

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, December 1, 1953.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.**LICENSING OF TAXI CABS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Following on the questions I asked last week can the Premier make a statement regarding the possible introduction of legislation to licence taxicabs in accordance with the recommendations of the recent committee of inquiry?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The matter was discussed in Cabinet yesterday. The Government will not introduce legislation on the matter this session, which is to end this week. There are several matters, not vital, still requiring some attention but it is hoped to have a draft Bill prepared and submitted to local government authorities in time for early consideration next session.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. PEARSON—The sub-leader of the *Advertiser* of Friday last, in dealing with the matter of the subsidy which has been proposed and I believe agreed upon by arrangement between the Treasurer and the Electricity Trust, said:—

Many producers, even in the more remote parts, are now receiving good returns; and a subsidy in such cases could only be paid at the expense of other consumers of electricity, some of whom might be in more difficult circumstances.

This may cause a misapprehension in the minds of some people as to the way the subsidy will be provided. I believe the Government intends that the subsidy shall assist in decentralization, and in the support of country industries as well as primary producers. Can the Premier say:—

(1) Is it not a fact that the rates for other than metropolitan users are fixed on variable charges, as indicated in the Trust's Tariff Columns, 2 to 8, all of which are a graduation of a scale of charges basically higher than the metropolitan area?

(2) Is it not a fact that the subsidy will be provided out of funds contributed by the Treasurer, and not out of the trust's own

revenue, and therefore will not affect rates to metropolitan consumers, except possibly to reduce them, by reason of total volume?

(3) Is not the subsidy scheme designed to enable the trust to reticulate to areas which otherwise could not possibly have a supply except at costs which would be prohibitive?

(4) Is it not intended that the rate of subsidy will be decreased as consumption increases?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The four questions can all be answered in the affirmative. In each case the position is as stated by the honourable member. The only qualification is that although the scale of charges makes provision for transmission costs I doubt whether they are precisely the amounts mentioned in each instance. It would be almost impossible to get them relative from year to year, because the position would fluctuate from year to year or even from quarter to quarter. The charges are based on transmission costs, and country areas far distant pay a higher price than the metropolitan area and nearer country districts. It is correct that the entire cost of the subsidy will be borne by the Government, and it does not mean an altered charge to present users of electricity, except, indirectly, as he stated, to reduce the cost slightly because of the higher volume of electricity generated. A considerable number of applications have been received, and a schedule of works under the subsidy scheme is being prepared and will be considered by Cabinet within a few days.

BURNING OFF GRASS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Premier say whether the Fire Brigades Board intends making available firemen and equipment from fire stations to burn off grass on application by owners of vacant allotments?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member was good enough to inform me he proposed asking this question. Of course, the Fire Brigades Board is not under Government control, though the Government appoints the chairman. I find there has been some correspondence between the Fire Brigades Board and the Chief Secretary on this matter, and the question of what steps can be taken to burn off stubble under the Bush Fires Act is involved. The Crown Solicitor's opinion was obtained and forwarded to the Fire Brigades Board. The latest information I have received is that the matter is being considered by the Fire Brigades Industrial Board to see whether the burning off of grass on vacant allotments is part of the duties for which fire brigades officers are employed.

HOUSING TRUST TWO-STOREY HOUSES.

Mr. DUNKS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last Tuesday about the new two-storey houses proposed to be erected by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have a report which shows that the houses comply in every way with the Building Act. The report, which may also interest people other than the honourable member, reads as follows:—

The query as to the design prepared by the South Australian Housing Trust for a two-storey house relates to two points, firstly, whether the Building Act contemplates the use of brick in the ground storey and timber frame in the first storey, and secondly, whether the size of certain small bedrooms is in accord with the Act. As to the first point, the use of mixed brick and timber frame construction is in accord with the Building Act. It may be of interest that, in bulletins published by such as the Commonwealth Experimental Building Station after considerable research into the matter, it is recommended that the ideal house for such as the South Australian summer climate is one where the part of the house used in the day time, such as the living room and the kitchen, is built in brick whilst the sleeping rooms are in timber frame. Whilst brick heats up relatively slowly and thus is cooler than timber frame during the day time, it also cools off much more slowly than timber-frame and is much hotter than timber-frame during the night time. Thus, particularly during the summer months, it is suggested that the brick part of a house is the cooler and the more suitable for use during the day time, but timber-frame is the cooler and the more suitable for night time use. As regards room sizes in the ordinary dwellinghouses, the Building Act does not lay down any rules at all and it is competent for a building owner to build rooms of any size he chooses. Obviously, it is desirable room size is conditioned by the use for which it is intended. In the design in question it would appear that the trust is intending to cater for the needs of a family with up to four children. Many families would prefer to have four small rooms giving one room to each child for his or her private use, in lieu of having, say, two large bedrooms which must be shared. The rooms as designed are adequate for the use for which they are intended and provide space for a bed and a small table and chair where each child can do his or her homework in relative seclusion, if so desired. Other relevant points are that, immediately adjoining these small bedrooms, is a common space 120 sq. ft. in area and that it is proposed to provide built-in wardrobes and cupboards sufficient for the needs of the children for whom these bedrooms and other space are designed.

I think the honourable member will find that report entirely satisfactory.

WHEAT STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT.

Mr. STOTT—Parliament is likely to prorogue on Thursday, but no provision has been made for a ballot of growers to be taken on wheat stabilization. I understand that provision has been made in all the other States whereby a ballot of growers can be taken without special legislation, whereas in this State it is necessary for a Bill to be passed authorizing the Minister of Agriculture to conduct a ballot. I am also informed it is not necessary for the Commonwealth Parliament to pass legislation on the general wheat stabilization plan until after the ballot is taken. As the South Australian Parliament may not be able to deal with a ballot of growers until next August, unless we make provision this session, I ask the Minister whether Cabinet has considered bringing down a Bill this week to give him the necessary power to undertake a ballot of growers? If the Minister does not know exactly what questions will have to be submitted, could he be given by regulation under the Bill the necessary powers in that regard when he knows what the questions will be and then take a ballot, probably in February or March next, and could a special clause be inserted in the Bill to enable him to have the Act proclaimed after the verdict of the growers is known?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The problem is largely one for the Commonwealth Government. I have been in more or less constant touch with the Federal Minister for Commerce and Agriculture and received a communication from him, I think yesterday, about the taking of a ballot, but it indicated there were still one or two matters outstanding in regard to the arrangements that were in train for a ballot to be taken on the same question in all the States. In other words, the States must be in agreement on the conditions to be laid down in respect of the ballot. I wired the Acting Federal Minister for Commerce and Agriculture urgently, informing him that this House was proroguing this week, and that in consequence, if the Commonwealth were desirous of our taking a ballot, it would be necessary for him to advise me promptly of its terms in order that I could proceed with the necessary legislation, but so far I have not received any reply. As it is primarily a Commonwealth concern, that Government must now advise me of the terms and conditions on which it wishes the ballot taken. I informed the

Commonwealth Government that we were prepared to pass the necessary legislation, but I must know what I am to take the ballot upon. I am not prepared to ask the House to give me a blank cheque to insert whatever conditions I think fit and I do not think the House would give me such authority, even if I asked for it. However, the matter is being fully considered.

Mr. HEASLIP—From the Minister's reply it appears that legislation will not be possible before this session ends. My constituents are anxious that a ballot be taken to decide whether wheat stabilization will continue.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—On any terms?

Mr. HEASLIP—They want the right to decide on the terms offered. I think they are entitled to that opportunity, particularly as the Federal Government now holds £9,000,000 of their money purely for the purpose of wheat stabilization, but it appears now that they are not to have the opportunity to decide whether there will be wheat stabilization. I understand Her Majesty will open Parliament in this State next March. Can the Minister say whether it will be possible then, if not before, to introduce legislation to enable a ballot to be taken?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Since I replied to the honourable member for Ridley, I have received an urgent telegram from the Commonwealth Minister for Commerce and Agriculture advising me that he has circulated my telegram regarding wheat stabilization to other State Ministers. His telegram continues:—

However now apparent quite impracticable secure agreement all points all States in time for your legislation December 3. Could you perhaps consider special enabling measure authorizing you take ballot if agreement on details reached with other Governments. Legislation could make it clear that stabilization if affirmed at ballot could not proceed in your State until full legislation passed. Only alternative seems to be for you to pass legislation along lines your telegram but make proclamation conditional upon affirmative ballot and upon similar legislation in all States and complementary Commonwealth legislation. However this alternative has disadvantage it might not be basis final agreement between States on minor points.

The honourable member will realize that we might take a ballot on a question on which the States are not all agreed, and in the final analysis it might leave the matter open for controversy. In the light of that telegram I will discuss with Cabinet whether it is possible for agreement to be reached to take a ballot on some terms and pass the necessary legislation during the next session of Parliament.

ROYAL TOUR.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Recently the Premier intimated that invitations would be issued to local governing bodies for distribution to people within their areas, so that such people would be able to see Her Majesty on the occasion of her visit to the showgrounds. Can the Premier say whether the Royal Tour Committee intends to issue invitations solely through local government bodies or whether certain titled or decorated persons will receive their invitations separately? I ask this question so that there will be no duplication of invitations and so that as many people as possible may see Her Majesty.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It will be necessary to issue, other than through local government bodies, a limited number of invitations. There are certain persons who, because of their position, should be present, and others who, because of their services to the community which have been recognized by Her Majesty, would be entitled to attend, but I will see that every step is taken to ensure that there are no vacant places because of duplication of invitations. Every council will be required to furnish a list of persons to whom it has issued invitations so that a check may be made to see that all accommodation is fully occupied. All invitations will be issued through councils, except for a small unavoidable supplementary list.

Mr. DAVIS—In reply to my question of last week the Premier said that he would place before Cabinet the matter of concession fares for country children wishing to visit Adelaide during the Royal Tour, and, later, that he was unable to reply to my question because the Minister of Education was ill. Can he say whether Cabinet has yet considered this matter and whether the Minister of Education is the deciding factor in regard to fares?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The function referred to is being organized by the Education Department and the basic arrangements for it are in the hands of the Minister of Education. Unfortunately, at the moment he is in hospital and will be there for a few more days, although I understand he is making satisfactory progress and will soon be able to resume his duties. As soon as possible I will get details of the concessions to be provided, but, until such details as the allocation of accommodation have been finalized it will not be possible to know what concession fares will operate because we do not know whether all districts will be included. For instance, the Queen will visit Whyalla and, as

the school children there will have the opportunity of seeing her, it would not be proper to exclude children from other areas which Her Majesty will not visit merely to make accommodation in Adelaide available for Whyalla children. I will get a reply to the honourable member's question as soon as possible.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Earlier this session I asked the Premier what arrangements were being made to issue invitations to attend functions associated with the Royal Visit to people residing in localities outside council areas. Has this matter been considered?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and the relative numbers of persons concerned have been established. Of course, in comparison with the metropolitan area, the numbers are small. I have discussed with the State Director of the Royal Tour how best to allocate accommodation, and I think we shall have to get the assistance of the members for the districts concerned to ascertain the best way of distributing invitations. They probably have better information about persons who perform public services in their districts than any Government department would have. I would be prepared to grant a bigger proportionate allocation to country people than would be justified upon a population basis because I think people in outback areas will have less opportunity of seeing Her Majesty than metropolitan residents, who will probably be able to attend a number of functions.

SOUTH ROAD.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question on the condition of South Road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have conferred with the honourable member and have asked for further information in reply to his question. A supplementary reply has not yet come forward; I will probably bring it down tomorrow. At present I prefer not to state what that further information may be.

UNLOADING OF STEEL CARGO.

Mr. TAPPING—This session mention has been made of the shortage of steel in South Australia, and the reasons given for that shortage have included lack of shipping. Today at 5 p.m. the vessel *River Murray*, with a cargo of steel from Newcastle, is due to berth at F wharf, Birkenhead. Five gangs have been engaged to work the ship from 5 to 11 p.m., and, although 300 waterside workers are without work today, the vessel's agents do not desire men to work the shift

from midnight to 7 a.m. Will the Premier ascertain the reasons for the loss of time in discharging the valuable cargo from this vessel?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Without knowing the terms of the award under which the waterside workers are working I presume that the owners of the vessels wished to avoid the payment of penalty rates, but I will find out the reason for the alleged delay.

SEWERAGE CONNECTIONS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Many houses within the municipality of West Torrens are not connected with the deep drainage system. The council recently served a number of orders on householders declaring their present method of night soil disposal to be an insanitary condition under the provision of the Health Act, and requiring that the premises concerned be connected with the deep drainage system. The majority of the people concerned desire to have this connection made, but are unable to give effect to their personal desire or to the notice of the local board of health because of the cost involved, which they are not in a position to meet. Many of them are old age pensioners and others are on a very limited income. The council could take legal action against the defaulters for non-compliance with its order, but this would be mere persecution, as they simply have not the funds available to meet the capital outlay. Until two or three years ago the Sewers Department operated a policy whereby it assisted householders in the connection of their premises with the deep drainage system by meeting the actual costs of the connection and charging an additional amount each year to the householders' sewer and water account until the amount involved had been eliminated. Without some assistance, all concerned are at an impasse. Can the Minister of Works give me a reply to the following questions:—

(1) Does the Government agree that where sewers are available it is most desirable that premises in the sewered area should be connected with the deep drainage as the only satisfactory and hygienic method of disposing of nightsoil and waste water?

(2) Will the Government agree that the inability of the very great number of householders to meet the present-day cost of such connection with the resultant fact that obsolete and unsatisfactory methods of nightsoil and waste water disposal are in operation is not a desirable feature of modern domestic life?

(3) (a) Is the past policy of the Government still in operation in respect to financing sewerage connections to private premises where the owner is unable to meet the cost involved in such connection?

(b) If not, what is the reason for its discontinuance?

(4) Will the Minister take steps to have the position reviewed with the object of again providing the finance which is necessary, so that the applications already held by the department and others which would follow might be met and the premises concerned connected with the deep drainage system?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—With his usual courtesy, the honourable member indicated that he intended to ask the question and I have gone into the position thoroughly. A limited and fixed amount has been authorized by Parliament for expenditure in this direction and obviously we cannot simultaneously provide extensions of the sewerage system to old houses or new homes without denying the facility to other people. Consequently, the first priority forced upon the Government and Parliament is to take the sewers along the streets. Thereafter it becomes the obligation of the householder, or the people financing him, to provide the funds to make the individual connections. It makes little difference in actual cost to the householder whether he borrows the money from, say, the State Bank, a private lending body or the Government, but in the aggregate the amount is very considerable. Consequently it has been resolved as a matter of policy to make sewerage available to the majority of the people, and where it can be shown that the individual cannot, under ordinary means of financing, find the money there is still a fund available for that purpose. Each case will have to be considered on its merits. In the past it was regarded as more or less automatic that the connection should be paid for by the Government, and as a consequence the Government was financing the private work of the property owner, but now this charge is regarded primarily, and in most cases is accepted, as being part and parcel of the original construction cost. If there is any case of real hardship, I shall be glad to take it up. There is a fund to meet such cases, but it would have to be shown that it was a hardship. The remainder of the work for the general community should not be encroached upon in order to make such Government assistance general.

FINSBURY TRAM SERVICE.

Mr. LAWN—I have received a number of complaints from employees of Chrysler Australia Ltd. working at Finsbury regarding tram transport. I understand that they cease work at 4.5 p.m. but a tram leaves Cheltenham at 4.4 p.m. The request for this tram to start 6 minutes later has been placed before the Tramways Trust but it has been refused. Employees have to wait a considerable time for the next tram and they have no shelter from either the hot or the wet weather. Will the Premier take the matter up with the trust to see if an alteration can be made in the timetable? Employees have assured the trust that if the tram departs a few minutes later it will be full.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will take the matter up as requested.

STRUAN FARM SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN—The Struan farm school was established near Naracoorte to give further training to boys from the Magill Reformatory. Can the Premier give the total area of the holding and the various purposes for which it is used and if used for grazing, the total number of sheep, cattle and other live-stock? Is the school self-supporting; that is producing sufficient to cover all the expenses? Has the purpose for which the school was established been achieved, and have the boys responded in the manner expected through their transfer from the Magill Reformatory?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member referred this matter to me some days ago and I have obtained a comprehensive report on the activities of the school. It states:—

Struan Farm School, with an area of 1,159 acres, was purchased by the Government for £18,000, and opened in May, 1947. On the property there is a large building, two storeys high, containing many rooms, three cottages, and various farm buildings. This is a training school which is conducted, as far as practicable, on homely lines and is a miniature society rehabilitating wards of the State along lines of self-control and teaching the boys the ordinary requirements of citizenship, together with rural and vocational training. Outside contacts and various sports have been encouraged and the boys receive regular religious instruction. All boys are trusted and are allowed to visit approved places, as arranged. Valuable services are rendered by local private enthusiasts and are greatly appreciated. Boys are made proficient in the use and maintenance of farm implements, engines, erecting fences, general handiwork, and are taught animal husbandry, growing crops, orchard work, vegetable growing, looking after sheep, general dairy work, topdressing pastures, cattle and poultry management, and pig husbandry. One

hundred and fifty boys have been sent to the institution, ages ranging from 14 to 18 years. There are, at present, 23 boys in residence. The present building can accommodate 30 boys. The average length of stay of a boy is about eight months. The boys receive regular payments for their services and board and lodging. Boys are required to pay for their clothing, certain outings, and other things.

From 1947 to June, 1953, £59,602 has been spent on provisions, clothing, light, fuel, vehicles, sundry maintenance costs, stock and equipment, and salaries. During this period the revenue of the school has totalled £21,056, sales of produce being £17,326. The present stock on the property comprises 994 sheep, 27 dairy cattle, 42 beef cattle, 71 poultry, 5 pigs and 2 horses. £2,500 has been provided by the Government on the recent Estimates for the purchase of additional sheep.

Since 1947, considerable improvements have been effected to the whole property by the staff and the boys, covering general maintenance work on the buildings, wind mills, troughs, fencing, pastures, and such like. Additional bathing and toilet facilities have been provided and the building furnished throughout, at the time of occupation. New farm implements, Guernsey dairy herd, Hereford beef cattle, stud sheep and rams, and various farm engines have been purchased. A modern poultry house, petrol and oil store, a modern dairy, cattle yards, new wool and shearing shed, and a new laundry have been erected. Electric light plant has been established, pine plantation planted, considerable fencing renewed, water supplies improved, orchard replanted, and a large vegetable garden established. A sports oval has been provided, the homestead renovated and repaired, and pastures improved.

The benefits that have accrued to the boys who have had this training have been considerable. The boys are encouraged to gain pastoral land farming experience with a view to inducing them to seek positions in the rural community. Character and ethical training, together with instruction given by the staff which also comprises evening classes on various subjects, give assurance and stability to the boys who are selected for this training school. Quite a number of the boys about 14 years of age, particularly from the Industrial School and who have come from neglected homes, have considerably benefited in health during their period of training at Struan.

INSURANCE OF THEATRE FIREMEN.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Premier any information to give following on the question I asked on November 18 regarding the insurance of theatre fire watchmen?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Reports from both the Government Insurance Officer, Mr. West, and the Public Service Commissioner assure me that employers are liable under the Act for the full compensation provided for. It is necessary for them under the law to take out a policy covering their employees.

CLOTHING PRICES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Premier anything to report following on the question I asked on November 5 regarding the difference in the prices of certain clothing in the eastern States and in South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I referred the matter to the Prices Commissioner, who states in a report:—

Since clothing was decontrolled, investigations have been intensified. All types of clothing, including shirts, have been closely checked and a lengthy investigation carried out involving correspondence and many interviews with manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, etc. The lines involved are mainly of interstate origin and, of course, would be involved with higher landed costs. In order to see that the South Australian public is not being discriminated against a close check has been kept on advertised prices not only in interstate metropolitan newspapers, but also in interstate country papers. There has been a conflict of opinion as to the responsibility for the increased margins, but progress has been made and adjustments have been effected not only on shirts, but other clothing lines. All types of clothing are under close surveillance. The general public could help if it would show more discrimination in buying. There are very good articles of clothing on the market much lower in price than the ones in question, and, further, they are of local manufacture. South Australians are strongly recommended to buy goods of local manufacture. Buyer resistance when alternative goods are available is a good price weapon.

This morning I received a telegram from the New South Wales Prices Minister, who is also chairman of the Prices Ministers' Conferences which are held from time to time, informing me that as a matter of policy the New South Wales Government had decided to decontrol all clothing forthwith.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ENFIELD LOAN) BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS—Recently a Select Committee was appointed to investigate the provisions of the Local Government (City of Enfield Loan) Bill. I understand they are different from provisions in other legislation. The sum of £250,000 is to be borrowed and the ratepayers will be responsible not only for repaying the money, but for the interest and the costs incurred in raising the loan. Under ordinary circumstances the ratepayers would have the right to demand a poll on the question before being forced into obligations under a loan. Ratepayers will have a debt hanging around their neck for 60 years. When the Select Committee meets will it invite any ratepayers to give evidence, or will it consider any requests from them?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Select Committee includes members nominated by members on the other side of the House. It has met and I purpose bringing down its report at the earliest possible moment. The subject can then be debated.

HOTEL SALES OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. DUNKS—There is a prevailing opinion that hotels are allowed to sell cigarettes after the closing hours of storekeepers and tobacconists, namely, 6 p.m. on week days and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays, with total prohibition of sales on Sundays. Can the Premier say whether hotels can sell cigarettes legally after hours?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not sure of the legal position, but I know it is done frequently. I fancy that licensed premises are not registered as shops, and that may be the reason for their being able to sell cigarettes after normal hours, but I will ascertain the legal position and let the honourable member know.

GALVANIZED IRON SUPPLIES.

Mr. HAWKER—Can the Premier say whether more or less galvanized iron has been available in South Australia since the lifting of controls?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In the main, the companies have maintained the same quota to each State as was provided under Commonwealth legislation, though at any given moment they are either a little behind or ahead of the quota. However, at present we are well behind in our galvanized iron quota. When materials controls were removed early in February last outstanding orders for galvanized iron amounted to about 1,400 tons, whereas today they amount to about 16,000 tons. Therefore, the position has deteriorated badly, and the claims made by firms that without controls the position would immediately improve have not been substantiated. Steel ships have arrived at Port Adelaide from Newcastle and Port Kembla during the last four years as follows:—

Year.	Ex New- castle.	Ex Port Kembla.
1950	16	9
1951	15	11
1952	21	15
1953 (to Nov. 30)	16	12

At present two ships are either loading or on the way to Adelaide, namely, *River Murray*, which was due to sail from Newcastle last Saturday, and the *Iron Master*, which has been delayed in loading at Port Kembla because

of industrial trouble. The 1952 arrivals from Newcastle included five small ships bringing less than 3,000 tons each. Galvanized iron is not now sent by road, but a few good shipments have been received from Sydney, where shipping space to Adelaide has been readily available. I understand that Lysaghts are at present rolling much more black iron, and are not concentrating as much as they might upon the production of galvanized iron. I fancy there is some financial advantage in rolling other gauges and black iron and at present the mills are not concentrating fully on the production of galvanized iron, but that matter is now being examined.

PORT PIRIE STORM DAMAGE REPAIR.

Mr. DAVIS—Some time ago I asked the Minister of Local Government whether the £5,000 which had been claimed by the city of Port Pirie to effect repairs following on damage by storm would be granted, and he advised that he had received no report from the committee investigating the matter and would make investigations. Since then I have heard news broadcasts stating that certain councils had been granted various sums, but Port Pirie has not been mentioned. Has the Minister of Local Government received the committee's report on Port Pirie and can he say why its claim has not been considered?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—When we appoint a committee we have faith in the integrity and industry of its members. If Port Pirie has received no consideration up to the present it is not because it is not going to receive it but because its claim is not considered so urgent as the claims of other places. The committee is a non-Party body, so Port Pirie has not been ignored because of Party politics. I have not received a report and I do not think it is my function to direct the committee's energies to any particular place. It is its place to do its duty, and Parliament has authorized me to make the funds available on its recommendations. As soon as I receive the report on Port Pirie I will endorse or reject it. Up to the present all its reports have received my endorsement.

HONEY CONSUMPTION AND BOARD'S REPORTS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of November 18 regarding the tabling in Parliament of reports by the Honey Board and the consumption of honey over the last few years?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The Honey Marketing Act does not require the board to report to Parliament. On the second

part of the honourable member's question a report from the board states:—

Year ended June 30, 1950. (Immediately preceding the establishment of the board.)	Sold in tins. lb.	Population.	Per capita consumption.	Wholesale bulk price per lb. (including cost of container).	
				lb.	s. d.
1950	21,722	700,184	1.86	0	7½
1951	14,443	720,140	1.20	0	8
1952	19,851	739,563	1.61	0	9½
1953	19,276	757,189	1.53	1	0

It is important to bear in mind that a very strong contributing factor to the fall in the local consumption of honey has been the increasing wholesale bulk price which was 7½d. per lb. before the board came into operation and has gradually been increased to 1s. per lb.

ACCOMMODATION FOR AGED.

Mr. LAWN—Last week, in reply to my question regarding the number of patients in mental institutions, the Premier said:—

The Government has gone to the extent of accepting voluntary lodgers who have not been certified as insane so as to enable them to be looked after in their advancing years. . . . They have gone there of their own free will and could leave tomorrow if they wished. They are getting the very best attention and evidently they are satisfied because they are staying.

On the same day the *News* refuted the Premier's statement. A journalist who had been specially appointed to investigate the accommodation in asylums of aged persons said that the Rev. A. D. McCutcheon was only one person who had been approached by so-called pensioner boarders at the mental asylum requesting that accommodation be found for them elsewhere and that he arranged alternative accommodation for some of these inmates. The press report stated that some of those unfortunate enough to be left at Parkside were requesting that accommodation be found for them outside. Can the Premier say whether the fact that these aged inmates do not leave the institution, although they are free to go, means that they are satisfied with their present living conditions and, if the report in the *News* that some or all of these people would prefer to leave Parkside is correct, will he ascertain the true position to see whether alternative accommodation can be arranged for them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no doubt that my statement that these people are in Parkside of their own volition and are free to leave if they so desire is true. The honourable member places an incorrect interpretation on my statement by implying that I described

them as satisfied merely because they stay in the Parkside mental institution, for I presume no normal person would live in an asylum if other accommodation were available. I said that the Government was providing accommodation there and that we were doing our best to provide additional accommodation as soon as possible. If the 26 aged persons who are there had alternative accommodation to go to tomorrow they could go to it.

Mr. Lawn—Will you provide alternative accommodation for them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In reply to his former question I informed the honourable member of the works being carried out. Everything possible is being done to meet the position speedily. The Commonwealth Constitution provides that the care of aged persons is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, and that responsibility has been confirmed by referendum. Aged persons receive pensions to provide for their maintenance and accommodation, and those pensions are designed to cover, not only food and clothing but full living requirements, yet the honourable member claims that, besides the Commonwealth obligation the State Government is obliged to provide accommodation for them. That is not true; in fact, in other States where accommodation is provided for pensioners they have been called upon to pay a substantial part of their pensions for that accommodation.

OIL USED IN DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister of Railways say whether the condition of the Railways Department diesel locomotives, which resulted in their being out of service for some time, was due to the use of reconditioned oil?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Reconditioned oil was not used, but because the oils originally provided were not available there was a changeover to lubricating and fuel oils which gave unsatisfactory results by gumming the pistons. The engines were brought in and cleaned and are now going back into service at the rate of two a day.

“POT OF GOLD.”

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 17 regarding the operations of a company known as the “Pot of Gold” then operating in Adelaide?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The following report of the detective-sergeant who inquired into the matter has been supplied by the Commissioner of Police:—

The following are the facts known regarding the setting up of this organization in this State. On Saturday, September 12, 1953, a man giving the name of Neal Townsend, single, aged 38 years, temporarily of 97 Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide, came to this office and introduced himself to the undersigned as being the sole proprietor of a business which he described as being the “Pot of Gold.” He stated that he had conducted a similar business in the other States of the Commonwealth, and had in fact just completed a campaign in Perth, Western Australia. In all States he met police opposition but was not prevented from operating and no action was taken against him. The press in the various States had given the venture much publicity and he produced newspaper clippings bearing out certain statements that the Crown law authorities had considered the legal aspects and could find no infringement of the law although they were not happy about the position. His reason for coming to this office was to make his presence and intentions of operating this venture known to the proper authorities. He stated that he had consulted the legal firm of Baker, McEwin, Millhouse and Ligertwood, of Victoria Square, Adelaide, and outlined his scheme to them for opinion as to its legality in this State. He was advised that as far as the facts outlined by him to them were concerned, it was a lawful business venture.

Townsend outlined the method of carrying on the business as follows:—Firstly, he produced a sheet of 16 coupons, each coupon bearing the name of a city or suburban firm (attached hereto). He then produced a carbon copy of an agreement drawn up and signed by the firm or trader whose name appeared on the coupon, these agreements being to the effect that the firm named would honour the free service as set out on the coupon. No charge was made for this service. He proposed to dispose of these coupons at 30s. per sheet, commencing as from Wednesday, September 16, 1953. This charge of 30s. was to cover his expenses and the prospective purchaser would receive the benefit of the free service mentioned on the coupon. At this stage Townsend had completed all these agreements and the coupons had been printed. I requested him to return to the Criminal Investigation Branch on Monday, September 14, 1953, when he would be informed of the legal views taken by this department. On Monday, September 14, 1953, Townsend presented himself and was informed that it was the opinion of the Crown law authorities of this State that if he commenced operating it was possible that he would be charged with an offence under the Trading Stamp Act. He left and stated that he would

act on the advice of his solicitor. On Wednesday he commenced selling these coupons through a telephone messenger service staff provided by himself, but he discontinued after about two hours and left this State immediately. I communicated with Mr. McEwin, his solicitor, and he confirmed the fact that Townsend had now left this State. He expressed his opinion of doubt as to whether Townsend committed any offence, it was a matter of legal argument. Numerous complaints were received from persons who received telephone communications, but only one person actually purchased the coupons and reported same. Townsend left this State before he could again be interviewed concerning this matter.

MORNING TRAIN TO PORT PIRIE.

Mr. DAVIS—Last week I brought to the notice of the Minister of Railways the cancellation of the 7.50 a.m. train from Adelaide to Port Pirie, allegedly for the convenience of interstate passengers who would be travelling on the East-West line. Has he a report on the matter?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I not only called for a report but had a long consultation with the Railways Commissioner. The altered timetable was the result of collaboration with the people who use the railway, both interstate and intrastate travellers. What has been done by the Railways Commissioner is a first class economic adjustment of the timetable. It does not appear that the people along the line are being inconvenienced, but the net result is that South Australian taxpayers, who are heavily subsidizing losses on the railways, will benefit to the extent of about £12,000. I will give the honourable member all the details if he so desires.

SCHOOL BUS SERVICE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Is the school bus service for the area west of Terowie to be discontinued?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. What is the average number of children carried on the bus this year?
4. Has any estimate been made of the number likely to be carried during 1954 if the service is continued?
5. If so, what is the number?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. Yes. To terminate at the end of the present term.
2. The minimum requirements for a service will not be met for 1954.
3. Average number carried—thirteen, plus four children to a private school.

4. Yes.
5. Six primary and four private school children.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. TEUSNER (on notice)—

1. Has the Electricity Trust made a survey of the electricity requirements of the towns of Sedan and Cambrai?
2. Is it the intention of the trust to provide such towns with electricity?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. A preliminary survey of both areas has just been completed, together with an estimate of the electricity requirements of the residents of both towns. Estimates of the capital costs involved and the expected revenues to be derived are now being prepared and should be known in approximately one month's time.

2. A decision on a supply of electricity to Sedan and Cambrai will be dependent upon the results of the investigation now being undertaken. Having regard to the amount of rural extension work to which the trust is already committed, it is unlikely that supply could be made available for at least one year, even assuming that extensions to these towns are approved.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT (RED CROSS SOCIETY.)

The Legislative Council intimated that it had passed the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:—

That this House approves of the making of a proclamation under section 16 of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, in the following form:—

Proclamation under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947.

South Australia, to wit. Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor of the State of South Australia.

By virtue of the provisions of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, and all other enabling powers, I, the said Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, being satisfied that money to the amount of twenty-seven thousand and thirty-four pounds six shillings and eightpence (£27,034 6s. 8d.) held by the Australian Red Cross Society, a body corporate incorporated by Royal Charter and a body to which a licence has been issued under the said Act for certain charitable purposes within the meaning of the said Act, are not and will not be required for those purposes, do hereby declare that the said money shall be applied by the said Australian Red Cross Society to its general purposes in South Australia.

The making of this proclamation has been approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Given under my hand and the public seal of South Australia, at Adelaide, this day of 1953.

By command,

A. LYELL McEWIN, Chief Secretary.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BLACKWOOD AND BELAIR WATER SUPPLY.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Public Works Standing Committee on the augmentation of the Blackwood and Belair water supply, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

RADIUM HILL WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to ratify an agreement made between the Premier of New South Wales, the Premier of South Australia and the Broken Hill Water Board for the purpose of enabling the Government of South Australia to obtain a water supply for Radium Hill from the Broken Hill Water Board, and for purposes incidental thereto.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The development of the uranium field at Radium Hill necessitates the provision of a reliable water supply for mining and domestic purposes. A considerable amount of boring for water has been undertaken on the field. The only result has been a rather limited supply of inferior brackish water not suitable for domestic use but possibly fit for some industrial processes. This has been harnessed and is being used where possible. Detailed investigations followed to investigate the practicability of impounding supplies of local floodwaters, particularly from the Olary Creek. The capital cost of all schemes was prohibitive and the supply doubtful. Pipeline schemes, one direct from the River Murray to Radium Hill, and the other drawing water from the

Morgan-Whyalla scheme at Jamestown, were next designed. Once again the estimates of cost were extremely high and the schemes were rejected. The urgent requirement of a domestic supply of good quality water to a rapidly growing population remained and water carried from Olary railway supply was costing £6 15s. per thousand gallons.

The nearest assured source of supply was Broken Hill where the city and mines obtain water by gravity from two reservoirs, Umberumberka and Stephens Creek, and by pumping from the River Darling at Menindee when necessary. A preliminary examination showed that the capital cost of a scheme to supply Radium Hill from Broken Hill would be much lower than from any other source. The members of the Broken Hill Water Board indicated that they would be willing to assist in providing water for Radium Hill. They agreed that a supply of 50,000,000 gallons per year could be made available and detailed designs of a scheme were prepared. The capital cost of this scheme was the most reasonable of all investigated. The Broken Hill Water Board submitted the matter to the New South Wales Government and the Premier of that State advised that his Government would be prepared to introduce legislation to permit the sale of the water at a rate of 21s. per thousand gallons initially, with periodical reviews of the charge.

The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works was then asked to examine the proposition. Its report recommended that a pipeline and pumping station be constructed at an estimated cost of £287,000. Negotiations with the Government of New South Wales have resulted in an agreement acceptable to both sides. The Bill now submitted is for the ratification by this Parliament of this agreement; and the Government of New South Wales has promised to submit similar legislation immediately into the New South Wales Legislature. The agreement will come into force when ratified by both Parliaments, and will operate for 10 years in the first place, and thereafter until terminated by 12 months' notice given at any time after the commencement of the tenth year.

The New South Wales Government undertakes by the agreement to include in its ratifying Bill provisions to give South Australia authority to construct pipelines and ancillary works within New South Wales, and to secure for South Australia the land in New South Wales required for such pipelines and works. The New South Wales Water Board undertakes to grant to the Government of South

Australia rights to construct and maintain such pipelines and works in the Umberumberka storage area as are necessary for the purposes of the agreement. South Australia will be entitled under the agreement to take water from the Broken Hill Water Board's works at a point selected by the board in the Umberumberka storage area. The maximum amount which we can take is 200,000 gallons on any day, and 1,250,000 gallons in any week. South Australia is responsible for building and maintaining all the works necessary to take the water from the point of delivery, and also for any costs incurred by the Broken Hill Water Board in connection with works necessary to take water from its existing works to this point. The price of the water is to be 21s. per thousand gallons for the first three years. Thereafter the price will be fixed by by-laws to be made under the legislation of New South Wales.

The other provisions of the agreement are ancillary to those I have mentioned. They deal with matters such as metering, payment of accounts, interest on overdue payments at the rate of 5½ per cent, arbitration and other minor matters. The Bill in addition to ratifying the agreement will enable the South Australian Government to expend loan money, voted by Parliament for uranium production, on works and operations carried out under the agreement either in this State or in New South Wales. In the absence of such a provision the authority to expend loan money in New South Wales would be doubtful.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ENFIELD LOAN) BILL.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Local Government) brought up the report of the Select Committee on the Local Government (City of Enfield Loan) Bill, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Local Government)—The committee was unanimous in its report on the Bill, but I feel I should indicate that in addition to the expenditure of about £250,000 there will be an expenditure of about £25,000 on railway construction work.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Continued from November 26. Page 1693.)

Committee's report adopted. Bill read a third time and passed.

o

PUBLIC OFFICERS SALARIES BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to raise the salaries of the Auditor-General, the Public Service Commissioner and the Commissioner of Police. The salaries of these officers were fixed by Parliament in 1951 in accordance with a report made by the President of the Industrial Court. Last year a sum of £150 representing the increase in the living wage between July 1, 1951, and August of last year was added to the salaries by the Public Officers Salaries Act, 1952. The salaries of the Auditor-General and the Public Service Commissioner are at present £2,450 a year and the salary of the Commissioner of Police, £2,200 a year. Since the passing of the Public Officers Salaries Act, 1952, the salaries of heads of departments and senior officers of the Public Service have been increased by the Public Service Board. The increases were based in part on increases granted to similar officers in the eastern States and, it should be pointed out, were additional to the living wage adjustments.

The increases made in the salaries of heads of departments ranged from £200 to £350 a year and the Government is of opinion that comparable increases should be made in the salaries of the Auditor-General, the Public Service Commissioner and the Commissioner of Police. After giving full consideration to the question the Government has decided to introduce this Bill, which increases the Auditor-General's salary to £2,750, the Public Service Commissioner's salary to £2,600, and the salary of the Commissioner of Police to £2,450. The increases take effect from July 1 of this year. The Bill repeals the Public Officers Salaries Act, 1952, which will be of no further effect if the Bill becomes law. In order to clearly state the salary to be paid to the Public Service Commissioner I shall move to insert an amendment as follows:—

If the Public Service Commissioner holds office as chairman or a member of the Public Service Board his salary, as fixed by this section, shall be in addition to such salary as the Governor may declare to be payable to him in respect of the said office.

From time to time there have been discussions with the Public Service Association on the question of the Public Service Commissioner holding office on the Public Service Board. The Government does not at present intend to alter the existing practice, but wants to make it clear that the Public Service Commissioner's salary is being fixed at an amount lower than it might be if he were not entitled to something in addition for being a member of the Public Service Board. I think the salary fixed for duties on the board is about £150 a year.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION
ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 1684.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This measure makes no substantial alterations to the provisions of the Act, but few people outside the House know much about the Parliamentary superannuation fund so I shall make some comments about it. The Act passed in 1948 provided for the payment of pensions to members, or their widows, in respect of 12 or more years' service in Parliament. It clearly indicated that a member must serve for at least 12 years before becoming eligible for a pension. The annual contribution was fixed at £58 10s. a year, and the minimum aggregate contribution at £351. That means a member must pay six years' contributions before becoming eligible for a pension, irrespective of his length of service in Parliament. Several members have been in this House for many years, but none of them has qualified for a pension. If they had to resign for any reason they would have to pay about one year's contributions to qualify, and they must have been members for 12 years. The Government's contribution to the fund has been pound for pound of members' contributions, plus a special contribution as recommended by the Government Actuary. The benefits under the Act are:—

(1) A pension for 12 years' service of £250 a year, though in addition to having paid six years' contributions a member must have attained the age of 50 before becoming eligible.

(2) An additional £20 a year in respect of each year's service in excess of 12, with a maximum pension of £370.

(3) A return of contributions if the member has served less than 12 years and is defeated at an election.

(4) A widow's pension equivalent to three-fifths of the pension her husband would have been entitled to if he had left Parliament by resignation or defeat.

That means that widows of members with less than 12 years' service cannot get a pension, but widows of members who had 12 years' service or more and were over 50 receive three-fifths of the pension their husband was eligible to receive. Under the Bill members' contributions are increased to £72 a year and their pensions by £50 to make the minimum £300 and the maximum £420. The proposals in regard to members' pensions are not over-generous; in fact they could be said to be ungenerous, but the widow's pension is to be increased to three-quarters of the member's pension, which is a substantial improvement. Under the old scheme the widow's pension was sufficient to deprive of an age pension those who would otherwise be eligible for it, notwithstanding that in order to provide that pension their husbands would have to make substantial contributions to this superannuation scheme.

Another amendment which is amply justified is that dealing with pensioners holding offices of profit under the Crown. The 1948 Act provides that any payment they receive for such office affects their pension and that, when that amount reaches the amount of the pension, they are automatically disqualified from receiving a pension, whereas this Bill provides that up to £500 may be earned from such office without the pension being affected and that over that amount the pension will be reduced on a *pro rata* basis. At various times former members of Parliament are available and are admirably qualified for positions of this kind, and the old provision would often preclude their taking such positions; therefore this provision merits support.

The new provisions are entirely voluntary. Members may elect to remain in the old scheme at the old rates of contribution and benefits or to join the new scheme, although a member must contribute to the scheme at least in accordance with the provisions of the 1948 Act. In five years the fund has reached amazing proportions. At June, 1953, its balance was £43,901. Its income for 1952-53 was £11,293, consisting of members' ordinary contributions £3,446, members' special contributions £247, pound for pound Government contributions £3,446, Government special contributions £2,750, and interest earned £1,404. Expenditure for 1952-53 was £2,265, consisting of members' pensions £477, widows'

pensions £1,190, refunds of contributions £538, and administration expenses £60. The surplus for 1952-53 was £9,028. The income for 1951-52 was £10,593, expenditure £965, and the surplus £9,628. I believe the actuarial basis for the scheme is too conservative, although it is difficult to find a sound actuarial basis for such a scheme because the membership of Parliament is too small to enable a scheme covering only Parliament to be measured in terms of other schemes associated with private or public undertakings. Further, because of the electoral system, membership of this Parliament has become almost static. There are, of course, certain seats which change hands from time to time, but, generally speaking, those seats change so often that no one occupant of such a seat qualifies for a pension, so that his occupation of the seat hardly affects the fund at all. He pays his contributions for one or two sessions, and on his defeat his contributions are returned to him and the fund gains only slightly because of the interest earned while his money was in it. In order to qualify for the 12-year period it may be necessary to win five elections, and the member who can win five elections in a Parliamentary institution such as this becomes somewhat a permanency.

Mr. John Clark—He deserves a pension.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, but at the same time I cannot imagine any member who has reached the age of 50 years, has more than 12 years' service, and has made the necessary contributions to the fund resigning his seat merely to take out his pension, particularly as it is not over-generous. Some day we shall have to reconsider the structure of this scheme and adopt a different principle, which will mean two things: a reduction of the qualifying period and an increase in the minimum rate of pension, with no corresponding increase in Government contributions. The future will unfold the story that the balance in the fund at the time of reconstruction, plus members' contributions, will be more than sufficient to keep the scheme solvent, and if they were not it would be sounder practice to make a special appropriation from time to time rather than adhere to the present hard and fast practice of actuarial contributions by the Government. The Bill is an improvement in respect of widows' pensions and is some improvement in regard to members' pensions, and, although the increase in contributions is substantial, on balance I support the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I will not vote against the Bill and thereby claim publicity in the press by condemning other members for improving their financial position. In fact, I do not think the Bill will mean a financial gain for some members. I will set out the factual position as I see it and also as I understand it affects some part-time Parliamentarians. I became a member of Parliament almost four years ago and am worse off financially today than I was then. By Christmas I will have nothing in the bank, although I had a little when I became a member. My small bank balance means that on being defeated and on attaining the age of 65 years I would be eligible for an age pension, despite the means test. If anything happened to me today, my wife would be entitled to an A class pension of £3 15s., and I assume that, even after I had served 12 years in this House, she would still be entitled to a B class pension of £2 17s. 6d., towards which I pay income tax each year. I understand the policy of the Liberal Party is against compulsion, and indeed it is making much ado about a Bill on compulsory unionism now before the New South Wales Parliament, but this Liberal Government is compelling me to contribute at present £58 10s. a year for a pension. Under the Bill as drafted I shall have the option of increasing it to £72 in order to qualify for the increased pension. If the Payment of Members of Parliament Bill does not become law, I shall be compelled to remain on the present pension because I could not afford to pay another penny into the fund, but if it is passed I shall have to discuss our position with my wife. Those who are canvassing the Legislative Council to oppose the salaries Bill should consider that. They are not in the same position as those on this side of the House who are on duty from 9.30 a.m. until the House rises, and do not arrive at 2 o'clock like certain other members after they have finished their private business. By paying the increased subscription I shall be entitled to a pension of £300 a year on retirement after a minimum of 12 years' service. That is not enough to live on these days, whereas to members on the Government side that is only pin money. They imply that by receiving the pension they would be disqualified from the old age pension. Under the Commonwealth pension scheme I would be entitled to £3 10s. a week, but under the proposal in the Bill I would be obliged to pay £72 a year to get only £2 5s. more a week than I would get at 65 from the Commonwealth pension scheme. If anything happened to

me before I was 65 my wife would be entitled to an old age pension of £3 10s. a week at the age of 60 years, whereas under the Superannuation Fund, if I died she would then receive only £3 16s. a week, notwithstanding that I had served at least 12 years and paid 12 annual contributions into the fund. Therefore, the Bill will not be of much benefit to members on this side whose sole income is from their Parliamentary salary.

Even those criticizing the increased Parliamentary salary will admit that we could not continue on our existing income from this source, but for publicity purposes they say they do not want members' salaries increased, although they want an increase in the Parliamentary pension as they would not qualify for the old age pension. This session we have dealt with the Public Officers Salaries Bill providing for increased salaries for certain public servants, and members opposite offered no criticism against that. It is not right that Ministers of the Crown should be paid less than public servants who come under their jurisdiction. Another Bill passed this session provided for His Excellency the Governor to receive £13,000 a year, the highest allowance for any Governor in Australia. The Victorian Governor is the nearest with £6,000. No criticism was offered against that Bill by members opposite. Recently we also provided for judges to receive a pension of £1,625 a year on retirement—£200 more than the proposed increased Parliamentary salary, and members opposite offered no criticism against that. For the judges' widows a pension of £800 is provided, and yet we, as members of Parliament, are to receive £300 a year pension after having served a minimum of 12 years. In effect our wives would receive 6s. 3d. a week more than they would under the Commonwealth age pension scheme. Members on this side will receive no benefit under the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Contributions by members."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

To strike out "seventy-eight" before "pounds" in paragraph (b) and to insert "seventy-two."

Inadvertently, the amount of £78 appeared in the draft of the clause, but in my second reading speech I mentioned it should have been £72.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 7) and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1652.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I oppose the Bill. I have failed to find any valid reason why it was introduced. It was suggested that there has been no claim by consumers for the amendments. The Premier said they were introduced following on a request from an association of small storekeepers in the metropolitan area. Those of us who know that area fail to appreciate that there is a desire by a reasonable number of these storekeepers for the freedom provided in the Bill. I suggest that the move came from the proprietors of smallgoods shops, cafes and confectionery shops at seaside and holiday resorts. I am supported in that statement by the Premier receiving a deputation recently introduced by Mr. Pattinson. I cast no reflection on him because if I were in a similar position I would be under the same obligation. It is significant that the people likely to profit most under the Bill are the people behind the move for the amendments. The Premier said that it would provide a little more freedom to storekeepers stocking the goods mentioned. He is willing to give them the right to sell cigarettes, tobacco and butter after ordinary trading hours. When giving his second reading explanation he read a long letter from the South Australian branch of the Federated Retail Confectionery, Refreshment and Mixed Businesses Association of Australia. It took up in *Hansard* about half his printed remarks, which indicates that he was not enthusiastic about the proposal.

The letter said that there has been an influx of New Australians, apart from more people living in flats and a large number of whom husband and wife are working. New Australians should not be used as an argument in support of the Bill. I suggest that from the beginning of the last war until they came to Australia they could not get butter, tobacco and cigarettes on the free market in their native countries. I can speak with some authority on this matter because I visited many of the countries from which they came, and I know of the black marketing which took place, particularly in regard to tobacco

and cigarettes. People walking down the street had a number of people following them waiting for cigarette butts to be thrown away. They would be pounced on and the tobacco would be taken out to be used as currency, particularly in Berlin when I was there in 1947, for the purchase of cameras, watches and other things. Why should we be requested to amend our laws to meet the desires of New Australians. We should do all we can to assimilate them into our community, but they should first learn our laws and ways. Only by doing so will they become good Australians. The Premier said that in Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland cigarettes and tobacco are considered essential and are exempt goods, and that the matter was before the Victorian Parliament. That is a poor argument particularly when we recall his attitude towards proposed Opposition amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. We suggested that some of the provisions in legislation in the eastern States should be included in our legislation, but the Premier said that what may be good for those States may not be good for South Australia. I suggest that that applies to the proposed amendments in this Bill. The letter from the association said that eggs and bacon are a working man's breakfast, more especially in these times. I am not a young man, and I know that eggs and bacon have been the ordinary man's breakfast for many years. If a person visits the Continent and is given coffee and rolls for breakfast, which is the recognized Continental breakfast, but desires something different and asks for the English breakfast he gets eggs and bacon, yet it is suggested that they are particularly required in these days. It is argued that butter is used in sandwiches, but who has sandwiches for breakfast? I am trying to ridicule the suggestion behind the move for the amendments.

Mr. Lawn—They ridicule themselves.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes. We do not have sandwiches for breakfast. The things we do have for breakfast are still non-exempt. Now if a housewife runs out of butter she can get 2oz. of it after ordinary trading hours, but rarely does it happen that she is without any butter. It may happen that visitors consume all she has and that she cannot get any more until morning, but is that a real hardship? Two ounces of butter was the weekly ration for English people in the war years and for a few years after. Only in the last 12 months has butter rationing been lifted entirely. Therefore, people of English extraction do not suffer a hardship when they run

out of butter after trading hours. We have all purchased sandwiches at a seaside resort and it requires a microscope to find the butter. It is generally accepted that the butter has been melted or has been mixed with milk and put on the bread with a paint brush. The move behind the Bill is obvious. It is to give people who conduct mixed goods businesses at seaside and holiday resorts the right to sell tobacco and cigarettes. It has been done for a specific purpose, namely, to increase the value of their goodwill, as well as increase profits. During the war, when tobacco and cigarettes were strictly rationed, their sale was controlled by a board set up by the wholesale and retail tobacconists. I believe it distributed supplies equitably. I know of a tobacconist on the Henley Beach Road who did not treat his customers fairly and the board refused to supply him. However, it acted fairly in sharing his quota amongst two or three other tobacconists in the area. This man sold his business for a small sum, but the purchaser applied for a supply of tobacco and cigarettes to increase his profits and goodwill. I thought there was some justice in his case because he was licensed to sell tobacco and cigarettes as well as to do hair-dressing and I took it up with the board. The board said that this man paid only a small sum for the business, but that its value would be increased greatly if he were supplied with tobacco and cigarettes and that it would be unfair to other retailers in the district who had played the game with their customers. It can be seen that there is much merit in the objection of the Retail Tobacco Sellers' Association that this Bill will result in an increase in the goodwill of many mixed businesses, cafes and restaurants. Many eating places are open until the small hours of the morning. Some New Australians have opened businesses and cabarets, and the public will be able to obtain cigarettes and tobacco from them at late hours.

The Premier referred to his observations overseas. No-one will deny that one can purchase cigarettes and tobacco in many countries during hours when other businesses are closed, but there is no control over this type of business overseas, nor in regard to the sale of liquor in certain respects. The Premier spoke of copying the methods of other States and countries overseas, but to be consistent he should consider the sale of liquor after 6 p.m. I am not expressing any opinion on this matter, but at least he should be consistent. Liquor is in strong demand at all hours, and it is obtainable overseas at all hours. I have visited cafes and estaminets in other

countries. The ordinary licence expired at 1 a.m., but by paying 10 francs one could get an extension without committing a breach of the law. The normal closing hours in America are 1 a.m. for the sale of liquor in saloons, but during the war the Bartenders' Union applied a closing hour of midnight in the main cities on the west coast, and I have no reason to believe it did not apply in other large American cities. The Premier's arguments were not sound. If they were he would be prepared to extend the exempted commodities. The only real point in the Bill is the provision enabling cigarettes and tobacco to be sold after normal hours.

The Premier expressed distaste at the fact that he had to sign many prosecution orders for breaches of the Early Closing Act. Doesn't he have the same number of proposed prosecutions in respect of the licensing laws? I am sure there is a greater demand for liquor after ordinary closing hours than for tobacco, cigarettes or butter. The Early Closing Act was introduced to protect employees. At one time traders could open at any time, but later awards and determinations were prescribed to protect employees. It would not have been possible for firms to comply with the conditions laid down if other firms could compete with them and sell commodities not exempted after normal hours. Shop Board No. 1 prescribes the wages and conditions of employment of persons employed in shops selling goods such as tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, other smokers' requisites, and groceries. The base rate to be paid to adult male assistants is £13 6s. a week, a margin of £1 15s. above the basic wage. That margin was prescribed to cover the skill gained by experience necessary for employees engaged in those shops. The adult female base rate is £9 19s. 3d. A 40-hour week is prescribed, to be worked between 8.30 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. Mondays to Fridays inclusive, and 8.30 a.m. and 12.30 p.m. on Saturday. The time worked each day is to be continuous except for the prescribed meal hour. The clause on overtime provides:—

(a) All time worked in excess of 40 hours in any one week shall be paid at the rate of time and a half.

(b) Any employee who works (a) before 8.30 a.m. on any day; (b) after 5.30 p.m. on Monday to Friday; (c) after 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays, shall be paid at the rate of time and a half for the first four hours and double time thereafter for the time so worked on any such day calculated according to the rate above-mentioned applicable to such employee as the rate per week of 40 hours. Such work shall be

paid for at such overtime rates notwithstanding that apart from the time so worked the employee has not during the week worked for 40 hours.

The determination applies:—

in respect of the occupations of persons employed in shops (other than persons employed in a trade or business for which a board is recommended) in the sale, whether wholly by retail or partly by retail and partly by wholesale, of goods of any one or more of the following classes, namely, drapery, haberdashery, mercery, millinery, hosiery, other articles of apparel, Manchester goods, fancy goods, perfumery, toilet requisites, boots, shoes, slippers, books, stationery, papers, magazines, sheet music, school requisites, pictures, picture frames, toys, sporting requisites, tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, other smokers' requisites, shaving requisites, musical instruments, gramophones, gramophone records, pianola rolls, flowers, trees, plants, shrubs, seeds, bulbs, cuttings, garden manures, sprays, other gardening requisites, grocery, tea, dairy produce, cereals, patent medicines, and confectionery (other than in confectionery shops).

The persons who will gain the extra "freedom" suggested by the Premier are employers of persons covered by the Restaurant Board as follows:—

Cooks, waiters, waitresses, cashiers, night porters, and boots, day porters, oyster openers, kitchen hands, shopmen, shopgirls, pantry hands, pie-stall assistants, generals, house-keepers, and laundresses who are employed in a restaurant, tearoom, cafe, cool drink shop, cake shop, ham shop, fish shop, confectionery shop, fruit shop, canteen, messroom, or pie-stall. So it will be seen that those who will benefit under this legislation will be able to sell without restriction cigarettes, tobacco, cigarette papers and butter.

Mr. Dunks—The employees will have to be paid extra for working overtime.

Mr. FRED WALSH—The award provides:—

The maximum number of ordinary hours per week to be worked in order to entitle an employee to the weekly wages fixed by this determination shall be 40, and such hours shall be worked inside 12 hours from starting to finishing time (inclusive of meal hours) unless the excess time be paid for at overtime rates. Therefore, a person can start work at 9 a.m. and work for four hours, be off for four hours and then be brought back to work another four hours and work up until 9 p.m., and yet still be within the provisions of the determination. Unlike the other employees, they are not required to work their time continuously, exclusive of meal hours, but are permitted to break their time—perhaps three times a day, provided they finish their ordinary day's work within the 12 hours.

Mr. Dunks—We may be able to alter that for the other people, too.

Mr. FRED WALSH—The honourable member cannot get away with it as easy as that. If he had his way people would not work under any determinations at all, and the rule of the jungle would operate as it did many years ago. The rates applicable under the Restaurant Board Determination for certain adult employees, male £11 14s. 6d. and female £9 2s. 6d., leave a margin of 3s. 6d. for adult males above the basic wage as against a margin of 35s. in the other determination. Therefore, the employers have the advantage of working those who will be given all the "freedom" the Premier talks about the longer spread of hours at cheaper rates than those we are trying to protect. I want Mr. Dunks to know the position regarding overtime. Whereas in the other determination I quoted any person who worked before his starting time or after his finishing time shall be paid at the rate of time and a half for the first four hours and double time thereafter, in this instance all he gets is the time worked in excess of his weekly or daily hours. Therefore, it means he does not get anything additional for starting earlier than the prescribed hours, whereas the others get paid overtime for the time worked in excess of the ordinary time.

Mr. Hutchens—Does that mean they could be worked 40 hours in 3½ days without getting overtime?

Mr. FRED WALSH—It could be properly construed that way. The motive behind the Bill is to give people engaged in certain classes of business unrestricted action in respect of sales by virtue of the fact that they will be permitted to sell tobacco, cigarettes, cigarette papers and matches in competition against those who are compelled to conform to the ordinary hours and who have to pay higher rates and pay for better conditions. No request has been received from the ordinary suburban shopkeeper, generally known as a family store-keeper. This type of store is usually run by a family. The proprietor may or may not devote the whole of his time to the business. He may be working in an industry during the day while his wife or another member of the family looks after the business, and he then takes over during the evening and perhaps on Saturday and Saturday night. In another case a man may devote all his time to the business and in the evening, when he wants to take his wife out, another member of the family attends to the business. No attempt has been made to show that there is a demand on behalf of these people for an extension of their privileges to sell exempt goods. I therefore ask

members to seriously consider the Bill before voting for it. I feel that it is not necessary and is unjust to a certain section of the community, and that the main move came from those engaged in mixed businesses at seaside and holiday resorts. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. JENNINGS (Prospect)—I also oppose the Bill. It was introduced as a non-controversial harmless measure designed only to exempt tobacco, cigarettes, cigarette papers and butter from the provisions of the Early Closing Act. The Premier suggested that it would have no serious repercussions. I oppose it because I believe it is the beginning of the breaking down of the principle that was recognized in the Act, and the thin end of the wedge. If good arguments can be advanced to exempt tobacco, cigarettes and butter then there are many other commodities for which arguments just as good can be found. The more the commodities that are exempted the greater will be the pressure on us to exempt other commodities. This would have a disastrous effect on many well-established and reputable businesses and their employees. In introducing the Bill the Premier obviously succumbed to the submissions of a pressure group. He admitted that he had representations from a certain organization, and, as Mr. Fred Walsh pointed out, half of his second reading explanation was taken up in reading a letter from it. Apparently he gave no consideration to representations of other interested parties. He endeavoured to give the impression that he was on the side of the small mixed business man, that he stood like the Rock of Gibraltar and would not be influenced by big storekeepers. This pose was designed to favourably influence members on this side. If that is so, then it was a waste of time because we are not influenced by pressure groups of any kind, but are genuinely concerned about any legislation which will have a deleterious effect on the working conditions of employees, which conditions have been built up slowly and painfully over the years. The inevitable effect of the Bill will be that businesses run on a family basis and which employ no labour will be at an advantage when compared with the businesses which employ labour during regular hours and under award conditions. Is it fair that they should be penalized because of their obedience to the law, and should the law be altered to suit the convenience of a few people who are careless and negligent about having enough butter, tobacco and cigarettes to keep them going until normal trading hours come

again? There could be a serious effect on employees of firms covered by awards. If these businesses suffer through unfair competition there will be eventually, if not immediately, an assault on the wages and conditions of the employees. If there are many employers like Mr. Dunks, who is an acknowledged advocate of low wages, it will not be long before we have the assault. The ultimate result would be that general working conditions would deteriorate.

Several times this session the Premier has said that legislation introduced must be remedial in character. What is remedial about the Bill? There is no benefit for most people in the community. It panders only to those people who are lazy and negligent and will not look after their needs. Is it a hardship on a housewife in these days to make sure that she has sufficient butter to last until next morning? The decent housewife would be ashamed to admit that she could not arrange things better. As I have said, this is the thin edge of the wedge. The excuse for the sale of butter has been made because it is said we can purchase bread and cooked meats; therefore, to complete the sandwich we must have butter. If we exempt butter we will soon be asked to exempt pepper and salt and tomato sauce to make the sandwich more appetising. If we agree to exempt tobacco and cigarettes we will be asked to exempt cigars and matches. Members opposite would not expect smokers to resort to the native fashion of rubbing sticks together to produce fire. It has become a matter of exempting one item and using that to exempt other items. The ultimate result must be a complete breakdown of early closing principles. The Premier said that the law at present was not being observed. If that is so it is an admission of maladministration by a department under his direct control. If we are to be consistent and amend laws because they are not being observed, let us remain in session a few more months and examine all the laws which are not being observed. Of course the Premier is not consistent. I have not heard him advocate the extension of drinking hours because there is evidence of much drinking outside legal hours. He has not advocated the repeal of the law prohibiting starting price bookmakers, yet we know there is much starting price bookmaking. It is illogical to claim that a law should be amended or repealed because the minority do not adhere to it.

Another amazing argument concerns New Australians who are said to be not conversant with our laws. Does the Premier sincerely

want us to believe that we should alter our laws to conform to the laws the New Australians were used to before coming to Australia? South Australians would not be happy to know that the laws which bind them were made because they were more convenient for New Australians. If we continue to act in this way we shall soon be talking about assimilating old Australians into the New Australian community. The Premier said the legislation had not been reviewed since 1935. If that is so it is time it was reviewed, but if there were a comprehensive review it would not result in further goods being exempted, but rather in the exclusion from the list of some already exempted goods. The argument used in regard to butter is that it is a perishable item. Tobacco is not perishable, although it is perishing expensive. Home refrigeration has made tremendous advances since 1935. Many homes now have refrigerators and most of the others have efficient ice chests and it cannot be said that butter cannot be kept in any quantity. The general trend in regard to shopping hours since 1935 has been towards reductions to the benefit of the workers in industry, and nobody has suffered in consequence. Now it is proposed to reverse things to suit the convenience of lazy, ill-organized people who cannot purchase enough butter, tobacco and cigarettes during ordinary shopping hours to last them until ordinary shopping hours commence again. If there is any value in the principle established by the Act let us retain it, and not meddle with and weaken it, and ultimately destroy it.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—The opposition to the Bill is ludicrous. One would think that it dealt with the introduction of a 48-hour working week or did something drastic in regard to industrial matters. If it did, the vigorous protests we have heard today would be justified. Again and again Mr. Jennings referred to ill-organized people who forget to buy enough butter to last them until next morning. Arguments similar to those put forward on this measure have been adduced previously. A few years ago the question was the sale of petrol, and the one person to whom no sympathy was offered was the motorist who forgot to fill up his car before bowlers closed. According to the member for Prospect, the person deserving terrible condemnation is the housewife who forgets to obtain enough butter. However, I think the member for Prospect deserves condemnation for introducing a trivial argument and ludicrous opposition to the Bill.

The member for Thebarton spoke for some time about industrial awards, but it seems to have been overlooked that Australia is one of the best organized countries in the world for the working man. He gets ample justice and it would be hard to find a country more comfortable in which to work than Australia. Many ludicrous charges have been put forward in opposition to this Bill, such as that it is an assault on employee's wages and conditions. The member for Prospect used this argument, but I think he reserved his full fire for any measure introduced to exempt matches from the provisions of the Early Closing Act. The Bill merely provides for a few small articles to be placed on the exempt list, principally butter, tobacco and cigarettes. I should say this will be a welcome convenience to the general public and will be hailed by working people as much as by any other section as an advance on present conditions. They will be pleased to be able to buy cigarettes after trading hours.

Although in some respects early closing legislation is justified, it had a rather bad origin. It was introduced first to prevent a man from working while his rivals slept, but that is an abominable principle. We should like to see people working hard with a view to making a success of their business. We should not like to see people prevented from working and building up a business of their own. I particularly have in mind the family business, where all members help to make it a success, but that was the class of business that the member for Prospect selected for attack. One of the best ways to make a success of business is for the family to work hard together. This is an experience that few families who have been through it would have missed. Two groups outside Parliament are particularly interested in the Bill, one being for it and the other against it. As far as I know little consideration has been given by either party to the wants of the consumer, but it is the duty of members to examine all aspects of legislation and view it from everyone's point of view. I hope we shall examine this Bill from the consumers' point of view and make it possible for people to buy items that they forgot during normal trading hours without breaking the law. The effect on the community of the passing of this measure will be small. In 1948 we heard a striking speech on the Early Closing Act by the member for Glenelg. A somewhat different type of Bill was then being debated—I think it was to tighten the law—but the honourable member

referred to the triviality of many provisions of this legislation. The Bill before us is not of any greater importance, but it makes the legislation a little more liberal and sensible and will give more convenience for the average citizen. I support the measure.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I oppose the Bill. I listened with great interest to the members for Thebarton and Prospect. I considered they spoke logically, but the member for Alexandra said they were not only illogical but brought forward ludicrous arguments. He particularly took the member for Prospect to task and warned him he might be in dire trouble when he got home if he found he was out of butter. I know his wife and consider it most unlikely that she will have forgotten to obtain sufficient butter, but in any case he has good neighbours so even if he has no butter he may be able to get some from them without having to break the law. When listening to the member for Alexandra I wondered whether he would advocate workmen being aroused when they forgot to set the alarm so that they would not be late for work. I do not think he would, but if the argument were carried to the extreme we should be confronted with some such provisions. Mr. Brookman also said the remarks of the member for Thebarton were ludicrous, but rightly pointed out that Australia was the best country in the world for the working man. That is through efforts of the workers themselves, or of their elected representatives in unions or in Parliament. Those privileges—if they are privileges: I consider them rights—have been fought and won, and will be kept. I could instance a long list of reforms that have been won by the elected representatives of employees. Many of them are now in operation throughout the world and were pioneered in Australia, some in South Australia. The member for Alexandra said we should consider the views of the consumers, but he did not say that most consumers were also employees. The member for Thebarton fully stated the case in opposition to the Bill. He put forward sound arguments, certainly not ludicrous arguments. In explaining the Bill the Premier said:—

The purpose of the Bill is to add to the list of those goods which may be sold outside the specified hours and to give a little more freedom to those storekeepers stocking those goods.

He said the principal items to be exempted were butter, tobacco, cigarettes and cigarette papers. That is not a long list, but it may

be the beginning of a move to stealthily filch from the employees the benefits of early closing. He also said:—

I am daily confronted with instances of shopkeepers who have supplied persons with a few cigarettes, a pound of butter or some other non-exempt goods out of specified trading hours. The fact that consumers want this legislation is proved by the number of such prosecutions.

That is a peculiar type of illogical thinking, and just another example of what we have had more and more in this House lately, namely, the type of logic peculiar to the Premier. He said that because some consumers and storekeepers were prepared to break the law the Act should be amended to assist them. If we follow that further, we must come to the inevitable conclusion that under our present system all law breakers, if they command a substantial number of supporters, will be able to have the law amended so as to legalize their illegal actions; that is if they have enough support and their pressure group has enough influence in the right places. If we want to be facetious this can be applied to after-hours drinkers, gamblers, burglars and even abortionists, who are forced to break the law, for they could come along and say, "We want this and other people want it. You should alter the law so that we can have it."

Mr. Hutchens—The spirit of this Bill seems to be in that direction.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes, and, if followed to its logical conclusion it can lead only to complete disregard of the law and eventually to anarchy. The original Early Closing Act was passed in 1926 and has been built up to its present high standard over a long period. It is not the function of Parliament to undermine that standard. Butter is already exempt when sold in small quantities, and the Government merely wants to make it easier for the thriftless housewife to buy it after hours. Nowadays there are easier means of keeping butter and other perishables in good condition than were formerly available. Not everybody can own a refrigerator, but butter can be kept cool and wholesome in a cool safe, and few people cannot afford a cool safe. Most people find they have good neighbours when they run out of these perishable foodstuffs. The law about the hours for the sale of these commodities is well-known, and the unfortunate housewife who runs out of butter can easily find something else to replace it.

Mr. Lawn—I have had dripping in my day.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The privileges contained in the Bill are to be given to shops

staffed mainly by families at the expense of those employing large numbers of workers who are not anxious to work at night. Why should it be necessary for them to work at night? If we force those shops to remain open we penalize the shopkeeper who is paying award rates. Shops selling mainly cigarettes have borne the brunt of wartime and post-war shortages, and tobaccoists' shops which have operated under grave difficulties have earned a right which should not be taken from them. Those who so eagerly seek the extensions provided in the Bill will regard this as only the first step in their campaign to gain more and more concessions and eventually to completely wipe out the Early Closing Act to the detriment of all employees. The Act was introduced to protect the employees, and that is still the reason for it. The member for Thebarton showed us that protection is necessary even in these enlightened days, and I, together with other members on this side, wish to see employees protected and not exploited.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I support the Bill, as I would any Bill giving freedom to the individual rather than compelling him to be tied up by regulations or laws confining his right to work, despite his wish to work. I can see no harm in the Bill to anyone, for it merely gives the right to the individual to work longer hours than those being worked by others who may be competing with him. If he sees fit to work why should he not be allowed to do so? One of our greatest troubles is that we are not working hard or long enough, with the result that costs are constantly rising. A man who sells the commodities named in the Bill is performing a service which is appreciated by the community, and those opposing the Bill most strenuously are those who are in a big way, including the big stores which must employ labour. The Bill does not cut down the standard of the conditions enjoyed by workers, for anyone employing labour has to observe the award and workers working overtime must receive penalty rates; therefore it is strange that the Labor Party is opposing the Bill. We have been told about the family group who, starting in a small way, are prepared to work to build up something for the future.

Mr. Davis—To the detriment of the business man employing labour.

Mr. HEASLIP—The man who works eight hours is paid for eight hours' work, but the family group must be prepared to work for more than eight hours. Why should they be

prevented from doing so if they want to? Most businesses today originated from the small family group, and when the time arrives when they must employ labour they are in open competition with other businesses employing labour, which is good for the community and must reduce costs. The member for Prospect said that the general trend since 1935 had been a reduction working hours. I believe that is at the root of our troubles and has resulted in increased costs, decreased production and inflation. Under this Bill we are giving the individual the right to work if he wants to do so. The shorter the working week the higher must be the cost of the commodity produced, and who pays for the increased production costs? The consumer, who is the working man. I am surprised to hear the Labor Party advocate a reduction in working hours, because the workers must pay for the resultant increase in costs. Ultimately, longer working hours must be beneficial to the community.

Mr. Davis—By giving the shopkeeper the chance to sell a little more butter and a few cigarettes?

Mr. HEASLIP—These commodities are regarded as the necessities of life today, and, unfortunately, are considered when computing the cost of living. If I stay at work until after 5.30 p.m. I should have the right to buy a packet of cigarettes on the way home. By increasing the working hours we will reduce the cost of living; therefore I support the Bill.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I listened with amazement to the statement by the member for Rocky River that he was surprised at the Labor Party's opposition to something which would benefit the worker. Has any member ever before heard that the honourable member was interested in the welfare of the workers? Yet with tongue in cheek he makes these abominable statements, hoping they will be believed, while all the time he is doing his utmost to break down their standards of living. He was rather critical of members on this side and said we were lending protection to big business. We are not ashamed to protect big business when protection is warranted. We believe in protecting the employers who provide decent conditions and wages for their workers. Hairdressers will be detrimentally affected by this Bill because the sale of tobacco and cigarettes is one of their sidelines. Mr. Heaslip says that we should

encourage open competition at all times, but it is illogical to indulge in such talk one day and then say the opposite the next. He was talking with his tongue in his cheek. Recently we passed the Textile Products Description Bill which had the support of every member on this side. The honourable member said of it, "This Bill is something which woolgrowers have been trying to have enforced for years." We are prepared to protect the consumer, but I did not hear one word from the honourable member on that occasion as to the protection of this class.

Mr. Heaslip—You did not read my speech properly. I did say something about it.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The wool industry is the wealthiest industry in the country today; the growers are riding on the sheep's back. We gave protection to the wool industry on that occasion, and in opposing this legislation we shall be giving protection to the big industries and protecting the big employers who are prepared to provide award conditions. We have heard the prattle, "We want people to work and work hard, and we should let them work if they are willing to do so." That is irrelevant to the Bill. Not one member who favours the Bill has given one bit of evidence to show that anyone is prevented from working if he wants to work. Those engaged in small businesses can work as long as they like and there is nothing in this legislation to stop them. To say it will prevent people from working is introducing foreign matter into the argument. The member for Alexandra used the same parrot phrases as Mr. Heaslip, and said, "The families working together in business should be encouraged." Such talk applies to the old days, when parents exploited their families to such an extent that legislation had to be introduced to abolish child labour. In South Australia, because some parents were more concerned about making money than educating their children, it was found necessary to introduce legislation to compel children to attend school until aged 14. Is the honourable member advocating a return to the old conditions to meet the convenience of those who have no thought for tomorrow? That was the trend of his argument. We should be careful not to take away this precious legislation which has been on our Statute Book for so long. It was difficult to know whether he was supporting or opposing the Bill. He said, "Australians are the most comfortable people in the world and have everything to make them comfortable and the passage of this Bill will have no marked effect." They are the truest

words the honourable member ever uttered. Then, why was this Bill introduced? He realizes with those who are supporting the measure that it will not have any marked effect, but it is the thin end of the wedge and may have a definite effect upon the working conditions of this country generally.

Mr. John Clark—It is bowing to a pressure group.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so. I forcibly oppose the Bill, because it has not been introduced with the decency expected, being so late in the session. Each member received a letter from the Retail Traders' Association as far back as October 26, but the introduction of the Bill was delayed until November 25. Because it is being forced through, members have not time to give it proper consideration, and therefore it should be rejected. The Bill amends the second schedule of the Act which allows 2oz. of butter to be sold when required. The member for Thebarton showed that 2oz. would meet an emergency. In these days housewives are able to keep their butter for a long period. Recent figures published show that there are more refrigerators in South Australia per head of population than in any other State, and there are only a few homes which, if they haven't a refrigerator, have not an ice chest or a cool safe.

Mr. O'Halloran—Fifty-one million people in England have been on 2oz. of butter a week for a long time.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so, and they managed on it, but the fact that we in Australia can buy pounds of butter when we want it is another reason why such a Bill is unnecessary and undesirable; it is a reflection upon our intelligence to ask us to bow to such a request. Not one member supporting the Bill has proved to me that cigarettes and tobacco are necessary for the preservation of life. The present law provides protection for the decent employer and prevents parents from wrongfully exploiting children. The Bill is the thin end of the wedge. An attempt is being made to break down the conditions for which workers have fought for some time and I oppose the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—In his second reading speech the Premier read a letter from the Federated Retail Confectionery, Refreshment and Mixed Businesses Association. I have received a letter from the Retail Tobacco Sellers' Association of South Australia, which sets out its case against the Bill as follows:—

The Retail Tobacco Sellers Association records its most emphatic protest against the

proposed Bill to be introduced by the Premier as an amendment to the Early Closing Act, to permit "the sale of butter, cheese, cigarettes, tobacco and other goods in small shops after ordinary business hours," and to allow "certain goods to be placed on the Exempt Schedule." This association feels that the proposed Bill has been prepared without full consideration having been given to those businesses which will be most seriously affected. As our association has been constituted for the purpose of protecting its members against unfair competition, and to protect their legal rights, this association claims that the following points should have been, and must be given the consideration which are their due.

(1) That the Retail Tobacco Sellers Association in S.A. with a membership of over 600, many of whom are employers, will be unfairly penalized by this Bill. That this association considers it improper for the Premier to consider the request of a deputation from the Confectionery and Mixed Businesses Association without also seeking to obtain the attitude of other business sections who are vitally interested. There are tobacconists businesses in this State, of 50, 60 and 70 or more years' standing, and although these people are specialists in the tobacco field, they have been totally overlooked, or completely disregarded by the introduction of this Bill. We consider also that the impropriety is greater as the Bill is submitted by the Premier, who is the Minister for Industry and Prices Minister for this State.

(2) As the intention of the Bill is to permit extended trading hours in cafeterias and mixed businesses for the purpose of selling cigarettes and tobaccos and other goods, we would point out that:—

(a) The present trading hours are sufficient to supply the needs of all consumers. It is only the thoughtless, forgetful person who purchases after trading hours, and we consider that his carelessness should not be rewarded. Any consumer can conveniently carry all the tobacco or cigarettes he is likely to need during the period that the Early Closing Act requires tobacconists to be closed. There are ample avenues open during the present hours of trading to purchase goods mentioned in the Bill without increasing the hours of sale; these goods will not perish overnight.

(b) Those seeking the extended trading hours are businesses which handle only the lines easily dispensed; they are cigarettes and cigarette-tobacco sellers, and carry none of the additional smokers' lines which are stocked by the normal tobacconist. The genuine retail tobacconist, whose hours are distinctly specified, gives a full service covering all smoking requirements. Most cafeterias and mixed businesses stock cigarettes and tobacco only to increase their goodwill, which clearly indicates that their service is to encourage the sale of other commodities. Many businesses of these types have, over recent years, been

sold to successive purchasers for ever-increasing goodwills, more frequently than any other retail establishments.

(c) If the law in relation to "latest legal trading hour" for any commodity is to be changed at the will of a minority group, the economic stability of all retailers will be jeopardized. It is a retrograde step to eliminate and amend any law by the request of a minority group, so that their illegal action may be pursued.

(d) The Bill lends encouragement and incentive to these "family businesses" to flout restrictions as it suits them, on any other prohibited lines and will act as a precedent for further statutory relaxations to regularize growing inroads on the trades of recognized specialized traders.

The number of prosecutions mentioned by the Premier in his introduction of the Bill is merely a fraction of the number which should have been reported. The fact is that hundreds of mixed businesses and cafeterias have repeatedly sold cigarettes and tobacco after hours, deliberately breaking the law, and making provision for any resultant fine. In this way, they have illegally, and in a grossly unfair manner, caused hardship to the legitimate tobacconist, who has to observe fixed hours. In October of 1952, the Premier is reported as having said that the Early Closing Act was turning people into criminals. That is hotly disputed by this association, who considers that the traders and customers who contravene the Act are making criminals of themselves. The Early Closing Act was initiated for the protection of employees by the limitation of working hours. It was an accompanying necessity that businesses affected thereby be protected from unfair and illicit trading during statutory closed hours. The statement of the Premier that, "Small businesses cannot sell cigarettes and tobacco after hours although hotels do" is nothing less than a condonation of an illegal offence. Cigarettes and tobacco are non-exempt goods, and hotels are not permitted to sell them after 12.30 on Saturdays. The fact that they do sell after these hours is merely an admission of the inefficiency of the administration of the Act, and as the Premier is the Minister for Industry in this State, our association voiced its strongest protest on this statement.

The association has also protested repeatedly to the Factories and Steam Boilers Department against the practice of hotels selling after recognized trading hours of this class of merchandise. And the legalizing of an offence, merely because it is prevalent, is a sign of sheer weakness, and is to be deplored. The Premier protests at the number of prosecutions he has had to sign, but we would point out to him that although the Factories and Steam Boilers Department are constantly alert in checking employers and Shop Board Determinations to see that the wages paid, and the times worked by employees agree with the awards, they have refused to check the activities of many cafeterias and confectioners with whom after hour trading has been rife for many

years. Difficulties of policing this Act, and distaste at having to sign prosecution orders.

This argument is fallacious as the Act will still have to be policed unless all goods sold by exempt shops are freed under the Act. To say that tobacco, cigarettes, butter and cheese are the only lines sold is erroneous, for we all know these are but some of the lines sold. We feel that the cost of administering the supervision and checking of law-breakers of this type is not to be taken as an excuse for amending the law to permit their activities to be regarded as legal. All traders whose hours are governed by legislation are subject to wage determinations, fixing finishing times for employees, with overtime rates applicable outside those hours. Confectioners are not so restricted as overtime rates under their determinations are not so heavy as covered by Shop Board determination No. 1. Many confectionery and mixed businesses are family controlled and very often with the husband fully employed during the day. The number of employees engaged in mixed business and confectionery businesses is a fraction of the number employed in retail tobacco stores. Confectioners and proprietors of mixed businesses know full well that certain regulations are to be carried out if they stock non-exempted lines, and if they are not prepared to conform to the legislation, the necessary steps should be taken to compel them to do so.

This association feels that the Premier has been unduly influenced by American trading methods on his recent trip abroad, and that such influence does not apply in a similar manner to this State, nor are those influences beneficial. This community is not big enough to support stores that can open all night, and we can see no advantage in the permission to sell after the legitimate stores will be forced to close because of staff. Employers in the retail tobacco business are finding, and have found for several years, that illegal after hour trading is reducing their turnover in a serious manner, while general over-head costs have continued to rise over the same period. Unless these traders are given the protection of the law, this economic position will lead to drastic staff reductions, detrimental to employer, employee and the public generally. The Retail Tobacco Sellers Association has for many years endeavoured to bring a deputation before the Premier (as Prices Minister) to consider the low retail margins permitted to tobaccoists, but in every case it has been found inconvenient for the Minister to receive such a deputation. In view of these constantly rising costs, and the niggardly margins, it is impossible to meet the additional wage overheads which will be caused by the extended hours of trading if the same staff are to be employed. We are well aware that any application made by this association for award rates to be amended so that all hours worked could be at normal rates, would be doomed to failure. We realize that trade unions would vigorously oppose an application of this type, and yet cafeterias and mixed businesses can operate under this anomaly to the detriment of other businesses.

We draw your attention to the fact that ever since rationing of cigarettes and tobacco commenced in 1941, tobaccoists throughout Australia have done their utmost to co-operate with

the general public, and more particularly with returned servicemen, with regard to their quota supplies. All tobaccoists in this State have a proud record for the way in which they have maintained regular supplies for ex-servicemen, even holding them up to 60 days after the date of issue, and although rationing of supplies from the manufacturer officially ceased on 1st January of this year, every reputable tobaccoist has continued to maintain this service to his ex-service personnel customers. During these long years of rationing, who carried the burden of supplying the public in an equitable manner? Who supplied ration cards out of the meagre profit permitted, and kept faith with the public as they have done for decades past? Who did not use tobacco and cigarettes as a means of disposing of other goods? Who stood up to insults and abuse from the unthinking few? If this was not a service to the public, we do not know what the word means, for it would have been easy to dispose of a month's stock to the black market and entail no expense. The tobaccoists were the people who carried this burden as part of their service to the public. They do not expect thanks for doing the correct thing, but they do expect to receive some consideration, as they are employers who maintain high class stores and are specialists in their trade, and are now to be faced with most unfair competition. Stock which could have been sold in one day, has been held for those who were entitled to purchase. The tobaccoist has endeavoured to do everything possible for the public by rationing his supplies, and this has involved him in higher selling costs. This, we consider, is a service which has not been, and will not have to be, extended by the cafeterias and mixed businesses. Tobacco retailers would, in this instance, also be penalized by the present Bill. Tobaccoists have, for many years suffered the extreme disadvantage of restricted supplies of local brands, and at various times, of shortages of imported brands.

We have only to look at conditions of the trade in Sydney to see what happens when unfair competition prevails. Sydney today has no stores to compare with Adelaide, and Melbourne in the tobacco trade; the business has been driven into "hole in the wall" type of stores that are not an asset to the community. It is not the aim of the community to be fully employed? Do the people who employ labour deserve to be made the target of legislation that will in time force the bigger store out of business, or into the small type of stores as can be witnessed in Sydney or America, where there is almost extinction of the tobaccoist, and the sale of tobacco in all-night drug stores and restaurants is the order of the day. It has been stated that the acceptance of this Bill would be merely the thin edge of the wedge to enable other items to be added to the exempt schedule. In the opinion of our association, it would be more than that. We contend it would split open the Early Closing Act, and enable those who at present trade after hours in several commodities to extend their activities to include hundreds of associated items. This is not an exaggeration, but it is quite obvious that the trader who will break the law for one item will break it for others. Amending legislation to legalize his activities is

equivalent to giving him *carte blanche* to extend his activities beyond those items enumerated in the present Bill. The cumulative effect must be a breakdown of the Early Closing Act and return to unrestricted hours of trading that existed prior to its most necessary introduction.

This is a Bill of expediency and not necessity, and in its opportunist intention will prove of ever-increasing detriment to the community in general, and disastrous to legitimate traders and their employees in particular. The alternative is to define what an exempt store can sell; this should eliminate the trouble of policing the Act, and seeing that these stores had lines for their exclusive sale, if they stocked other lines such as tobacco and cigarettes and groceries, they should be closed at the same hour. This should lead to better class stores and service as well as security in the fact that they would not have undue competition for the lines they sell.

It is realized that this is revolutionary but it is felt that no policing would be necessary or very little at all. Surely a store can sell exclusively milk, cream, cooked meats, fruits, vegetables, sandwiches, cakes, confectionery, and milk drinks and get a living without branching into other lines which have ample outlets to supply public demand. The fact that the public buy from these stores is only a habit, they do not go there to purchase uncooked meats and clothes. They seem to be able to get these items from stores during the prescribed hours, so why not tobacco, cigarettes and groceries. We think the Bill most unfair, unjust and uneconomical, and we intend vigorously to oppose this interference with existing legislation. This information is placed with you with the request that you do all in your power to safeguard the welfare of all law-abiding and legal traders and their employees in your constituency and elsewhere in the State.

I have also received a letter from two brothers who have a tobacconist and hair-dresser's shop in the city. They concur in all that has been said in the letter I have just read. In all court actions, whether in the civil, criminal, police or arbitration courts, the onus is on the applicant to prove his case, and the onus of justifying any Bill is on the person introducing it, but the Premier did not justify this Bill. He said a request was received from a storekeepers' association for it, but he did not say there was any request from consumers. His only point about consumers was his statement that:—

The fact that consumers want this legislation is proved by the number of prosecutions. We are adults, not children. It would be laughable, if it were not tragic, to say that because of the number of prosecutions consumers want this Bill. This is saying, in effect, that the hundreds of prosecutions for breaches of our liquor, gambling, and road

traffic laws prove that the people want the relevant Acts amended. Does the Premier intend amending those Acts? His only other justification for the Bill was his statement:—

On the Continent trading hours are exempt and new arrivals here are at a loss to understand why we have these lines in stock and will not provide them at all hours.

I do not know whether these New Australians have offered funds to the Liberal Party and have brought pressure to bear on it, saying that in other countries they were able to get much more from political parties because of their contributions to their funds. For the Premier to say that New Australians want the Bill amended is as laughable as his only other argument to justify the Bill, namely, the number of prosecutions. There is much more gambling in European nations than in Australia. They have their casinos and roulette tables. If New Australians tell the Premier they want more gambling facilities must the Government introduce amendments to the Act? Will he amend our liquor laws if New Australians say other countries have beer gardens and no closing hours? He did not say how many members the storekeepers' association had, but the letter I just read said there were 600 members of the tobacconists' association. When the Premier said that the number of prosecutions justified an amendment, he said, in effect, that murder was justified because of the number of prosecutions for that crime. Thousands of South Australians invest money in a lottery every week, so according to the Premier's argument our Lottery and Gaming Act should be amended. The trades union movement represents thousands of South Australians. When a deputation from the Trades and Labor Council waited upon the Premier recently asking him to continue to pay cost of living adjustments to Government employees he refused. The deputation also asked him to legislate for long service leave for all employees, but that request was refused too. On one occasion the Premier says a request from a handful of people justifies a Bill, yet he refused those requests by the trade union movement.

It is hard to imagine a responsible Government bringing down a Bill such as this as the result of a request by a few people, for the measure will have grave effects on the community and there will be much hostility to it. Some members referred to family businesses. Before the trade union movement was born many people were forced to work long hours for six or seven days a week. Child

labour was used in the coal mines of Great Britain and long hours were worked in Australia, but the trade union movement has obtained many reforms. It obtained a basic wage sufficient to keep the worker, his wife, and up to three children, but the value of that wage dwindled. In 1938 the Arbitration Court found it was only sufficient to keep the worker, his wife, and one child. Rather than have an increase in the basic wage the Menzies Government of that time introduced child endowment for all children under the age of 16 years, except one. We know that the Liberal Party attacks the conditions of the workers and would like to see the worker, his wife, and children kept in slavery. The member for Rocky River stated that all people who want to work long hours should be allowed to do so. Some members opposite want to abolish the 40-hour week, and I have heard the member for Mitcham say that he believes in the survival of the fittest.

Mr. Dunks—And he still believes in it.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and I deplore the attitude adopted by many Liberal members, for people generally want to see the bad old days banished for ever. It would be a retrograde step to force wives and children back into industry and it would be equally deplorable to force a family to work long hours, even in their own business. Why shouldn't a person in business be able to get sufficient from it to support himself, his wife and family, the same as the person in industry, and, if he wants assistance, why shouldn't he be able to afford to hire labor and then he would not need this legislation. The Liberal Party encourages the family business, and, although on the face of it that encouragement may seem justified, some women have told me that they and their husbands work up to 80 hours a week. Surely that sort of business should not be allowed to continue, for the days of slavery are gone. In the court the onus is on the plaintiff to prove his case, and the Premier set out to justify his case on this legislation by saying that the members of a certain trade organization had asked for this measure and that New Australians were at a loss to understand why they could not buy certain goods outside ordinary trading hours. He said that the present Act permitted the sale of two ounces of butter outside those hours and that larger quantities should be available for sale, but how will the family which uses only margarine fare under this Bill?

Mr. Michael—Do you say margarine should be included?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member wants it included, as other Government members will want cigars and possibly matches included, and then we shall finally get back to the request from the trade association and include even rabbits. The Bill provides for the sale of cigarettes but not matches outside ordinary hours, so the man with neither cigarettes nor matches will still have to wait for a smoke until the shops open the next morning. The Bill is one of the most ridiculous ever introduced.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I, too, oppose the Bill which, although it does not seem important, makes it possible for the public to purchase at any hour, butter, tobacco, cigarettes and cigarette papers, but certain storekeepers have asked that other items should be available for purchase outside ordinary trading hours, so I regard this Bill as only the thin edge of the wedge for the introduction of those other items. Inquiries should be made to ascertain who are the members of the Federated Retail Confectionery, Refreshment and Mixed Business of Australia (S. A. Branch). Some years ago some small storekeepers wilfully robbed the unemployed of their paltry rations so that the secretary of their association could be paid, and since then I have always carefully considered overtures from that organization. When I drew attention to what was going on previously, the Government, after investigations, found my charges correct and refused to allow those people to act as its agents in certain matters. Later I was told that I was using Parliamentary privilege to make statements that I dared not make outside the House, but I challenged those people to a discussion at a meeting in the Town Hall and refused to withdraw my statements. Recently I received from an association a letter claiming that the benefit being sought is for others, but such a statement is sheer hypocrisy, for some shopkeepers in my district do not favour keeping their shops open after 6 p.m., as they consider ordinary hours adequate. One shopkeeper told me the previous owner of his shop had given up the business because his health had broken down under the strain of long hours, but the present owner is doing just as well, although he closes his shop at 6 p.m. Customers have adapted their buying habits to the new hours. In the days of the later closing of liquor bars, I remember an advertisement depicting a man running for his life and shouting, "Great Scot! 10.55 and I forgot my Chateau Tanunda brandy." When the hotel closing hour was changed to 6 p.m., the figure "5" was merely pasted over the "10" so that

the same man was running at 5.55 instead of 10.55. Are country housewives able to run around the corner to the shop to make small purchases outside ordinary trading hours?

Mr. William Jenkins—They can get goods at any time.

Mr. STEPHENS—But their shops are not as handy as they are in the city. When I was a boy shops were open until 10 on Saturday night, and after closing time goods had to be delivered. I remember approaching one man about the late deliveries. He was a churchman and he told me that when the ladies bought their new hats on the Saturday night they wanted them delivered so that they could wear them on the Sunday morning. When 9 o'clock closing came there were letters in newspapers saying that business would be affected, and that the poor widow should have been considered. Then we got one o'clock closing on Saturday and the same things were said about the poor widow.

The Retail Confectionery, Refreshment and Mixed Businesses Association says it is not desired to obtain a greater turnover in business. Of course that is not desired; there is only the desire to help people. It also said that essentials desired by the general public should be available for purchase after the normal closing hours. Of course they do not want to make greater profits. All they want to do is to cut down the profits of the decent employers. The letter also said that New Australians are not familiar with our laws and regard themselves as being subjected to unusual treatment and that we should do all we can to assist them. If New Australians could buy wine and other goods up to 9 and 10 o'clock at night in their native countries, should we amend our laws to enable them to do it here? We should educate them to our way of life and if they do not agree with it let them go back to where they came from. I do not think the Premier is keen to have the Bill passed, but when he says "Yes" we know that it will pass, and when he says "No" that is the end of it. He is a big man in this State and tells us what to do. In his second reading speech on this measure he said:—

The purpose of this Bill is to add to the list of those goods that may be sold outside specified hours and to give a little more freedom to those storekeepers stocking the goods.

Mr. Dunks asked whether it was intended to include margarine in the proposal, but the Premier said that as far as he knew no request for it had been made. If the Bill is passed one of the next things to be exempted will be

margarine. It will be said that it was not included this time because no request was made. There is a general invitation to ask for further goods to be exempted. If we open the door on this matter we must be consistent. I smoke cigarettes, but should I be able to buy them any hour of the night when another man cannot get a glass of beer after 6 o'clock, or the sick person cannot get medicine? When I was a child my father used to demonstrate the right and wrong way to do things. I remember his having a circle of sand on a plate and putting water inside it. When he took a few grains of sand away the water rushed through the opening and soon all the sand was washed away. That was his way of saying that we should never start to do things wrongly. If we open the door now on this matter we shall have people worrying us to have more goods placed on the exempted list. Butter is to be placed on it. Now it is possible to get two ounces of butter after hours, but if I wanted a pound of butter I could easily get it by going to eight shops and getting two ounces from each. The whole thing is ridiculous. I hope the Premier will withdraw the Bill realizing that he has made a mistake. Its introduction is a step in the wrong direction. If he goes on with it I am afraid it will be carried, to the detriment of all South Australians.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I shall not give a silent vote on this measure, which provides something that is necessary. We have gone too far with restrictions. I am prepared to support any man who is prepared to do something for himself. I will give him as many concessions as possible, provided they are consistent with the well-being of the community. Some members opposite, like the member for Hindmarsh, spoke about the evils of this Bill. Mr. Hutchens confirmed my suspicions that the Labor Party was out to help big business, but it is time we took a stand to help the man who is prepared to help himself. He also said that only a few people have not a refrigerator, but some, perhaps through illness, cannot afford one. These people cannot keep adequate stocks of food on hand, and must be given the opportunity of purchasing goods as they require them. Again, a man may be away working in the country. Perhaps his wife could not pick up his weekly tobacco ration and when he gets home he is without a smoke. Why should he not be able to get his weekly supply? Hotels sell cigarettes, so why should not the small shops be

able to? The arguments put forward by members opposite carry little weight. The member for Port Adelaide said this measure was the thin end of the wedge. but if it is shown later that other items should be included in the list of exempt goods I will support any move to have them included. The argument about slave driving is utter nonsense. Many families like to work together to get a business going successfully. Young people would not stay at home if they did not get a fair deal, and this shows the weakness of the Opposition's argument. Some members objected to a man's wife helping in the shop, but not many men make a success of their businesses without the help of their wives. What is the difference in principle between a wife serving over the counter and doing other useful jobs? I support the Bill.

Mr. CORCORAN (Victoria)—I oppose the Bill because it is not justified. No conclusive evidence has been placed before us that the public is concerned about this matter. No members of the public have approached me asking my support for the measure. The Bill may undermine one of the principles embodied in the Early Closing Act. Government supporters have stated that this legislation will provide additional facilities, but most housewives work to a system and rarely run short of commodities. I do not desire to encourage anyone to be unsystematic, but I am more concerned about the people making a living from the sale of tobacco. If we want to grant any concessions we should consider those people. However, by passing this Bill we shall cause hardship to tobacco retailers, because it will affect their business. I want to see them protected, and my opposition to the Bill is not contrary to the desires of the public. I am a smoker, and I consider it just bad luck if I run out of tobacco. If I do run out it will probably be on account of the rationing of supplies, for the smoker's main worry has been to locate a continuous supply. I do not wish to ignore the needs of the public, but we can encourage people to become careless and unsystematic by passing legislation such as this. If we grant some concessions they may want others later, thus breaking down the principles established in the Early Closing Act. When it was first introduced many people in the South-East said it went too far, but they became accustomed to it. I do not wish to speak disparagingly of New Australians, because I am pleased to see them coming into this country and shall do all in my power to see them

assimilated, but the Premier's reference to their needs was pure camouflage. We have had no representations from them about this measure. They have been used to conditions prevailing in other countries, but they should not mind complying with our laws when they come here. If they are responsible people they will realize Australia has received them with open arms and not seek to have our laws amended, especially when those provisions have been won after a hard fight. They should try to adopt our way of life.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I oppose the Bill. I have no objections to anyone making a success of his business, but some members opposite have accused Opposition members of trying to prevent people from being successful. I oppose any legislation giving one section of business people an advantage over others. This Bill will give concessions to many storekeepers over big businesses in the main streets of our cities and larger towns. Suburban shopkeepers will use these concessions and sell butter, cigarettes and tobacco as catch lines in order to sell other articles they stock. To give them an advantage over people who are paying wages under an award would be most unjust. Few small storekeepers pay wages and, although it may be true that the family man runs the business with the aid of his wife and family, I am opposed to his running it by making his wife and family work long hours, for the children must find time to do their homework and the wife to do her housework.

I was surprised at some of the arguments advanced by members opposite on this Bill. While the member for Prospect was speaking I heard the Minister of Agriculture say that he was listening to the funny story of the day. It may have been a funny story to him, for it may have taken his mind back to the days when he and his kind paid their aboriginal labourers with a couple of sticks of tobacco, and probably he wants to see that day back again. The member for Rocky River said he was prepared to let anyone work who wanted to work and members on this side wish to allow those willing to work to do so, but we want to prevent the exploitation of labor which occurred years ago when children were forced to work in the mines to ensure a living for the worker and his family. Through the years we on this side have fought to improve the worker's conditions and do not desire to pass legislation which will lower the standards built up over the years, but members opposite wish to take

away the workers' rights by means of this camouflage Bill which will break down the conditions won by shop assistants only after a long fight.

Years ago shop assistants worked under the worst conditions possible in any industry, and probably some members opposite would like to see them on the same basis as rural workers, with no award and no protection, working from daylight to dark. As a union organizer I remember the time when, during the wheat season, farmers were not satisfied until the last load was in, and great difficulty was experienced in those days in breaking down the hard conditions imposed by farmers on their labourers. If we allow this legislation to pass we will receive requests that other goods be included as exempt goods and that we return to the days when night trading was fashionable. This and other Governments have seen fit to fix the hours of trading for shops, and we should not break away from existing legislation. Everybody should be on the same footing as to hours of trading. It has been said that the housewife may need a pound of butter or a man a packet of cigarettes, but any man who relies on the grocer for his quota of cigarettes will be unable to get them anywhere else in any case. I trust that members opposite will let common sense prevail and defeat this Bill.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside)—Much has been said about this Bill which in no sense touches on the principles involved in it, which are those dividing the Liberal and anti-Liberal elements in this House. Liberal members stand for enterprise and the widest possible ownership of trade and business. We believe in self-employment, whether on the land, in the factory or in the shop, that it is laudable for a man to work towards the ownership of his own business, and in the maximum variety of service to the consumer, for that is stimulating to our economy. We stand for the rights of consumers and for their right to exercise a freedom of choice. The opposition to this Bill is based on a similar doctrine to that of compulsory unionism—what is good enough for one is good enough for all. The member for Gawler said that if the principle that because a section of the community does not like a law the law should be changed were pursued to its conclusion, lawbreakers and evil doers would require the law to be changed in order to legalize their unlawful and immoral activities. There is no analogy between a person desiring to murder or rob and someone wishing to sell a few shillings' worth of goods outside ordinary trading hours.

Mr. John Clark—At present that is illegal.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Yes, but it is not sinful, wicked or immoral. No breach of Christian ethics is involved in selling a packet of cigarettes after hours, whereas murder, theft and rape are morally and spiritually bad. Many respectable housewives—including, I am sure, the wives of many trade unionists—will not be pleased with their condemnation by the member for Prospect, who called them incompetent and inefficient and made other offensive and abusive remarks about the way they conducted their domestic affairs. I am sure the good women of Prospect would not like their being classed in that category, for most Australian housewives are remarkably efficient.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is why they don't want this Bill.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—If their tasks are made lighter in the slightest degree the Bill will be justified on those grounds alone. The member for Prospect assured the House that he had not been coerced or pressed into his attitude on this Bill by any pressure group, and, of course, it could not be said that he had been moved by any trades union objections to it. Certainly he would not be espousing the cause of big business for the sake of big business. The attitude of members opposite generally goes deeper than that.

Mr. O'Halloran—Yes, it rests on fundamentals.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Members opposite are moved by the same concept which moved Mr. Clyde Cameron, M.H.R. to say recently in the Federal House that the Labor Party would nationalize all big businesses, whether they produced motor cars or blended tobacco on a large scale. I remind members how much easier it is to nationalize one or two larger businesses than many small ones, and recall that Mr. Dedman once said in the Federal Parliament that we were allowing a nation of little capitalists to grow up because many workers owned their own homes. Is it equally anti-social to own one's own business? The British nation, once derisively referred to by Napoleon Bonaparte as a nation of shopkeepers, has become renowned for its integrity, which has been built up on the enterprise shown by Britishers. If the member for Prospect pursues his view to its logical conclusion, he should move that the goods already exempt be struck out of the schedule so that it would not be possible for a child to buy an ice-cream or a soft drink outside ordinary

trading hours. If these things are so wicked, let him do that, but I think children are as entitled to buy their lollipop after 6 p.m. as at any other time; therefore the objection to this Bill is doctrinaire and has nothing to do with whether the goods sold are eggs, candles or cheese, because the Labor Party knows that the continuation of capitalism relies on free enterprise, the sovereignty of the consumer and the right to exercise the consumer's choice. The more the consumer is harassed the easier it is to nationalize an industry. I remind those whose cause is being espoused by the Opposition that already there are countries where the sale of tobacco has become a State monopoly, and therefore, the more tobacco sold by independent and enterprising people, the more difficult it will be to nationalize the industry. For that reason the opposition to this Bill is much deeper than any argument on the three items included in it, for these items are among those the sale of which Labor would, if given half a chance, nationalize at the first opportunity. I support the Bill.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I oppose the Bill for the reasons given by the honourable member for Burnside for supporting it. I believe principles are at stake in this Bill, that it will create more anomalies than exist at present, and that no request has been received for it from consumers. I do not accept the statement that it has been introduced at the request of consumers. When introducing the Bill the Premier was honest enough to say it was at the behest of people who wanted to sell certain commodities. With respect to Mr. Geoffrey Clarke's arguments, I cannot see that there is much initiative in a person who wishes to build up his business by selling goods that certain other people are not permitted to sell. Under the Bill a confectionery or cool drink shop will be able to sell tobacco at certain hours when a tobacconist will be prevented from doing so. Where is the logic in that? If that is the kind of initiative which has built up this British nation, it is something different from what I was taught. One of the great principles that has made the British nation great and its name respected is the sense of fair play in business and in every other walk of life. The member for Burnside said the Government introduced the Bill because it believed in freedom of choice and private enterprise. In effect we are saying to the people, "You will be able to buy a

pound of butter, but you cannot buy a pound of margarine." That is a delightful freedom of choice—every man for himself.

Mr. Dunks—The honourable member can move to amend the Bill to provide for the sale of margarine.

Mr. RICHES—I do not intend to try to amend it. Like other honourable members, I have received correspondence from the Retail Tobacconists' Association, the Shopkeepers' Association and other bodies which have asked for this legislation. I believe in espousing the cause of the small business man, but we shall create dissatisfaction if we provide one set of conditions for some people in an industry and a different set for others in the same business. There is no demand for the Bill. I frankly admit that anomalies are inevitable when such legislation is introduced. I tried to follow the logic of the member for Burnside, but could see no analogy between compulsory unionism and the attitude of Labor members on this Bill. If anything like compulsory unionism were introduced it would be acceptable to me. I am still not unnopeful that the Premier will reconsider the Bill. He admits that he has had representations from those who will be adversely affected, and that it is sectional in its operations.

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—I did not intend to speak, but because of the peculiar things said by members opposite I feel that I must put my viewpoint before the House. I have been accused by the member for Adelaide of believing in the survival of the fittest. That is what has made this nation what it is. The honourable member has correctly indicated my belief. It is rather peculiar to me that although our fathers 30 years ago and perhaps our grandfathers 50 years ago made their mark in the world and put themselves on the map as leaders in industry, their sons or grandsons today are saying, "Don't let the little fellow start. Keep him down. We do not want him to come up." As soon as such people get into a big position they say to Parliament, "You stop the little fellow from starting." I am surprised to hear members of the Australian Labor Party advocating that system tonight. In effect, members opposite say, "If a worker has saved enough money to open a shop and is prepared to keep open at all hours we will stop him. We will protect the big men—the fellows who employ labour." In 1946 that is actually what they did. I was successful in the industry in which I grew up because I was able to work when I liked and give whatever

service I liked to the community. I could bake a loaf of bread at any hour of the night, and if I cared, I could deliver it in the morning. That position does not exist today. Big business has said to both Parliamentary Parties, "You stop a man from starting a business. Make him a wage slave for the rest of his life. Don't give him the opportunity to get into business himself." That is the philosophy of members opposite. I do not think I am breaking faith with the Premier if I say that when he first suggested an amendment of the Act to the Party many other articles were included in the schedule. Members of the Party were opposed to that and said that only two things were to be included.

Mr. Riches—I thought you did not have a Caucus meeting.

Mr. DUNKS—Surely, the honourable member does not believe all the old women's tales he hears. We have a Party meeting; we do not call it a Caucus, as we do not like that word. At these meetings we discuss our own problems and we have the privilege of differing with other members of the Party. On one occasion I said to a prominent Labor man "Are you always unanimous in Caucus?" and he said "We are when we come out." We are not like that. If four or five other items had been included in the proposal we would not have supported the Bill. It is said that the retail grocer will go broke because he will lose the sale of a few pounds of butter, but how many exempt shopkeepers have been asked for two ounces of butter? Before price fixing exempt shopkeepers could make a profit by selling two ounces of butter and wrapping it. In earlier days wrapped butter was unknown. The grocer had butter delivered to him in bulk and he sold it unwrapped. I believe it happens in Victoria now. The proposal in the Bill will not deprive the grocer of any business, but it will mean that people will be able to get butter legally which they now get illegally. Some people say they will not observe a law if they think it is a bad one. About 20 years ago I visited Kangaroo Island with two religious gentlemen, one of whom liked a drink of alcohol. On the Sunday morning one of them went out just before breakfast. When he came back his son, who was a Salvation Army officer, and his friend, who was a local preacher in the Methodist church, took him to task for going for a drink on a Sunday morning. He said, "It is a bad law and I do not think I have done terribly wrong in having a drink on a Sunday morning." People who get butter

after normal trading hours are not doing anything really wrong. The retail storekeeper thinks he will lose business, but it will not happen. If we legalize the sale of butter after hours customers will be able to get it without having to sneak into the shop and wait until no one is about. The average Australian housewife is a good manager and she has more cupboards in her kitchen than ever before. We can be sure that the larder is well stocked with all the goods she needs, so there will be no big traffic in the sale of butter after normal trading hours.

Members opposite oppose the Bill because the man who runs his own shop will be able to work longer hours whilst the man who employs labour will not be able to do so. Our trouble is that we have tried to get a high standard of living without demanding a high standard of service. We have provided a 40-hour working week and overtime payment when extra time is worked. Why shouldn't the man who has to observe these conditions be able to sell exempt goods as long as he covers up his non-exempt goods? In 1945 the Honourable R. S. Richards, who was then Leader of the Opposition, was successful in having the Act amended which compelled the hairdresser to close his shop on weekdays and 12 o'clock on Saturdays. If the tobacconists are to be hard hit over the proposal in the Bill let them approach the Government with a view to their being allowed to remain open later. We can remember the days when we had small kiosks in King William Street where tobacco and cigarettes were sold, but they have all gone now. Whether it be a grocer, a proprietor of a cool drink shop, or a tobacconist, only a certain quota of cigarettes and tobacco can be sold. Therefore, the wholesale tobacconists could easily control the position. They could sell only to tobacconists, and then cigarettes and tobacco would be sold only during the time those shops were open for business. I support the Bill because I believe in giving the small man a chance to trade.

The member for Burnside repeated what Napoleon said, that the British were a nation of shopkeepers. The fact that Britain has been a nation of shopkeepers has made it what it is today. If I belonged to the Labor Party I should try to encourage the man working for wages to become a shopkeeper as soon as possible. Members opposite seem to think that while a man is working for wages he is a wage slave and that as soon as he gets a shop of his own he is a bloated capitalist. However, he may work much harder in his own

business than when employed, but there are many small business men working long hours and not making more than the basic wage, but satisfied to do it because of their freedom. Some years ago I said that a hairdresser and tobacconist near my home was forced to close his shop at 6 p.m., but two cool drink shops almost opposite him were selling cigarettes and tobacco. As a result his competitors took much of his legitimate business. If members opposite had allowed the hairdresser to remain open after 6 o'clock he could have competed with them for as long as he wished. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Minister of Industry)—I hope the House will not reject the Bill. The Government has no sectional interest in mind, but believes the consumer must have reasonable service. Recently I had the opportunity of travelling in other countries, and frequently have to visit other States, but the barriers against the consumer getting reasonable service are greater in this State than in any other State or country I have visited. If this measure is as iniquitous as members opposite would have us believe how iniquitous is the position in Queensland? I shall read a list of goods exempted under a schedule in that State. For many years Queensland has had a Labor Government, so if this amendment were so iniquitous one would think the list in Queensland would have been reduced, but what do we find? It goes much further than anything we have done in this State. I understand that Victoria is taking action to exempt tobacco and cigarettes now.

Mr. Fred Walsh—And to introduce a lottery in that State.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, but let us keep to the Early Closing Act. I have the original list of exempt goods in Queensland, and shall let any honourable member see it, but I shall quote from the revised list. It exempts biscuits, bread, and butter. Under this Bill we propose to allow people to buy butter after hours, but the Labor Party in Queensland allows people there to obtain butter. This list also exempts beverages (non-alcoholic), books (whether printed or blank), confectionery of all kinds, cakes, condensed milk, cheese, and cigars. We are only providing for cigarettes, tobacco, and papers. Queensland also exempts cigarettes, cigarette cases, cigarette holders and making machines, cigarette holders and cutters, cards (Christmas, Birthday and New Year), playing cards, copy books, cream, death chamber

and funeral requisites, eggs, erasers, fish (fresh and cooked and preserved, not tinned), cut flowers, cooked foodstuffs, fruit (fresh or dried), game, ice, ice cream, matches, and match boxes. We have been told that the Bill will inevitably lead to a demand by the public to be able to buy a box of matches after hours. I was told that by a deputation this morning, but the Labor Party has been in office in Queensland since 1932.

Mr. Lawn—But you do not accept Queensland as a standard?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The attitude of the honourable member's Party on this Bill is singular. It is not espousing the cause usually espoused by the Labor Party, the cause of the underdog. I compliment the Labor Party because on many occasions it supports this cause, but now it is trying to stop the consumer and the small business man from purchasing and supplying some goods. The Queensland list also includes motor spirit, motor oil, milk, music (sheet, but not phonograph or pianola rolls), nuts, newspapers, onions, photo films, poultry, potatoes, tobacco pipes, and pipe cases. We are far behind Queensland. The list also includes pocket knives, paper of all kinds, postage and duty stamps, razors, razor strops, rubber stamps, shaving cream, shaving soap, shaving powders, stationery (including all kinds of writing materials), school bags, tobacco, tobacco pouches, vegetables (fresh or dried), and walking sticks. That State is far ahead of us. I am sure if my Government included walking sticks in this measure the Opposition would have almost fainted.

We propose to raise the standard of living in South Australia and allow people to buy more than two ounces of butter after hours, yet we find the most powerful opposition that members opposite have put forward on any measure this session has been advanced against the Government's proposals. They say they are derogatory to the principles of the Australian Labor Party. They want the people to be regimented. They do not want the public to have better services, and they do not want the 40-hour week to be undermined. They fear that union standards may be broken down; that is the issue at stake. The members for Port Pirie and Adelaide said that great principles were involved, but the Queensland Labor Government is not curbed by any wicked Legislative Council. It has dictatorial powers and could alter the list of exempted goods by proclamation at any time. The schedule I have just read was included in the proclamation.

This is not something which was debated on the floor of the House but something issued on a take it or leave it basis. However, the Queensland Government has been a little more generous to the public than my friends opposite would be, because it has allowed some concessions and comforts to the public. For instance, it allowed them food to sustain their life and walking sticks for those who were ailing.

Mr. Riches—What is the position of the tobacconist in Queensland?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The proclamation states:—

The following schedule of goods comprises those which may be sold in exempted shops after the prescribed closing hours for non-exempted shops.

Then follows a list which is completely analogous with that discussed in this House today. In addition, certain goods are recognized as chemists' lines which may be stocked or sold in exempted shops, but only in the hours that chemists' shops are allowed to open in a particular district. When chemists' shops are required to be closed such goods must be structurally separated from the exempt goods. Then follows a list of those goods.

Mr. Riches—Are Queensland tobacconists allowed to sell tobacco after hours?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Tobacco shops in Queensland are exempted shops.

Mr. Riches—Therefore they may sell tobacco.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received no request for that in this State. This morning I received a deputation which, from the way its members spoke, included representatives of tobacco selling interests, but, as I interpreted its request, it desired, not the right to sell but to stop somebody else from selling. The deputation also included a hairdresser who asked why these people should be able to sell his lines after hours, but I felt inclined to say that only a short time ago the hairdressers requested that they should be put under the control of a professional board and that it seemed strange that they should now wish to have a pre-emptive prerogative to sell tobacco. The Bill does not give effect to the request of the deputation that first saw me and which requested that eggs, bacon, uncooked rabbits and sausages be included. The Government considered those were not goods which would normally be bought for immediate consumption but rather those which might reasonably be expected to be purchased under ordinary

housekeeping rules. From my knowledge of the situation, which is possibly greater than that of any other member, I say that the public will not acknowledge that the present limitation on the sale of tobacco and cigarettes is proper, for by every possible means it entices the trader to break the law. Under the existing legislation, if the trader breaks the law, he is prosecuted, but all the prosecutions have not made one iota of difference to the attitude of the public on this matter, for people do not consider it immoral to buy a pound of butter or a packet of cigarettes after ordinary closing hours.

Mr. Jennings—Do they consider it immoral to have a bet off the race course?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Many probably do not, but Parliament has provided legislation whereby under proper rules they can have a lawful bet. The consumer should have the right to purchase the commodities named in this Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:—

Ayes (23).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunks, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, and Hincks, Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. William Jenkins, Macgillivray, McIntosh, Michael, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford (teller), Quirke, Shannon, Teusner, Travers and White.

Noes (13).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis Dunstan, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McAlees, O'Halloran, Riches, Stephens, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Stott. No—Mr. Tapping.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1926-1951. Read a first time.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the Hon. M. McIntosh and read a first time.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Marine)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to provide for increased pilotage fees and for the registration of fishing

boats at a small fee. Members are aware that the Government proposes to increase the revenue from harbour dues and charges in order to cover the increased expense of the Harbors Board. All but two of the proposed increases in revenue can be made without legislation. The two which require legislation are provided for in this Bill. Under the Harbors Act at present it is not possible to charge a pilotage fee of more than £20 on the arrival or departure of a ship. The revenue from these fees does not cover the cost of the services provided. The Government considers it desirable to remedy this position but because of the limit fixed by the principal Act it is not possible to do so. It should be noted that South Australian pilotage fees are at present only a fraction of those charged in other States, particularly the fees charged for the pilotage of larger vessels. The increases to be made in this State have not yet been decided upon, but the Government can assure members that they will be reasonable, especially in comparison with the fees charged elsewhere. The Bill accordingly removes the limit on pilotage fees.

Recently the Harbors Board has incurred considerable expenditure at Robe, Port Wakefield, Port Kenny and Port Adelaide on facilities for fishing boats, and accordingly the Government is of opinion that some small amount should be paid by fishermen as a contribution towards this expenditure. Legislation is required for this purpose and this Bill therefore provides for the registration of fishing boats used by fishermen in the course of their business at a fee not exceeding £5 a year. Comparative charges for the pilotage of a vessel of 10,000 tons gross and 6,000 tons net are Adelaide £34, Fremantle £78, Hobart £40, Sydney £100, Brisbane £140, and Melbourne £225. I have other figures which illustrate how far behind South Australia is in charging interstate and overseas vessels for services rendered.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 2, at 2 p.m.