

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, September 28, 1955.

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

**QUESTIONS.****BROKEN HILL RAIL SERVICE.**

Mr. **TAPPING**—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently concerning a daytime express to Broken Hill?

The Hon. M. **McINTOSH**—Yes. I have taken the matter up with my colleague and, through him, the Commissioner of Railways, who reports that it is not practicable to run a day service to Broken Hill as not sufficient appropriate carriages are available to provide the additional service. I will take the matter further if the honourable member has any more data for me to submit.

**FLOWER DAY.**

Mr. **PEARSON**—Today in Adelaide we are witnessing the annual observance of Flower Day. It is being observed here and in a number of other places in various ways, and last Sunday special church services were held to commemorate the occasion. I believe that this annual exhibition of what men and women are able to do in co-operation with nature in the production of beautiful things is a valuable observance, and that from the appreciation of beautiful things some culture emanates which is valuable to the well being, morale and outlook of the people. I think every member would like to express to the people responsible the appreciation this Chamber feels for the work done. I believe, too, that the Premier, being a gardener, would not miss the opportunity to comment—

The **SPEAKER**—I really think the honourable member is arguing the question.

Mr. **PEARSON**—Will the Premier express through the press and radio the thanks and appreciation which I am sure people generally, and members in particular, feel to those who have done so much to organize this day?

The Hon. T. **PLAYFORD**—I shall be pleased to express appreciation of the work of the organizing committee in connection with the Flower Day festival. I think all members will agree that Flower Day has become an important annual function in Adelaide. It emphasizes the lovely things that nature, with the aid of man, can produce.

**TURN ROUND OF SHIPPING.**

Mr. **McALEES**—It has been reported to me from Wallaroo that waterside workers there have been receiving attendance money for a considerable time. What is known as a rock boat—a vessel carrying phosphate rock—arrived, but instead of working around the clock with a full complement of men it is only being worked by half the usual complement. Inquiries were made as to the reason and the union was told that it had not been able to use Port Adelaide because of the shortage of labour and berths at that port. I have made inquiries at Port Adelaide and been assured that had the ship arrived at Port Adelaide it could have been berthed and been well manned. I bring this matter forward to ensure that the waterside workers are not blamed for the slow turn round of ships. Only 33 men are working on that ship, whereas 190 are on attendance money. Will the Premier make inquiries to ascertain that the blame for the slow turn round cannot be placed on the waterside workers?

The Hon. T. **PLAYFORD**—I will make inquiries from the port authorities, obtain a report and advise the honourable member of the result.

**NORTH ADELAIDE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.**

Mr. **DUNNAGE**—Some time ago the Government purchased a property in Pennington Terrace, North Adelaide. I understand it was allocated to the Education Department but so far as I can ascertain nothing has yet been done. Can the Minister of Works say to what department this property was allotted and what is being done with it?

The Hon. M. **McINTOSH**—The property was purchased at a very satisfactory figure and it was resolved that it would make a good location for the Correspondence School. The question of remodelling and adding to it has been considered and the Government has already authorized the expenditure of a substantial sum, amounting to several thousands of pounds, to make it adequate for the purpose. That work is going ahead. The accommodation that will be vacated in Currie Street will then be made available to the Highways Department, and I think everybody will be satisfied with the ultimate result. In the interim obviously some may feel dissatisfied because they are not getting immediately what they expect. The work at Pennington Terrace will be undertaken by the Architect-in-Chief's department because it is thought that in view

of the time involved in securing outside contracts it can be done more expeditiously that way.

#### ASSISTANCE FOR ABORIGINES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Can the Premier say whether there is a fund to which the Government contributes and which is available for the general purpose of assisting aborigines, apart from the money provided for the Aborigines Board? In other States there is a trust fund that can be used for the general purposes of aborigines, and I inquire whether in South Australia there is such a fund or moneys which could be used to subsidize the aborigine's move for a hospital in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know of any such fund. Annually the Parliament votes to the Aborigines Department certain moneys for the assistance and general welfare of aborigines in this State, for the maintenance of various farms established by the State, and for assistance in connection with housing, etc. This is usually controlled by the Aborigines Board and the administrative officer is the Chief Protector of Aborigines. I do not know of any special fund. There is certainly no State fund and I do not know of a Commonwealth fund. I think the Commonwealth makes money available through the Department for Territories, which provides assistance in some directions for aborigines.

#### FROST DAMAGE.

Mr. TEUSNER—Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained a report following on my question of last week about a survey being made by departmental officers of the frost damage done recently in the Barossa district, and also in other parts of the State?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I have a statement following on a survey made by Mr. Strickland's officers. I understand the Minister of Lands has information on frost damage, largely in the irrigation areas. The officers of my department made a general survey, which embraced both areas. I will read the portions that are relevant to areas other than irrigation areas. They are:—

In the Barossa Valley chief frost losses occurred with apricots, wine grapes and peaches. Damage was most severe in the Angaston, Light's Pass, Nuriootpa and Dorrion areas, whilst Greenock and Moppa suffered only in isolated pockets. Tanunda, Lynoch and Rowland Flat districts suffered little damage other than in pockets and low lying areas. Some properties in both the irrigated and non-irrigated regions sustained heavy

losses representing up to 90 per cent of particular types of crop, such as sultanas and apricots. Usually however, such properties comprised other types of crops which were little affected. Overall estimates of district losses on even an approximate scale are difficult, because of the considerable variation from property to property, and the uncertainty of likely yield from secondary growth of vines. Estimates which are necessarily very approximate have been made by district officers. The estimates refer to overall district losses and not to individual losses, which were very high in some instances.

The report then mentioned individual districts and the losses in each case, and regarding the Barossa Valley it said:—

As indicated above, damage varies considerably throughout the valley. Overall estimates are 30 to 35 per cent for apricots, 10 per cent for wine grapes and 2 to 3 per cent for peaches.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Lands a report regarding the recent frost damage in irrigation areas?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have the following report:—

Reports received from the district officers show that frosts were experienced in all irrigation areas on the 17th, 18th and 19th September and that wide-spread crop losses will result. The losses which vary in intensity will be most severe in stone fruits, sultanas and other early shooting varieties of vines. Little damage has been reported to citrus and this is confined mainly to young trees. The information received is from quick surveys of the position and although closer investigations will be made the actual losses will not be known until the crops have been harvested and delivered. There is enough evidence available at this early stage, however, to say that the overall losses will be appreciable and that in many cases individual losses will be high.

#### SOUTH-EAST RAILWAY TIME TABLE.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Minister representing the Minister of Railways furnish any information regarding the time table for the new service between Mount Gambier and Adelaide? I understand there is to be an entirely new set-up, and I have received a few queries opposing the time table.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The intended time table has been published, and I think the honourable member's question arises therefrom, namely, that it is not entirely satisfactory to the Mount Gambier end of the system. The latest data I have is through the honourable member, addressed to the Railways Commissioner, putting out some suggestions from the Postal Department regarding the matter. I will take it up with the Minister of Railways and bring down a reply as early as possible. It would mean, of course, another alteration to the proposed time table. The

honourable member would recognize the fact that what might suit best the end of the journey might not suit best the intermediate section. There are about 300 miles between here and Mount Gambier. Although it might suit Mount Gambier to have a certain timetable set, it would reflect itself throughout the journey. A good deal of the route is in my district and what suits Mount Gambier may not suit places between, say, Bordertown and Tailem Bend, or other stations reached before or after those towns. The question will be further looked at in the light of the information supplied by the honourable member and I will bring down a reply from my colleague.

#### GRASSHOPPER INFESTATION.

Mr. WHITE—The member for Stirling's question on grasshopper infestation has created interest. I know that from two telephone calls I had this morning. Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to give an overall picture of the controls that are being used throughout the State so that we will know how the matter is being handled?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—This morning I obtained a report from the Director of Agriculture because I was anxious to ascertain how the campaign on the grasshopper front was proceeding, and it seems that, generally, there is great activity and co-operation by landholders and district councils. However, he advises:—

It is desirable to make an urgent appeal to landholders and district councils to deal with grasshopper hatchings on their properties. Full co-operation at the present stage can avert a disastrous plague. Every swarm sprayed with the correct insecticide helps in preventing the development of a plague. Whilst most district councils and landholders have shown admirable co-operation, the department is very much concerned by the lack of action by a few landholders to control hatchings at present taking place. Neglect on the part of the few can greatly reduce the effectiveness of the campaign. District councils are empowered to purchase insecticides direct from merchants and claim reimbursement of the cost from the Government. This means that the insecticides are free of cost to the landholders. The widespread areas over which hatchings are taking place make it very difficult to deal with the hoppers in any other way than spray treatment by the landholder on his own land. Concerted action by district councils and landholders could deal with the whole area simultaneously if need be. No other scheme could hope to be so efficient, providing district councils and landholders accept the responsibility and faithfully deal with the grasshoppers in their own respective areas.

A few individuals who are apparently not prepared to undertake the work for their

own protection have suggested that the Government embark on an extermination campaign such as it instituted against the fruit fly, but if they considered the magnitude of the areas over which there are hatchings I think they would realize that we would need not a battalion but a division of men to cope with the problem. The Director continues:—

District councils in Upper Eyre Peninsula are very active and reports indicate good co-operation by landholders. Reports of activity have also been received from district councils of Snowtown, Gladstone, Browns Well, Port Germein, Crystal Brook, Paringa, Bute, Owen and Encounter Bay. Merchants report having distributed 2,200 gallons BHC and Dieldrin. Shell Company has disposed of stocks of Aldrin to "A" Class Depots in the vulnerable areas. Information on the distribution of these stocks is not yet available. Supplies of all recommended insecticides are coming forward as required and the distributors consider that they will be able to cope with demands.

#### CONTROL OF ONION WEED.

Mr. HEASLIP—Much publicity has been given to grasshoppers and much money is being spent on their eradication, but the grasshoppers are not with us yet. They may, or may not, come, but if they do come they will be here for only one year, whereas the onion weed is with us now and will remain for very many years unless something is done to control it. It is taking up pastures that should be devoted to stock, and yesterday I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he would ascertain from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation whether funds could be made available to evolve some method to control or eradicate it. He did not answer that question, and I ask him whether he will take it up because I believe the control of onion weed to be much more important than the control of grasshoppers.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I hope the honourable member is correct in assuming that the grasshoppers will be gone tomorrow, but I am not quite so sanguine. I thought I made it clear yesterday that research is going on for the control of onion weed in an endeavour to find efficient and economic sprays. That is proceeding at the moment, but no economic spray has yet been discovered. There has been no let up in this work, but I will certainly follow up the honourable member's question.

#### RIVER MURRAY FLOOD.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Works any further information to give the House about the flood coming down the River Murray?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am glad to keep the honourable member and the House and the State as well advised as I can on this matter in the light of circumstances that exist from day to day, which sometimes alter because of winds and rains. I think that when the honourable member asked a previous question I said it was estimated that the flood level would be about the same as the peak of the 1952 flood, and that estimate still remains correct. The level this time will probably be about 3in. above the 1952 level, and the peak period estimated has been found correctly estimated. The last information I had on this subject was on September 19, when the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage, with my authority, wrote to the liaison committees along the river advising that the peak would be reached at Wentworth on October 9, at Renmark on October 19, and at Murray Bridge on November 5. Towards meeting that position all the timbers have been taken out of the locks and the barrages are entirely open, and water is being let out from Lake Victoria so as to make room for the floods coming down. According to press reports there have been further heavy rains in the upper reaches of the Murray, but fortunately they will not add to the flood peak because it has passed those regions. I think the peak level is about 100 miles past the influence of those later rains, and they will mean a continuation of the high river rather than aggravate the present flood. Each liaison committee has been fully advised of the position. The Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage is going up and down the river with his officers to see whether anything further can be done that has not been done and, apart from myself, he would welcome any practicable suggestions to alleviate any difficulties that may arise. So far we feel there is no need for any great apprehension except, of course, the inevitable consequences of a high river.

#### METROPOLITAN TAXICAB BILL.

Mr. JENNINGS, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the control of taxicabs in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, and for incidental purposes. Read a first time.

#### EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 21. Page 834.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I support the Bill, which simply provides for the closing

of shops, other than exempt shops, at 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays. It confers an advantage on shop assistants in these establishments which might otherwise be denied them, because most shop assistants are required to work a 5½-day week, whereas most other workers in industry are required to work only five days. There is no reason why shop employees should not enjoy that advantage, but the Bill does not aim at anything of that nature, nor does it attempt in any way to interfere with other shopping hours provided by the legislation. Even in those industries where a continual process involves men working six or seven days a week, a five-day week has been provided by awards; consequently, the employee works his 40 hours in five days as in other comparable establishments. For instance, transport workers work a five-day week under their Commonwealth award.

True, only recently Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Tonkin, after an exhaustive inquiry, granted traffic men employed by the Municipal Tramways Trust a five-day week, not because he wished to embarrass the trust financially, but to give justice to employees and make their conditions conform with accepted working conditions in industry generally. Unfortunately, the Tramways Trust saw fit to appeal against that decision, not, I think, because of the impracticability of working a five-day week, but rather because it would financially embarrass the trust. I do not wish to enter into the pros and cons of the trust's financial position, but merely to point out that the Commissioner considered the five-day week practicable.

The position of workers in hotels is analogous to that of shop assistants. Under their legislation hotelkeepers are required to open their bars six days a week, but under the appropriate award the hotel employee is required to work only five days a week, and if he works on the sixth day he receives penalty rates. If such conditions are considered appropriate for hotel employees, they should be applied to shop employees. Many more examples of the five-day week in comparable industries could be cited.

It can be taken for granted that most members have at some time observed the responsibilities undertaken by shop assistants in busy departmental stores, particularly at peak periods. They are required to attend to the wants and whims of the ordinary customer and to do their work efficiently and so that it will react to the benefit of their employer. Further, they are required to stand on their feet throughout the whole day and this causes

not only physical and mental fatigue, but also nervous strain, particularly during the last hour. Despite this strain, however, they rarely express any resentment at the extraordinary whims of some customers. For these reasons they are entitled to even more consideration from members than employees in other industries who do not have to put up with the same difficulties. We admit that shops should be open on Saturday mornings to cater for the requirements of those people who find it impossible to shop on week days but we suggest that from 8.30 until 11.30 is sufficient time for them. If this proposal becomes law people are certain to do their shopping before closing time. If they did not, they would have to ask shopkeepers to break the law.

Most people who work a five-day week and do their shopping on Saturday mornings have completed their purchases and are on their way to their afternoon's entertainment by 11.30. No hardship would result to anyone if shops closed at 11.30. Is it not fair that those who are required to work on Saturday mornings to cater for all sections of the community should have equal rights of being able to attend their particular mediums of entertainment on Saturday afternoons? It does not matter whether they are shop assistants, managers or proprietors, they are entitled to their entertainment whether it be football, cricket, croquet, bowls or horse racing at the weekend. Members should examine this legislation in that light and not argue that because 12.30 has been the closing time for a long period it should remain.

Reference has been made to small suburban shopkeepers. Let us examine that aspect impartially. I suggest that the shopkeeper who employs labour because of the volume of his business—and there are many in the suburbs—is not affected in any way because he is bound by the provisions of awards and determinations, which require employees to finish work at 11.30 on Saturday mornings. The relevant section of Shop Board No. 2 determination applying to the metropolitan area provides:—

The maximum number of ordinary hours to be worked in any one week to entitle employees to the weekly wages fixed by this determination shall be 40, to be worked between the hours of 8.00 a.m. and 5.30 p.m., Mondays to Fridays, and 8.00 a.m. to 11.30 a.m. Saturdays.

The Leader of the Opposition said that if employees were required to work until 12.30, that time should be paid for at overtime rates. The board makes provision for a payment of

25 per cent over and above the ordinary day's work for all work performed on Saturday mornings. Those shopkeepers who employ labour in the suburban areas are covered by provisions of the wages boards and no hardship will be imposed on them if we agree to 11.30 compulsory closing.

In those places where no labour is employed the shopkeeper will have an opportunity of taking advantage of the compulsory closing at 11.30 of stores complying with the provisions of awards by obtaining any business that may be forthcoming. I think all members desire to make competition as fair and equal as possible and it should not be possible for a person to be in a position to compete unfairly with persons who are required by determinations and awards to conform to certain conditions. If shops were closed compulsorily at 11.30 they would not be losing any legitimate business because suburban shoppers would know that a local store closed at 11.30 and would make their purchases before then. This would apply more especially where there was no Saturday morning work. These people have a greater opportunity to do their shopping earlier than 11.30. It has been said that even if the shops were open till a later hour there would still be a rush by some people to shop at the last minute. Many people go to hotels just before closing time and if they closed later there would still be the same rush.

Mr. John Clark—It happens on polling days.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes. If we had polling hours from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. there would still be some voters who would rush in just before closing time. The closing of shops at 11.30 is not a new proposal. On Saturday mornings no shops are open in Tasmania or New Zealand. In about 1936 the necessary legislation was passed in New Zealand, and since then there has been no move to alter it. The position has been accepted in the right way by the people both in Tasmania and New Zealand. I have had an opportunity to see the position in both places. If I thought a hardship was being imposed on the shopping public by the closing of shops at 11.30 I would not support it. The Premier referred to the shopping position overseas, and said:—In most places in America it is a matter of "go as you please." Shops are kept open at times when the proprietors feel that most customers can be served. I do not advocate that for South Australia.

I do not think any of us want to see the American position apply in South Australia, whether it be in connection with the saloon bar, drug store, or departmental store. Some

saloon bars in America open at 5 a.m. and close at 2 a.m. Strangely enough it was the unions who during the war caused the closing of saloon bars in America at either midnight or 1 a.m.

Mr. O'Halloran—In some States they do not close until 4 a.m.

Mr. FRED WALSH—When I was there the generally accepted closing time was 2 a.m. I would be the last to advocate such a position here. The Premier reminded the Leader of the Opposition that he had seen the shopping position overseas and that it was more or less "an open go." Overseas the desires of the people in regard to Saturday entertainment is entirely different from ours. There can be no comparison because in the Continental countries there are no recognized sports on Saturdays. Their sports are held on Sundays and public holidays in the summer or early autumn. At other times there are snow sports, but they are not indulged in by many in relation to the population. On Saturdays there is no organized sport as we know it, and on those days shopping is a sort of entertainment. Both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have been overseas and they know that on the Saturdays the people window shop and then spend the rest of the day in saloons, cafes, or under awnings in the streets. No other country in the world, except New Zealand, can compare with Australia in the matter of sport, mainly because of climatic conditions. Here in Australia we are concerned about our leisure time on Saturdays and the legislation has been designed to make it possible for people to participate in or watch sport on those days.

The Premier very briefly opposed the Bill. There was not much in his speech to pull to pieces; it contained no strong points. When he wants to damn a Bill he attacks it by saying that it means something more than it says. He gives a lead to those who sit behind him and I shall be surprised if they do not take it. He indicated to them how to view the Bill. He said it implied more than was apparent and that it was the beginning of something to come later, the elimination of Saturday shopping. The Leader of the Opposition introduced a similar Bill in about 1951. It provided for the closing of shops at 11.30 a.m., mainly to conform to the desires of the workers in the industry and to provide equal conditions. To be consistent he has introduced a similar Bill now. There is no suggestion of closing shops on Saturday mornings. Members opposite should look at the position from that angle. There is to be

no imposition on anyone, and no sacrifices are sought. The Bill provides for those who render a service on Saturday mornings to the purchasing public an opportunity to share in the pleasures and entertainments that are generally enjoyed on Saturdays.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—When early closing was first introduced many years ago it was thought that by closing shops early on one day during the week it would be beneficial for people keen on sport or travel. Some country towns favoured mid-week closing, and I believe that still applies in some centres. I think in the first place the compulsory closing time was one o'clock. Later it was amended to 12.30, and now we have this Bill making it compulsory for shops to close at 11.30 a.m. In my town most shops close at 11.30 now because it suits them to do so, but that may not suit all towns. One argument advanced by the member for Thebarton (Mr. Fred Walsh) was that 11.30 closing would give more time for employees to get to sporting fixtures, but most of them, except racing, do not start until about two o'clock. Football matches start even later, so if the shops remained open until 12.30 most people would still have ample time to get to sporting fixtures. Mr. Walsh also said that it would be fair and equitable for shop employees to be allowed to knock off at 11.30. He said their work was arduous, and I think all will agree with that. Standing in a shop is certainly tiring, particularly for women and girls, but there is another side to the question. Many shoppers have to be catered for on Saturday mornings, and the present hours give a little longer period in which to shop, so there is not so much rush at any particular time. Nowadays we are inclined to pass restrictive legislation, and I believe the present hours are reasonable. There is no need to legislate for the compulsory closing of shops at 11.30 on Saturdays, though in some country towns that is more desirable than in the city to enable people to travel long distances to get to sporting fixtures. Why not leave the hours as at present, leaving it optional for shops to close earlier if they want to? I oppose the Bill.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the Bill. While I was listening to the member for Gouger I was convinced, until the end of his speech, that he would support it. He said that in his own district most businesses observe 11.30 a.m. closing on Saturday, but that we were inclined to legislate for too

many restrictions. However, when we consider present-day trends I believe there is a necessity to apply restrictions for the benefit of people employed in industry and shops. The employer, as well as the employee, will benefit from this Bill. In my district there is 100 per cent support for 11.30 closing, and shops there close religiously at that time on Saturdays. It is the desire of the organizations that control those shops to close at that time.

Mr. Lawn—The Premier said they wanted 12.30 closing. Did he mislead the House?

Mr. TAPPING—Today I sought information from the president of the association in my district, and he said that every member of his organization stood strictly by 11.30 closing. From my observations, and judging by the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Thebarton, it is the general wish of the people that shops close at that time. About two months ago the Industrial Board that fixes the wages and conditions of shop employees voted five to three in favour of closing at 11.30, and emporiums in Adelaide are adhering to that time. As the member for Thebarton pointed out, the employees of those shops who work on Saturday mornings are paid time and a quarter until 11.30, and time and a half if they work beyond that hour.

Mr. Lawn—That would increase costs?

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, but my point is that both the employer and the employee want 11.30 closing. Most people turn their attention to sport on Saturday afternoon, and if shops close at 11.30 they will have time to go home and change and get to their sport at the appointed time of starting. The standard working week is now 40 hours, and there are not many people who work on Saturday mornings. From inquiries I have made I am convinced that retailers' associations in Norwood, Glenelg, Semaphore, Port Adelaide and Prospect want 11.30 a.m. closing on Saturday.

Mr. Fletcher—Why not close them altogether on Saturday and be done with it!

Mr. TAPPING—By closing at 11.30 a.m. on Saturday nobody is penalised.

Mr. Fletcher—You are only thinking about city people.

Mr. TAPPING—I always believe that the same consideration should be given to country as to city people. To close shops at 11.30 on Saturdays would be a progressive move. Perhaps Mr. Fletcher wants to get back to the bad old days when people worked every day of the week. Country people should be placed in the same category as city people, and I am

sure there would be no objections from the country to 11.30 a.m. closing. It seems that Mr. Fletcher wants to penalize the people he represents. Earlier closing would benefit both the employer and the employee. I hope the days have passed when even the employer wanted to work longer hours. He needs relaxation just as much as the employee does, and if shops were closed at 11.30 a.m. he would have a chance to take part in sport.

Mr. Fletcher—Both the employer and the employee want too much.

Mr. TAPPING—No. I do not think the honourable member will say that before the next State elections. The Industrial Board voted five to three for 11.30 a.m. closing, which meant that the chairman did not have to give a casting vote. The voting disclosed that one representative of the employers believed in 11.30 closing. This Bill is a step in the right direction and it is hard to find how many people do not favour 11.30 closing, but I think 95 per cent would favour it.

Mr. Fletcher—Yes, in the city.

Mr. TAPPING—No, in the country too. The honourable member is trying to discredit the people he represents.

Mr. Fletcher—I am not.

Mr. TAPPING—Not many people work on Saturday morning now, and I am sure the people of Mount Gambier favour 11.30 closing.

Mr. Fletcher—Ask the people in the country.

Mr. TAPPING—I have not been in the country so much as the honourable member has, but I think that country people are progressive. I think he is out of step with his constituents. The statement of the member for Gouger might have carried some weight years ago, but in these modern times the people desire relaxation and favour 11.30 closing so that they may attend sporting fixtures on Saturday afternoons. This measure is a progressive move, and only a small minority wish to shop after 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays.

Mr. Fletcher—Why open on Saturday morning at all?

Mr. TAPPING—In some States shops do not open on Saturday morning, and I ask Mr. Fletcher to support this Bill, which is a half-way measure.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I, too, support the Bill, which is a most desirable one. Members who have supported it have established a good case for its acceptance. It has been said in this debate that shop assistants are amongst the few workers who work on Saturday morning and that most others enjoy a five-day working week. That is true,

and in order to give service to those workers who have Saturday morning off shop assistants are willing to work. The recognized day for sporting fixtures in this country is Saturday. Most employees who enjoy the five-day working week appreciate the services of shop assistants so much that they support the 11.30 closing so as to give shop assistants a better chance to attend Saturday afternoon sporting fixtures. The member for Thebarton (Mr. Fred Walsh) drew members' attention to the Tramways Trust case before Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Tonkin, from which it is evident that the Tramways Trust has to arrange its rosters in order to meet the effects of Saturday morning closing times. Ever since the war the 11.30 closing hour has been accepted by the people and it seems almost ridiculous that arguments should be advanced for the retention of 12.30 in the Act. I was interested to hear the interjection by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Fletcher), which was similar to a remark by the Premier.

The SPEAKER—Honourable members must stop conversing aloud. Conversations are distinctly audible from the Chair.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The arguments advanced against the Bill are unreasonable and have long since been rejected by South Australians; further, I hope they will be rejected by this Parliament on this occasion. In his speech on the Bill the Premier said:—

A man employed in a factory works five days each week, and he has little time in which to shop because his hours of work almost completely coincide with shopping hours. He must do his shopping at some other time. Later, in reply to an interjection by Mr. John Clark, he said:—

There is no "but" about it. The honourable member wants me to reason as he does. The Bill would have the opposite effect to what is desired in this matter. Mr. O'Halloran suggests that all the shops should not be in the city, but his proposal would have the reverse effect. Generally in the outer suburbs shops remain open until 12.30 p.m. whereas the large departmental stores in the city close at 11.30. If the Bill is carried the outer suburbs shops will have to accept 11.30 closing. This has been put to me by people who are opposed to the Bill. It would undoubtedly affect the smaller shops in the suburbs that are rendering a necessary service. The member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) correctly said that the 11.30 closing time had been accepted by suburban shopkeepers. As long ago as 1911, when Saturday afternoon closing was being debated in this House, Mr. McDonald said:—

There were many elderly people able to make a few shillings in their shops after 6 o'clock

when the bigger shops were closed. This Bill would wipe them out altogether. These little shops did small business during the ordinary hours, but after six when the householder wanted some trifling commodity it could always be procured from the small shopkeeper. Why should they smother these people who did not employ any assistants?

Later, in the same debate, Mr. Homburg said:—

People would not come to a Friday night market to purchase fish for Sunday morning's breakfast, or rabbits, dressed poultry or meat for Sunday's dinner; neither would they, after working hard all day and knocking off work at 6 o'clock on Friday night, hurry off to their homes and make preparation for a visit to the market, knowing they had to get up next morning and go to work.

Those arguments have long since been rejected, but yet they have been advanced in this debate in favour of the retention of 12.30 closing on Saturdays despite the fact that the 11.30 closing arrangement has been honoured by most South Australian shopkeepers. Members of my Party appreciate the valuable work done by country people, but those people are in a position to adjust their working hours to enable them to shop, which is something that employees in secondary industry cannot do. Mr. Fletcher's statement that country people do not support 11.30 closing shows that he is out of step with his constituents. I hope that the honourable member will realize that and support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I too, support the Bill and speak from experience gained at Clare, where 11.30 a.m. closing on Saturdays has operated for many years and everyone is quite happy about it. The man who comes in from the country knows that the shops close at that hour and is able to arrange his business so that he can complete it by 11.30. After all, if the shops were open until 2 p.m. there would always be the shopper who would arrive at one minute to two. Even under the present set-up someone is always arriving just as the shopkeeper is about to close his shop. The hour of 11.30 suits the district I represent and I do not see why it should not suit the people of Adelaide and suburbs. By noon on Saturday the main street of Clare is empty and people are home enjoying their mid-day meal preparatory to devoting their afternoon to sport and other interests, whereas if the shop assistants were employed until 12.30 unnecessary stress and strain would result. There has been no disagreement in this matter amongst the residents of Clare, and once the principle is applied to the metropolitan area there will be no difficulty and people will be



able to have an earlier mid-day meal and enjoy themselves all the better on Saturday afternoon. The Bill will undoubtedly react to the advantage of people at present required to work until 12.30 p.m. If a person cannot get his shopping done by 11.30 a.m. he should not shop on Saturday morning.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—Had it not been for some of the specious arguments used in support of the Bill I would not have bothered to speak, but when members start to talk about getting certain people away from their work in time to go to sporting fixtures I am reminded of the large volume of people who, because of their employment, cannot get to any sporting fixtures at all. I am sure the sponsor of this Bill would be the last to support a suggestion that we dispense with public transport on Saturday afternoons in order that the persons employed therein might attend sporting fixtures. They are members of the public and just as much entitled to their entertainment as persons employed in any other industry.

Mr. Fred Walsh—They work their 40 hours in five days.

Mr. SHANNON—But they do not go to sporting fixtures on Saturday afternoons. The argument advanced in support of this measure is that we should give people employed in shops an opportunity of going to football, tennis or racing.

Mr. Quirke—And so we should.

Mr. SHANNON—Let us deal with that aspect—that we should give people employed in industry every opportunity to attend sporting fixtures on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. O'Halloran—If we can reasonably do so, why not?

Mr. SHANNON—If that principle is to be applied I suggest there will be no sporting fixtures because no one will be available to render services to make those fixtures successful. I remind members that some people are employed as gate keepers. If persons cannot be employed on Saturday afternoons there will be no refreshment bars. The argument is specious and does not cut any ice. The rights of the purchaser should not be entirely overlooked. I would not support an arbitrary law which prevents the giving of service by people willing to give it. There are a number of small business people in my district who want to serve the public when the public wants that service. I do not want to interfere with that arrangement because everyone is happy with it.

Mr. O'Halloran—I suppose shops open in your district on Sunday.

Mr. SHANNON—Many people from the Leader's district take a drive in the hills on a Sunday and enjoy a cup of tea and sandwich in my district. That service is greatly appreciated, but I do not know whether it is desirable in view of some of the arguments advanced by members opposite. Perhaps we should prevent that practice. I point out that if 11.30 closing becomes compulsory and all shops have to close at that time, the big storekeepers who are large employers of labour will benefit most. The little man who must struggle to make ends meet should not be denied the right to continue working for another hour if he desires to. If he cannot employ labour but with his wife is prepared to provide a service to the public there is no harm in that. I suggest to the general rank and file of Australians that a little less of this spirit of going after things for themselves and of seeking every opportunity to take time off to go to some sporting fixture, and a little more application to the job of providing things that Australia badly needs, would be a better principle.

Mr. Fred Walsh—In other words, go back to a 56-hour week?

Mr. SHANNON—There are many people in my district who cannot avoid working a 56-hour week.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I would like to exchange bank balances with them.

Mr. SHANNON—They have to work around the clock in their various occupations on the land. It is impossible for them to complete their work in less than 50 or 60 hours.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—Perhaps dairy-men should knock off at 11.30.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not see why we should milk cows over the week-end. The cows might desire to go out and disport themselves on the village green on a Saturday afternoon. This all boils down to the fact that we are directing our attention to matters that are not of great importance to Australia. Our economy demands a lowering of costs. We have already priced ourselves out of near markets, particularly the near East. Nations, more distant than us by thousands of miles, are taking those markets from us because of our cost structure. This legislation, in principle, is another attempt to slow down Australia's efforts and I oppose it.

Mr. FLETCHER secured the adjournment of the debate.

# LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (LOTTERIES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 21. Page 935.)

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—I am surprised that more members have not spoken on this matter. It is not merely a question of lotteries but, more important, the respect that the people of South Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth should pay to our legislation. I recently heard the Attorney-General discussing democracy and he drew attention to the factors which comprise democracy. He said, in effect, that laws are the foundation on which democracy is based. I know from personal experience that the law this Bill seeks to amend is broken every day. Sometimes a police officer who is more officious than his fellows prevents some person from conducting a lottery—usually some hard-working woman who has arranged it in the interests of some organization she is particularly concerned with. She discovers, to her surprise, that she has broken the law. For the first time in her life she becomes aware that the law provides that money cannot be raised for any organization, no matter how worthy, by means of a lottery.

I do not suppose anyone in South Australia is less interested in lotteries and gambling than myself. I do not object to people gambling because it is their personal responsibility. If they can afford it I can see nothing wrong with it, but it leaves me cold. It spoils good sport for me. On occasions I have been invited to have a game of bridge and at one time I was a keen bridge player, but as soon as someone said, "We will play for 6d. a hundred"—which was not a great stake—the whole joy of that game disappeared.

Mr. John Clark—Did it worry you?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—No. I do not like it because I have noticed that gambling brings out the worst features in a person who is losing. I would rather keep away from it. However, this Bill is something different. The member for Stirling (Mr. William Jenkins) made some unkind statements about the member who sponsored this legislation. He is reported in *Hansard* as having said about the sponsor:—

... he may want to whitewash it and hoodwink the public and honourable members. That was uncalled for, and it was unjust. I have not always agreed with Mr. Frank Walsh in regard to lotteries and gambling, but I have not felt that on this occasion he has tried to

mislead me or the public. I think he is standing four square for what he believes. If we had more men in this Chamber big enough to stand for what they believed to be right, irrespective of whether they were proved to be wrong on occasions, this would be a better place. I support the Bill. I disagree with the member for Stirling who said that he could not understand why Mr. Frank Walsh said he was sorry this was called a lottery Bill. If the member for Stirling had read the Bill he would understand why it has been referred to as a lottery Bill. Previously the member for Goodwood introduced a Bill for a State lottery, something I would not support, although most of the people of the State seem to favour it.

Mr. Wm. Jenkins—It will come if we pass this Bill.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I would not support a State lottery because it is against my moral principles. South Australia is a sovereign State and can get all the money it needs, if it uses sufficient intelligence. Not only are State lotteries against my moral principles, but against everything I believe in regard to finance. I received a circular saying that four churches were opposed to this type of lottery. Each of the churches mentioned in the circular uses lotteries when raising money for its own purposes, and I can see nothing wrong in that. Women do much good work in raising money for organizations. Someone knits a baby's suit to be raffled with tickets being sold at 6d. or 1s. In other cases cakes are raffled. All these raffles are illegal. If it continues, either the police are unaware of what is going on or they turn a blind eye to it. I doubt very much whether the police are trying to prevent it. We should not put on our Statute Book legislation that cannot be enforced or is not intended to be enforced. Mr. Frank Walsh spoke about houses and motorcars being prizes in the proposed lotteries. The Chief Secretary has power to prevent any attempt to exploit the public, but I am particularly interested in people who work for various organizations. At Renmark there is a motor cycle club and the only time it can function is on Sunday afternoon. Recently I heard a statement that people in the area should join the club for the purpose of being educated in the use of good manners on the road and in the principle of "Safety First." Suddenly the police stopped this Renmark Club from operating because it made a charge in order to raise funds. In nine cases out of ten charitable activities in the Renmark district benefited. This body is

doing a first-class job in the interests of young people, but because of legislation, which I do not support, it has been prevented from operating. Subsection (1) of new section 9a states:—

An application may be made to the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery in accordance with this section by any of the following bodies, namely, (a) Any club, the principal object of which is to carry on an outdoor sport or game and which makes no charge for admission to matches or contests and does not derive any income from any such charge.

I am not entirely in support of the Bill because it is too narrow and restrictive. More faith should be placed in the Chief Secretary, who is in a position to decide things much more easily than is proposed. There is visualized in the provision a club that does not make a charge at its functions. In a report presented to Parliament recently a magistrate pointed out that half the trouble with our young people was the lack of sporting and other functions to interest them. I think Mr. Frank Walsh had this in mind when he drafted the provision. He does not want a charge made. Perhaps he suggests a collection being taken up to meet expenses. Would it not be better to legalize what is taking place rather than have a policeman come along and say, "I must take your name because you are doing something illegal." I would rather legalise these things than have them done under the lap. Paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of new section 9a states:—

Any association or body of people carrying on any school or religious instruction, hospital, or other institution to assist the sick, the infirm, the aged, or the needy, so that such institution is not carried on for gain or profit to the individual members thereof.

Various institutions need financial assistance. The Minister of Education has from time to time publicly thanked the committees that are associated with our schools. He has said that without their help our education would not be at its present high standard. Is there one member in this Chamber who has not taken part in a school raffle or lottery? I have done so many times. Is there any member who has not taken part in a raffle or lottery to benefit a church? I have purchased innumerable tickets for this purpose and I do not feel that I have committed any great sin in doing so. If that is my biggest sin, then I am happy. Two years ago Mr. Frank Walsh moved to have lotteries held in South Australia for the purpose of financially assisting hospitals, but I would always oppose such a

move. Paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of section 9A states:—

Any association which is not carried on for the purpose of profit or gain to the individual members thereof and which carries on some other work or activity which, in the Chief Secretary's opinion, is charitable.

The reference to "in the Chief Secretary's opinion" is important. Now we come to another safeguard. Not only must the activity be charitable, but if in the Chief Secretary's opinion it does not come under the heading of a charitable organization he may not give his approval. So far I have been in accord with the provisions of the Bill, for I cannot see anything wrong with them. However, I am not happy about the next provision, which states:—

A club, association or body of persons shall not be granted more than one permit under this section in any financial year.

Why not? Perhaps the member for Goodwood (Mr. Frank Walsh) had in mind some big football club in the city. I am not particularly interested in city football clubs, but I am interested in small organizations in my district and throughout the country. Many people have helped certain organizations. Rather than have a clause stating only one permit may be granted in any financial year I would have a provision that a permit may be given to a body that the Chief Secretary thinks is a responsible body. For instance, if the Barmera Primary School Committee told the Chief Secretary it proposed to hold, as opportunity offered, various lotteries a permit should be given that would last a year. That is a responsible and reputable body, and it could then have as many lotteries as it thought the public would be prepared to subscribe to. What would be wrong with that? I ask the honourable member who introduced the Bill to consider that and in Committee I shall raise this point again. Then the Bill states:—  
An application for a permit shall not be granted unless the Chief Secretary is satisfied that the net proceeds of the lottery will be devoted to a purpose, work or activity such as mentioned in subsection (1).

Here we have another safeguard to prevent the public from being exploited by people professing to support charitable organizations but by the time the expenses are taken out little is left for the body supposed to be helped. I think that during the war Parliament passed somewhat similar legislation to protect people wishing to help the Red Cross. Many people in Adelaide promoted dances and other functions supposedly to help the Red Cross and so benefit our soldiers overseas.

but it was found that most of the money went to those who sponsored the functions and very little to the Red Cross. Under the provisions of this Bill that is safeguarded, and any person giving a baby's dress or a cake for a raffle must give it free of cost to the organization concerned.

Mr. Stephens—Couldn't that person take out the expenses?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I shall come to that later, but the net proceeds must be devoted to the purpose mentioned. Then the Bill states:—

No person will be engaged for hire or reward in the management or carrying on of the lottery.

This means that there will be no possibility of anyone building up some big organization under the guise of working for charity but at the same time charging for wages or salaries. The Bill also provides that no money prizes may be distributed in the lottery. There may be a point there, but I do not think it is a strong one. I do not see any difference between giving a motor car or a house and giving money. However, it is such a fine point that I am not prepared to argue it. Then the Bill states that a permit for a lottery shall not be granted unless the Chief Secretary is satisfied that at least nine-tenths of the members of the association or body of persons are resident in South Australia. I take it that that ensures that those who sponsor a lottery will be personally interested in the cause for which the lottery has been founded. Many people have done much to build up social undertakings that, for obvious reasons, the Government cannot enter into. The Bill makes legitimate a practice that has become accepted, and I cannot see how this will break down the morale of South Australians. I have mentioned the tremendous power of the Chief Secretary in safeguarding the people's interests, but clause 3(5) states:—

A fee of two pounds shall be paid to the Chief Secretary on every application for a permit under this section and one-half of the fee so paid shall be refunded if the application is not granted.

I am entirely opposed to that. That is far too much for the usual type of lottery or raffle. A fee of £2 could cut the profits by 50 per cent. There should be no charge for an application for a permit. Next we come to the punitive clauses of the Bill, and I am in agreement with them. The Bill states:—

A person who contravenes this section shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds.

Any person who wrongfully exploits the good nature of the people under the guise of helping some organization should be severely punished. This legislation makes legitimate what has become an accepted practice; therefore, we shall be making legal something that has brought the law into disrepute. I support the second reading, but I hope the Bill will be amended in certain directions in the Committee stages.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)—I pay a tribute to the member for Chaffey (Mr. Macgillivray) for his honest approach to this Bill, but I regret that the Government has not extended to me even normal courtesy in considering a private member's Bill. For the benefit of the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) in particular, I repeat that I do not regard this as really a lottery Bill. I have publicly stated that as long as I am on the Opposition side of the House I shall never introduce a Bill for a State lottery because I know its fate from the outset. The member for Stirling said he was sorry that this Bill had been called a lottery Bill. I, too, regret that, but that is the only way it could be described by way of title. From one organization I received a circular to which I replied that, if it was a good thing to raffle paintings on condition that the money raised be used to benefit the fine arts, I could see no objection to legalizing this method of assisting other worthy causes. There is no compulsion implied in my Bill. Referring to me, Mr. Jenkins said:—

I fail to see why he should be sorry it is called a lottery Bill, for it is a lottery Bill purely and simply, though he may want to whitewash it and hoodwink the public and honourable members.

In making out a weak case a person will frequently indulge in personal reflections. I have never tried to hoodwink, whitewash, or mislead other members, and I never will. My approach on all matters, whether popular or unpopular, is always honest and open, and Mr. Jenkins might have used a little more discretion. He says I am wrong when I say that the Bill would have no effect on the finances of this State, but it appears to me that the Government is willing to allow certain fund-raising methods to continue so that cheap revenue may be obtained by way of court actions against people who merely wish to do something in the interests of those who play organized sport.

In explaining the Bill I mentioned a certain organization, and the Government, if it opposed the Bill, should have pointed out any weak-

nesses in that regard. I am most sympathetic to those good citizens who undertake the responsibilities of secretary or treasurer in a cricket club or some other amateur sporting body. The club most successful in raising funds is that which does so by a method prohibited by the Lottery and Gaming Act, and the Premier probably knows of one or two such clubs. If we know that this kind of thing is going on, why don't we legalize it? My purpose in including proposed new section 9a (2) was to prevent commercializing of lotteries conducted by sporting and other bodies, and I consider that the provision should be given a trial.

I understand that the usual prize in a lottery is money, but my Bill provides for trophies as prizes. I am not foolish enough to think that the Bill is the answer to our fund-raising problems. I realize that many fine people are doing excellent work and donating much money towards charitable causes. I do not want to deny those people such opportunities, nor does this Bill seek to do so; I merely wish to make the path of worthy organizations easier. I ask Government members, particularly the member for Stirling, why a certain courtesy was denied me. Further, police records will show how much cheap revenue has been obtained from prosecutions under the Lottery and Gaming Act against people who desire to do something for various good causes.

The House divided on the second reading—

Ayes (9).—Messrs. Corcoran, Dunstan, Fletcher, Macgillivray, McAlees, Quirke, Stephens, Tapping, and Frank Walsh (teller).

Noes (20).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Jenkins, McIntosh, Millhouse, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford (teller), Riches, Shannon, Teusner, Travers, and White.

Majority of 11 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

#### STEELWORKS FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. O'Halloran.

(For wording of motion, see page 686.)

(Continued from September 21. Page 847.)

Mr. HUTCHENS—I support the motion. During the course of the debate we have heard a number of high sounding phrases such as low morality in public dealings and the fleching of rights that were given to private citi-

zens used for the very purpose of catching the ears of the press. These remarks came from certain learned gentlemen who make their living by defending those who offend against the rights of others. It is common practice for those people, when they have a weak case, to set out to destroy the characters of those who are charged with the responsibility of protecting the masses in order to defend those who have failed in their moral obligations, so it is not surprising that they should have adopted such an attitude on this motion. I do not agree with this type of attack, as I feel the debate should be argued on its merits without any endeavour to condemn those who are acting conscientiously in the interests of the people. I congratulate the honourable member for Mitcham, a young and new member of this Chamber, on so effectively advertising to the world that, while drawing a salary from State revenue for his Parliamentary duties, he is a lawyer who is practising and ready to receive a brief. This young and able man who has come into this House and made an impression in the short time he has been here will, in the not far distant future, sincerely regret the speech he made on this matter.

Those who have opposed the motion have gone to quite a deal of trouble to misconstrue its very purpose, to read into it something that is not there and to suggest that it has some purpose other than that set out, so I shall read it for those who are unable to understand it. The motion provides:—

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the urgency of the need for the establishment of a steelworks at or near Whyalla in the interests of the people of South Australia—

That is the point that has been missed willfully by those who opposed the measure.

in view of the failure of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to establish such steelworks within reasonable time in accordance with undertakings given in consideration of being granted leases of areas containing high grade iron ore on Eyre Peninsula, and in view of the necessity of developing the low grade ore deposits elsewhere on Eyre Peninsula in conjunction with the high grade ore contained in those areas for the economic operation of such steelworks and in order to ensure an adequate and continuous supply of ore thereto, the said leases should be terminated, the mining, transport and crushing plant operated by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in association with such leases should be acquired by the State and a joint committee of both Houses, with equal representation of the Government and the Opposition, should be appointed to advise the Parliament

on the future use and disposal of all iron ore on Eyre Peninsula so that all interests may be fully considered and fairly served in the distribution of same.

There has been a suggestion that if the motion is given effect to the company's works at Newcastle will be denied any iron ore from South Australia, but the motion says nothing of the kind; on the contrary, it says that a committee with equal representation of the Government and the Opposition shall give consideration to the distribution of this iron ore, and if it finds that it is wise in the interests of South Australia that the company should receive a quantity of the ore at a reasonable price, there is no reason why it should not. The company has received a good deal of praise from certain people and it has been suggested that the members of the Opposition have a particular dislike to it, but I do not support that. We realize that it has done much in the development of this State, and are prepared to give credit where it is due. Although it is interesting to look at what the company has done, how has it been done? How has it achieved what it has achieved at Newcastle and in other parts of New South Wales? It has only done it by its right to secure the raw materials, and it is the first to admit that fact.

The ACTING SPEAKER—Order! I ask honourable members not to converse aloud.

Mr. McALEES—On a point of order, I was going to ask that the honourable member be given the same opportunity as the honourable member for Torrens was given.

The ACTING SPEAKER—I remind the honourable member that I have dealt with the point of order he raised.

Mr. HUTCHENS—To establish that fact I quote an extract from *Iron and Steel*, a booklet issued by the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Limited in May, 1950, which contains the following:—

Assurance of an economic source of steel supply has resulted in many secondary industries, using steel as their essential raw material, being established throughout Australia. Probably the most spectacular evidence of this is furnished at Newcastle, N.S.W., now the most important industrial city in Australia, with the steelworks itself closely neighboured by kindred industries, a number of which are B.H.P. subsidiaries.

On the next page, under the heading of "Iron ore," the following appears:—

The iron ore used by the Newcastle Steel Works is hematite, which is the scientific name for what is really an oxide of iron,  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$ . Supplies were originally obtained from Iron Knob, 34 miles north-west of Whyalla, South Australia, but in recent years the adjacent Iron Monarch deposit has become the main

source of supply. Iron Monarch ore is of high grade averaging approximately 62 per cent iron. Readers will appreciate this measure of the ore's quality when they learn that ore of 70 per cent iron content is theoretically pure iron oxide.

It is admitted that the progress made by the company has been because the iron ore from South Australia is of such high quality, and there is no denying the fact. Later, the journal sets out the following:—

The main raw materials consumed on a weekly basis at the Newcastle Steel Works when on full production are:—coal, 31,000 tons; limestone, 6,700 tons; iron ore, 28,000 tons; fresh water, 18,000,000 gallons; salt water, 583,000,000 gallons.

These figures were taken from 1947 accounts, but I had the pleasure of visiting Newcastle works in 1953 with other people, when we were told that the consumption of coal had been considerably reduced over the last 20 years, in some cases by 50 per cent. The manager went to no end of trouble to explain this to the delegation, and to prove his point quoted the consumption of No. 1 blast furnace. Not only did he give us the figures but he repeated them on two other occasions so that we could correctly note them. He told us that that furnace used 1,200 tons of iron ore and 700 tons of coke, made from 980 tons of coal, each day. The honourable member for Burra (Mr. Hawker), in opposing the motion, said it was more costly to bring coal to South Australia than to take iron ore to New South Wales and that we need more coal than iron ore, but scientific research has made it possible for less coal than iron ore to be used at the Newcastle works. Surely the manager would know a little more about the manufacture of steel than the honourable member for Burra. Fifty years ago the site, which was chosen by David Baker, was a complete swamp. The plant began operation in 1913 with one blast furnace and three steel furnaces, and today the site occupies an area of 747 acres and there are 8,000 employees. All the company's activities, i.e., workshops collieries and associated industries, employ 17,230, and wages and salaries amount to £15,000,000 per annum. In addition there are 14 open hearth furnaces, five with a capacity of 135 tons and nine of 125 tons. Each furnace uses each week approximately:—

1,167 tons of molten iron.
417 tons of scrap iron.
133 tons of iron ore.
83 tons of limestone.
33 tons of dolomite.
20 tons of other materials.

---

1,853 tons.

And it is to be noted that 99 per cent of the ingredients used in making steel comes from South Australia. It would be wrong to say that this development is not a good thing; we know it is, but as a Parliament I feel that we must appreciate that the directors of this great company are charged with certain responsibilities, the first and foremost of which is to provide satisfactory dividends for the shareholders. This in turn demands that the public has to be convinced that the company is giving it some service. Having acknowledged that fact we must reach the conclusion that their foremost concern is profit and that all else is of secondary importance. We must ask ourselves then what are our responsibilities as members of Parliament. We are charged with the responsibility of serving the interests of the South Australian people; they are our shareholders, and it is evident that we desired, and had every reason to believe, that South Australia would have had steelworks long ere this. A Parliament of the past entered into an agreement in the full belief that a verbal undertaking would be honoured, and it is so much hollow talk to say that no such agreement was ever made.

In order to establish that point I shall quote extracts from *Hansard* of 1937, beginning at page 1079, the year in which the Indenture Act was passed. The Honourable R. L. (now Sir Richard) Butler was then Premier and he piloted the Bill through the House. In his second reading speech he had much to say, and I have picked out extracts that support my case, although if challenged I am prepared to read the whole of his speech. These are things he had to say:—

It has been my privilege to introduce many measures to this House but none has given me greater pleasure and none has been of greater significance or importance to South Australia than this Bill.

Over and over again throughout my travels abroad I found that the tendency was not to centralize defence but to decentralize. That is a policy which must ultimately be adopted throughout Australia.

The opposite course seems to have been the policy pursued in Australia; in fact, it has only been during the last year (mainly due to the attitude of South Australia) that not only the Commonwealth but the larger States realize the danger of continuing this policy of centralizing industries in practically two States of the Commonwealth.

At the same time South Australia is not without blame in the matter. We have lost many industries through lack of efficiency, initiative and capital.

We appeared to have some hazy idea that the establishment of secondary industries would

imperil the primary industries. There was failure to realize that these two great industries should go hand in hand and that so long as the primary industries are made our first consideration those engaged in that industry have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the establishment of secondary industries.

There is in my opinion no country in the world richer in all kinds of raw materials than is Australia.

I have pleasure in asking members to ratify the agreement with the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. for the establishment of a branch of its works at Whyalla. No words of mine are necessary to show the significance to South Australia of the proposals. I have only one regret and that is that our old friend, the late Mr. J. C. Fitzgerald, is not alive to see the realization of one of his dreams. Hardly a session went by when he did not make some reference to the necessity of iron and steel being manufactured in South Australia. During my many discussions the directors of the Broken Hill Pty. Co. have always been tremendously sympathetic to South Australia and have always expressed the hope that some day they would be able to do something on a large scale for this State. It was that desire which led me to write to them asking whether they would be prepared to establish a branch of their works here. Although for some time prior to this the company had been making investigations it immediately set aside a large number of its staff to formulate a definite scheme, and after some months of negotiations we succeeded in reaching the agreement which is now before the House. It is generally realized that iron and steel are key industries and that wherever they are established other industries must ultimately follow. If steel works had been established in South Australia I am certain that the sheet steel industry would have been located here. Even now I am of the opinion that if the Broken Hill Pty. Co. ultimately manufactures strip steel here a branch of the sheet steel works is within the bounds of practicable possibility, more particularly as the motor body industry is the biggest user of such steel. It is tremendously important and the actions of the whole world reveal it, that whenever a steelworks is established 101 other industries grow up around those works, especially subsidiary industries. I am certain that the establishment of this blast furnace will be followed by the establishment of steelworks and I can visualize the development in this State in connection with secondary industries. I am sure that every member will approach the question with that aspect in view. Not only should members consider what it gives to us today but what it will mean to South Australia in the future. It means a lot today to have a firm prepared to spend approximately £1,500,000 on the works set out in the agreement. Ultimately we can look for the establishment of steelworks. No matter to what part of any country we may go, it will be found that once a blast furnace has been established for the manufacture of pig iron, steelworks ultimately follow. That is a natural corollary.

The position is that blast furnaces for producing pig iron do not of themselves require a great deal of water and no large government water schemes are demanded for this purpose, in fact none; but it has been found in practice that the establishment of blast furnaces is commonly followed by the installation of coke ovens and steelworks, and these latter establishments require large quantities of water.

Clause 13 is the only clause in the agreement that deals with water, and it is somewhat nebulous in its operations. It reads:—

In order to assist the company to further extend its works by the establishment in the vicinity of Whyalla of coke oven plant and or works for the production of steel, rolling mills and other plant, the Government on being notified by the company that it is prepared to establish any such works will use every endeavour to provide the company with a supply of fresh water at the site of such works sufficient for the full requirements of the company at such fair and reasonable price as may be mutually agreed upon.

The company estimates that as time goes on it may require to use about 500 million gallons per annum or 10 million gallons a week

Mr. Lacey—We would have to put the water question beyond doubt.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—That is so.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—If we carry out our part of the undertaking the company should carry out its part.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—Yes. The company realizes the force and reasonableness of our arguments.

The directors of the company say that they would not like to attach their names to an agreement which they might not be able to carry out.

They informed the Government that they intended to establish steelworks an assurance would be given that the best endeavours would be made to provide an adequate water supply.

We shall not only get a return by way of royalty, as there is taxation to be taken into consideration, apart from the value of employment and the payment of huge sums in wages and salary.

I think the extracts I have read prove beyond doubt that the Parliament of that day was convinced out of the mouth of the Premier of the day that South Australia was to have a steelworks and rolling mill and all the subsidiary industries that go with them.

Mr. O'Halloran—Had it not been for that belief Parliament would not have passed the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so. No member would have the audacity to suggest that Sir Richard Butler would have told this House something he did not seriously believe. Today we are still without any indication from the company when this work will be undertaken.

As representatives of the people we must pay full regard to all that has happened. If we cannot depend on the words of people who enter into an agreement, we have every justification in breaking that agreement. We must do everything possible in the best interests of the people we represent. We have never suggested that the great works at Newcastle are not of value, but they are only capable, under full production, of producing 1,000,000 tons of ingot steel a year. Industrial development in Australia in recent years has been colossal and no industry can function without steel. In our modern civilization we cannot eat without using steel: We must use knives and forks. The greater the development of a country the greater the necessity for steel. We have been told that in 1960 we shall need at least 500,000,000 tons of steel. The B.H.P. Company is in a position to supply steel throughout Australia at a lower price than that demanded overseas by manufacturers, but only because of the high grade ore it receives from South Australia. We have been told that the company supplies steel throughout all parts of South Australia at the same price as in Newcastle, but the company's directors must endeavour to pay the highest dividend to its shareholders and if they can supply steel at Newcastle they will sell it there and as a result South Australia receives far less steel than it requires.

In the belief that the company would carry out its oral undertaking to establish steelworks Parliament agreed to supply water to Whyalla, and referred the project to the Public Works Committee. That committee, under the chairmanship of Sir George Jenkins, investigated the proposal to ascertain whether it was economically sound and whether the State would get some return from it. The committee's recommendations were:—

1. The provision of a water scheme to improve the water supply to the northern water district and the lands extending north of that district as far as Port Augusta and to furnish a supply of water to Whyalla for the purpose of enabling the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. to establish and operate steel and other plants.

2. That the water supply for such scheme be taken from the River Murray.

3. That the route of the pipeline required to supply the necessary water be that recommended by the Engineer in Chief and delineated on plan printed on page 9 of this report.

4. That the scheme described in this report as the major scheme and designed to supply 1,200 million gallons per annum to Whyalla and 900 million gallons per annum to the northern district, and estimated to cost £3,122,000 be adopted and undertaken.



It is obvious from the amount of water that was to be supplied that the Committee believed the company would establish a steel-works at Whyalla within a reasonable time. It is interesting to read the committee's report. On page 23 the following appears:—

The evidence of Messrs. Miles and Kleeman convinced the committee that Whyalla suffers from a definite shortage of water for domestic purposes. The committee desires to point out, however, that Whyalla's domestic need no matter how pressing, could not possibly warrant the provision of an extensive supply from the Murray River. It is obvious that only a large industrial enterprise could absorb and pay for water in sufficient quantities and at a reasonably remunerative rate as to bring within the realm of practicability a pipeline supply pumped from a source 240 miles away.

The works of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company at Whyalla comprise such an enterprise, and, in consequence, the committee sought from the company an expression of opinion regarding its existing water requirements at Whyalla, the possibilities of development, and the revenues that would be likely to accrue to the State if it were to supply Whyalla with Murray River water. The committee, therefore, submitted a number of questions to the company. The questionnaire and the company's replies are set out below:—

1. Does the company intend to establish industries at Whyalla that will require a supply of fresh water?

Answer—The company has agreed in principle to the establishment of a ship building yard at Whyalla and has already made financial commitments in this connection. Further, it is hoped that some time in the future a steelworks may be established at Whyalla. A decision in this latter regard will depend upon future determining factors, such as local and general market conditions.

2. If so, what are the industries and what is the maximum quantity of water the company is likely to require?

Answer—Should ship building be actively carried out at Whyalla, it is anticipated that the increased population from such an industry, together with the consumption resulting from the blast furnace plant and the township, would total approximately 2,500,000galls. per week with an assured supply of good fresh water. When and if a steel plant were established, it is estimated that the making and rolling of 5,000 tons of ingots per week would require an additional 5,000,000galls. per week. Increased township requirements to cater for 2,000 steel plant employees (say 5,000 persons) would be 2,000,000galls. per week, representing a total requirement of 9,500,000galls. per week, say 10,000,000galls. per week. Therefore, with an assured and adequate supply of fresh water it is assumed our annual requirements would be:—(a) with ship building established 130,000,000galls.; (b) for a steel plant with a capacity of 5,000 tons per week—520,000,000 galls. It must be stressed that these figures do not take into account the following factors:—

1. Sewerage system.
2. Growth of steel plant beyond the 5,000 tons indicated.
3. Establishment of other industries.

The company has done nothing to assure that there will be an early commencement in the provision of steelworks at or near Whyalla. If it indicated that there would be an early commencement everyone in the State would be happy and be pleased to forget about the Opposition's motion. However, we have a duty to perform and therefore are making this move. In case the evidence I have already submitted is not sufficient to establish that Parliament was of opinion that the company intended to establish steelworks after the passing of the Indenture Act, we should examine some of the remarks made during the debate on the Bill. I consider they are of vital importance and should not be forgotten by the people of South Australia. The following are extracts from the debate on the Whyalla Water Supply Bill on August 22, 1940:—

The Hon. T. Playford—I have been informed that steelworks must receive consideration in the future, but that the company was not in a position at this time to give any definite assurance of their establishment . . .

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—If the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited decided to establish steelworks at Whyalla it could under this clause get the benefit of the lower tariff.

On page 366 of *Hansard* of August 27, 1940, appears the following extracts from the debate on the Northern Areas and Whyalla Water Supply Bill:—

The Hon. R. S. Richards—But I think that if they listen to what I say they will realise that all the benefits have not come from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited but that this State has given the company wide concessions which has enabled it to enhance its position as an industrial corporation and to increase its profits, not only in South Australia, but from its activities in other States.

This being so, I think the Premier ought to ask the company for something more definite than is contained in Mr. Darling's letter referred to in the report of the Public Works Committee's saying in effect, "Look at the amount of money we have spent over there and draw your own conclusions as to whether we intend to erect steel mills or not."

The economics of smelting have so far altered since the company commenced shipping iron ore to New South Wales that it has found it more economical to bring coal or coke to Whyalla than to take the ore away. The general manager stated in evidence before the Select Committee on the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited's Indenture Bill that after the company had established a blast furnace, coke ovens and steel mills, there would be subsidiary industries at Port Augusta, Port

Pirie and Wallaroo, but strangely enough the six members who represented those places all belong to one Party.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins had this to say at page 439 of *Hansard* of September 3, 1940:—

When negotiations were opened the company asked the engineers to provide 500,000,000 gallons of water a year. At that time this was considered sufficient to provide the requirements of the tin plate works then contemplated, the requirements of the blast furnace and the population which would be carried at Whyalla as a result of tin plate works being established. Later, the company increased its request to 1,000,000,000 gallons a year and the present proposal goes a little further because of the likelihood of other industries being established following the establishment of a steel rolling mill and possibly a tin plate mill as well. The committee therefore recommended a scheme that would enable the Engineering and Water Supply Department to supply 1,200,000,000 gallons so that over and above the 1,000,000,000 gallons asked for by the company there would be a reserve of 200,000,000 gallons. Taking a long view of the question, I think honourable members in considering a scheme of this magnitude will agree that it would be unwise to make provision only for what would be sufficient to meet immediate requirements. As the committee's report will indicate the original scheme considered was for the supply of 500,000,000 gallons a year to Whyalla. It was known as the minor scheme. Later the committee examined the scheme now recommended—the major scheme—which provides for the supply of 1,200,000,000 gallons a year to Whyalla.

The Government would need to be extremely careful in reducing any water charges under the clause unless it were definitely established that some industry, not foreseen under this legislation and requiring a large quantity of water, would be established at Whyalla. Throughout the inquiry, and even before it was instituted when Parliament first considered the erection of a blast furnace at Whyalla, the establishment of steelworks had always been envisaged. I think members of the Public Works Committee are unanimously of the opinion that steelworks will ultimately be established at Whyalla. If the company decided to erect steelworks there the Government would have to carefully consider the question before reducing the price of water. I think members of the Public Works Committee believe that the charge as recommended in the Bill is fair, having regard to the possible establishment of steelworks.

The company took the view that it was not its place to supply the people with water. During negotiations with the company's representatives—Mr. Jones and Mr. Harold Darling (Chairman of Directors)—we found they were prepared to place their cards on the table and discuss the matter fairly. On leaving the committee room Mr. Darling said, "We are desperately in need of water at Whyalla." The question arose whether we should recommend the work unless the company gave a definite assurance to establish steelworks at

Whyalla. The committee examined Mr. Jones and Mr. Darling very closely on that point. The witnesses pointed out that Australia was at war and the company did not know what would happen. They said the company could not give any definite assurance to the committee that the industry would be established. We had to face the possibility of risking the expenditure of a large sum of money in supplying Whyalla with water to enable industries to be established, or consider whether we should wait until the company desired to establish them. If we adopt the latter policy I feel we shall not get those industries because, with the further development of the steel industry in Australia and the demands for steel from other parts of the world, they will go where there is an assured supply of water as they can establish steelworks in 12 months and we could not provide them with a water supply in much under three years. Mr. Jones, the representative of the company, was asked how long it would take to establish steelworks at Whyalla and he said, "Twelve months." I asked him whether he thought the Government would be justified in taking a gamble in spending over £3,000,000 to provide Whyalla with water without any assurance that steel works would be established and his reply was that the company had taken much bigger risks than that. We must take that risk if we want those industries to come here. It is useless to say, "If you establish steelworks at Whyalla we will supply the water," because the requirements of the industry may demand the establishment of the works within 12 months and we could not supply the water in much less than three years. As the result of its inquiry the committee is convinced that a company which is spending such vast sums as this company is spending at Whyalla in the construction of harbour facilities and the reclamation of land will not do so simply to carry on ship building and a blast furnace, but that it must obviously have in view the establishment of other industries. That being so I commend the Bill to the House in the belief that it will contribute to the future industrial development of the State and assure the northern water districts of a supply of good water for a long time to come.

It all adds up to the conclusion, despite what Mr. Millhouse said, that previous Parliaments firmly believed the company gave a verbal undertaking to establish steelworks at Whyalla of a size to meet requirements and recompense the public for the money spent by the State. A query was raised, whether there was a need to establish steelworks here, but they have been proved to be necessary. Mr. Shannon said, in effect, that every civil servant should be denied his civil rights and should hold his tongue. He said that because Mr. Dickinson, Director of Mines, was bold enough to speak for the people.

Mr. Riches—It was mighty good when he spoke in favour of a pyrites industry at Nairne.

Mr. HUTCHENS—His views on that matter were accepted, but when he speaks in a way that does not please some people they say that he should have held his tongue. More members of our Public Service should speak out and let us know the true position. Mr. Dickinson said it was necessary to take action in this matter so vital to South Australia. Much money was spent in providing water to meet the needs of the Company at Whyalla. Mr. Dickinson has made it clear that there is sufficient iron ore in this State to establish other steelworks at Whyalla, and at the same time supply the needs of the B.H.P. Company. If something is not done to acquire these high grade ore deposits we will pass on to posterity a folly committed by the present generation. In the future it will be necessary for low grade ore to be used in the manufacture of steel which will increase the price of the finished article. In 1953 this House agreed unanimously that it was essential to establish steelworks in South Australia but since then

the Government has given no assurance that substantial action will be taken to give to the people what is rightly theirs. That is why this motion has been introduced. It gives the Government an opportunity to declare itself and I challenge it to do so. I believe it has no policy whatever for the establishment of steelworks in South Australia. It is humbly and weakly accepting the refusal of the company to honour an agreement that was surely made and confessed by people in this House of the Government's political colour. It behoves the Government to say, "We demand for the people what is rightly theirs so that the State can progress through the establishment of steelworks."

Mr. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 29, at 2 p.m.