedure by which the selection will be made.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by Hon. C. H. Simpson, clause further amended by—

> Striking out all words after the word "notice" in line 32, down to and including the word "appointment" in line 34, page 9, and inserting the words "of the names of three persons who are members of the Association" in lieu;
>
> striking out all words after the word "allow" in line 37 down to and including the word "office" in line 39, page 9, and inserting the words "the names of three persons are so notified to the Minister he shall select one of such persons to be appointed to the office" in lieu;
>
> striking out all words after the word "notified" in line 2 down to and including the word "office" in line 5, page 10.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Terms of tenure of office of members of the Board:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That the word "elected" in line 18, page 10, be struck out and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 16—Termination of term of office before expiration:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

> That the word "elected" in line 25, page 10, be struck out and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 17—Deputies for members:

On motions by Hon. C. H. Simpson, clause amended by—

Striking out the word "elected" in line 37, page 11, and inserting the word "selected" in lieu;

striking out the word "elected" in line 3, page 12, and inserting the word "selected" in lieu;

striking out the word "elected" in line 4, page 12, and inserting the word "selected" in lieu;

striking out the words "an elected" in line 12, page 12, and inserting the words "a selected" in lieu.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Salaries of members:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the word "elected" in line 27, page 13, be struck out, and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

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

Clauses 20 to 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Quorum:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the word "elected" in line 16, page 16, be struck out and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 27—Determination of questions by the Board:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the word "election" in line 30, page 17, be struck out and the word "selection" inserted in lieu.

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

Clauses 28 to 39—agreed to.

Clause 40—Jurisdiction of Board to hear and determine appeals and applications relating to classifications and reclassifications:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the word "elected" in line 17, page 31, be struck out and the word "selected" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (10) on pages 34 and 35 be struck out.

This provision applies to appeals and applications relating to classifications and reclassifications. It lays down hard and fast that an appeliant must be a member of the Civil Service Association. I would refer to the wording of this clause. It is discrimination between those who are actually members of the association and those who are not. It was explained at the second reading stage that nearly all the 4,300 in the Public Service are members of the association and their dues are deducted from their pay. Some of the 43 not in this category have not made provision for deductions to be made, but still contribute their dues. There are a few who have not joined the association, for what reason we do not know. This clause makes it clear that if one is a member of the association and is financial, he has full rights of appeal. Otherwise he has not.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Would that apply to a temporary employee?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I do not know how it applies. I do not think so; but I would not be sure. The point is that we say that this provision should apply to all; and that those who are not included in the association—and there are very few of them, and they presumably have their reasons for not joining—should not be excluded from rights of appeal.

Hon. F. H. R. LAVERY: The reason for my interjection is that I know of a person who has been a temporary employee for nine years. He is a member of the association but cannot appeal against an appointment to a permanent position. I wonder whether this clause covers that. The man I refer to is in the Health Department. At one period, when he was single, two men with a period of service longer than his received permanent appointments, and now he is looking for such an appointment. It could not be said that he was actually temporary after having been employed for nine years. He is a member of the association, which says it can do nothing because he is not a permanent officer.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I cannot answer the hon. member's question. There must be some reason why the officer concerned is not appointed to the permanent staff. Without the details, I am not able to reply to the point raised.

The principle in the clause is that only members of the association are entitled to appeals. I do not see anything wrong with that. Surely if a person receives the benefits derived from the activities of an association, he should contribute to it!

Hon. C. H. Simpson: It is compulsory unionism.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not want to give that illustration of compulsory unionism which I could give; but to secure the benfits of any organisation —whether it be political, professional or

industrial—one has to be a financial member, and should be. There are always a few in most walks of life, however, who will take all and contribute nothing.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Only about one half of one per cent. are involved in this instance.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Then why worry about it?

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Why worry about excluding them?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The association is entitled to some respect. It does all the work to obtain good conditions, concessions and a standard of wages. These things have been gained through the association; and that applies to other organisations—even the Farmers' Union. Surely to goodness if a man wants to appeal against the appointment of a financial member to a position, he should belong to the association! Should a person who deliberately refuses to contribute to the association on some personal ground be entitled to the benefits of the association? I do not think so.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	10
Majority for	4

Ayes.

Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Chas. Lathan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. Cunningham (*Teller.*)

Noes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. E. M. Davies (*Teller.*)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. J. M. Thomson	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. D. Teahan

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the word "not" in line 7, page 35, be struck out.

Not all appellants are skilled in presenting a case; and if they feel they have a case and are not capable of submitting it as they would like to do, the argument is that they should be able to engage a legal practitioner to do it for them.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The object of the provision is that if a man were able to engage legal assistance he would have an advantage over another employee. The word "not" was included at the request of the association. It is hardly right that in regard to appeals against some trivial punishment or some promotion or a refusal of transfer, or a transfer from one district to another, or one job to another, a legal practitioner should be called in to advise the board, which should know best.

The appeal board should know what it is about. The Public Service Commissioner should know what he is about in the first place. But there are certain rights of appeal; and surely we should not turn the Public Service Commissioner's office into a court to which the legal profession are called. Members of the association feel that when they have a genuine appeal they should not be forced to engage counsel because the other fellow does so. Suppose an officer is appointed to a certain position by the Public Service Commissioner and other officers appeal against the appointment. If the appellants engaged counsel, the appointee would be forced to do the same or else suffer a disadvantage. It is not fair to members of the association to allow one to have an advantage, particularly the aggrieved one.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: There seems to be an anomaly inasmuch as in one part of the measure an employee can engage the services of a legal practioner to plead his case. It could be that for him the other part is just as important as the one in which he is allowed to appeal. This division applies to applications in respect of classifications, reclassifications, allowances, interpretations and anomalies. In this he is not allowed the right of appeal; yet it is available to him on the question of dismissal or punishment. In the scheme as envisaged he can appeal against the commissioner's decision, to a part-time board appointed for that purpose. If he felt he could not present his case, the amendment would give him the right to have it presented by a solicitor.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	16
Majority against	8

Ayes.

Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	Hon. F. D. Willmott (*Teller.*)

Noes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. G. MacKinnon
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery (*Teller.*)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. J. M. Thomson	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. D. Teahan

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 41 to 65—agreed to.

Clause 66—Service required of notice of punishment on officer concerned:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (5) in lines 25 to 34, page 65, be struck out.

This amendment is consequential on one agreed to in a different clause.

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

Clauses 67 to 89—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 13:—

(1) If the Public Service Commissioner is appointed as a member of the Board (whether as Chairman or as an appointed member) the Governor shall appoint a person as a fourth member of the Board.

(2) The Public Service Commissioner shall not sit on the Board on the hearing of any appeal under section forty or section fifty-two of this Act against a decision given by himself but on the hearing of every such appeal the Board shall be constituted of the two members other than the Public Service Commissioner and the fourth member appointed under this section.

(3) If the Public Service Commissioner is Chairman of the Board the fourth member shall sit as Chairman on the hearing of the said appeals, and if the Public Service Commissioner is an ordinary member of the Board the fourth member shall sit as an ordinary member on the hearing of those appeals.

(4) The fourth member of the Board shall not act as a member except as provided in this section.

This applies to the fourth member of the board acting as a member of the part-time board where the Public Service Commissioner has given a decision and there has been an appeal against that decision. It means that the case will be submitted to an entirely fresh tribunal. This new clause provides the machinery for that purpose.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This new clause is consequential on one moved earlier and is therefore necessary.

New clause put and passed.

New division:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move—

That after the word "appropriated" in line 4, page 20, the following new division be inserted:—

Division 2.—The Public Service Commissioner.

33. (1) The Governor may from time to time appoint a Public Service Commissioner.

(2) The Commissioner shall have the powers and authorities, and shall discharge and exercise the duties and functions by this Act vested in or imposed or conferred upon him.

New division put and passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—JUNIOR FARMERS' MOVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [9.22] in moving the second reading said: The principal Act, which was passed in 1955, has as its object the sponsoring and encouragement among youth of the study of agriculture and farming, an appreciation of rural life, education and the ethics of good citizenship. As members are aware the movement is a very solid one, consisting of a large number of clubs with good membership.

The Act provides for the appointment of an advisory council of 11 persons, one of whom shall be a nominee of the Institute of Agricultural Science. This institute is an Australian one and in actual fact the representative on the council is nominated by the Institute of Agriculture at the University of Western Australia. The Bill seeks, therefore, to make sure that the nomination can be made by the Institute of Agriculture.

The second amendment provides that any councillor, or deputy councillor who is a public servant shall not forfeit any of the rights he possesses as a public servant. The Agricultural Department and the Education Department each has a representative on the council. The Agricultural Department's nominee is acting as chief executive officer of the body. This position is not a Public Service one and it is desired that any occupant of the position, who is a public servant, shall not jeopardise any of his rights.

The third amendment provides that any officers appointed by the council shall not come under the provisions of the Public Service Act, but shall be entitled to the leave and superannuation rights enjoyed by the Public Service. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [9.25]: I want to say a few brief words on the amendments contained in this Bill. They are very necessary and have been asked for by the Junior Farmers' Movement. There is, however, a further amendment which the Junior Farmers' Movement suggested, and to which it would like consideration to be given. The amendment to which I refer is not included in the Bill, and you, Mr. President, would therefore no doubt rule it out of order. Nevertheless, I would like to mention it so that consideration might be given to this aspect when the matter again arises.

The Junior Farmers' Movement is not in any way controlled by the Government; it is responsible for its own affairs; and it is strange, therefore, to find that Section 6 should read as follows:—

> The Minister may from time to time issue directions relating to the purposes of this Act to the council either generally or in respect of any particular matter and the council shall give effect to directions so issued.

That clause is redundant and should be repealed to enable the Junior Farmers' Movement to have complete control of its affairs. I mention this matter in passing so that consideration might be given to it in future.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [9.27]: As the provision to which Mr. Jones has referred is not contained in the Bill before the House I do not think it would be possible to do anything about it under this measure. I suggest, however, that the hon. member consult with the Minister for Agriculture, because he may have some notification in respect of the information which the hon. member seeks. I have not had the information forwarded to me, and the hon. member in charge of the Bill has not got it on his file either. I think it would require a new Bill to alter the Act in the manner suggested by Mr. Jones.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 15th October.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [9.30]: I have studied this Bill carefully; and without saying I agree with every one of its provisions, I intend to support the second reading. The Bill contains quite a number of amendments to the principal Act; and all of its contents were comprehensibly and lucidly explained by Mr. Willesee when he introduced the measure. It is not necessary, therefore, for me to traverse the various amendments which are proposed.

Our Companies Act is one of the largest and one of the most important on the statute book. Our Act was proclaimed in 1947. Unfortunately, it was based upon the 1929 Act of the United Kingdom, which, by 1947, was beginning to creak to such an extent that in 1948 the Parliament of the United Kingdom completely revised it. Therefore, when our Companies Act really came into force it was in quite a few respects out of date, and contained quite a few anomalies which were rectified by the United Kingdom Act of 1948.

This Bill proposes to remove some of those anomalies. There are quite a few in the Act, as Mr. Willesee mentioned. The provision with relation to advertisements upon the petition by a company in connection with a reduction of its capital is ambiguous in much the same way as in the Associations Incorporations Act, with which we dealt a week or so ago.

There is also ambiguity with respect to the disqualification of certain persons as liquidators. If anyone should be disqualified as a liquidator by a company I suppose it is the promoter. Yet of all persons who are disqualified at the moment, the promoter is one who is not.

In connection with private companies, there is also an anomaly. Private companies do not have to lodge balance sheets in Western Australia; but if a foreign company is required to register in another State, and by the law of that State to lodge its balance sheet, it is also required to lodge its balance sheet in Western Australia if it carries on business here.

Proprietary companies in some of the Eastern States lodge balance sheets there, but they do so in a sealed envelope. Our Act does not make provision for lodging them in a sealed envelope, with the result that although the balance sheet is not available in the State where the company is registered, it is available here. Whilst that anomaly may perhaps increase the tourist traffic to this State, I think it is one that should be rectified.

There is another point in regard to which there is a definite weakness in our Act. It is in respect of the provisions relating to redeemable preference shares. The provisions of our Act were copied from the United Kingdom Act of 1929. In 1948 it was found that that section from which it was copied was really unintelligible, and it has since been redrafted.

Also, in relation to the alteration of the memorandum of association of a company, the general position is that in the main the memorandum of a company cannot be altered in any of its principal respects. In the United Kingdom it may be altered in

respect of matters which are governed by the articles, or can be governed by the articles by a special resolution.

There is no such provision in our Act, with the result that in a case such as votes of members—the voting rights of members which we ordinarily find under articles which can be altered from time to time—if the provision for voting rights happens to be in a memorandum and the company desires to alter its provisions, even although every member is in favour of altering the provisions it cannot be done, and the only solution is to wind up the company. That seems to be a drastic remedy to achieve a very ordinary internal desire of the members of the company.

The Bill proposes to change a long-established practice of fixing the fees by Act of Parliament. It seeks to discard that practice and in future to fix fees by regulation. To my mind, that is a retrograde step. At the moment Section 409 of the principal Act provides that the fees, as fixed in the schedule to the Act, may be varied by regulation, but they shall not be increased by regulation.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Who fixes the fees? Is it Crown Law?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: At the moment they are fixed under the schedule to the Act; and Section 409 says the fees as contained in the schedule to the Act may be varied, but not increased except by Act of Parliament. I feel that it would be unwise for Parliament to depart from the principle which is contained in the Act at the moment; and which, to my mind, is a good one. The fees, which are not altered with frequency, should be specified in the Act.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Does the Crown Law take the authority to make these alterations?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: It is by regulation in this Bill. The Bill also proposes to double all the existing penalties in the parent Act. If one refers to the schedule of the Bill, it will be found that there are three pages of alterations. Daily penalties are being increased from £5 to £10, and other penalties are being increased from £100 to £200, and so on. It does seem to me that the penalties which are already in the Act—and they are legion—are sufficient. The company secretary and the company director are liable for a penalty of some description in almost every step they take.

Therefore, notwithstanding the change in money values since 1947, I feel we should hesitate before we double the penalties as proposed in this Bill. I venture to suggest that if it were a question of the Industrial Arbitration Act and the penalties which it contains, we would probably find the Government being not quite so ready to bring down an amending Bill to double all the penalties. On the contrary, if my memory serves me rightly, it was only last year that we had a Bill presented to us to either reduce the penalties or cancel them altogether. When the Bill goes into Committee, we should look at the question of these penalties.

The Bill proposes also to vary the amount of preferential claims with respect to wages and salaries, having regard to the change in money values. I do not see any serious objection to that; but there is a point in connection with preferential claims which is a new idea so far as Western Australia is concerned. It is proposed to make holiday pay a preferential claim.

There is a decision of our Arbitration Court which explains that holidays and holiday pay are something entirely different from salary. A man has a right to his salary at the end of each week, but a holiday is something which is essentially given to him in order that he might refresh himself in mind and body, and it does not accrue until the end of the year. It is something to which he has not a right to the same extent as he has to a salary. Seeing we are dealing with the rights of creditors with a company in liquidation—and in nine cases out of ten I suppose it would be an insolvent company which would involve a sacrifice by creditors—I would suggest to the member in charge of the Bill that he might have another look at that particular point and consider whether it would be advisable to delete that provision from the Bill.

With respect to receivers and managers, the existing provisions of the Act, which were copied largely from the United Kingdom legislation of 1929, have been brought up to date and tightened up by copying the provisions of the United Kingdom Act of 1948.

The outstanding provision of the Bill relates to unit trusts; and, as Mr. Willesee explained when moving the second reading, unit trusts—which I found when I was in England in 1934 were then quite an established institution in that country—have in recent years become popular in Australia. They have a particular appeal because they provide the small investor with the age-old advantage of spreading his investment and not having to put all his eggs in one basket.

A man with a substantial amount of capital—say £1,000—can probably invest £100 in each of 10 companies; but a man who has £50 or even £100 to invest finds it is not practical politics to look around for 10 companies in which to invest his money. But by subscribing to membership in what are known as unit trusts, he can obtain a unit which represents a proportionate share in 10, 20, 50 or 100 public companies.

With the development of unit trusts, it has been considered necessary to see that the ordinary conditions of the Companies

Act relating to the publication of prospectuses and the prohibition of share hawking should apply with equal force to such trusts.

While on the question of share hawking, although share hawking from house to house, by personal canvassing, is prohibited with respect to shares in any company, and it is proposed by the Bill to prohibit such activities in respect to shares in unit trusts, no such provision is included in the Building Societies Act with respect to shares in building societies. I suggest to the Minister that this omission is a matter to which the Government might give its atteniton, because the evil of share hawking on a house-to-house basis applies no less to shares in building societies than to shares in public companies or unit trusts. I merely mention that in passing.

The Bill proposes that every fixed trust, as these companies are known, should lodge with the Registrar of Companies, annually, a list of all its members. Whilst with respect to a limited company it may be necessary or desirable that a list of the members of the company should be lodged each year with the Companies Office, I find it difficult to see any justification for requiring the members of those fixed trusts to have their names listed and registered at the court. After all, they are not direct shareholders in the company. The shareholders of the company are still shown, if that information is wanted for credit or other purposes. But here there is simply a group of persons pooling their money to buy shares in companies.

It seems to me that if the trustees of a fixed trust have to lodge with the Companies Office the names of the many thousands of persons who hold units in the trust, they would, by so doing, provide a good mailing list for any cheapjack company promoter; there would be a ready made mailing list on which anyone with a proposition not so good, could work, because it would be a mailing list of many thousands of small people who might be susceptible to plausible propaganda. In addition I imagine that the lodging of the annual return at the Companies Office would entail a considerable amount of work for the management of the trust.

Hon. W. F. Willesee: Would the management have to lodge the return with the Taxation Department?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I doubt it. The department has in this State the form A.D. which relates to dividends, although the completion of that form is not required to the same extent as it used to be. It is not required at all in the other States, but for some reason or other it is in Western Australia.

Hon. W. F. Willesee: I wondered how the Taxation Department would check the dividends.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The unit trusts would probably have to lodge the return; or alternatively each member would receive a notice which he would attach to his income tax return. There has recently been an income tax case on the question of whether the capital profits that the fixed trusts make are taxable in the hands of the unit holders. It has been held that they are not a taxable profit but a capital one right through.

Another provision in the Bill seeks to remove a pretty harsh provision with respect to registered auditors and liquidators who do not carry out their duties with the efficiency and integrity required by the Act. Under the Act a person is not permitted to act as a company auditor or a company liquidator unless he is registered; and provision is contained in the Act that in cases of neglect or dereliction of duty, the Registrar of Companies may cancel the registration of the auditor or liquidator.

At the moment this is the only power he has, so no matter how trifling the offence, if the registrar feels it warrants some punishment, the only thing he is permitted to do is to cancel the registration of the practitioner, which is rather drastic. The Bill proposes to alleviate this position by giving the registrar power to cancel or suspend the registration, or to fine the practitioner up to £100; or he may penalise him by both a fine and suspension.

Hon. L. C. Diver: That is the auditor?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes.

Hon. L. C. Diver: How about secretaries and trustees?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: No, this deals with auditors and liquidators. They are the ones who have to be registered.

Hon. L. C. Diver: Do they have to be qualified?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes. In that regard, the proposal in the Bill is a move in the right direction, but on this matter I feel, as on every other question, that where a man's livelihood is at stake or a penalty is involved, his livelihood or the general penalty should not be exclusively in the hands of one man but that there should be a right of appeal.

In this instance I consider there should be a right of appeal to the court. If the provision for appeal were included in the Bill it would be futile for the person concerned, if he had been punished fairly and justly, to appeal, but on the other hand if he felt he had been unduly punished, that right of appeal would be available to him. I think that is fair. The Bill is essentially a Committee measure. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 15th October.

HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [9.58]: The Bill has a twofold purpose—firstly, to relax the restrictions of the Act as they apply to railway refreshment rooms to permit them to serve liquor to travellers on railway road buses; and secondly, to provide for hotel sites in new housing areas.

In connection with the former purpose, the Bill goes a little too far in that it not only provides the machinery by which railway road bus passengers may obtain refreshment in a manner applicable to railway travellers, but it also varies an important principle inasmuch as it seeks to provide that any person, whether he be a bona fide traveller or not, may be permitted to obtain liquor at railway refreshment rooms during restricted periods of trading.

These railway refreshment rooms pay no licences; they pay no taxation; and in general terms they do not have to comply with the very many restrictions placed on hotelkeepers under the Licensing Act. Therefore I feel that it is quite wrong to permit them to serve liquor to any one at all during the restricted periods of trading provided under the Act.

The second point in the Bill, concerning the provision of hotel sites in new housing areas, is quite a reasonable one. But here again I think that the provision needs a little tidying up, in that it would be possible, if the Bill were passed in its present form, for the State Housing Commission, or some other State instrumentality, not only to provide for a hotel site in the new subdivision, but also to establish and conduct a hotel on that site. I feel that this principle, too, is wrong; and in order to cover both those matters, I have prepared two amendments which will be dealt with at the appropriate time.

At present we have on the notice paper two other Bills dealing with the Licensing Act; and apparently these have been kept at the bottom of the notice paper so that the committee, which is at present investigating all the aspects of this important legislation, may be able to consider them and perhaps make some recommendations embodying the provisions in those two Bills.

I feel that this measure also should be dealt with in that manner; and therefore I hope that the Minister will see fit to place it at the bottom of the notice paper so that we will not have to give it further consideration until after the findings of the committee have been placed before us.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.3]: Like Mr. Mattiske, I believe that the three Bills before us, all of a minor nature, should be dealt with after the committee investigating the Licensing Act has submitted its investigations to the Government. Two of these Bills have been introduced by private members, and the other one has been introduced by the Government.

One of the private member's Bills deals with the obtaining of two bottles from clubs on Sundays; and the other, introduced by Mr. Baxter, deals with Sunday trading in two or three hotels in the Mundaring area. The measure we are now discussing provides for the serving of liquor to bus passengers, and also the provision of hotel sites in new housing areas.

The committee investigating the Licensing Act is not a select committee, but it is one composed of members of both Houses of Parliament. I am not prepared to support any of these amendments to the Licensing Act at present because I think it would be wrong in principle. These Bills should be sent to the committee for its consideration and advice; and then, when its recommendations are brought before the Government and the Government decides to take any notice of them, that would be the time for us to give consideration to them.

Just dealing briefly with this Bill, it is in my opinion an attempt to give 9 o'clock to 9 o'clock trading to railway refreshment rooms which are now open purely for the convenience of train passengers. In some areas, such as Watheroo, where there is no hotel nearer than 25 to 30 miles the 9 o'clock to 9 o'clock trading for the refreshment rooms would be quite suitable.

But in places such as Mullewa and Yalgoo, where the hotels rely on the small amount of business offering, 9 o'clock to 9 o'clock trading on the part of the refreshment rooms would seriously affect the publicans; and I am sure it would be quite wrong. I believe that even now at Yalgoo the Act is not policed as well as it should be, and that a certain amount of trade that rightfully belongs to the local publican is going to the railway refreshment rooms.

I do not think there is much wrong with the provisions dealing with sites for hotels in new housing areas, provided no more State hotels are built, and provided the sites are put up for auction by the Government. I will agree that once it was known that a site was to be for a hotel, and that a licence would be granted immediately, the value of the block would increase enormously; and I would say that the State Housing Commission would make substantial profits on the sale of such land. However, I suppose that is something we cannot overcome.

It is my intention to vote against all three amendments to the Licensing Act until such time as they are considered by

the committee to which I have referred, and it has had an opportunity of studying all the ramifications and presenting its report to Parliament.

On motion by Hon. W. R. Hall, debate adjourned.

BILL—OPTOMETRISTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th October.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.7]: This is a very small Bill introduced by Sir Charles Latham; and while, at first, I was inclined to disagree with its provisions, I find after further consideration that it is not as bad as I thought it was. When one studies its provisions one finds that it states—

> Any person who not later than the 30th day of June, 1958, makes application in the prescribed manner to the board for registration under this Act, and proves to the satisfaction of the board—

The person making application must prove himself to the board's satisfaction; therefore, the final say rests with the board itself and not with Parliament. We are not giving an optometrist the right to practise; all we are doing is giving to the board the right to say whether or not a person shall practise. Because of that safeguard, I think we could agree to the measure.

A person making application must be over the age of 21 years and be of good character. The provision also requires that the applicant must be able to indicate that—

> being a natural born, or a naturalised British subject, he has resided continuously in the Commonwealth of Australia for not less than five years during which period he has resided in Western Australia for at least two years—

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: This man has been here for five years.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It goes on—

> and he had, for not less than five years immediately prior to his coming to the Commonwealth of Australia, been continuously and bona fide engaged in the practise of optometry, either as an optometrist or optician; and he has passed a reasonable test in the work of an optometrist prescribed by the board.

So it appears that, throughout, the board is in control of the situation; and all we will do by passing this Bill is to enable it to sit in judgment on the character and ability of any person making application to it. I do not think there is anything wrong with the Bill, and I support the second reading.

HON. W. R. HALL (North-East) [10.10]: I support the Bill because I can see nothing wrong with it. Some years ago we passed legislation enabling a person who had been in Malaya, or one of the islands, to practise optometry; and to my way of thinking that man was quite efficient in his work, and was fully qualified. Provided a person can pass a test prescribed by the board, I think he should be allowed to practise.

It seems to me that in the metropolitan area we are particularly short of professional men; and if one wants to interview anyone connected with the medical profession, an optometrist, a chiropodist, or somebody like that, one has to make an appointment and wait for some days before being attended to. So I think it is time that we allowed people who can pass the necessary examinations to practise.

The public are entitled to this service; and, after all, they pay dearly for it. As long as a man is efficient, can pass his examinations to the satisfaction of the board, and is of good character, there is no reason why he should not be allowed to practise in this State.

If I remember rightly some medical practioners who came to this country were not permitted to practise for a certain period. They might have been highly qualified; and so I can see no reason why, if they pass all the requirements, they should not be permitted to practise. Some of those who would be affected by this Bill would be fully qualified, and no doubt could pass the necessary examination. So long as they do that they should be allowed to practise.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central—in reply) [10.12]: I am very grateful to those members who have seen the Bill in its proper light, and I am sorry that some of my friends in the House have not been here to hear the points that have been made by some members.

There is no responsibility on this House to say whether or not a man is qualified to practise. All we will be doing, by passing this Bill, is to place the responsibility on those who are qualified to determine whether or not a man has the necessary knowledge. That has been the usual practice; and the only difference between this and the normal method of going into practice is that such a person has to spend two or three years at the university, and the rest of his time must be spent studying and working in a place where he can get his practical as well as his theoretical knowledge.

The man in question is getting on in years, and he has practised in Alexandria and Cairo. I am very hopeful that the board will agree that he is sufficiently qualified, because there is no doubt in my mind that he is. Some of these people are making spectacles now, and it is far better to let them know just where they stand instead of allowing people without the

practical knowledge to go into the business. I hope the House will agree to this measure. Years ago there was no control of optometrists; in those days they were known as opticians. All the men practising at that time possessed qualifications similar to those held by the person intended to be covered by this Bill. They did not have the appliances which are in use today.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: We do not want to go back to those days.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: No. The person I am referring to seems to be highly qualified; and under the Bill, the board will be able to determine his qualifications by examination. I am pleased that the Government members in this House have not made this a party measure. If members were in a strange country, and they possessed the same knowledge as this man I am referring to, they would not like to be called on to pass examinations before being able to practise in their profession or calling.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	8
Majority for	7

Ayes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	*(Teller.)*

Noes.

Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. Murray *(Teller.)*

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. L. A. Logan in the Chair; Hon. Sir Charles Latham in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 34B added:

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It is only right that if the person concerned is to be permitted to sit for an examination to enable him to practise as an optometrist, he should not only be able to make and fit spectacles, but also to test eyesight. It is essential for him to know something about the theory and practice of the profession, as well as the making of spectacles: I consider that he should have to satisfy more than a reasonable test in the work of an optometrist prescribed by the board. He should pass a reasonable theoretical and practical test; in other words he should know something about the training in this profession.

It is not fair on students who have undergone training at the University, and who have learned the theory of the work, to allow this person to practise and give advice on eyesight, to prescribe glasses, and to say whether they are correct. He should also have a basic understanding of the profession. I therefore move an amendment—

> That after the word "reasonable" in line 24, page 2, the words "theoretical and practical" be inserted.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I oppose the amendment. The responsibility should be placed on the board to determine what is a reasonable test. I want the board to be satisfied.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: We should be realistic about this legislation. It is not a matter of being kind to one person. Here a principle is being introduced which could become very dangerous. The amendment asks that a test be held both in the training and in the work of optometry; surely that is a reasonable request. An optometrist in testing sight and making glasses may know little of the reasons behind the work he is performing, so the request for theoretical training is made.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I oppose the amendment for the inclusion of the words "theoretical and practical." Under this, any person aspiring to be an optometrist has to go before the board to prove by examination that he is qualified in theory and practice. People practising optometry possess the necessary appliances to test eyesight. They prescribe spectacles and the type of lenses.

I would sooner see the word "reasonable" deleted so as to prescribe that an applicant has only to pass a test, not a reasonable test, in the work of an optometrist. The board is the best judge as to whether an applicant possesses the qualifications of an optometrist. In the metropolitan area and in the Goldfields towns there is a shortage of optometrists; therefore as long as a person has the necessary qualifications, I am prepared to support any measure to enable him to practise.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: This Bill only provides that between now and the 30th June next applications may be made for registration under the Act. After the 30th June next, further legislation will be required. It does not set aside the existing Act altogether.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The letter from the Optometrists Board indicates that this person does not possess the necessary qualifications.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Then the board can reject him. Let the board take the responsibility.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It has already taken the responsibility. It has refused to permit this man to practise because he has not the qualifications.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This is what the letter from the registrar of the board contains—

> This man first applied to this board for registration in 1952, but as he did not possess the qualifications as set out in Rule 30 the board had no alternative but to advise him that he could not be registered under the Act.

Hon. L. C. Diver: What rule is that?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: One of its own. Do members not think that we must protect our own students by asking that this man should know something about the job both in regard to theory and practice?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You haven't any confidence in the board.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I have not much confidence in the wording of the Bill.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Or in the board.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I have little confidence in anyone attempting to introduce this sort of measure all the time which whittles away a standard which an attempt is being made to maintain in this State in all these ancillary services. We are only lessening in the eyes of those who are going to practise in this way the value of the work. I am very concerned that we should not continually introduce measures of this kind.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I give you my word I will never introduce another one!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I hope I will never see another one of this sort introduced in this place. It could be a dangerous precedent.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think there is a lot of merit in the amendment. Dr. Hislop takes the view that we are not here to consider the particular interest of an individual but the interest of the community; and I think it is only right and in accordance with our duty to the public that we should do what lies in our power to ensure that people who aspire to test people's eyes and make glasses for them and charge them fees should pass proper and adequate standards.

I do not know anything about the occupation of optometry; but I do know the eye is a most delicate part of the human body, and that when we trust it to the keeping of certain people it is only right that we should do what we can to ensure that very high standards are maintained by those people. We know that in the early days folk travelled around country districts, made tests of people's eyes, and prescribed spectacles which led to a good deal of suffering.

Now the profession has decent standards, and people have to qualify in an adequate way. That is something that is due to the public and especially to people in country areas who do not know who's who. A man visits a town and subjects all and sundry to tests, makes glasses, and charges them pretty high fees; and their welfare is at stake.

I do not think that the amendment will do any harm. These people need to know some theory and to have a good deal of practical knowledge; and by inserting the words proposed by Dr. Hislop, we will indicate to the board that that is the type of test a man should be able to pass. We would be failing in our duty if we did not do something along these lines.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: There is no professional man I admire more than the optometrist, because I am one of those unfortunate people who were born with very inferior eyesight. At an early age I was taken to professional eye doctors; but it was not until I gave them away and went to an optometrist that I could see a sheep in my paddock half a mile away. So I have every reason to be grateful to these people, and that was before there were qualifications.

We have passed laws that people must do certain things and reach certain standards, but the real acid test comes with the passing on of that knowledge to the persons submitting themselves for examination. We have a board which issues a certificate of worthiness to candidates which it thinks fit to engage in the profession. The Bill leaves the responsibility to the board to make a determination. Surely if we insert these words we show a lack of confidence in the people charged with that responsibility.

Not wishing to affront that board, and having every confidence in it and in the optometrists practising in Western Australia; and feeling sure that the board will see that the standards are not lowered, I propose to support the clause as printed.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I am surprised there has been so much debate on this matter. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify for the benefit of the board the intention of Parliament that these two aspects should be included in the particular examination. At present the Bill provides that a man shall pass a reasonable examination. That would imply

theoretical and practical knowledge, and the amendment simply clarifies the position.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	10
Majority for	2

Ayes.

Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. G. MacKinnon	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	Hon. A. F. Griffith

(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. W. R. Hall

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

House adjourned at 10.44 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 22nd October, 1957.

CONTENTS.

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

QUESTIONS.

LAND AGENTS BOARD.

Capacity, Ability and Integrity of Members.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Justice:

(1) Have any complaints as to the capacity, ability, or integrity of any member of the Land Agents Board been received?