HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 20, 1954.

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

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENT FOR ANNUAL LEAVE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any further information concerning the question I asked on two previous occasions relating to payment for annual leave to Government employees prior to their commencing such leave?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I regret that I was unable to get around to examining this matter this morning, but will get a report as quickly as possible.

UNITED KINGDOM SHIPPING STRIKE.

Mr. PEARSON—The shipping strike in the United Kingdom has spread to wide dimensions and it has been reported in the press that practically all ships are held up in United Kingdom ports and no cargoes are being discharged or worked. Large quantities of meat, eggs and other perishable products have been shipped from Australia to the United Kingdom in recent months and I am concerned as to whether or not they are deteriorating as a result of not being unloaded. Has the Minister of Agriculture any information on this matter which may relieve the anxiety of producers?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—My information is to the effect that these commodities are held under refrigerated conditions in the ships and, therefore, deterioration would not be taking place, but a serious effect of the hold-up is that these commodities are not reaching the markets and presently, when they do, they will be in such volume that there may be some depressing effect on prices. That, at the moment, seems to be the worst aspect of the hold-up.

MOONTA MINES ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. McALEES—Has the Premier considered the petition I presented on October 6 relating to the supply of electricity to Moonta Mines where people urgently need it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the Electricity Trust supplied me with a report on this matter. He said that work was in progress, and had been, for about two weeks before the petition was presented. However, no definite information could be supplied as to when the supply would be available because the trust is having difficulty in obtaining the necessary transformers for its extension work. I will get further information for the honourable member.

PORT GERMEIN GORGE TREES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Some time ago I brought before the notice of the Minister of Agriculture the fact that trees in the Port Germein gorge appeared to be dying from some disease. It would be a tragedy if they were to die and the beauty of that gorge were to be lost. The Minister promised to bring down a report. Has he that report?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I asked the Conservator of Forests to have an officer examine the condition of the trees in the gorge, and he reports as follows:—

Inspections by an officer of this department indicate that the red gums referred to by Mr. Heaslip are not actually dying, but are suffering from an unthrifty nutritional condition, which has been accentuated by insect attack on the leaves. This condition is not uncommon in certain limestone areas in the region, and has also been noticed on Wirrabara Forest Reserve. Examples of the leaf insect attack can also be seen fairly frequently in the hills round Glen Osmond, giving almost an appearance of sandblast. Attacks to date, however, have not been fatal. As far as is known these attacks are usually brought under control by native parasites, but the appearance of the attacked trees sinks to a very unthrifty condition during the attack. In the jarrah country in Western Australia, where the tree has grown for long periods of time, the Forests Department there have under investigation a complaint that is eventually responsible for complete deaths in small areas, but up to date, causes and remedy have not been determined.

CONTROL OF NOXIOUS WEEDS.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—In view of the rapid spread of many noxious weeds throughout rural areas and the apparent inability of councils to effectively control them, will the Minister of Agriculture consider some method of State control through his department by a more direct application of the Act and to some extent by taking the onus of prosecutions for offences under the Act out of the hands of district councils which, in many instances, seem reluctant to prosecute? There appear to be in the prosecution sections of the Act anomalies which tend to permit the spread of weeds. Could his department set up a small subdepartment with plant to deal with noxious weeds directly their appearance is notified in any area? If that were done there would be a

body directly responsible to the Minister and some of the laxity in dealing with the control of the weeds would be tightened up.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I recently convened a meeting of the Noxious Weeds Advisory Council—a body functioning in my department—with a view to examining various suggestions and proposals for the more effective control of noxious weeds. The council had before it a proposal that where a council failed to handle the matter in its own district the department would take over. The cost would, of course, have to be borne by someone. The obligation is at present on the landholder himself and if he fails to take effective methods the cost incurred by either the council or the department would, of course, be charged to him. However, the matter is still under consideration and until legislation is framed and Cabinet has approved of it I cannot say how it will ultimately emerge, but I hope that we shall be able to introduce legislation on this matter this session.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Not long ago the Government submitted to local government bodies a proposed Bill that would do the very thing suggested by the member for Stirling, but it got no support from the councils. It was felt that if the councils were not prepared to be left with the responsibility there would be no hope whatever of a Government department succeeding where local people had failed. Therefore, the Bill did not go on. I am perturbed to think that one so closely associated with local government as the member for Stirling should bring forward a suggestion such as he has, which flies completely in the face of the decision already given by local government authorities. If the Minister intends to introduce legislation along the lines suggested this session will he reconsider his decision and see that it is submitted to councils before their power is filched from them and to see whether they are in favour of it, for they have shown conclusively in the past that they have not been?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I hope I did not give the impression that we intended to filch powers from councils, but we hope to provide machinery to take up the slack where a council fails to undertake its responsibility. Therefore, I do not think there would be any necessity to submit the legislation to local government bodies for their approval. Furthermore, I said that I hoped we would be able to introduce the legislation this session, but I cannot at this stage say whether it will be prepared in time for that.

MINOR SCHOOL WORKS.

Mr. TEUSNER—I understand that it has been extremely difficult for the Education and Architect-in-Chief's Departments to proceed with the expeditious repair of certain schools and school residences, particularly in country areas. I understand, too, that many school committees in those areas are prepared to assume some responsibility for having these works done and that local contractors in many cases are prepared to carry out the work. I suggested to the Minister some time ago that he consider decentralizing certain activities of the department and I ask him whether it is proposed to do this?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Ever since my appointment as Minister I have been concerned at the delay in the school building programme, which has not been due to lack of money provided by the Government. I am not reflecting in any way on the Architect-in-Chief's Department, but one of the main causes of the delays is that his department has been cluttered up with hundreds of small jobs; in fact, I think there are well over 1,000 jobs that have been approved by the Education Department but not completed by the Architect-in-Chief's Department. It is not only the actual construction of the job; every job, however small, seems to require plans and specifications and estimates of cost.

Mr. O'Halloran—And inspection.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, and as is the habit of school committees, they change their minds from time to time and when any minor alteration to a plan or specification is required the whole procedure has to be gone through again. At the beginning of June, on my recommendation, Cabinet approved of a regulation allowing school committees to expend Government money to more than double the amount that they were formerly allowed for urgent repairs. The maximum amount for the larger schools was £40 in any one year, and this has been increased to £100. In a furthor effort to assist the Architect-in-Chief, whose department is heavily committed with a large school building programme, approval has been given for greater use to be made of private contractors for small works involving renovations and additions costing under £400. Primary school committees and high school councils will be asked, when requesting such minor works, to submit working drawings and clear but simple specifications, accompanied by one or preferably two quotations from local contractors. If the work is considered to be necessary these drawings,

specifications and quotations will be referred to the Architect-in-Chief. If he is satisfied with them and if funds are available he will authorize the school committee to have the work done. On completion, the work will be inspected by an officer of the Architect-in-Chief's Department and, if certified satisfactory, the accounts will be paid by the Architect-in-Chief. That is not as far as I would like to go, but we are taking one stage at a time, and I am sure it will bring a greater acceleration of our work if we can get rid in this way of a large volume of minor works. I ask members who have great influence with school committees and high school councils to endeavour to secure the services of local contractors so that we can get more work done for the benefit of schools throughout the State.

COMPOSTING OF GARBAGE.

Mr. MICHAEL—From a perusal of *Hansard* I find that earlier this session questions were asked by the members for Unley and Stanley regarding the composting of garbage. In reply the Minister said that Mr. Hodgson, Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment, was overseas investigating this matter. When in the city of Pretoria recently I was able, through the courtesy of a member of the South African Parliament, to spend two or three hours with the engineer for that city, and I was impressed with what was being done there in the composting of sewage, the saving and purifying of effluent, and making it available to industry. South Africa is considerably in advance of Australia in that direction and the saving of water is of great value as South Africa is a country having in general a low rainfall. Does the Premier know whether South Africa is included in Mr. Hodgson's itinerary, and if not, would it be possible for him to visit that country?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—So far as I know South Africa is not included in the itinerary, which was drawn up by Mr. Hodgson himself. I will, however, have the matter examined to see whether it would be possible for him to visit that country.

CRUCIFEROUS CROPS AS LIVESTOCK FEED.

Mr. SHANNON—Following on representations I made some time ago to the Minister of Agriculture, has he a report regarding the possibility that the use of cruciferous crops as stock feed causes harm to stock and goitre in young people who, for instance, drink the milk from dairy cows fed on these plants?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The Director of Agriculture reports:—

Cruciferous plants contain substances which are capable of suppressing thyroid function and may, therefore, possibly be implicated in goitre incidence. Such effects, however, are only experienced when the crucifers are consumed continuously in a high proportion of the diet and for a lengthy period, *e.g.*, 12 months. In any event, the substances responsible for thyroid depression in animals are destroyed when the plants are digested and the effects could not be passed on to humans eating meat from such animals. The usual practices for feeding the commonest cruciferous crops to livestock in most areas of the State are as follows:—

1. Rape: Used for fattening store lambs, from the end of December on. The crop is fed for about 4 to 6 weeks at this time and usually in association with some roughage.
2. Chou Moellier: Used for feeding to cattle and sheep at the break of the season in late autumn. The period of feeding is about 4 to 6 weeks.
3. Turnips: The tops are used in the same way as rape, for fattening store lambs and the roots as early winter feed for cattle and sheep. Again, the period of feeding would not exceed 4 to 6 weeks.

The foregoing examples apply to the agricultural areas and the South-East. In the Adelaide hills, a less regular use is made of cruciferous crops for stock feeding. Here the crops are fed as available, *e.g.*, cabbage and cauliflower residues, turnip tops, but again the periods of feeding are restricted. In summary it is seen that cruciferous plants cannot affect the thyroid function of humans through the meat or other produce of animals feeding on them and the chances of undesirable effects to the animals themselves are very remote because of the restricted feeding periods.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—According to the Auditor-General's report recently tabled, grants to local governing bodies last year totalled £1,603,554, of which £818,290 was in respect of capital works and £785,264 for maintenance works. Expenditure on grants during the year represented an increase of £879,410, and was more than double the amount for the previous year. Loans for road work and purchase of machinery amounted to £569,164 and were more than four times greater than those for the previous year. In view of this statement and the statement of the Commissioner of Highways reported in this morning's press that local governing bodies will have to consider increasing their rates to meet the costs of maintaining roads following the conversion of tram to bus routes, can the Premier, in the absence of the

Minister representing the Minister of Local Government, say whether the Government has considered increasing its grants to local government bodies over and above the amount already guaranteed for Unley and Mitcham councils?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This matter has been examined and the Government has decided that the Tramways Trust shall pay one penny, instead of as at present only a small fraction of a penny, for each bus mile operated on the roads. That amount would be more than would be paid if the trust's buses were owned and operated by a private person, in which case the registration fees would be fixed under the Road Traffic Act according to capacity and weight. Road users will be under no disability because of the changeover as the buses will pay higher fees for the use of the roads than other vehicles of the same tonnage and capacity. It has also been provided that the amounts paid by the trust shall be segregated for use in the areas where the buses operate so that here again there will be no disability arising from the changeover from the point of view of municipal authorities, with the following exception: For many years the trust has taken up much of the expenditure on the maintenance of roads in the metropolitan area; not only has it maintained its steel tram lines, but also the area between the lines and 18in. on either side. This has been a very heavy cost involving the tramways in the operation of road-making plant and a road-making gang. Under the circumstances now to obtain, it will pay fees for the use of the road at a somewhat heavier rate than that provided for private industry.

DUPLICATION OF MORGAN-WHYALLA PIPELINE.

Mr. HAWKER—Two or three years ago the Government announced its intention of duplicating the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, taking a more northerly route from Hanson to about Port Germein. As many landholders in the district are anxious to improve their water supply, especially for homesteads, they would like to know, before going in for that expenditure, whether the new route for the duplication has been decided, and if so, when the work is likely to be completed. Has the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a report on this matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Some considerable time ago the Engineering and Water Supply Department reported that the capacity of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline was being drawn on to a greater extent than had been anticipated when the line was constructed and that it would be necessary in future to duplicate a certain portion of it. Since it was constructed very substantial diversions have been made. One feeds water to Yorke Peninsula and there has been an extension to the Woomera Rocket Range, where a large town has been established. I believe some surveys have been made, but whether they are conclusive is something I am not able to tell the honourable member, but I will get for him the latest information and indicate when it is expected the work will be undertaken.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Can the Premier say whether any consideration has been given by the Government to making loans to local government authorities to assist them in the disposal of garbage in the same way as loans have been made to assist them with the purchase of roadmaking machinery?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, I have not heard that topic raised. Garbage disposal has always been considered to be a matter for the councils. The question of extra equipment for roadmaking arose because not only district roads are concerned. Frequently local government bodies do work for the Government on main highways and the provision of plant to them has become the concern of the Highways Department. I will have the matter examined for the honourable member.

ORLIT COMPANY AND BRICKMAKING.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have a report indicating that the Orlit Company which is operating at Salisbury has engaged staff to make cement bricks for its housing project, and that a woman is employed. I am not sure whether it is correct that she is working in partnership with her husband. Brickmaking is very heavy and laborious work for almost any person, and I do not think we should continue with the policy of employing a woman, especially as I know the conditions which appertain on most building jobs in the matter of amenities. Will the Premier ascertain from the Housing Trust whether it is a fact that a woman is being employed in this way and, if so, will the practice be discontinued?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no knowledge whatever of the matter raised by the honourable member. It involves work being done by a private firm. I heartily agree with him that the physical work associated with brickmaking is totally unsuitable for a woman. I will have inquiries made and if action appears to be necessary I will see what can be done.

BULK HANDLING OF WHEAT.

Mr. HEASLIP—Earlier in the session I asked the chairman of the Public Works Committee a question regarding bulk handling of wheat. He made a lengthy statement but did not promise anything. He implied that the committee would soon be in a position to bring in a report. I understand that since then another proposal has been put to the committee by the Minister of Agriculture and that it is passing through various hands, so we still have no report on the matter, which is becoming really urgent. I understand the latest plan envisages a toll being levied on the coming harvest. Unless a report is brought in soon and Parliament is able to deal with the necessary legislation it will mean that the wheatgrowers will have to wait another 12 months before anything can be done. Can the chairman of the committee say when it will be in a position to bring in a report?

Mr. SHANNON—I have some sympathy with the people concerned regarding the urgency of the matter. I propose to answer the question in two sections. First I will deal with the last matter raised by the honourable member. A proposal has been referred to the committee by the Minister of Agriculture for a Bill to be introduced to give a franchise to a co-operative company to be set up to control bulk handling installations in this State. Certain constitutional matters have been raised with regard to that legislation and of necessity the committee had to refer them to the only authority possible, the Crown Law Department, for a ruling. The matter has been with the department since the question was raised by another high-ranking Government officer, but I have not yet had a report from the department.

Mr. Heaslip—Is it not a matter for the committee.

Mr. SHANNON—The members of the Public Works Committee are not legal men, but laymen, and when a legal question is raised in a matter referred to them they must seek legal advice, and they do so from the Crown Law Department. I assure the honourable member that I have urged, through the Minister, that the matter be expedited. I am as anxious to get rid of the particular inquiry as any member in this Chamber. In regard to the general question of bulk handling in this State, what I said earlier can be reiterated with the qualification that the committee has reached the stage where I believe the first recommendation regarding the installation of a system in a division in South Australia has almost been concluded. We are still awaiting details of certain equipment that will be absolutely new to South Australia. It is something that has not yet been tried in this State. We are seeking from the manufacturers operating costs of the equipment in order that we may be able to compare them with the costs of the orthodox methods now known and used throughout the Commonwealth for the bulk handling of wheat. If they approach what has been said for them it is obvious that we will have something to offer the farmers that they will be pleased to avail themselves of.

STRATHALBYN RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—My question relates to the railway crossing adjacent to the police station at Strathalbyn. It arises out of an accident which occurred there three weeks ago when a large truck was carried by the engine of a train 40 yards along the line. A previous application has been made for a warning device in the locality, but none has been supplied. In view of the recent accident will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways ask for a further examination to be made of the position and if possible a warning device placed there?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will have the matter examined and advise the honourable member.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1953. Read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 484.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The purpose of this Bill is to provide certain concessions to charitable organizations in respect of motor registration fees. I express my appreciation, as did the member who introduced the Bill, of the work which has been and is being done in South Australia by a wide range of charitable organizations. The State has recognized the worth of that work and every year, from the "Chief Secretary's Department, Miscellaneous" vote and from votes in the Budget, practical assistance has been given to those organizations. That assistance will be maintained in the future. Mr.

Riches was faced with the problem of defining a "charitable organization" and with deciding who should receive the benefits from the proposed amendment. Having no doubt given this matter considerable thought, which it certainly required, he said, in effect, "The best way is to hand it over to the people who have the authority to administer this Act and make them decide from day to day which charitable organizations shall come within the scope of the amendment." That position, I feel, is quite unsatisfactory. It would become a matter of interpretation by the Government of the day. From the point of view of administration it becomes almost an impossibility. We experience much difficulty in administering the present concessions which apply to commercial vehicles, but we can check whether a commercial vehicle is being used for the purpose for which a rebate has been granted; that would not apply under the Bill. Let me suggest a simple example of the problem that might arise. A person is employed as a secretary to a charitable organization and it is necessary for him, in the course of his employment, to have a motor car. He uses it for his work and, as a result, the vehicle is exempted from all or part of the registration fee. That motor car is in his possession all the time and he has the right to use it in his own private capacity as well. From that simple example—and I could give many more difficult ones—members will appreciate that it would be impracticable to administer the Bill and to ensure that it would apply to the organizations the mover desires it to apply to.

Secondly, the Bill provides something I have never been happy about, namely, a remission of taxation to an unspecified class which could be determined by the administration of the day. It would be subject to alteration of policy by the person in charge of the department at any particular time. If there are to be remissions in any taxation, Parliament itself is the appropriate authority to decide what precisely they will be and who is to receive them. We have always been jealous of the prerogative that no taxation can be levied without the direct sanction of Parliament, but under this Bill taxation would be levied in accordance with what, after all, would be only an opinion.

Mr. O'Halloran—Taxation may be remitted.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, under certain circumstances. In connection with income tax laws a committee is set up which can remit taxation when certain grave hardship can be proved. That hardship is defined and is capable of legal interpretation, but it is not so under this Bill. I appreciate the problem which confronted the mover but he has not been able to submit a definition of "charitable organizations" and when he stops to consider the ambit of this amendment he will realize the difficulties of administration. There are organizations which may be regarded as completely charitable, but there are others which are only partly charitable. There are organizations whose charity is even a shade less than the amount of their paid work. I have been advised by my officers that consistent administration of these provisions would be extremely difficult and that under those circumstances the amendment is undesirable. I point out that any charitable organization in this State which is undertaking work of a public nature can apply to the Government for financial assistance in connection with its work.

Mr. Riches—What about the Whyalla Boy Scouts' Association?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It might be considered a charitable institution, but it might not be. I know the honourable member brought down this Bill because of the activities of that association, for he asked a question about it this year.

Mr. Shannon—Has it been agreed by the Commissioner of Taxes that donations to that organization may be deducted for the purpose of income tax?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know, but members only have to consider the problem in connection with such deductions to know how complicated it becomes.

Mr. Riches—That organization does not seek any assistance from the Government.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—But the Boy Scouts organization may, and the Whyalla boy scouts are only a branch of the large organization. Probably the association gets assistance, and if it does not pass on some of it to Whyalla I have no doubt it has good and proper reasons for it. I emphasize that registration fees are called road taxation, but all the money collected is credited to the highways fund for the maintenance of the roads.

Mr. Riches—Then there should be no concessions at all.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There is strong ground for that argument also, but at least we should not carry an amendment giving an unspecified privilege of taxation reduction. This would place anyone trying to administer it in an invidious position because many organizations could be considered as coming

within the scope of the concession, but I would not like to have the duty of defining where the line should be drawn.

Mr. Riches—If your objections were answered satisfactorily what would your attitude be then?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the honourable member moved purely and simply, for instance, to exempt the Whyalla boy scouts I would still oppose the amendment because it would be a parochial one and not of the type that the House should consider. Special cases always make bad laws, but if the Boy Scouts' Association, or any other association, is doing a public work and applies for a grant it will have exactly the same consideration as has been always given. The Auditor-General is always asked to investigate the work done by a charitable organization to see whether it benefits the community. The Government has never rejected any of his recommendations for grants, and that is the proper way to deal with this matter, for it leads to proper accounting and provides a case for consideration by the Grants Commission. Further, it does not impoverish the road fund and it provides not only a solution of the problem of charitable organizations but also money which is necessary to maintain them. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I listened to the Premier with much interest, but I support the Bill. I appreciate that the Government has subsidized many charitable organizations, even though it has not been forced to do so, but there have been times when it has also assisted primary producers when in need. I stress that many workers in charitable organizations give their time in order to relieve the Government of a great deal of expenditure, and we are aware of the great work that boy scouts do in collecting various types of material which are made available to relieve suffering. In many cases they assist in providing hospital services for people, though in the final analysis this is the responsibility of the Government. Whatever is granted to charitable organizations it is eventually put back into the pockets of the Government. A great number of organizations, particularly some religious bodies, have provided housing accommodation for the aged and have gone to considerable expense in purchasing vehicles to carry out their work. We must not be satisfied with simply being sympathetic towards these organizations. The member for Stuart is only asking for something tangible to be done to assist those who are prepared to assist themselves, and the Government and the people too.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—The Premier made some strong points about the difficulties that would have to be faced if the Bill became law. Those in charge of the department concerned would be very dubious about granting concessions. Under the Bill a vehicle must be owned by a charitable organization and used solely in its work. Press reports show that in another State there have been many complaints lately about people who act as collectors for charitable organizations on a commission basis. They earn a lot of money, but some of them have avoided paying income tax. It would not be desirable to employ them in the commercial world, yet they have crept into the field of charity. This legislation would make it possible for a charitable organization to buy a motor car, secure the services of a canvasser, pay him for his work, and claim a rebate on the registration fee of the vehicle. It would encourage the increased use of vehicles in this way beyond an economic limit.

Mr. Riches—How could a reduced registration fee do that?

Mr. SHANNON—By encouraging charitable organizations to buy motor vehicles for the use of their canvassers.

Mr. Riches—You don't believe that would happen?

Mr. SHANNON—I believe it is likely to happen, for this legislation provides a concession that at present is not enjoyed by such organizations.

Mr. Riches—Do you think charitable organizations will buy motor cars merely to take advantage of the lower registration fee.

Mr. SHANNON—If such an organization saw that a profit was to be made by the use of a vehicle for which a registration concession was provided, it might be encouraged to enter a wider field. I know of a case in which a motor vehicle is being used on a State-wide basis by a salaried collector for a charitable organization, and, because this legislation would encourage the spread of that practice, it is undesirable. Who is to decide whether a charitable organization qualifies under this legislation? Today many such organizations do not qualify under the Income Tax Assessment Act.

Mr. Riches—And yet some of those bodies are assisted by this Government!

Mr. SHANNON—Although every charitable institution is not automatically assisted by this Government, if a good case can be made out for assistance it will be considered.

Mr. Riches—That is what this legislation seeks.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member dodges the issue of deciding which organizations shall qualify as charitable organizations and passes the buck on to the Government of the day.

Mr. Riches—The onus is on the organization to establish a case.

Mr. SHANNON—No; it is for the Government administering the legislation to decide the issue. An organization may put up a good case and yet not convince the Government.

Mr. Riches—The onus is on it to convince the Government.

Mr. SHANNON—It is on the Cabinet of the day to decide whether or not a certain body qualifies as a charitable body.

Mr. Riches—The same as it must do to qualify for a Government grant.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not know that that is so. After all, some bodies that do not qualify under the Income Tax Assessment Act are assisted by the South Australian Government.

Mr. Riches—The Government must be convinced of their *bona fides*.

Mr. SHANNON—Yes, but above all it must be convinced of their need. I would prefer some other form of assistance for these bodies. Our road fund must be adequate to keep our roads in order, but this legislation would both reduce the fund and encourage the greater use of our roads. This legislation would make it more difficult for the Government to know its commitments to be met from the road fund. Parliament would not know the effect of this legislation until the end of the financial year, and, generally speaking, it is better that Parliament keep a tight finger on concessions. Although the legislation has the merit of trying to assist people whom we are all anxious to assist, I oppose it because it does not approach the problem from the right direction.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—I think the House agrees that the honourable member introduced the Bill with the best of motives. It will be conceded that, following on questions asked earlier in the session, his mind has been exercised considerably as to how he could assist a worthy cause. I agree that an organization like the Boy Scouts' Association is deserving of assistance and that it appeals to any public-spirited citizen when a group of lads endeavour to educate themselves, extend their social life and learn useful things. An enormous amount of voluntary work is done by people associated with organizations so that their proteges will gain experience and receive guidance as a group. I would not have risen to discuss this matter but for one or two proposals made during the debate. The Treasurer and other members critically analyzed the major objections to the Bill, which in my opinion sets out to move a mountain when possibly only a molehill is involved. The Treasurer said that special cases make bad laws, and there is no denying that.

Mr. Riches—Half of you object to the Bill because it is too broad and the other half because it is too narrow.

Mr. PEARSON—I am not concerned about the grounds on which other people object to it. I am concerned with only my own objection. There is a constant effort to widen the scope of the exemptions in relation to motor vehicle registrations. I have frequently raised what I thought to be sound cases for reductions in registration fees, but I have been refused them, and the grounds on which they have been disallowed have in my opinion been valid and have satisfied the people on whose behalf they were made. Not only have I constantly asked for a widening of the scope of the exemptions, but the other day the honourable member asked for a very wide extension of them. He asked that motor utilities be covered and referred to the utilities that had been purchased by workmen in his district, because they could be bought more cheaply than motor cars, in order to travel to and from work, only to find that under the new scale of fees the amount of the registration had increased materially. These people felt that they had a proper case. The final reply to the honourable member's query has not come to hand. I instance this to show that there is a continuous effort to break down the force of the legislation and to plead guilty to making my own contribution in this regard. Whatever the honourable member may declare he cannot escape the full effect of this Bill. He introduced it with a specific case in mind, but he must accept the responsibility for introducing a measure that may cause an unknown number of applications to come in for assistance. The obvious problem is who shall determine a charitable organization. The matter has been referred to in this debate. Mr. Riches mentioned the Salvation Army, as well as the Boy Scouts' Association, but where do we get in this matter? No one

denies that the Salvation Army does an extensive and valuable social welfare work, but so do hundreds of other organizations. I do not think that there is one single religious denomination that is not engaged in social and charitable work. Missions are attached to city and country churches, and where missions are not attached it can be claimed validly that church organizations are carrying out work which would in their opinion qualify them for reduced registration fees.

Mr. Davis—What is the objection to granting them?

Mr. PEARSON—We cannot grant exemptions to everybody.

Mr. Shannon—We cannot do that and have good roads as well.

Mr. PEARSON—I will deal with that matter later.

Mr. Riches—You cannot deny that it is charitable work, and that the vehicle is used solely in that way.

Mr. PEARSON—There are lots of ways of defining whether a vehicle is solely used in a certain direction.

Mr. Riches—You could use the same verbiage in connection with primary producers.

Mr. PEARSON—I will deal with primary producers later. I said that a number of organizations could apply for reductions honestly feeling that they were entitled to them, and that is the whole difficulty. Mr. Riches said it would not be for the Government or the Government officer to decide exactly which were and which were not persons qualified for exemptions, but for the organizations to prove it.

Mr. Shannon—They could satisfy themselves all right.

Mr. PEARSON—When there is a concession about it is not difficult to convince oneself of being entitled to it.

Mr. Riches—I said the onus was on the organization to convince the Government.

Mr. PEARSON—Yes. Two parties would be concerned. One would be the organization and the other the Government officer appointed, presumably the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. The organization would take its case to the responsible authority which would have to decide whether or not the organization deserved consideration. The organization would have already made up its mind that it was entitled to a reduction but the authority would then have to decide the matter and on him would come the opprobrium which must descend on somebody when some organization does not get something to which it believes it is entitled.

Mr. Riches—You heard the Treasurer suggest that the organization could be assisted through the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. PEARSON—I heard the Treasurer refer to that matter and I will deal with it directly. When deciding who should receive financial assistance Cabinet must come into the matter, but the responsibility would be on the head of the officer, presumably the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, who made the decision.

Mr. Riches—It would have to be proclaimed.

Mr. PEARSON—Some officer would have to recommend the proclamation. Somebody would have to take the rap. I do not know who it would be, but I would not like to be that person. I would be happier having to deal with a question not so close to public sympathy. If it were a matter of right or wrong it would not be so bad, but when we have to knock back someone who is pretty close to public sympathy it not only involves the person concerned but the wide circle of people who believe they are entitled to assistance. Mr. Riches referred to primary producers. In his second reading explanation he said that vehicles in the same district were using the same roads, yet were registered at half the rate. I have no doubt that that is correct. To make his case more specific he mentioned primary producers. He also said that councils do not pay registration fees. He assumed they received grants from the Government, and he said that therefore there should be either general concessions or no concessions. I think he said that if the Treasurer's suggestions were correct there should be no concessions at all. I point out that it is logical for councils to receive concessions because of a specific reason. After all they spend road funds.

Mr. Riches—I did not refer to councils.

Mr. PEARSON—The honourable member said there should be wider concessions or none at all.

Mr. Riches—Have you looked at the list of concessions?

Mr. PEARSON—Yes and it would be longer if the honourable member and I had our way. I have already said that I have not been able to get my way in the matter. Councils are in an entirely different position. They spend money obtained through the registration of motor vehicles. They do not cause road funds to be depleted because they do not pay registration fees.

Mr. Riches—No-one said they did.

Mr. PEARSON—There must be concessions for some people and I am trying to point out why I think some people are entitled to them.

It is not a valid argument to say that because councils get concessions other people should get them. The councils spend money obtained from the registration of motor vehicles and they do not in any way deplete the amount of money available for road work because they do not pay registration fees. If they did have to register vehicles it would only be a matter of taking money from one trouser pocket and putting it in another. I think primary producers should get a concession because for at least 50 per cent of the period their vehicles are not on public roads. If a pastoralist in the honourable member's district bought a new vehicle and did 20,000 miles in the first year not more than 5,000 to 6,000 would be on public roads. By the same token I have several vehicles—trucks and utilities—which are registered at a concession fee. Except during harvest time and on odd occasions throughout the year those vehicles are rarely off my property. If the usage of roads is to be a determining factor in the amount of registration to be paid, how could a utility used on a primary producer's property in the district of Stuart be compared with a taxicab plying for hire in Adelaide? There can be no comparison and there is no logical reason why each should be charged the same fee. There might not be any reason to consider primary producers in these days on the score of hardship—I would scarcely contend that myself—but there is good solid reason to consider them on the basis of equity. Contrary to what was implied by interjection, I think there are good reasons for granting concessions. The crux of the whole matter boils down to this: that most of the bodies which could be classified as charitable organizations and, therefore, worthy of consideration under this well-meaning Bill, are already receiving assistance, directly or indirectly, from Government sources. In this respect the scope of both State and Commonwealth Government activities is widening annually. Rightly or wrongly they are assuming a greater degree of responsibility for the maintenance of charitable organizations. It seems to me that a concession of the nature envisaged in the Bill would resolve itself merely into an additional subsidy granted by the Government for the purposes of maintaining the organizations' activities. If that is so, then so far as the road fund is concerned it would be much wiser, if the organization could present a case for an increase in subsidy, to provide an amount for the purpose of enabling it to pay its registration fee for the use of its vehicle.

Mr. Riches—You are assuming that charitable organizations always get subsidies and receive sympathetic consideration.

The Hon. T. Playford—If he is, he is assuming wrongly because they have to prove their case for a subsidy.

Mr. Riches—They have to prove their case in the Bill.

Mr. PEARSON—I do not think the member suggests that the Government is niggardly in its subsidies to charitable organizations.

The Hon. T. Playford—Many charitable organizations never ask for subsidies.

Mr. PEARSON—Then the Government cannot be blamed if they do not get any. I do not want to develop that argument, but point out that if an organization is receiving assistance it should do what the Government does in relation to its departments, and that is to debit each department with its costs so that each department knows where it stands in relation to its own activities. Rather than give a charitable organization an indirect subsidy as provided in the Bill, it would be better, if it could prove its case, for the subsidy to be increased to enable it to pay the registration fee the Act provides. I think the mover introduced this Bill with a sound and generous motive but he made the error that in order to crack a nut he produced a 16 lb. hammer and he sought to drag into the ambit of this debate discussions which need never have been introduced to serve his purpose. For those reasons I am unable to support the Bill.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I support the Bill and was surprised to hear opposition to it. The case against it is one of the weakest I have heard in this House. It is difficult to understand members' opposition to it, particularly as it is designed to provide assistance to organizations which render great service to this State. I was particularly surprised that the member for Flinders should oppose the Bill. He admits that he has four vehicles and is enjoying the concession the Bill seeks to provide to charitable organizations. Many others enjoy that concession and are making great profits from the use of vehicles in respect of which those concessions apply. The organizations we seek to provide with half registration fees are rendering a service to the State and are relieving the Government of its responsibilities. These bodies work long hours for little, if any, remuneration in the interests of the sick and poor.

Mr. Teusner—I do not think the member for Flinders said he had four vehicles.

Mr. DAVIS—I understood him to say he did, but whether he has four or two the point is that they are registered at half rates. He uses them frequently on his own land but suggests they are not used very often on the roads. If he, as member for his district, only uses his vehicles for a small percentage of the time on the roads, there are many enjoying the same privilege who travel long distances upon the roads. I know of landowners who are carting goods not only to the railheads but hundreds of miles to the city. Much has been said about the administration of the provisions of the Bill but it would be no more difficult to administer than it is to administer the provisions relating to others who receive similar concessions. Mr. Pearson also referred to the fact that councils' vehicles are registered free of charge. Those bodies use their own roads and are building roads for others to use and they should not be required to pay any registration fee because if they were not doing that work the Government would have to undertake it.

Members have referred to the subsidies granted annually to charitable organizations by the Government and the Premier said that before any grant was made the organization had to prove its right to a subsidy. If an organization could prove its case for a subsidy it could easily prove it is entitled to the concession provided in this Bill. Mr. Pearson suggested that the subsidies should be increased to cover the cost of registration. The Bill will provide relief to the extent of about £8 a year on each vehicle and if the Government were prepared to approve of a greater subsidy to an organization for the purpose of meeting the cost of registration there would be no need for this Bill. However, there is no certainty that that would be done. I hope sufficient members opposite will be convinced of the desirability of providing concessions to charitable organizations to enable this Bill to pass.

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—One cannot help praising the member for Stuart for having introduced this Bill, the object of which is to assist charitable organizations. I think the Bill is founded entirely on wrong premises and, for that reason, I am unable to see my way clear to support it. I think I am as sympathetic to charitable organizations as any member but I am sorry that into the debate has been intruded the suggestion that because local governing bodies and primary producers receive concessions it is a sound reason for charitable organizations receiving such concessions.

Mr. Riches—I never mentioned local government bodies, but there is a long list of people who do receive concessions.

Mr. DUNKS—I know that, but there is a long list of charitable organizations which receive annual grants from the Government. The Government in power at the moment has been more generous to charitable organizations in this State than any previous Government occupying the Treasury benches. The Bill provides for exemptions in certain circumstances and if granted they will deprive the road fund of certain moneys. That aspect must be examined. We have experienced sufficient difficulty in establishing the road fund and in persuading the Federal Government to devote money to that fund. Having achieved that, is it fair that we should remove money intended for roadmaking from that fund to enable the granting of concessions in registration fees to certain bodies? I agree that the organizations are entitled to help and if the future can be judged by the past I think the mover will realize that he can rely on this Government to assist those organizations.

Mr. Riches—Have you ever heard me refer to the Flying Doctor Service?

Mr. DUNKS—I have.

Mr. Riches—The Government has been a long time in coming to its assistance.

Mr. DUNKS—It must be considered whether the granting of a subsidy is in the interests of the State. Probably the Government has said, "We do not think it opportune for a subsidy to be made." I think there is a tendency for many sections to masquerade as charitable organizations and try to extract as much as they possibly can from the Government. We use the term "Government" but does the money come from the Government or from you, me, and everybody else? The Government has no money until it is extracted from someone else, but we expect the Government as custodians of the public purse to decide where that money shall be spent. The member for Port Pirie said something that was perfectly true: that in some instances charitable organizations are relieving the Govenrment of its responsibilities. There is no question about that. About 10 years ago, before the hospital was its present size, I went to an annual meeting of the Children's Hospital and was asked to move the adoption of the annual report. In doing so I said that I thought the managing body was entirely wrong in trying to run the hospital as

a charitable organization and to expect women to stand in the street and rattle tins to raise money for it. I said I thought the State Government should have the responsibility of financing the hospital, just as it has with the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I thought the managing body should be left to control the hospital if it were prepared to do so voluntarily, but that they should not have to get people to contribute to run a national organization. I was not very popular. My comments were not mentioned in the next morning's newspaper because they did not line up with the newspaper's policy and I do not think they met with the approval of the people in charge of the organization. There are some people who consider it a great honour to look after a charitable organization and find the money to run it, but some of them are in great difficulties. This system of charity evidently started when the State was young and when there were probably a good many fairly rich people who owned big properties that were eventually passed over to charitable organizations. They banded together under that British tradition which has been handed down to us and said they would look after people in less fortunate circumstances, but those days have gone. We live in what is commonly known as the welfare State, and Federal and State Governments are in general looking after these organizations very well. The concession proposed does not seem very much, and the member for Port Pirie said it would probably amount to only about £8 a year. However, it is difficult to compute that, because one organization may have only one vehicle, but another may have many. As the member for Onkaparinga said, some organizations may be induced to employ people to collect funds and therefore the concessions might be more than the £8 suggested.

Mr. Riches—If that is your fear, would you accept an amendment excluding primary producers from concessions?

Mr. DUNKS—I do not think it is advisable to give concessions on motor vehicles. I am not prepared to admit it is necessary to give them to primary producers, though I don't want to debate the matter. Primary producers are part of the economy of the country and I cannot see that it is any more necessary to give concessions to them than to firms manufacturing goods to be sent overseas. If General Motors-Holdens or Chrysler Australia Ltd. sent motor bodies out of this country, should they be given concessions in running their vehicles? That is never suggested. The concessions that have been given must of necessity be a charge on commercial and private motorists. Registration fees were increased not long ago and I believe that that was warranted as we needed more money for the Road Fund. We must be very careful about taking money out of that fund. It is difficult to ensure that people using a charitable institution's vehicle do not use it for their own private purposes.

Mr. Riches—The district trained nurses and ambulance organizations have no difficulty.

Mr. DUNKS—Perhaps not, but it is not easy when a traveller or representative goes into the country.

Mr. Stephens—You can easily find examples of it being done.

Mr. DUNKS—Two blacks do not make a white. We are all prone to say that somebody else does something, or that some other State does something, so why shouldn't we? I do not subscribe to that argument. We should make up our minds whether a thing is right or wrong. The Bill makes it clear that the Registrar is to satisfy himself whether an organization is a charitable organization, but these bodies have to prove whether they are charitable organizations before they can collect from the public, so I do not find any difficulty about that part of the Bill. Some members thought that this would lead to some criticism of the Registrar if he refused to recommend that a certain body be considered a charitable organization. The boy scouts were mentioned, but I do not think they would own up to being a charitable organization; in fact, they told me some years ago that they were not allowed to canvass for money. Later they had special drives, and I believe that once a year they have a street collection. If there is one thing I detest it is the street collection. It is terrible that our women should have to stand in the streets and rattle tins, with only one person in every six or seven taking any notice of them.

Mr. Lawn—A lottery is the answer.

Mr. DUNKS—I am not prepared to cure one disease by another. In a fair city such as this it is a great pity that people have to rattle tins in the street for deserving causes. If someone from another country saw this being done he would think he was in some poor Asiatic country. Most of these organizations are worthy of support, and if they applied to the Government for a small advance or subsidy it would be readily granted. The Government is probably giving some of them £500 or £1,000 a year. If one organization

wants another £8 this is not the right way to get it. I think the member for Port Pirie said that we were depriving the people concerned of something that they had, but if they have not got it now we cannot be depriving them of it. I do not agree with his reasoning, but there are many organizations that get assistance from the Government, such as orphan homes, the Red Cross and District and Bush Nursing Society, and the boy scouts.

Mr. Riches—Are you sure the boy scouts get a grant?

Mr. DUNKS—Yes. There are very few bodies that work in the interests of the general public that do not get a contribution from the Government. Small kindergartens usually help themselves, but the Government makes a grant to the Kindergarten Union each year. I advise the honourable member not to proceed with his Bill, but to recommend to organizations that he believes need help to request the Government to provide them with the equivalent amount for which he is asking.

Mr. Stephens—Why don't you support the Bill and then move amendments in Committee?

Mr. DUNKS—Because I do not agree with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Riches—You have supported resolutions requesting assistance for various organizations.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes, and I amended one of the honourable member's motions last year in such a way as to make it possible for both sides of the House to support it.

Mr. Davis—To save the face of the Government.

Mr. DUNKS—No, the Government did not come into the picture. My amendment led to a conference and the amended motion being carried. I do not agree with any money being taken out of the Road Fund as would happen under this Bill. I want any contributions to come from general revenue. If the member for Stuart brings down a measure for this purpose and if I can see that the money will be used for people in necessitous circumstances I shall be prepared to consider it, but I oppose this Bill.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I support the Bill, which relieves certain charitable organizations from the payment of full motor registration fees. Such organizations must prove to the satisfaction of the Government that they are charitable organizations, and a statutory declaration to that effect must be furnished to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Abuse of this legislation will be impossible because exemptions will be granted only while the vehicles are engaged full-time on charitable work. Members on this side have at all times assisted primary producers and have supported the granting to them of exemptions on commercial vehicles even though such vehicles were not engaged on primary production all the time. Indeed such vehicles are sometimes used to take horses to racecourses.

Mr. Macgillivray—Racehorse owners are not primary producers.

Mr. STEPHENS—A farmer who owns a racehorse or a trotter may carry the animal in a commercial vehicle on which a primary producer's exemption has been granted. The Bush Nursing Society, a charitable organization, does a wonderful job in helping the sick, and, although its nurses attend all calls made on their services, some members opposite would not extend to that society the concession granted by this Bill. I am frequently disgusted when I hear people say, "We will do all we can to help charity, but this is the wrong time to help." The only thing wrong with this Bill is that it has been introduced by a member on this side. These charitable organizations want practical support, and members have the opportunity of giving that support by voting for this Bill, which gives the Government the right to declare which organizations are entitled to registration concessions. The Meals on Wheels organization at Port Adelaide does a wonderful job in giving cheap meals to age pensioners, and this Bill will help such an organization; yet some members opposite oppose the Bill although they support the granting of a concession on the registration of the wealthy primary producer's vehicle. Mr. Dunks said he opposed the Bill, but no doubt he would vote for it if it benefited the big manufacturer. I hope members will support the Bill and thus show that they are genuine when they say that want to assist charitable organizations.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—Although not wishing to cast any reflection on the motives of the honourable member who introduced the Bill, I do not believe it is a practical way of achieving his objects. Who will provide the money to finance the concessions under it? The member for Port Pirie said that these would amount to about only £8 for each charitable organization, but I point out that only the larger organizations run motor vehicles. There are many small charitable organizations in the country that would not qualify under the Bill because they do not own vehicles. Their work is done by voluntary workers who use their own vehicles and pay their own running costs. Members of such

country organizations as church guilds frequently drive long distances into the town to put in a hard day's work for charity, but they would not benefit under this legislation. The cost of the concession contained in the Bill would be paid for from a common fund that has its object the improvement and maintenance of our roads, and people who do charitable work in a voluntary capacity would suffer because the money involved in such concessions would not be available for that objective. I believe we have reached the stage where too many concessions are being asked for. This legislation would merely take money from one pocket and put it in another, in the process benefiting the larger charitable organizations at the expense of many voluntary charitable workers; therefore, I cannot support it.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—Like previous speakers I am certain that the motives behind the introduction of the Bill are the highest, but I oppose it because its scope is indefinite. I commend the activities of our many charitable organizations including the girl guides, boy scouts, Red Cross, Salvation Army, and Mothers and Babies Health Association, but the vagueness of the Bill would make it hard for the person responsible to decide which are charitable organizations. Assistance to charitable institutions should be given but not in the manner proposed by the honourable member. It should come from general revenue. We must zealously watch the inroads into the revenue derived from motor registrations. Our roads are in a parlous condition and the position must be watched closely. The onus for the final decision would be on the Treasurer and that would place him in a most invidious position. Mr. Stephens said the Government had not given much help to charitable institutions, but in the Estimates for the year ended June 30, 1954, under "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" grants totalled £44,290. It is said that the Boy Scouts' Association should be recognized as a charitable institution, but it is because in those Estimates the association received a grant of £500, and the Girl Guides Association £350. If they should be in need of further financial assistance representations could be made to the Government and no doubt an extra sum would be provided in the Estimates, which would help in the matter of motor registrations.

Mr. Riches—Would you support that?

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Definitely. If the matter were dealt with as I have suggested the Government would know the amount to which it was committed, but under Mr. Riches' proposal the position would be indefinite. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HAWKER (Burra)—Like other members who have spoken I agree that charitable organizations need financial assistance, but I do not agree with some members that it would be difficult to define a charitable organization. That is not the biggest hurdle, nor the reason why I oppose the Bill. We have several instances where charitable organizations are defined. The Federal Income Tax Department allows deductions for contributions to various charitable organizations, and that could be the basis for deciding what are such organizations.

Mr. Riches—They are defined for purposes of the Charitable Purposes Act.

Mr. HAWKER—Yes. As I have said, I do not oppose the Bill on that ground, but when defining charitable organizations there would be heartburning on the part of some applicants. Under the income tax legislation churches are not considered charitable organizations, but they might want to be regarded as such under the Bill. The Government has long recognized that many charitable organizations in the State need financial support and it is surprising that some Opposition members have doubted the Government's sincerity in the matter. They say that because the Government does not support one proposal to assist a charitable organization it is not in sympathy with any of them.

Mr. Riches—You are unsympathetic towards some charitable organizations.

Mr. HAWKER—In principle we have sympathy for all charitable organizations, but there may be some which, for various reasons, the Government does not think justify being assisted. Mr. Jenkins referred to the large number of organizations that received financial assistance during the year ended June 30, 1954. The St. John Council for South Australia Public Appeal Fund received £5,000 in the previous year.

Mr. Riches—See if you can find anything for the work done in the country by the St. John Council?

Mr. HAWKER—I do not know whether the money was granted in connection with the country or not. I would say that it covered the whole State as the Bill applies. The St. John Council is a charitable organization. The Flying Doctor Service received £1,000, and grants were made to The Adelaide Benevolent and Strangers' Friend

Society, Kuitpo Colony, The Royal Institution for the Blind, Royal Humane Society, South Australian Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb, Salvation Army towards prison gate and night shelter work, and St. John Council, and subsidies were paid in respect of the Prisoners' Aid Association, burial of pauper patients at country subsidized hospitals, rail fares for blind persons, rail fares for crippled children, rail fares of discharged prisoners, and rail fares and freight on goods account various charitable organizations. Grants were made in respect of the Boy Scouts Association, Girl Guides Association, Legacy Club, rail fares of blind and incapacitated soldiers, rail fares of returned soldiers on Anzac Day, National Safety Council, and Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. In the previous year there was a grant of £193 to the South Australian Country Women's Association towards the Port Augusta hostel, which is in the honourable member's district. This shows that Government members have supported grants to charitable organizations. It is unfair to say that we have not supported them. If concessions were made in connection with motor registration fees it would be a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I cannot see any need for the duplication. If the Bill were passed it would be difficult to police the position. Many organizations would claim something to which they were not entitled, and some of those entitled to consideration would not claim. I see no need for the Bill.

Mr. JOHN CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on the second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 970.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—In moving the second reading of this Bill the Leader of the Opposition said that the Industrial Code had already been loaded against the workers. If this is the argument for passing this Bill, there is no reason to pass it at all. In no sense can the Industrial Code be said to be loaded against the workers. The whole object of the Code is to secure benefits for the workers and it has been the instrument by which very great benefits have been secured. The idea that this Parliament has passed the Industrial Code or any of its amendments for the purpose of prejudicing or depriving the workers of something will not stand examination for one moment.

Apart from general arguments against the Bill there are a number of specific proposals in this Bill which are not desirable and I intend to ask the House to vote against it. The first proposal in the Bill is to bring agricultural workers under the Code. This proposal has, of course, been before this Parliament several times previously and has never been accepted. There are very good reasons for not accepting it. It would be highly embarrasing to agriculture, which has to face increasing and stringent world competition, if the terms and conditions of agricultural employment were minutely regulated in the same way as those of secondary industry. Like everyone else I want to see agricultural workers get good wages, and I believe they do get them now, but as members are aware, it is not the actual rate of wages prescribed by industrial tribunals which imposes severe burdens, but rather the conditions of awards and determinations, particularly with respect to hours and overtime. Secondary industries, if they are embarrassed by conditions imposed by industrial tribunals, can obtain protection by means of a tariff, or can sometimes secure assistance from the public revenues, but in general primary industries cannot obtain protection in this way. Furthermore, it would be a serious mistake to introduce rigid legalism into the relationship between primary producers and their workers in view of the very great measure of harmony which exists at present. South Australia is the last place in which it is necessary to protect the agricultural worker by bringing him under an Industrial Code.

The next point to which I draw attention is the Leader's proposal that the Industrial Court and the Industrial Boards shall have jurisdiction to determine whether any improvers or juvenile workers shall be employed in the industry. "The object of this amendment," said Mr. O'Halloran, "is to make it clear that a board may decide that there shall be no improvers or juvenile workers employed in a particular industry." That is the meaning of the amendment, but the Leader's explanation gives no reasons why it is considered necessary. Why should the court or a board be empowered to say that there are to be no improvers or juvenile workers in an industry? The question will arise what the term "juvenile workers" means. Does it include apprentices? If it does include apprentices, what reason is there for any board or court to say that there shall be no apprentices? There is no justification for this amendment. The provisions of the principal Act which enable industrial boards

and the Industrial Court to fix the number of apprentices and improvers is quite sound, but it is noteworthy that those who framed the Act carefully avoided any language which might be construed to mean that apprentices or improvers could be prohibited altogether.

Another provision in the Bill is that the courts shall have power to appoint boards of reference and to assign to any such board the functions of allowing, approving, fixing, determining or dealing with any matters or things referred to the boards by the court. I am aware that a somewhat similar power is conferred on Conciliation Commissioners by Commonwealth legislation. Possibly in the Commonwealth sphere a board of reference has some virtue because a Conciliation Commissioner may have jurisdiction in every State and he obviously cannot be everywhere at once. But the jurisdiction of our Industrial Court is limited to South Australia and there is not the same reason for delegating to boards of reference power to decide matters which the Act gives the court power to decide. I suggest that it is a good policy not to have boards of reference if they possibly can be done without. It is one thing for Parliament to give jurisdiction to the President or Deputy President of the court whose qualifications, status and tenure of office are appropriately fixed by law. It is quite a different thing to give jurisdiction to a board of reference which may consist of any persons, qualified or unqualified. When Parliament lays it down that matters are to be decided by the Industrial Court I suggest that the proper persons to decide those matters are the members of the court and not outsiders who may be brought in from anywhere. On the information available to me at present I am not prepared to support a provision for boards of reference, nor am I sure that the Leader of the Opposition considers them necessary. He himself suggests that it might be sufficient to confer additional powers on industrial boards, which certainly is a preferable way of dealing with the matter.

Another point about this Bill which I do not like is the provision relating to the definition of piece-work. The Bill aims at ensuring that every sort of sub-contract work, where the person undertaking the sub-contract does not supply all materials and plant necessary to complete the sub-contract, is to be regarded as an employment on piece-work. In other words, the Bill is going to make it difficult for persons to change over from being employees and acquire the status of independent contractors. There is no good reason why barriers should be erected against a desirable change of this nature. The status of being an independent contractor is, on the whole, decidedly preferable to the position of an employee and it is a good thing for a community to have a large proportion of its citizens holding the status of persons conducting small private enterprises of their own. Why should we legislate to restrict their right to become entrepreneurs and say that they must still remain and be treated as employees? There is no good reason for legislation of this kind.

I point out that if persons do not want to go on to piece-work or if they do not consider it to their advantage they still have an award fixed by Act under which they can work. Obviously they would not become sub-contractors unless it was to their advantage. I realize there is always an objection to sub-contract work because a sub-contract frequently permits a person to work a little harder and to be more energetic and efficient.

Mr. O'Halloran—And to work much longer.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I work long hours and I do not think it is anything to be apologetic about. I believe that if I can work longer hours the community is not worse off, but better off. In considerations such as this we come up against the old philosophy of the member for Adelaide of one man-one job, with as little work as possible in that job.

Mr. Dunks—And for as much as he can get.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. We will improve our standards of living and have better standards of living through the production of our citizens. I know that from the point of view of policy the Opposition would not like good standards of living. The poorer the standards of living the better political capital the Opposition can make out of it. If conditions were really bad our friends opposite would immediately rise to their feet and with voices shaking with indignation say, "Look at this dreadful state of affairs." The philosophy of the Party I lead is the opposite of that. The better off people are and the more status they have in the community the more they will vote for Liberalism. I can quite understand that the Leader will, by legislation if possible, hold a man down to always being a worker, and he will have the loyal support of the member for Adelaide in so doing. So far as we are concerned, we will protect the employee in the appropriate industries by appropriate awards, but if a person desires to enter into a business on his own or desires to

become a sub-contractor and do a little more than the standard darg which may be set for the ordinary wage earner, why should not he be allowed to do so?

Mr. O'Halloran—That is what the Bill provides for.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. The Bill prevents for all time a person who is an employee at the moment from becoming a sub-contractor. In other words, always hold him down. If he is held down enough he will probably vote for Labor and try to get up, but he would be erroneous in his ideas because the whole purpose of this Bill is to stop him from becoming a sub-contractor. The interests of the community are best served if we permit our citizens to use their enterprise and initiative. Another provision of the Bill to which objection may be taken is the one which enables the court to direct that preference must be given to unionists.

Mr. McAlees—Don't you believe in that?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think the honourable member believes in it. I understood that the Australian way of life was to permit freedom of the individual and to allow him to decide his religion and his associations. It seems to me to be a very poor advertisement for unionism that people should be compelled to join it. In my Party people join because they believe in its principles. We do not have to legislate to make them join. We believe that the merits of the Party ensure that people will joint it. When you have to compel people by Act of Parliament to join a union then it is about time the unions conducted a self-examination to see whether they are giving the service their members require. I think the Leader unwittingly has done a disservice to unions in suggesting this provision because I believe that on many occasions unions have helped.

Mr. Davis—Where would the workers be without them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think they would be much worse off without them, but compulsory unionism would be a form of tyranny.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is nothing about compulsory unionism in the Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but it enables the court to prescribe it. That is wrong in principle. Courts can make mistakes just as anyone else can.

Mr. Lawn—Do you think a court appointed by yourself could make a mistake?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, just as a court appointed by the honourable member could. Modern thought has established certain things as being the hope of the future of this world. People believe in certain fundamental freedoms, such as freedom to choose one's own religion.

Mr. Lawn—And one's own Government.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and one's own associations. People should also be able to choose whether they should belong to a union, but that is not provided by the Bill.

Mr. Lawn—You don't understand the Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It will give someone else the right to say whether a worker shall belong to a union. I am aware of all the arguments which have been and can be alleged in favour of a provision on these lines, but, nevertheless, I am opposed to it. It is a step in the direction of compulsory unionism. I suggest that the dignity and the strength of the labour movement itself would be impaired by the enactment of any such legislation. A union can speak with greater authority and command a greater degree of respect when its members join without compulsion. Furthermore, it is contrary to the principles of British liberty to compel a man, under the threat of loss of livelihood, to join a union when he may heartily disapprove of some particular line of action which the union has taken. The policy of members opposite is compulsory unionism. Their Party has already provided it in three of the States where it is in office, and the Leader of the Opposition has brought down a modified version here because he knows that anything stronger than this Bill would not be accepted by the House.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are not suggesting that you will accept it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, I have already said it is fundamentally wrong. I would be the last one to deny the very great benefits which workers have obtained from membership of unions, and I would go so far as to say that they ought to be encouraged to join them, but I do not favour the application of compulsion in this matter. And preference to unionists is a very strong form of compulsion. The provisions in clause 10 of the Bill enabling industrial boards to do "all things for the interpretation of an award or determination" are rather unusual. I do not know whether the Leader's Bill carries out his true intention in this matter; but I may point out that the word "award" in the Code means an award of the court and "determination" is the word used in relation to the decisions of industrial boards. Read

literally, the provisions of paragraph (*d*) in clause 10 would empower an industrial board to interpret an award of the Industrial Court. In other words, an inferior tribunal is given jurisdiction over the decision of a superior tribunal. This is, of course, a wrong principle. If the Leader merely intended that an industrial board should have power to interpret its own determinations there might be something to be said for it. The Bill also repeals all the provisions prohibiting and penalizing strikes and lockouts. It is true that we do not have many prosecutions nowadays for breaches of these provisions, although there are some. Nevertheless, the existing provisions as to strikes and lockouts are important sanctions for the due observance of industrial awards and determinations.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are coming around to compulsion now.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Only the compulsion that we use every day of the week to enforce laws passed by Parliament. That is the compulsion exercised by the police to protect the community against the wrongdoer and to protect the weak against the strong.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is hardly proper to mix up the Criminal Code with the Industrial Code.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Some sections of the Industrial Code enforce the due observance of awards and orders of a court. Is it intended that a party that does not like the terms of an award is to be at liberty to strike or shut down the works, as the case may be?

Mr. O'Halloran—You can't stop the employer from closing down the works.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If a lock-out is ajudged to be illegal by the court, action can be taken against the person responsible for it. The sections of the Code that the Leader wants to delete provide the methods of policing awards and orders of the court. What is the good of having an Industrial Code, an Industrial Court, and industrial arbitration if an award of the court can be flouted with impunity. One might just as well scrap all the expensive apparatus which has been built up and leave the parties free to make their own bargains. What respect is likely to be accorded to decisions of industrial tribunals which can be ignored with impunity? I observe also that the Leader proposes that the jurisdiction of industrial boards to fix rates of pay shall be raised from £20 to £33 a week. A figure of £20 was fixed at the end of 1951, since when there has been a relatively small increase in the living wage—about £1 16s. a week—but nothing which would justify increasing the jurisdiction to £33. The Leader said that he has taken the figure of £33 from the Workmen's Compensation Act. In that Act £33 a week is the wage limit of the classes of persons who are entitled to workmen's compensation, but it has nothing whatever to do with the question whether a worker is to be subject to the jurisdiction of an industrial board or of the industrial court. The movement in the living wage would justify only a very small increase in the present figure of £20—possibly to £22—and there is no reason for raising the amount as high as is proposed in this Bill. Finally, I observe that in clauses 13 to 18 of the Leader's Bill he proposes to double a number of the penalties prescribed for breaches of the Code. These penalties, it is to be observed, are all penalties imposable upon employers.

Mr. O'Halloran—No.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They are all one-way traffic. The Government's legal advisers concur with me that these penalties are all imposable upon employers, and none on employees. The Leader stated that the Code was loaded against the worker, but I would suggest that by these amendments he is endeavouring to load it against employers. It may be that the penalties in the Code need revision, but why single out a few of them applicable only to employers? For the reasons which I have mentioned, and others also, the Bill is not acceptable. I do not, however, deny that there may be some desirable amendments of the Code in this Bill but they are mingled with many that are unsatisfactory. I am not prepared to support the Bill. It is some time since the Industrial Code had a major overhaul, and I believe there are some provisions that could be simplified or improved.

Mr. O'Halloran—You will take my Bill home and then bring it down next year as your own.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, the honourable member flatters his Bill, but I think it would be beneficial for representatives of employees and employers and competent Government servants to examine the Industrial Code in the light of existing circumstances. There may arise from such a discussion a number of useful amendments that could be considered by members. I do not promise to introduce a Bill, but if, when he replies later in this debate, the Leader feels that something could be done by employers, employees, Government authorities and representatives of the Industrial Court in examining the Code in the light of existing circumstances, he may wish to comment on the proposal. However,

I do not suggest that he withdraw his present Bill. Because it contains one or two provisions which are completely wrong in principle and which I cannot under any circumstances accept, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the Bill. Indeed, if I had had any doubt about it before, I would fully support it after hearing the Premier's inconsistent arguments. In speaking on this remedial Bill he attempted to justify the legislative *status quo* and said that the Industrial Code was not loaded against the worker; but after I have shown how it is loaded against the worker, I trust the Premier will withdraw the first argument he advanced against the Bill. He went on to say the Bill would greatly embarrass agricultural employers. Of course it would embarrass those people who, under a gerrymandered electoral set-up, put this Government into office to look after their interests. Section 144 of the Electoral Act provides that there shall be no bribery in connection with elections, but surely the promise by the Government to rural employers to refuse to extend the provisions of the Industrial Code to rural industry is a form of bribery.

The SPEAKER—I hope the honourable member will not proceed on those lines or he will find himself in trouble.

Mr. LAWN—The Premier said he likes to see agricultural workers getting good wages, but I can tell him of rural employees who are receiving 30s. a week and working 10 hours a day for seven days a week.

Mr. Pearson—You cannot prove that.

Mr. LAWN—I accept that challenge and will repeat certain statements that I made in this year's Address in Reply debate. If it can be shown that rural workers are not getting good wages and enjoying good conditions, another of the Premier's arguments will be refuted. He said the employer and the employee in primary industry were working in harmony, but if that is so why has the rural worker been trying for years to have the provisions of the Industrial Code extended to cover his industry? Section 5 of the Code states:—

> "Industry"—(*a*) means craft, occupation, or calling in which persons of either sex are employed for hire or reward—
>
> I. in any business, trade, manufacture, or calling carried on by way of trade or for purposes of gain (except agriculture).

So it will be seen that rural workers are precluded from applying for an award of the State Industrial Court. Many of these workers have joined the Australian Workers Union and approached the Federal Court for an award. From my knowledge of that approach and from conversations I have had with men engaged in rural industry, I know that no real harmony exists between the rural employer and employee. Under the Code "agriculture" (without limiting its ordinary meaning) includes horticulture, viticulture, and the use of land for any purpose of husbandry, including the keeping or breeding of livestock, poultry, or bees, and the growth of trees, plants, fruit, vegetables, and the like. That definition covers the occupations of almost all members opposite. The Premier who said the Code was not loaded against the worker, is himself engaged in market gardening and therefore exempt from the provisions of the Code. It is loaded in favour of the Premier, his colleagues and all people they represent. It is for that reason and not because it is not loaded against the worker that members opposite oppose the Bill. The Premier tried to misrepresent some of the Bill's provisions and said there was no justification for empowering the court to say there should be no apprentices and/or improvers in an industry, but I visualize industries employing none of the tradesmen we normally recognize as such; therefore in those cases it will be wrong to permit the registration of improvers and apprentices. The Bill merely seeks to give the court power to say whether there shall be apprentices and/or improvers in an industry.

The President of our State Industrial Court should have been here this afternoon to hear the Premier express his lack of confidence in the court to say whether there should be apprentices and/or improvers in an industry. Section 21 (1) states:—

> The court shall, as regards every industrial matter over which it has original or appellate jurisdiction, have power . . . . .
>
> (*c*) to make any award or order, and, without being restricted to the specific relief claimed by the parties to such matter, to include in any award or order any matter or thing which the court thinks necessary or expedient for the purpose of dealing with such matter—

However, after telling the court what it may do, the Code makes the following proviso:—

> Provided that the court shall not have power to order or direct that, as between members of associations of employers or employees and other persons offering or desiring service or employment at the same time, preference shall in any circumstances or manner be given to members of such association or to persons who are not members thereof.

Therefore, irrespective of the merits of a case presented to the court and of any agreement arrived at between employers and employees and presented to the President for ratification, the Premier, speaking as master of the Liberal Party, says, "The court shall not have the power because we have no confidence in it to determine that matter." Yet the Liberal Party poses as the champion of arbitration.

Mr. McAlees—The Premier said arbitrators made mistakes.

Mr. LAWN—Yes; according to the Premier, if the court grants anything to employees of wheat farmers, market gardeners or any other primary producers, it is a mistake. The Premier, who is concerned merely with the protection of his colleagues engaged in primary production, says that any industrial award that would give rural employees a 40-hour week and a decent standard of wages and conditions would be a mistake on the part of the court. I was interested this week to hear the Premier say that the Government has got into a terriffic tangle with a French contractor over railway equipment. He said the legal position was being examined to see if the Government could get out of the contract and that it would be happy to do so because there is no control over subcontractors. The Bill does not say that there shall not be subcontractors, but that they should be controlled in the same way as contractors. The Premier would probably like some safeguard against sub-contracting in his contract with the French firm. The French firm is on the verge of bankruptcy and has given the work to subcontractors. The Premier said, in effect, that there was merit in some of the matters in the Bill, but not all of them. He further said that he would look at the Industrial Code with a view to overhauling it. He had much to say about compulsory unionism, but that is not mentioned in the Bill. Before going farther on that matter I want to deal with the portion of the Bill which enables the court to provide for rural workers. Today I was challenged by Mr. Pearson to show that people work in rural industries seven days a week and 10 hours a day for 30s. a week. *Truth* of Saturday, January 23, 1954, contained an interesting article about the tough deal pensioners received from farmers. The person concerned in the article is well-known to me. I know the industry in which he worked until he retired at 69 years of age. He did not leave at 65 in order to get the old age pension. He noticed an advertisement in the press inserted by a farmer in respect of light work, and thinking he would be able to add a few shilling to his pension applied for the job. Here is the extract from *Truth*:—

Pensioners, beware! Don't fall readily for those advertisements which promise light, easy farm work, excellent accommodation, good wages for active pensioner. You might find, if you check, that the advertisement was worded by a slave master. The slave master's idea of "light, easy farm work" is a working week of 60 hours, up at dawn and finish after dark, digging ditches, stacking hay, building fences, clearing scrub, all for 30s. a week and keep. And if the pensioner complains or his health cracks up he is sacked on the spot and it's just too bad if any wages are owing to him, because he has no legal redress against the slave boss. This man became ill whilst doing the work and the boss said he was no good and that he would take him back to town in his motor car, but he made him get out at the Big Tree at Glen Osmond and find his way back to the city. The Act is loaded against these workers and is in favour of the employer. The article continued:—

This type of cruel exploitation is being practised every day by outwardly respectable city businessmen who have discovered in the old age pensioners a cheap and ready source of labour for the out-of-town farm properties. What do they care if the pensioners' old bodies break under the strain. There are plenty of old men desperately anxious for any job by which they can augment their pitifully inadequate pensions. Victims of this callous racket have called in their dozens to the Trades Hall and to *Truth* office in recent months appealing for justice, but nothing can be done for them. Rural workers in this State are not covered by any award and the Premier (Mr. Playford) has consistently refused to authorize an award for them.

The article then set out a typical case:—

Typical of the victims is a 69 year old pensioner who visited *Truth* the other day. He had been trapped by the glowing promises of a prominent city businessman who had offered him a congenial job on his farm at Milang. The old man, after a month at this congenial occupation, had blistered hands, a strained back and an injury to his bladder which has made a big operation urgently necessary. The pensioner had answered an advertisement inserted by the businessman in which "light, pleasant farm work" was offered. The work kept him continually on the go for 10 hours a day. It included digging a trench for an irrigation pipe, man-handling heavy pumping equipment, clearing scrub, baling, and stacking hay, and milking a large herd of cows.

This is what the pensioner said about the matter:—

I strained myself lifting some heavy machinery several days ago and was in agony. When the boss came down from the city I was just hobbling around. I told him I was

in pain and that I wanted to see a doctor. He just said, "All right, you're finished. You're sacked. Get your things together. I am driving back to the city later and you're coming with me." He drove me back, but he didn't bring me to the city. He put me off at Glen Osmond, at the old gum tree, and left me to find my way from there while he drove on to the city. I was in great pain and I couldn't lift my luggage to carry it to the tram stop. I waited until a taxi came along and hailed it. I spent my last few shillings on the fare. He owed me five days' wages, 27s. 6d.

When he dumped the man at Glen Osmond the boss didn't have the decency to give him the 27s. 6d. He rode in his own flash car, but he did not care whether the pensioner had enough money to hire a taxi. In any case the man should not have had to find his way back to the city. The report continued:—

Truth referred the old man's plight to the Australian Pensioners' League secretary (Mr. John Millikan). Mr. Millikan said, "We know of other cases similar to this." Trades and Labor Council secretary (Mr. Bert Shard) said "We have received many complaints from old people who are being exploited by farm owners. But unfortunately there is nothing much we can do for them. Until rural workers are granted an award which will lay down conditions of employment and set a standard of wages they won't have a leg to stand on. For years we have appealed to Premier Playford to amend the Industrial Code to include rural workers, but he has always turned us down flat because he says that most workers get their keep."

Mr. Quirke—What provision in the Bill is there for a man 69 years of age?

Mr. LAWN—If the Bill is carried in its present form all rural workers will have the right to apply to the court for an award.

Mr. Quirke—A man over 65 years of age?

Mr. LAWN—The court's awards always provide for old and infirm workers. No court would give an employer permission to do what this particular employer did. Wherever special conditions have been made for old and infirm workers this sort of thing has never been allowed. I know of many cases where people not physically sound have been granted permission by the court to work for reduced wages. Supporters of the Government are looking after themselves and the people they represent, and so there is no award for rural workers. The *Truth* article continued:—

Truth thinks this excuse is so poor as to make condemnation unnecessary. Why is the Premier so reluctant to provide an award for rural workers?

I have given *Truth* the answer. The portion of the Bill which has caused some misunderstanding, and whether deliberate or otherwise I will leave members to judge, is the part which amends section 21 of the Act. I referred to this earlier in summarizing the objections to the Bill. Section 21 (*e*) sets out the power of the court to make an award and then restricts it by providing that the court shall not have power to order preference of employment. There is much difference between preference of employment and compulsory unionism. In the first place preference of employment is to be given to financial members of a union and it does not mean that everyone on a job must be a member of the union. It only means that if an employer wishes to engage labour and a financial union member is offering his services he shall receive preference but otherwise a non-unionist may be engaged. On the other hand, if an employer is dismissing men and non-unionists are in his employment they must be dismissed before financial union members. The Premier referred to freedom. He condemned compulsory unionism because he said he believed in freedom of religion and association. That was a hypocritical statement because he admitted, after interjections, that he believed in the freedom of the people to elect a Government of their own choosing. He was just as embarrassed then as a result of the interjections as he suggests the primary producers will be if this Bill is carried.

The Treasurer and other Government members who speak gliby about freedom are holding office only as a result of the electoral gerrymander. The Premier has a record term in office only because the people cannot shift him. The Commonwealth Liberal Party has introduced compulsory national service training and no doubt in time of war it would introduce a compulsory call-up if it thought the people would return it to power at the elections. The Premier should not try to tell us that the Liberal Party believes in freedom. It has removed the right of the people of this State to change the Government. On page 850 of the 1953 *New Zealand Official Year Book* the following reference appears:—

All workers who are subject to any award or industrial agreement registered under the Act must become members of a union. It is not lawful for an employer to employ or continue in employment, in any position or employment subject to an award or industrial agreement, any adult person who is not a member and has not been exempted from membership. Provision was made in 1951 for exemption from union membership on religious grounds if the applicant satisfies the Conscientious Objection Committee appointed under the Military Training Act, 1949, that his religious objections are genuine, and on payment of the

amount equal to the prescribed subscription to the Social Security Fund. (An amendment passed in 1943 provides that, where a person who is obliged to become a member of a union fails to do so, he is deemed to have committed a breach of the award or industrial agreement to which his employment is subject, and is liable to a penalty not exceeding £5 in respect of every such breach.) Non-members may, however, be employed in cases where union membership is limited and there are no union members available.

It is clear that in New Zealand compulsory unionism applies, but there is provision for conscientous objectors to make a mandatory donation to the Social Security Fund instead of paying union fees. They do not obtain the benefits of trade unionism without making some contribution. What would be the position if some people in this State asked the Government to exempt them, by legislation, from taxation? I listened to Government members this afternoon objecting to charitable organizations receiving reductions in the payment of motor registration fees. Why should a man working in industry and enjoying the benefit of a 40-hour week, margins and other conditions of employment be permitted to say to a unionist "You mugs can pay for those benefits, but I am not making any contribution"? In Tasmania legislation was passed by the Lower House but rejected by the Upper House in regard to this question. The policy of the Tasmanian Government, however, is to grant preference to unionists in respect of Government contracts. Last year in New South Wales this provision was passed:—

An employer engaged in any industry or calling to which an award or industrial agreement applies shall give absolute preference of employment to members of the industrial union or unions engaged in such industry or calling.

Section (2) of the Queensland Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1932 states:—

Preference.—Where it is mutually agreed by the parties concerned or considered advisable by the court that preference be granted either generally or to any particular union or organization, such preference shall be granted subject to such conditions as the court may approve.

In Western Australia, section (6) of the Industrial Arbitration Act states:—

"Industrial matters" means all matters affecting or relating to the work, privileges, rights and duties of employers or workers in any industry, not involving questions which are or may be the subject of proceedings for an indictable offence; and, without limiting the general nature of the above definition, includes all matters relating to—

(*a*) The wages, allowances, or remuneration of workers employed or usually employed or to be employed in any industry, or the prices paid or to be paid therein in respect of such employment;

(*b*) The hours of employment, sex, age, qualifications, or status of workers, and the mode, terms, and conditions of employment.

That Act does not specifically refer to preference or compulsory unionism, but it has been held by the Western Australian courts that the court has power to grant preference. In 1905, Parker J. held that preference would be granted if special circumstances could be shown, and the special circumstances were that (*a*) the union would suffer without it; (*b*) the majority of workers were members of the union, and (*c*) the employer would not be prejudiced. It is now considered that power to grant preference to unionists is contained in the definition of "Industrial Matters" in section 6 of the Act. This view was taken by Dwyer P. in 1934 in *W.A. Meat Company v. W.A. Meat Industry Employees.* It is contained in 14 W.A.I.G. at page 132. Dwyer P. stated that this power was also founded upon section 94 (*b*) which gave the court power to make such order as it might deem necessary for the peaceful conduct of industry. Wolfe J. followed this opinion in the Building Trades Award of 1939, contained in 18 W.A.I.G. at page 526. He based his opinion on the definition of "Industrial Matters" and also on the authority given the court in section 94 (1*b*) to exercise its jurisdiction for the sake of industrial peace. In the same year in the Master Builders case the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court to grant preference was challenged before the Full Court. Mr. Chief Justice Northmore said:—

Preference to unionists is not specifically mentioned in the definition of the words "Industrial matters" but in my view the authority to grant such preference is to be found in the general words of the definition when read with clause (*h*) and clause (*b*) of section 94 (1).

The point I stress is that this Bill seeks to remove from the present Industrial Code the proviso which restricts the court from granting preference. If that proviso is removed the Industrial Court in South Australia will be under similar legislation to that in Western Australia where there is no specific mention of preference to unionists, but where the court has held in a number of cases that it is within the power of the court to grant such

preference. The question of preference to unionists is not new. The original legislation in New South Wales in 1912 provided that an award could be made declaring that preference of employment should be given to members of any industrial union over other employees offering their labour at the same time, all other things being equal. That applied for some time and a provision of that nature remained in the New South Wales Act until 1953, when it was amended on the lines I have already indicated. In 1926 the New South Wales Act was amended to provide that:—

The court or a board may on an application or reference to it in that behalf prescribe by award that absolute preference of employment shall be given to the members of the industrial union or unions specified in the award.

Trade unions have won for themselves a position of respect and importance in the body politic, and it ill behoves the organs of propaganda, such as the press, radio and Liberal Party members of Parliament representing country constituencies, to make unfair attacks on them or to misrepresent the position or criticize the Labor Party for introducing a Bill to remove an objectionable and discriminatory restriction on the rights of the South Australian court to adjudicate upon this matter. It is a mockery to suggest that unions and employers should submit their disputes to the court but that the court is hamstrung in making awards to promote the smooth working of industry.

The organizations of both employers and employees are the cornerstone upon which our vaunted arbitration system has been built. From the inception of arbitration the courts have recognized registered organizations of employers and employees as being truly representative of the persons to be bound by an award. Without the support of the trade unions the system could not possibly work. The health, well-being and happiness of the employees in any industry, and of the community at large, depend upon just industrial conditions and the smooth working of industry. I emphasize that, when people enter an industry and take advantage of the conditions operating, there is no reason why they should not contribute to union funds. Arbitration is very costly. Unions incur great expenditure in presenting cases to the courts and in fighting appeals.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you think arbitration would be simplified if members of the legal profession were kept out of it?

Mr. LAWN—I do, and that was the rule in the Commonwealth court, but the Menzies Government amended the Act to permit members of the legal profession to go back into the court. Actually, they were never prohibited from appearing before the court, but they could not appear before the Conciliation Commissioners until the Act was amended.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you think the legal profession has taken up technicalities rather than expediting the hearing of cases before the court?

Mr. LAWN—Yes. Laymen have to listen to jargon in the court and ask afterwards what it is all about.

Mr. Macgillivray—And pay £100 a day in fees.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. Recently there was a case against the Plasterers' Union in the State Industrial Court, and I think it cost the trade union £350 or £450. The union was prosecuted for a breach of the Industrial Code because it was alleged that it got its members higher wages with certain employers. That was called a strike and the hearing cost the trade union movement a great deal.

Mr. Macgillivray—Why doesn't the movement take up the question of the appearance of the legal fraternity in the court?

Mr. LAWN—It did, but the Menzies Government has allowed it. The South Australian Government is looking after the interests not only of employers but of professional men. The discriminatory restriction contained in section 21 of the industrial Code should be removed in the interests of employees and also to remove any suspicion of a lack of confidence by the Government in the State court. The Government appoints the President and the Premier probably had this in mind when he objected so strongly to the appointment of boards of reference, for he would have no say in that. He would not be able to appoint the chairman of a board or any of the members. I hope the Bill will be passed.

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—I appreciate the opportunity of being able to speak on this Bill because if there is one thing I think I know something about it is the industrial conditions in South Australia. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said that the provisions of the Industrial Code were loaded against the worker, but if he was an owner of industry he would say definitely that they were loaded against the employer because concessions have been made from time to time to employees, often to the detriment of employers. The Leader of the Opposition said that this Bill would promote

industrial peace and better relations between employers and employees, and he may have some argument there, for over the years industrial legislation has probably had this tendency. The courts have told employers particularly what they have to observe and what hours the employees may be worked, and I remember that years ago when President Jethro Brown was on the bench of the Industrial Court the trade unions tried to persuade him that he could prohibit people from working, but he told them that he did not have any such power.

Mr. Stephens—Who tried to do that?

Mr. DUNKS—I think it was the baking trade union. The Industrial Code states:—

"Employer" means any person, firm, company, or corporation employing one or more employees in any industry, whether on behalf of himself or any other person, and "employee" means any person employed in any industry, whether on wages or piece rates and includes any person whose usual occupation is that of employee in any industry.

As there are many matters that I wish to discuss I now ask leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BREAD BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6 *p.m. until* 7.30 *p.m.*]

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Bill recommitted.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1049.)

New clause 7—"Payment for leave not taken."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move to insert the following new clause:—

7. Section 76a of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by striking out the words "who has attained the retiring age" in the first and second lines of subsection (1);

(*b*) by adding after the word "retires" in the second line of subsection (1) the words "or resigns";

(*c*) by adding after the word "retirement" at the end of subsection (1) the words "or resignation";

(*d*) by striking out the definition of "the retiring age" in subsection (2) thereof.

(*e*) by adding after the word "retirement" (twice occurring) in subsection (3) the words "or resignation".

The amendments refer to the same topic. The Parliamentary Draftsman reports:—

I attach hereto a new clause which carries out the instructions of the Government with respect to paying lump sums in lieu of long service leave to Government employees on retirement or resignation at any age. The present law is that when an employee retires at the compulsory retiring age without having taken all his long leave a lump sum can be paid to him in lieu of leave not taken. For the purpose of income tax such payment is regarded as a retiring allowance and only 5 per cent is taxable. If, however, an employee retires before the retiring age he is not entitled under the present law to a lump sum in lieu of leave. He must take his leave on salary before his retirement or resignation takes effect. For income tax purposes such salary is taxable in full like any other salary.

The Government has acceded to requests made from several quarters that lump sums in lieu of long service leave should be payable to Government employees on resignation at any age. This will have two advantages for the employees. The first is that under the taxation laws only five per cent of the lump sum will be regarded as income. Secondly, the employee will be entitled to enter upon pension immediately upon retirement without any postponement during the period on which he is deemed to be on leave. This latter concession will involve some small additional cost to the Government and the Superannuation Board, but will not necessitate any increase in superannuation contributions.

If a public servant takes his long service leave before reaching the retiring age, the Superannuation Board will be involved in additional costs, and this applies particularly to those retiring on invalidity benefits.

Mr. Shannon—Would it cover an officer leaving to join another service or private employment at a higher salary?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. Under the Public Service Act a person may be granted long service leave on account of his service. If he takes it on retirement, he does not at present receive a lump sum in respect of it unless he is retiring on account of age. For instance, if an officer has 10 years' service and resigns to work for a private firm, he is accorded the privilege of a payment representing three months' long service leave, except in the rare case of a serious misdemeanour by the officer. This provision will apply in such a case. The report continues:—

This latter concession will involve some small additional cost to the Government and the Superannuation Board, but will not necessitate any increase in superannuation contributions. But it will remove a grievance which has been a source of dissatisfaction for some time and will bring this State into line with the Commonwealth and the majority of the other States in this particular matter. The Government feels that the clause will commend itself to honourable members both as assisting to remove an

anomaly in taxation and as conferring on Government employees a benefit which will be much appreciated.

Mr. SHANNON—The South Australian Public Service has lost many highly skilled and qualified men to the Commonwealth, other State public services and private firms. In many cases these men have attained their skill because of 15 or 20 years' experience in the State Service, but this amendment will not encourage them to remain in the employment of the State. If we give them the privilege of being able to draw in cash any long service leave payment as a lump sum, the drain upon our skilled staff will increase rather than decrease. It is not the practice in industry generally to recompense by a lump sum in lieu of long service leave an employee who has been enticed to a competitive firm by an increased salary. Although I believe that a man invalided out of the service before reaching the normal retiring age should receive the maximum benefit to which he is entitled, I see no satisfactory reason why a physically fit man leaving the service for financial gain should be recompensed for his long service. That is not the way to hold our Public Service together. We have advertised for qualified men for important work has been held up because of the lack of them, but it would be wise to look at the implications of the proposed change. If we accept it one day we might discover that our wastage has increased.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The proposal, if accepted, will be regarded by public servants as an important concession and make the service more attractive. It is most important that we be able to recruit personnel. Long service leave does not become available until an officer has been in the service for some time, during which period he builds up superannuation rights. If he leaves the service he sacrifices those rights. The only concession given in this new clause is that instead of a public servant taking his long service leave over a period he will be able to get a lump sum payment. The Public Service is satisfied with this matter, which is as good as is provided for in the Commonwealth and other State Public Services. At present the Government contributes about 80 per cent of the superannuation payments and the proposal will mean an extra cost to the Government, but it has always taken the view, and it is accepted by the Grants Commission, that this State is part of the Australian economy and that our State Public Service conditions should be comparable with those existing in the Public Services in the other States. The Education Department has been following the procedure set out in the new clause and the Public Service has now asked for it.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The Premier set out most of the points I intended to mention. I have not discussed the proposal with the other members on this side but I think it will appeal to them. It has my support. It will benefit public servants who leave the service for invalidity reasons. The only benefit derived by the small minority mentioned will be the taxation remission, but that will be comparatively small. I do not think a man would sacrifice a permanent position in the service that he has held for some years, and after he has gained a status and contributed to the Superannuation Fund. It is not a question of holding the service together but of putting it together. At present many positions are being created in the engineering and metallurgical sections of the service.

Mr. Shannon—We are losing men too.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, but there is an old proverb that points out that distant fields are always greener. Many of the members of the service who have transferred to what they regard as greener fields will be only too happy later to return to the Public Service.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I am pleased that the Premier has introduced this new clause. I drew his attention to an anomaly some time ago because at that time certain railway employees were heavily penalized through taxation because this provision was not in our legislation. An appeal was made to the Income Tax Board of Review but the decision went against them because the Act did not allow the payment of a lump sum on retirement from the service. It is said that the taxation remission is very small but it is a satisfactory concession when a member retires with about six months' superannuation due to him on 5 per cent of which he has to pay tax instead of on the whole amount. It is a valuable remission, otherwise members of the service would not have thought it worth while raising the matter before the Income Tax Board of Review, which found in favour of the Commissioner and against the appellants.

New clause inserted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. This short Bill is for the purpose of providing that the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act will continue in operation until the end of the season 1957-1958. This amendment is necessary in order to carry into effect the Wheat Industry Stabilization plan which has recently been agreed to by all the Australian Governments and accepted by the wheatgrowers. In this State 8,907 were in favour, 760 against and there were 75 informal votes, making a total of 9,742 votes. As 18,628 ballot papers were posted out, these figures represent a 52 per cent poll. I am very disappointed over the poll because the figures for this State were the lowest in the Commonwealth, and that is not to the credit of wheatgrowers. I am bound to say that because they had extended to them one of the most generous stabilization schemes that could have been devised and which carried with it an extraordinary guarantee by the Commonwealth at a time when markets are uncertain and world prices are on the decline. Despite that we had a very poor response in the ballot and it makes one wonder whether the wheatgrowers, or those of them who neglected to exercise their privilege to vote, deserve the very good treatment embodied in this scheme. At the time when the amending Bill was before Parliament last year, the Australian States were endeavouring to reach agreement on a three year plan although Victoria was then in opposition. Last year's Bill was accordingly based on the assumption that there would be a three year plan and provided for the extension of the legislation up to the end of the 1955-1956 harvest. The new stabilization proposals, however, will apply to the wheat crops of the seasons from 1953-1954 to 1957-1958, both inclusive, and it is therefore necessary to extend the existing stabilization legislation for a further two seasons. This is the sole purpose of the Bill. The scheme was fairly adequately debated when I introduced the Wheat Ballot Bill a month or two ago and I therefore do not intend to discuss the matter on this occasion.

Mr. Macgillivray—How much are the wheatgrowers guaranteed for export wheat over the cost of production?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The guarantee in respect of export quantity is the cost of production. In respect of the home market it is rather more than that, of course. If world prices decline below the level of the cost of production the home consumption price will be based on the cost of production.

Mr. Macgillivray—But how much are they guaranteed above cost of production?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The home consumption price is 14s. at the moment. Therefore the farmers will receive 1s. 5d. over the cost of production for this wheat.

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

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT ADVISORY COUNCIL BILL.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1053.)

In Committee.

Clause 12—"Duty of council"—to which Mr. O'Halloran had moved—

In line 1—after "shall" insert "(1)".

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The merits of my amendment were being debated when progress was reported yesterday. The honourable member for Torrens submitted that the result of the amendment would be to by-pass the courts and make the Metropolitan Transport Control Board the sole appellate tribunal, but far be it from me to interfere with a rule of law. I tried to draft my amendment in such terms that it would limit appeals to the administrative decisions made by the controlling authority, whoever it may be. However, because of my complete lack of legal knowledge I confess to difficulty in drafting amendments and if the honourable member is concerned only with the rule of law and is satisfied with the justice of my amendment he might help me by drafting an amendment to solve the problem. The Premier attacked the amendment from an entirely different basis. He said that he did not agree that the council that I have proposed was the proper body and he even suggested that it might have an unsympathetic turn of mind towards appellants from the taxi cab industry, because it might feel that drivers of taxicabs in the main were or would become owner-drivers. If they made appeals then the representative of the railways might feel that they were running in competition with the railways or tramways, and might not take a very kindly view towards them. It is not this Committee's duty to appoint an appellant body which will take a biased view.

If the Treasurer believes in the principle that there should be an appeal, and no fair-minded man should deny that, and thinks some other body would be more appropriate than the one I suggest, I shall be happy to hear his submission. In the meantime I ask the Committee to accept my amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment.

Ayes (9).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan, Jennings, McAlees, O'Halloran (teller), Stephens and Frank Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs Brookman Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney Heaslip, Jenkins, Macgillivray, Michael, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford (teller), Quirke, Shannon, Teusner, Travers, and White.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Fred Walsh, Lawn, Tapping, and Hutchens. Noes—The Hons. C. S. Hincks, Sir George Jenkins, and M. McIntosh, Mr. Hawker.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (13 to 17) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 943.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the Bill, which is unexceptionable. It makes amendments for the granting of privileges and remissions for those who normally are not committed to prison under the ordinary provisions of the law, such as juvenile offenders, or persons coming under section 77a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The Bill provides for something that has long been necessary. It has been the custom to release these people, but the validity of such releases has been very much in question. Of those juveniles released from imprisonment as a reward for good behaviour, only one offender has been returned to prison. In effect, granting to them of these privileges which accrue to ordinary prisoners as the result of good behaviour is an incentive that in future their characters will be satisfactory and that it is a remedial measure.

There has been another view on this matter, one which has been taken by some people in the service, that prisoners in this category should not be granted these privileges, because, for instance, it was alleged that juvenile offenders might kick up sufficient fuss to get themselves committed to prison and then get the rewards provided for good behaviour and then be released, whereas otherwise they would have been under the detention of the Children's Welfare Department until they reached 18. That has not been borne out in practice. The Bill validates a practice which has proved itself over the years, and I therefore have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I also support the Bill, and notice that it validates what apparently has been the practice for some time. Principally it provides for the remission of sentences of certain types of persons who are not usually received into gaols. They are particularly sexual offenders and juveniles. It is obvious that if a remission of sentence is of use to the ordinary type of prisoner, there is an equal argument that similar conditions should be granted, where desirable, to those special types of prisoners not previously covered as a reward for past good conduct and as an incentive to good future behaviour. Further, the Bill deals with the release on licence of life prisoners. If they were released in the past there was no control that could be exercised over them, but under the Bill they may be released under certain conditions, which seems to me to be absolutely desirable, and I can see no argument whatever for opposing this provision. After all, if a prisoner has been sentenced to gaol for life and it seems desirable to release him after a long period, if the authorities cannot impose any conditions on him after release they would be scarcely inclined to take a risk with him. If, however, they can release him on licence they will have some control over him. My principal reason for speaking on the Bill is that I visited the Adelaide Gaol some time ago and found the visit most instructive. It gave me great confidence in the administration of our penal institutions. People might get the idea from films that we have some mild form of American prisons in this State, but I was most impressed with the way the Adelaide Gaol was run. The meals are particularly good and I do not think any complaints could be made about them.

The general atmosphere of the gaol was one of cleanliness, smartness and efficiency, and there was a healthy atmosphere of good discipline, a discipline that was combined with courtesy that was applied to all the prisoners. I am sure every prisoner felt it was worth his while to behave properly and it was pleasing

to see the respect they showed to the authorities. Of course, that is desirable in any corrective institution. In understand that short-term prisoners are detained at the Adelaide Gaol, and that long-term sentences are carried out elsewhere. There are also women prisoners at the Adelaide Gaol, and in this section I felt also that there was an atmosphere that was good and sensible and by no means harsh. On the other hand, it was a place where punishments were carried out properly. There was no suggestion of oppression or gloom, and that is commendable. Justices visit all our prisons at various times and through them a prisoner may complain if he believes he has just cause. This ensures that they get fair treatment, and I believe no-one could say that a prisoner was ill-treated when visiting justices act as a check on the ordinary administration of gaols. After visiting the Adelaide Gaol I considered that punishment was not carried out with sickly sentimentality, nor with brutality, but in an attempt to rehabilitate those people in whom there was some chance of rehabilitation, but on the other hand to sit hard on those who did not intend to play the game. I support the Bill, for there is nothing but good in it, and it will clear up some rather small irregularities.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—Clause 5 provides for the release on licence of life prisoners, and I am sure that we all agree with the principle enunciated here, but I wish to bring forward a suggestion that I think should be considered. The Premier said:—

> A prisoner so released is subject to recall at any time. Such legislation would enable life prisoners to be effectively kept under control after release for such period as may be thought desirable and clause 5 accordingly provides in these terms for release on licence by the Governor on the recommendation of the Comptroller.

I have not had much experience of long-term prisoners, but I know of one who was sentenced to life imprisonment and was subsequently released. Unfortunately, he went in as a young man and came out middle aged, and the impact of the changed conditions of society was apparently too much for him and the result was somewhat tragic. He committed an exteremely serious crime for which no doubt in his later years he was sincerely repentant, but I contend that we should go a step further than that now proposed. It is extremely difficult for a man to re-establish himself in the community after a long term in prison. However generous people may be, the stigma of his imprisonment remains, and his crime must bear heavily upon him on release, and probably throughout the rest of his life. It is difficult for people to overcome a prejudice against the employment of such a person or against admitting him into the home. I wonder whether it would be possible for the Comptroller of Prisons to arrange for the exchange of prisoners with another State or country. It it obviously necessary that these criminals, on release, be kept under surveillance, and if prison authorities in various States or in other parts of the British Commonwealth could reciprocate by supervising the conduct and behaviour of such men it might be possible to remove prisoners from one State or country to another, where they could begin a new life. If this is practicable it would be another step in the more humane treatment of prisoners and materially improve a man's chance to rehabilitate himself and lead a useful and happy life.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 21, at 2 p.m.