

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, September 29, 1955.

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

SENATE VACANCY.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated that the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia, in accordance with section 21 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, had informed him that in consequence of the death on September 14, 1955, of Senator the Honourable George McLeay, a vacancy had happened in the representation of South Australia in the Senate of the Commonwealth. The Lieutenant-Governor had been advised that, by such vacancy having happened, the place of the Senator had become vacant before the expiration of his term within the meaning of section 15 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, and that such place must be filled by the Houses of Parliament, sitting and voting together, choosing a person to hold it in accordance with that provision of the said section.

Later:

The **SPEAKER**—I have received an intimation from the President of the Legislative Council that he proposes to call a joint meeting of the two houses in the Legislative Council Chamber on Tuesday, October 11, at 12 o'clock noon, for the purpose of choosing a person to fill the vacancy in the Senate caused by the death of Senator the Honourable George McLeay.

Mr. **RICHES**—There are some members who have commitments in their districts on Monday and whose train services do not permit their arriving in Adelaide by 12 noon Tuesday. As most members would like to exercise their vote in this matter, could you, Mr. Speaker, ask that the time be altered?

THE **SPEAKER**—It has been the custom on previous occasions to hold the joint meeting at noon, but I will convey the honourable member's request to the President.

Mr. **DAVIS**—Would it be possible, Mr. Speaker, to hold the meeting at noon on a Wednesday?

The **SPEAKER**—I will also convey that request to the President.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated, by message, his assent to the Draught Stallions Act Repeal, Public Works

Standing Committee Act Amendment, Dairy Cattle Improvement Act Amendment and Prices Act Amendment Acts.

QUESTIONS.**RADIUM HILL WATER SUPPLY.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand that from 4 to 4½ years ago some discussion took place between the then Chief Engineer of the Railways Department and a contractor, who had done considerable work on railway water schemes in the north-east, as to the advisability of enlarging No. 1 and No. 2 railway dams at Mingary in order to provide some water for Radium Hill. Can the Minister of Works say whether the matter has been pursued any further and whether any investigations have been made as to the practicability of the scheme?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Since relinquishing the position of Minister of Railways naturally I have not been in touch with the latest developments, but I will get a reply from the Minister of Railways and bring it down, probably on Tuesday of next week.

IMPORT RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—My question relates to the headlines in this morning's press about the wide impact of import restrictions. In South Australia we have a large motor car industry, and associated with it are a number of secondary industries which import parts that are later incorporated in motor cars. Can the Premier say what effect the import restrictions will have on the motor car industry in this State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I reply solely in regard to the manufacturing side of the industry. In South Australia we have two principal firms. General Motors-Holdens produce an almost entirely Australian car; Chrysler Dodge, I understand, produce a car that contains over 80 per cent components of Australian production. The restrictions, as announced in the press, appear to fall most heavily on the completed car, much more heavily on cars that are not assembled than on minor parts that come in. I have had no communication from the manufacturing side of the motor car industry on this matter, but I imagine that the proposition would not cause it undue hardship.

TAILEM BEND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. WHITE—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked a few days ago about the supply of alternating current to Tailem Bend?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member asked when it would be possible for the Electricity Trust to supply Tailm Bend with alternating current. I conferred with the chairman of the trust, who informed me that it is still having considerable difficulty in getting sufficient steel and mechanical appliances for the extensions it has approved. It is not possible for him to give any undertaking that electricity will be available at Tailm Bend inside of 12 months.

SECOND CITY OVAL.

Mr. LAWN—There is some controversy over the proposed establishment of a second oval in the Adelaide parklands. I do not wish to be associated with representations either for or against the proposal, but it is well known that the Adelaide Oval is not up to the standard required by certain international associations and that the South Australian Cricket Association is not erecting additional stands. I ask the Premier whether the Government has considered the establishment of a second oval.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Some questions have been asked in another place on this matter and an opinion was obtained from the Crown Solicitor on the powers of the Adelaide City Council. I think a full report of the opinion was published on the front page of today's *Advertiser*, but I did not obtain that opinion. I regard this question as one of purely academic interest because when I saw that the cost of the proposed oval would be £480,000 I predicted that the City Council would not go ahead with it and that in 10 years the matter would still be under discussion. A cost of that magnitude would inevitably mean a fairly steep increase in city rates, so I think most people would go cold on the proposal. I do not think the honourable member will have to abandon his neutral position in this matter.

Mr. LAWN—This morning's *Advertiser* reports a statement made by the Attorney-General in the Legislative Council yesterday conveying the opinion of the Crown Law Office regarding the Adelaide City Council's power to set aside a portion of the parklands for an oval. The press statement said that the council had a certain power to close an area of up to 10 acres, and then went on:—

This, however, did not include the right to fence off a large area of the parklands for the construction of an arena into which the public would be admitted only on special occasions, and usually on the payment of a fee.

I understand that the Adelaide Oval has a greater area than 10 acres and that the public

are admitted to it only on special occasions, when a fee is charged. Will the Premier explain the position in regard to the Adelaide Oval?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Adelaide Oval was established by the passage of a special Act. No other oval, in the opinion of the Crown Solicitor—and the Government agrees—can be established in any part of the parklands without the approval of Parliament. The Government has had no request from the city council for a special Act and it does not expect to get one, but if one is received I think it is extremely doubtful whether the Government would ask Parliament to approve the proposal.

RADAR IN FISHING INDUSTRY.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Agriculture anything further to report regarding the question I asked last week about the use of radar to assist our fishing industry?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I do not think we have radar actually in use, for that is highly complicated and technical equipment, but we have what is known as echo-sounding equipment, and I think the visitor from abroad who referred to this matter was speaking of echo-sounding, though his remarks were associated with radar as well. At any rate, the position is rather better than I thought it was when I gave my previous reply. The Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game reports:—

Depth recorders are now known to have been installed on four of our crayfish cutters as well as the one aboard Haldanes' *Tacoma*. Mention of these installations was made at page 4 of my annual report under the heading Improvements and Alterations. A fifth recorder is being installed on another crayfish cutter that will soon be ready for sea. Recorders help to eliminate the hit and miss setting of crayfish pots by showing fishermen the type of bottom over which they are operating. Sand is useless country; it is on the rocky bottom that crayfish are found. According to reports from Victoria entirely new crayfish grounds are being discovered since the installation of depth recorders.

ARCHITECT-IN-CHIEF'S WORKSHOP.

Mr. FRED WALSH—A fortnight ago I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning the construction of a workshop for the Architect-in-Chief's Department to take the place of the one that was burnt down last year. With all respect, I think he mixed up my question, for I was inquiring about the reconstruction of the workshop not on the old burnt-out site but as to the department's intention to construct a workshop, as has been publicly stated, in the Netley area?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think there may have been some confusion, but I did not mix up the question because I said it was not the present intention to reconstruct the workshops on the old site, but that the Government had secured temporary accommodation at Finsbury and, as the honourable member stated, land was purchased at Netley for the purpose. I followed up the question and the following is the latest information I have:—A full report is being prepared by the Architect-in-Chief in regard to the erection of a new workshop at Netley for the manufacture of furniture and joinery. The submission of this report has been delayed because of shortage of architectural staff and the necessity to apply our available staff resources to essential work in our heavy programme of hospitals and schools. The conditions under which the employees have been required to work at Keswick are far from good and it is to the credit of those employees that, recognizing the department's staffing difficulties, they have been prepared to put up with poor conditions. It is likely that the estimated cost of a new workshop at Netley will exceed £100,000 and when the Architect-in-Chief's report thereon is received, I will submit the project to Cabinet with a view to its reference to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation and report.

BUS SERVICES FOR NORTH-EASTERN SUBURBS.

Mr. JENNINGS—The Tramways Trust intends in the near future to establish new bus services between Hyde Park and Northfield and between Hyde Park and Gilles Plains, both of which will supplant certain existing tram routes. It also proposes a variation of the present bus route through the suburbs of Medindie, Nailsworth, and Broadview. The proposed new route, although undoubtedly advantageous to some residents, is equally disadvantageous to others who are now enjoying a good service and who will lose it under the trust's proposal. Further, the proposed new road is not nearly so convenient to students attending schools in the Nailsworth area. The proposed change has, not unnaturally, agitated residents who are affected, with the result that a petition was circulated and signed by no less than 644 residents, and I have been asked to read it to Parliament.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot deal with a petition in this way; a certain procedure must be adopted.

Mr. JENNINGS—I am not presenting the petition to Parliament, Mr. Speaker. I am merely reading it in explanation of my question.

The SPEAKER—I do not think the honourable member should do that.

Mr. JENNINGS—Am I in order, then, Mr. Speaker, in explanation of my question, giving the House the prayer in the petition?

The SPEAKER—I do not think so. I have not seen it, but there is special provision for petitions and I would not think we should deal with this one in that way.

Mr. JENNINGS—Then in explaining my question I shall summarize the petition. "We, the undersigned residents of Broadview, Nailsworth—"

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have just ruled that the petition should not be read, and I think the honourable member's proceeding to read it is a flat contradiction of your authority.

The SPEAKER—I did not know the honourable member was reading it. That may not be done.

Mr. JENNINGS—The petition states that the proposed route is favourable to some residents of the area, but not to many of those at present enjoying a good service, and that it will cause inconvenience to students of certain schools and kindergartens in that area. It therefore asks—

The Hon. T. Playford—Question!

The SPEAKER—The honourable member must now ask his question.

Mr. JENNINGS—Will the Minister of Works be good enough—if he has not been good enough, in the past—to bring the contents of this petition, together with my interrupted representations, to the attention of the general manager of the trust for consideration?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—You have already ruled, Mr. Speaker, that a petition should be presented and read as such, and if this one is in conformity with the requirements of Standing Orders I suggest that it be presented to Parliament, and thereafter any member, by notice or otherwise, may direct a question thereon and the appropriate Minister, and Cabinet, will certainly give it every consideration.

Mr. JENNINGS—The Minister of Works may recall that recently I addressed a question to him concerning the alteration of the bus

route through certain northern suburbs. Will he be good enough to take up with the general manager of the Tramways Trust the fact that I have received a petition signed by 644 residents who are unfavourably affected by the proposed new route and ask whether the general manager can make available some alternative transport service to the people who are so disadvantageously affected?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I again suggest that if the petition is addressed to Parliament—

Mr. Jennings—It is not addressed to Parliament.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—If it is addressed to the Tramways Trust I shall be glad to receive it and take it to the trust to see whether it is possible to do anything in the interests of these petitioners.

SCHOOL STAFFING.

Mr. RICHES—At a school in Port Augusta this week I was informed by the head teacher that owing to sickness staff shortages were so acute that he was faced with the necessity of either sending children home or trying to teach a class of 120 himself. This situation often arises in one or other of the Port Augusta schools where so many married women teachers are engaged on the staff, and representations have been made from time to time that an additional appointment be made to the staff of one of the schools so that that teacher could be available for relieving in the district. Will the Minister of Education consider that request and obtain a statement on the staffing situation generally, because in my district it would appear that it has never been worse?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Firstly, there is a relieving staff generally and when, owing to sickness or other misadventure, a teacher at a particular school is not available a member of the relieving staff is sent there as soon as practicable. With the greatest respect to the headmaster of the Port Augusta school, I suggest that he communicate with his immediate superior, the Director, or me, rather than approach a member of Parliament, and he would then get a more expeditious reply and much earlier relief. I do not deny—nor do I desire to deny—that there is a shortage of teachers; there is a grave shortage throughout South Australia and I am doing my best to try to remedy that as soon as possible by the recruitment of teachers in South Australia, other States and abroad, and also by the slower but best method—the recruitment of young people to the teaching profession.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In reply to my question yesterday the Minister of Works said that the flood on the River Murray this year would be as high as, if not higher than that of 1952. There are only two crossings on the Upper Murray that remain open during floods—Waikerie and Lyrup—and Waikerie settlers and others, including the drivers of interstate transports, had hoped that when the crossing at Kingston was out of action the large punt there would be transferred to the Waikerie crossing, which has a small punt at present. Further, the settlers asked that the road leading from the Waikerie crossing for a distance of eight miles be put in order while the big plant being used on the Barmora-Morgan road north of the river was still available. Can the Minister give any information on those two points, which would affect the use of the Waikerie crossing?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—My information is not so much about the road at the Waikerie crossing as about the road at the Paringa crossing, because the honourable member's previous question mainly related to the road across Paringa Paddock. I have a reply regarding that, but no up-to-date information concerning the Waikerie crossing. The Commissioner of Highways states:—

Recently when it was known that the river would rise to a fairly high level this year, the department was advised by the secretary of the Renmark Irrigation Trust that his organization would not be able to assist in keeping the road open. Arrangements were therefore made with the district council of Paringa to construct banks, and this work is now in hand. Providing the flood is not higher than that of 1952, it is anticipated that it will be possible to keep this section of the Sturt Highway open for traffic.

On present indications it might be 3in. above, but that can be affected by intervening winds and rains. The report continues:—

If the river rises to the same level as in 1952, it will not be possible to keep open that portion of the Sturt Highway between Kingston and Cobdogla, nor the Bookpurnong section of the Loxton-Berri main road. A bank is, however, being constructed alongside portion of the Loxton-Berri main road near the Berri ferry to give access to the residents from Gurrui to Berri.

I will take up the other aspects of the honourable member's question.

WEST BEACH FATALITY.

Mr. STOTT—Shortly before the arrival of a plane from Melbourne last night a shocking accident happened near the approach to the West Beach aerodrome and a motor cyclist was

killed instantaneously. It was unofficially suggested that loose metal on the approach to the aerodrome caused the motor cycle to get out of control and the rider fractured his skull. Will the Premier take this matter up with the appropriate authority to see whether the approach to the aerodrome can be repaired in order to prevent further accidents?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no information concerning the accident mentioned but I will ask the Chief Secretary to ascertain from the Police Department whether it has any information as to the cause of the accident, and if the cause can be remedied I will see that it is. Unfortunately so many accidents today—and I am not referring to the accident in question—are due to high speed, and that cannot be remedied even by making roads better because so frequently that leads to higher speed. Some of the most unfortunate accidents occur on open roads which are good and traffickable.

KINGSTON JETTY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Recently I made representations to the Minister of Works on behalf of residents of Kingston concerning repairs to that portion of the Kingston jetty between the first and second landing. However, the Harbors Board has decided, notwithstanding those representations, that this portion of the jetty serves no purpose and will be demolished. Kingston residents are opposed to this proposal and have approached me to ask the Minister to intervene with a view to deferring any action the Harbors Board may contemplate in connection with that demolition until the Kingston district council, the local Chamber of Commerce and fishermen can make a further approach to the Minister. Will the Minister take up this matter with the Harbors Board?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—There is nothing I hate more on the face of God's earth than the demolition of something people have had. In this case the jetty, through time and weather, has deteriorated to such a state of disrepair that the Harbors Board decided that only the first 930ft. should be reconstructed and the remaining portion demolished. The portion between the first and second landings is not used except perhaps by some night fishermen. The Government did suggest that there should be a southern port, but it was not to be at that particular spot. I will have the demolition deferred until further communications take place between the board, the Minister, and local residents.

BRIGHT STEEL PLANT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "State to get £3m. Steel Plant," it is reported that a steel plant will be established at Kilburn. The article mentions Geo. H. Martin Pty. Ltd., and Bright Steels Pty. Ltd., of Sydney. Can the Premier indicate whether this will be a steel rolling mill requiring billet steel and, if so, where those supplies will be obtained from?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I understand the company concerned is the largest manufacturer of bright steel shafting in Australia, and it is a material of high quality and not of the normal type. I do not know where the firm obtains its initial supplies at present but I presume it is from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company which would produce the type of material required, at its works at Port Kembla and Newcastle, probably to the specification of this firm.

TEACHERS' EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Will the Minister of Education say whether he has any objection to teachers discussing their educational problems with the member for the district and seeking his assistance and guidance?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have no personal objection, but that is contrary to regulations and I think it would be better in the first instance for the teachers to seek remedies from the Director of Education.

SPARE PARTS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Last week I drew the Premier's attention to the case of a city motor firm that was unable to supply spare parts for a truck it had sold because of the restrictions imposed by the Commonwealth. In reply the Premier said he feared the restrictions were to be increased and that the quotas would be limited. I gathered that the Premier favoured an adequate supply of spare parts being brought in to keep equipment in operation. In view of the statement on restrictions in today's *Advertiser*, will the Premier say whether he has taken up the matter with the responsible Minister and, if not, will he do so?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have asked for information so that I can take it up with the Minister, as promised. From information I have had since the question was asked I believe the quota expressed by the Commonwealth is in accordance with a base period. I have given some consideration to the matter and the probable Commonwealth answer will be that the firm in question has had its quota but has

used it in importing new equipment rather than supplies to maintain old equipment. As far as I can understand, there is no restriction on the importation of new parts or parts to service vehicles already on the road. I think it is a matter of judgment on the part of the firm itself whether it imports new parts or parts of the type mentioned by the honourable member. I will have the matter thoroughly investigated and let the honourable member have a reply in due course.

RACING OFFENCES.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Earlier this session I referred to an allegation that a jockey had used a battery at the Morphetville racecourse. Subsequently the police took action against two persons resident in Victoria. An application for an extradition order was granted, but an appeal against it was upheld. I understand the matter has now gone to a higher authority. That was some time ago and in the meantime we have heard nothing further. I wonder whether it has been allowed to lapse. Can the Premier give any information as to the present position?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The last time this matter came under the notice of the Government was when the Attorney-General received advice from the Crown Solicitor that the State should appeal to the High Court in the matter. As far as I know that appeal is proceeding.

ROAD-MAKING COSTS.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on September 20 regarding road-making costs?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have received a reply from the Minister of Roads. The honourable member asked a question regarding the cost of using stabilized material in building up our roads and I said that it was not an entirely new process in South Australia because it had been tried in many places. I have received the following report on the matter:—

The Commissioner of Highways states that the stabilization method of road construction is not new to his department. In recent years a number of stabilizing machines have been manufactured and under certain conditions are used extensively in many parts of the world. The department has used the three common methods of stabilization, namely—

- (1) Mechanical, by mixing non-plastic and plastic materials, *e.g.*, the road between Moonta and Maitland.
- (2) Cement, by the mixing of cement with natural soils or other local materials,

e.g., section of the Lincoln Highway, and aerodromes at Port Pirie and Gawler.

- (3) Bituminous, by the mixing of bituminous emulsion with natural soils or other local materials, *e.g.*, the Coorong section of the Main South-Eastern Road, and section of the Port Lincoln-Cummins Road between Wanilla and Edillilie. Further sections by this method will be undertaken during this year.

Any form of stabilization applies only to the construction of the pavement and does not include the cost of earthworks or final bituminous surface treatment. Also many natural soils and/or local materials cannot be satisfactorily stabilized. Stabilization can be much more satisfactorily done with a machine designed for the purpose, but as the purchase of such a machine for the department is not warranted, stabilization work has been recently let by contract. On the basis of contracts let by the department the cost of processing alone, which does not include formation, supply of stabilization material, compaction or surface treatment, approximates 12s. a foot for 33ft. width of road. It is understood that this figure has recently been reduced to local authorities for suburban streets. For departmental country works the stabilization method of pavement construction is more economical only when local supplies of crushed stone are not available, although the reverse may be the case when dealing with large areas in suburban streets.

BRITISH MARKETS FOR AUSTRALIAN PRODUCE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Today's *Advertiser* states that the Australian and New Zealand representative of the Manchester Ship Canal Company (Mr. N. V. Wade) said yesterday that exports of Australian produce could be increased substantially if the huge potential market in the Midlands and north-west of England were fully exploited. He said that Australia already had the goodwill of traders and consumers in these areas and that if shipments could be made direct to Manchester a saving in freight and handling charges would be effected. He also said:—

Little Australian meat was sold in Manchester, and a mere trickle of Australian dried fruits went there. Butter and cheese identified as Australian were rarely seen in grocers shops in the north of England. Tinned fruits, tinned meats, tomato products, soups and milk could be sold in far greater volume if imaginative, hard-hitting publicity were used.

Has the Premier's attention been drawn to that news item and will he see whether it is possible to increase the sale of the commodities mentioned by Mr. Wade, which are mainly produced in surplus in South Australia, by adopting his suggestions?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Most of the items mentioned are sold either through boards

or through private channels, but I agree that Australia's advertising in the Old Country, particularly outside the metropolitan areas, is very inadequate. I believe that Australia must give a great deal of consideration to advertising in England because the time has passed when we can expect people coming here looking for bargains. We must step up our selling organization to the highest possible pitch and see that our advertising is effective and intelligent and is followed up by the delivery of high-quality goods at the cheapest possible price. Of course, these matters are all primarily Commonwealth responsibilities, and I will see that the Prime Minister has a copy of the honourable member's question and the article to which he referred.

TRAMWAYS TRUST REPORT.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about the report that the American firm of consulting engineers, DeLeuw, Cather & Coy. of Chicago, made to the Tramways Trust about two years ago?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I took up the question with the trust and was advised by telephone that it proposes to make the report available, together with further correspondence that took place between it and the Government at the time. The statement I made last week was correct, namely, that the report was made available to members at the time, but so that the House may have all the information before it I propose to bring down all the reports next week and lay them upon the table, though I do not propose to have reprinted those papers that have already been printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LOTTERY AND GAMING BILL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—According to a report in this morning's press it seems that I gave a wrong impression when speaking on the Lottery and Gaming Bill yesterday. What I intended to convey was that as long as I am on the Opposition side of the House I shall never introduce a Bill for a State lottery.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SCHOOL STAFFING.

Mr. RICHES—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

Mr. RICHES—In connection with a question I asked earlier this afternoon, the teacher concerned was a teacher at Port Augusta, but not

a teacher at the Port Augusta primary school. He is the head teacher at the Willesden school and he made representations to the Education Department in the first instance but was advised that the department did not have a teacher to send, although it was sympathetic. The approach to the Minister by way of question was made on my own responsibility following on the situation that had arisen. It prompted me to ask the Minister if he could make an overall statement to the House following on the statement he made earlier that he thought the Teachers Institute had exaggerated the shortage of teachers.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 887.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—This Bill makes certain slight amendments to the provisions of the Supreme Court Act so as to make it clear that an acting judge can carry on to clear up the business before him when his appointment has expired, and that a commissioner appointed to a Circuit Court may adjourn his cases from place to place and from time to time. This is a necessary measure to tidy up the legislation and put the powers of an acting judge or a commissioner beyond doubt and to save the State from a recurrence of the unfortunate position such as arose in the early days of the colony when a judge, believing that other judges were not properly appointed, invalidated some of their judgments. Legislation was required to overcome that difficulty. The proposal is unexceptionable, and I think it will receive the support of all members.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes amendments of the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act relating to three topics—namely, refusal of licences, zoning of retail milk deliveries, and the sale of reconstituted milk. I will deal with these matters in the order in which they occur in the Bill.

Clause 3 deals with the power of the board to refuse a licence to an applicant whose premises, plant or livestock do not comply with the Act. Under the present law in every case where the premises, plant or livestock are below the prescribed standard, the board, must, unless it is willing to grant the licence, give the applicant notice of the defects and cannot refuse the licence unless after the expiration of three months the defects still remain. During these three months the applicant is deemed to be licensed and is entitled to all the privileges of a licensed person.

These provisions were inserted in the original Act to protect producers supplying milk to the metropolitan area when the Act came into force. No doubt they were justified when the metropolitan milk scheme was introduced, but today they are a source of considerable concern to the board. They make it possible for substandard premises to be used for a considerable period, since a series of applications can be made in respect of the same premises, and each application gives three months' exemption from the Act.

Difficulty only arises in connection with new applications. There is no trouble as regards licences granted by way of renewals because the board does not refuse applications for renewals even where the premises are defective. In these cases the practice is to grant the renewal but serve a notice on the proprietor requiring him to remedy the defects. If the notice is not complied with the licence can be cancelled. But as regards premises not previously licensed or premises of which the licence has lapsed there is now no good argument for treating them as licensed for three months in every case where an application is made. In such cases the board desires power either to refuse the licence or to grant a provisional licence. If the board had this power licences for seriously defective premises could be refused, and the applicant could only make a fresh application after the premises had been put in order.

If, however, premises were defective only in a minor degree the board could grant a provisional licence which would enable the proprietor to carry on as a licensed producer for a specified period. Such a licence would set out what had to be done in order to put the premises in order and if the requirements were carried out an ordinary licence would be granted. If the work was not done during the currency of the provisional licence, that licence would lapse and the application would be regarded as having been refused. It will

be seen that the main difference between the scheme proposed in clause 3 and the provisions of the present Act is that under the clause there will be no automatic licensing of defective premises.

Clause 4 deals with reconstituted milk. Reconstituted milk is milk made from dried milk mixed with water or dried skim milk mixed with butter or butterfat and water. Some of this milk is already being sold in certain parts of the State. No doubt there is a justification for such sales in places remote from fresh milk supplies; but there is little or no justification for them within the metropolitan area. The Milk Board has asked the Government to empower it to control sales of reconstituted milk within the metropolitan area.

The reason for the request is to give protection to the licensed milk producers. Licensed producers have been required to spend large sums of money on the provision of new premises or the reconstruction of existing premises and many hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent for the improvement of the metropolitan milk supply. The producers are also required to spend considerable sums in maintaining their premises, plant and equipment in a hygienic condition. The premises are subject to constant supervision and the milk is tested regularly to ensure that it is properly constituted and free from bacteria. There are ample supplies of fresh milk for the city trade, as is shown by the fact that the producer receives the city price for only half of his output. Under the existing legislation reconstituted milk can be brought into and sold in the metropolitan area at lower prices than those fixed for locally produced fresh milk. The lower prices are possible because the milk from which the basic ingredients of reconstituted milk are derived are purchased at manufacturing rates. The sale of reconstituted milk in the metropolitan area on any scale would eventually undermine the marketing plan which protects producers and has been in operation for a number of years. For these reasons the Government has acceded to the request of the Milk Board that reconstituted milk should only be sold under permits granted by the board. Provision for such permits is contained in clause 4.

Clause 5 deals with the zoning of milk deliveries. Zoning was introduced during the war by the Commonwealth Government under the National Security Regulations. It was part of the war organization of industry, and

produced some satisfactory results. It reduced the amount of travelling which individual milk vendors had to do in order to serve their customers, by allocating to each vendor all the customers within his particular zone. The amount of milk delivered by each man was increased from somewhere about 40 gallons to 65 gallons a day. At the same time the vendors' profit margins were reduced by about 3½d. a gallon in order to give the customers some benefit from savings which were effected in delivery costs. These were substantial advantages, but there was one serious disadvantage in zoning, about which the Government had frequently had complaints. Zoning made each retail milk vendor a monopolist within his own zone, and although customers may have been dissatisfied with the service given them by their vendor, they had no option but to continue to deal with him.

When the war was over Commonwealth control of zoning came to an end, but zoning was continued by arrangement between the vendors themselves. It was not entirely voluntary, because if a new man desired to enter the retail milk trade and endeavoured to secure customers within the zone of an existing vendor, attempts were made to prevent the new man from being supplied with milk by the wholesale milk suppliers. The Government had complaints about this conduct, but did not receive much detailed information about what happened. By some means, however, zoning has been maintained by the vendors themselves without legal backing.

Clause 5 has the object of protecting the retail consumers. The problem which confronts the Government is to retain the advantage of zoning and, at the same time, to do away with the disadvantages to consumers which result from the lack of competition among the vendors. The remedy proposed for this state of affairs is what is commonly called block zoning. This is a system under which each zone is large enough to provide rounds for a number of retail vendors, usually three. Each vendor will be obliged by law to serve the customers who desire to be served by him within his zone, and the customers are free to change their vendors as long as they change to one of the other vendors operating within the same zone. The Government is informed that this system is quite practicable and works satisfactorily in other places. The Bill, therefore, confers on the Government the power to make regulations on the various topics which are necessary in order to introduce block zoning.

In preparing the Bill the Government had to make a decision as to the authority which should be charged with the duty of administering block zoning. The choice lay between the Metropolitan County Board and the Metropolitan Milk Board. The Metropolitan County Board is mainly a health authority charged with ensuring the cleanliness of premises of retail dairymen, and the hygienic condition and standards of milk sold by retailers. The Metropolitan Milk Board is concerned with the control of wholesale producers and suppliers, the relations between wholesalers and retailers, and the economic organization of the milk trade. It also has control of prices. The Government took the view that as the zoning of milk deliveries was an economic matter rather than a health matter and involved some control both of the retailer and the wholesaler as regards the milk supplied, that the Metropolitan Milk Board was the more appropriate authority to handle this problem. It happens, too, that the board is well equipped to do the administrative work connected with zoning. It will be noticed that in addition to setting out the regulation making powers necessary for zoning, the Bill states that the Metropolitan Milk Board must, as far as possible, ensure that in each zone there will be at least three persons carrying on business independently of each other as retail vendors of milk and cream.

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

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to make some amendments of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act which have been rendered desirable by the passing of the Bulk Handling of Wheat Act. Their object is to empower the Wheat Board to deduct certain tolls and charges due to the Bulk Handling Company, from the moneys payable by the board to wheatgrowers. The opportunity has also been taken to include in the Bill a clause to correct a misprint in the principal Act.

Under the bulk handling scheme members of the bulk handling company are bound by agreement with the company to pay certain tolls in respect of their wheat for a period of years.

The articles of association of the company state that the Australian Wheat Board is authorized to deduct the tolls from the money payable by the board to the members of the company. This, no doubt, operates as an authority or permission given to the board by the wheatgrowers in favour of the company but does not of itself impose an obligation on the board to make the deductions. Non-members of the company are not liable to pay tolls; but arrangements are being made by the company to provide that if a non-member of the company delivers wheat to a bulk handling installation, he will be liable, in accordance with the Bulk Handling Act, for a special handling charge additional to that payable by members of the company in the like circumstances.

It would be convenient for the bulk handling company and for the wheatgrowers themselves if these tolls and special charges were deducted by the Wheat Board from the money due to the growers in respect of their wheat. The Government understands that arrangements have been made between the company and the Wheat Board under which the board will make the deductions and pay the money to the company, provided that the Wheat Industry Stabilisation Act is amended to ensure that the board has the necessary power. The Wheat Board is of opinion that at present its legal power to make the deductions is doubtful. This opinion is based on section 12 of the Wheat Industry Stabilisation Act which provides that an assignment of moneys payable by the Board to a grower shall be void as against the board. The Wheat Board considers that any arrangement by which a member of the company purports to authorize the Wheat Board to deduct tolls may be an assignment within the meaning of this section and therefore void so far as the board is concerned. The board suggests that its powers to deduct tolls and non-members' handling charges from proceeds of wheat should be placed beyond doubt, and the Government, at the request of the Bulk Handling Company, has agreed to introduce the legislation required for this purpose.

Clause 4 accordingly provides that the Wheat Board shall have authority to deduct tolls due by members of the Bulk Handling Company, provided that the members give the Wheat Board an authority in writing. The clause also provides that the board shall be entitled to deduct non-members' handling charges from the proceeds of their wheat and pay the charges to the company. Payment to the company

by the board of any money deducted under the Bill will be a discharge, to the extent of the money so paid, of the board's liability to the grower. The other amendments do not affect the policy of the Act. There was a misprint in section 8 of last year's Act, the word "to" being printed instead of the word "by." This point is corrected by clause 3 and a minor improvement in the drafting is also made.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 893.)

Mr. WHITE (Murray)—I support the Bill, the object of which is to facilitate the entry of meat into the metropolitan area when it has been killed in places other than the Gepps Cross abattoirs. It proposes to achieve this by vesting in the Minister of Agriculture the right to issue permits. At present it is the prerogative of the Abattoirs Board to do this. The member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) claims that the Bill serves no useful purpose as it only shifts the seat of authority for issuing permits. I agree that the Bill does this, but that is the kernel of the matter. Quite obviously the present authority—the Abattoirs Board—would be prone to watch the interests of the works at Gepps Cross and would only permit meat from other killing sources to come to the metropolitan area when circumstances, such as the recent strike of employees at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, rendered it necessary. The Minister could view the issue of permits from other angles and he made this quite clear in explaining the Bill when he referred to country killing places being given permanent quotas for supplies of meat to the city.

One of the deterring factors in establishing abattoirs in country areas has been the difficulty in maintaining the works throughout the year. During the slack period valuable staff would go to other places of employment and the management of the abattoirs would experience difficulty in mustering sufficient labour for the busy killing season. From time to time various centres have formed committees to probe the question of establishing abattoirs and only 18 months ago I was a member of a committee which investigated the establishment of works at Tailm Bend which seemed an ideal centre because a number of railway

lines from districts where fat lambs and other stock were bred converge there. The staff problem appeared to be an insurmountable difficulty.

It would not be wise to have too many country killing works because much capital is involved in their establishment and they must be operated continuously in order to profit. This problem could be easily controlled by the method of issuing licences. The recent strike has been referred to during this debate, and I believe that comment is justified. Last Saturday I discussed this matter with several breeders of fat lambs and they claimed they had suffered a loss of 15s. a head through not being able to market their lambs at the right time. When this loss is applied to the whole State it represents a considerable sum. If killing centres were established throughout the State the slaughtering of lambs could be decentralized and the possibility of industrial disputes delaying slaughtering of lambs for export would be minimized.

I believe the leaders of the recent strike should be criticized. They seem to have been concerned only with holding or improving certain principles or ideals and apparently call strikes for that purpose. They never try to point out to slaughtermen that it is just as important to their interests as it is to primary producers to continue working while their grievances are ironed out. We are passing through a period when markets for primary produce are not as easy as they have been. It is imperative that we supply the markets we have in order to hold them. If we are unable to market primary produce profitably overseas we precipitate a period of depression that affects workmen possibly more than producers. That illustrates the desirability and necessity of establishing more country abattoirs.

I believe this legislation can be coupled with land development and trends in agricultural practice. Most land is at present being developed for grazing purposes and there will be a gradual building up of stock. In some of our old established districts there has been a change-over from cereal growing to stock grazing. Coupled with this development is the fact that we do encounter times when good seasons peter out and it becomes essential to slaughter surplus stock as quickly as possible in order to prevent wastage through lack of feed. This, in my opinion, amplifies the necessity for encouraging the establishment of country abattoirs.

I support the references of the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) to the inspection of

meat coming into the metropolitan area from killing centres other than Gepps Cross. I have received a complaint concerning the second inspections that are made. Meat is inspected at these centres by a competent person but when it enters the metropolitan area a further inspection is made. This seems to be somewhat superfluous; it causes inconvenience to the supplier and must create extra expense that someone has to meet. It is one aspect of the supply of meat to the metropolitan area that could be looked into. I have very much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—Following the precedent set by some members opposite I feel that I must first condemn most of this Bill and then support it for the little good it contains. It does not mean very much at present, but I am hopeful that some foreshadowed amendments we have heard about from the Minister may assist. However, there is a kernel of good that warrants our support. In his second reading speech, the Minister said:—

I believe that if we had had some country works operating they could have assisted materially, not only in feeding metropolitan consumers, but also in overcoming the grave problem of the export trade.

It is rather obvious why the honourable member for Rocky River could not agree with that, but I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Alexandra say:—

In most countries killing is done in many smaller centres than we have in South Australia.

That, of course, is so. According to the honourable member for Rocky River it is impracticable, expensive and a burden on the primary producer, but I cannot believe that. I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Murray favour country abattoirs. The Minister also said:—

If more country works were operating they could help us out in such an emergency.

If that is so and if the Minister believes it is, as I am sure he does, why are not these country abattoirs set up? Why cannot we establish them on a co-operative basis, possibly on a combination of Government and co-operative lines?

The Hon. A. W. Christian—We tried that at Port Lincoln years ago.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so, but one swallow does not make a summer, and times are different.

Mr. O'Halloran—It was a hotchpotch at Port Lincoln.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I do not think the Minister would say it was a perfect scheme. We cannot expect country abattoirs to function unless they have some guarantee of all the year round production.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—That is why Port Lincoln failed.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I cannot see any reason why that cannot be provided if the abattoirs are set up in the right places. Did it take the abattoirs strike to make the Government realize the necessity for the support or establishment of country abattoirs? I think it did. As should be well known to everyone in this House, the Opposition has advocated country abattoirs for years as part of its overall decentralization policy. We have not been very successful, however, because we have not had the opportunity to occupy the Government benches. I am hoping that this Bill has not been introduced in the expectation of its being very handy in future times as a weapon for strike-breaking.

Frankly, at first sight this Bill appeared to me to be another example of the Government's filching Labor policy, but a close analysis shows that it means very little indeed, and our policy does not mean a little; it means a lot. In fact, I believe it would be the salvation of primary producers.

Mr. Brookman—Are you in favour of private or Government abattoirs?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am in favour of a co-operative concern with the Government holding 51 per cent of the shares. For many years we have advocated the establishment of suitable secondary industries at or near centres of rural production to process its products, and obviously country meatworks come into this category. Let us at least attempt to stop the drift to the city. I shall not give figures of the drift as they have been given in *Hansard* on scores of occasions. The position is getting worse and worse. At regular intervals we hear of huge secondary industries to be established in the city. Only this week we heard of a new "steelworks"—I put that in inverted commas—at Kilburn. Frankly, I would like to know where the steel will come from. I hope that this company has close association with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, otherwise it will have a difficult task.

The SPEAKER—Of course, the honourable member would find that fairly effective on another matter.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes, Sir. Occasionally we hear of new industries being introduced into the country, but only very infrequently. I am prompted to ask, with other members of this House and people throughout the State, whether the Government wants increased population in the country. I and my Party maintain that if we only had a committee set up by this Parliament to advise on the decentralization of existing industries and the provision of new industries, including abattoirs and meatworks, in the country, we could do a wonderful amount of good for the State. We could at least attempt to stop the haphazard development of industry that has occurred. We have often heard the Premier praised for industrial expansion, but I believe he is just as much worthy of blame because there is no doubt that the policy he has adopted in his eagerness to assist industry has swollen the already large metropolitan area. Incidentally, this has increased the Premier's own problems as well.

Why is it that so few new industries are prepared to risk attempting to establish themselves in country areas? I would like to proffer a few reasons. Firstly, I believe it is because there is no decentralization committee, something that I and my Party advocate, and no plan to help the country in this way.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is no plan in this Bill to help.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—None whatever. The Bill is largely eyewash. Secondly, the Government obviously does not want the population of the country to grow. Someone may say, "What about the new town between Gawler and Adelaide?" but that is not truly the country. The third reason is that industries do not go to the country because there are not enough homes in country towns, and that is because the emphasis in this State has been on the city. I know that the Housing Trust in certain areas, including my own town, has built a number of homes, but it has not built enough, and the greatest concentration has been in the city. Fourthly, country towns lack the amenities that people desire, particularly sewerage. I have already brought before this House the grave difficulties of industries in country areas because they have no sewerage to dispose of their effluent. I have mentioned the Gawler Manufacturing Company, and only this week this company has been in touch with me again to inform me of their hopeless position because of the long delay in sewerage the town. I believe quite sincerely that industries are discouraged from going to

the country instead of being encouraged to go there. What a benefit it would be to our secondary industries if they were assisted to go there and if we had ancillary industries such as meatworks, establishments for treating hides and skins, sausage-making plants and other industries established in the country at or near the places where these things are produced! Despite what the honourable member for Rocky River said about the establishment of country meatworks I am sure they would be of benefit to the primary producer.

What this State sorely needs is a committee to advise on decentralization. That would certainly help to get rid of some of the difficulties I have mentioned. I think a change of Government could get rid of my second reason, that is, the desire of the Government not to have too large a population in country areas. A committee such as I have suggested could co-opt expert opinion and I sincerely believe it would do much good for the State. However, the Government apparently does not seem to like the idea of assisting in decentralization. Do not tell me that this drift to the city is common everywhere. That is a very old story and it is true, but that, after all, is not a reason, only an excuse. There is no reason why South Australia cannot show other parts of the Commonwealth the way to go, and I believe a committee such as I have suggested would assist there.

As I said by interjection to the honourable member for Alexandra, I see no reason why we should not encourage the establishment of a co-operative concern of consumers' and producers' representatives. We have many instances in South Australia that co-operation will work, especially when it is given some support. Why not have a combination of Government, producer, and consumer, all working together for the good of the country? It would be a great help in keeping people in the country. Let the Government give a lead in this matter and not just talk about it.

In this debate the recent abattoirs strike has been mentioned, but outside there have been varying opinions about it. The primary producers in my district have not expressed the view I expected. They are dissatisfied with the Abattoirs Board, and are not happy about the employees. I would like to know why this is so. I suggest that there may be too many members on the board or perhaps the wrong people are on it. The producers who spoke to me are fairly reasonable men and they said that although they produce the lambs the men at

the works kill them and they should have more representation on the board. It would be of inestimable value to the producers if we could get rid of the middle man in the sale of fat lambs. If my suggestions were adopted I feel they would be an effective solution of the problems facing the primary producers. We should not try to pull the wool over their eyes by passing this Bill. The simplest and perhaps the best way to assist producers and consumers would be for the Government to adopt Labor's policy on decentralization. If it runs true to form the Government will no doubt adopt it eventually. I would be glad to give the Minister a copy of it, framed if necessary. On second thoughts, however, as it appears almost certain that Labor will be in office next year I withdraw the offer in order to let it put the policy into effect. I support the Bill.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I support the Bill. Mr. John Clark made a theoretical speech and 90 per cent of what he said had nothing to do with the Bill. He said something about removing the middle man from the sale of fat lambs at the abattoirs, but if he understood the position he would know that it is possible for producers to sell their lambs without going through the middle man. Conditions change from time to time in the fat lamb industry, and often there is a large number of lambs available for sale in one area, and it would be a good thing if the producers could market some of them in the metropolitan area when the opportunity arose. Some years ago I was a member of a committee which investigated abattoirs in New South Wales and Victoria. The outstanding impression I got was the difficulties country killing works in those States had to face. I cannot recall one instance of a country killing works not having got into difficulties at one time or another and having to get money from the Government to keep it going. The problem is not so easily cured as Mr. Clark would have us believe. It seems that in order to solve the problem it is only a matter of taking money from someone else. I believe the Bill is a move in the right direction and in the interests of producers and the State generally.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I am undecided as to the real intention of the Bill. I wonder whether it is an attempt to provide against future strikes at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will make an unequivocal declaration that that is not so. By way of interjection he said it was not so, but I still find it difficult to

learn the real intention of the measure. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:—

By section 78 of the Act the Abattoirs Board is empowered to grant permits to bring carcasses and meat into the metropolitan abattoirs area from the Port Lincoln branch of the Government Produce Department. By section 77 of the Act the board is empowered to grant a permit to authorize any person to bring specified carcasses or meat into the metropolitan abattoirs area in any circumstances which, in the board's opinion, justify the grant of a permit.

It appears that, with perhaps a minor exception, the board already has the power set out in the Bill. The Minister also said:—

These sections were not designed to confer rights to bring specified quotas of meat regularly into the abattoirs area, and it is not likely that any country abattoirs, other than those at Port Lincoln, could obtain any substantial rights under them.

It would appear that the board can bring in a specified number of carcasses but not regularly. The Minister also said:—

Moreover, the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board, with all its virtues, should not be charged with the responsibility of deciding the rights of country abattoirs in the matter of slaughtering for the metropolitan area. It is therefore necessary that if country abattoirs are to be given extended rights to slaughter for the metropolitan area, some authority other than the Abattoirs Board should be empowered to decide the extent of such rights, and that legislative provision should be made for enabling a greater quantity of meat from country abattoirs to be brought into the metropolitan area than is likely to be permitted under the present legislation.

The Bill, in effect, places the power of deciding what meat from country abattoirs should come into the metropolitan area in the hands of the Government. It is laid down that the Governor may by proclamation declare what proportion of the meat slaughtered at any country abattoirs can be brought into the metropolitan area during any specified period. In view of that, it seems preferable for the Minister rather than the board to have the power. It is strange that this action by the Government coincides with the settlement of a strike at the abattoirs. Remarks by Government members in support of the Bill contain references to disputes at the works. Mr. Heaslip said there had been 43 in recent years. Of course, much depends on what he calls a dispute. Every time there is a difference of opinion it is said to be a dispute, and if Mr. Heaslip regards that as a dispute there have been many more than 43 in this House in four hours, not years. Mr. Hawker made a good point when he referred to the losses which may be sustained by producers when a ship proceeds

from port to port to load. He said as much time was spent in this way as would be the case in taking a cargo from Adelaide to England. I do not have the same doubts as he has because if the matter of country abattoirs were properly tackled the difficulty would be overcome. The honourable member said:—

The South Australian season is very short and if an abattoirs were established in the north there would only be a short time for working, whereas if situated centrally it could draw not only from the area nearby but from north and south and keep operating for a longer period.

If works were established at, say, Wallaroo they would cater for a considerable area to the north, east and south and I should say that enough carcasses would be available to load a ship in one consignment. The honourable member seemed to be out of step, however, with the alleged policy of his Leader. The policy of the Labor Party for many years has been in favour of decentralization. I remember the Honourable R. S. Richards, when he was Leader of the Opposition, advocating it for years and pointing out that one of the things involved was the establishment of country abattoirs. The Premier claims that the policy of the Liberal Party includes decentralization, but the member for Burra says:—

There seems to be too much talk about works being established in the country. If it will work, that is the best place for them, but if people are willing to set up abattoirs in the metropolitan area for export purposes they should be given the opportunity to do so.

There the honourable member was arguing against decentralization. What greater condemnation of it could there be, so apparently the Liberal Party is not so united as it claims to be. Of course, history proves that they are not supporters of decentralization, because there is a greater percentage of the population in the metropolitan area now than in 1933 when the Liberal Party came into power.

Mr. Hawker—I think I said "If it will work, that is the best place for them."

Mr. LAWN—I quoted the honourable member fully. There was no qualification whatsoever, but a definite condemnation of country abattoirs in favour of abattoirs in the metropolitan area. He also said:—

We should concentrate the killing, but I think we are overdoing it. The history of private enterprise in this State has not been encouraging. The Port Lincoln works were started by private enterprise, but they failed and had to be taken over by the Government.

There is condemnation of private enterprise by a member who always claims to be a great supporter of it. He was opposed to the Government's taking over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, but now both he and Mr. Heaslip say that they are getting power from the trust whereas they never would have been able to get it from the company. Now I come to some remarks by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip). He concentrated upon the aspect of industrial disputes, which had little to do with the Bill if we are to accept an interjection by the Minister. He opened by saying that he desired to reply to Mr. Jennings who, he claimed, had stated that the establishment of country abattoirs was the policy of the Opposition. He went on:—

I do not doubt that for a minute, but the Premier, in arguing against the establishment of country abattoirs in the past—and this goes back to the last election speeches—mentioned that the grazier would get better prices at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and said that was one reason why country abattoirs would not work successfully. Any producer who supports country abattoirs will do so at a loss, and no doubt for that reason the Opposition supports country abattoirs.

That was a most unfair and unwarranted statement which the honourable member cannot support. That is playing the game of politics very low. Long before I came into this House my attention was drawn to the difference between a politician and a statesman and many interpretations of the word "politics." I think the honourable member's remarks constitute an unwarranted and unreasonable attack on the Opposition and reveal colossal ignorance on his part, because no political Party which can command as much public support as is commanded by the Labor Party—more support than is commanded by the Government—would advocate that the people should get less for their efforts than they do today. Why would we want to see any section of our community getting less? I am not referring to those who live on rent, interest and profit, but to those who work. It would not be in the interests of the State for any Party to do something which would reduce the earning capacity of country producers. From an economic point of view the more flourishing our manufacturers and country producers are the better the economic position of the State. The same honourable member subscribes to a policy that requires a person to be 30 years of age before he can be a candidate for the Legislative Council. I know there is a lot of adverse criticism of Parliament, but it is statements like that of the honourable

member which lead the public to ridicule their Parliament. He was invited by the member for Stanley to give some proof of his statement, but could not and went on:—

We only need to consider the position at Port Lincoln. The producer cannot get the same price for his stock there as he can at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Where the population is greatest the demand is greatest, and that is where the best price is obtained.

I am not going to say whether he is right or wrong. All I say is that the Liberal Party has been in power for some 23 years, and it remains in office only because of the electoral gerrymander based on a proportion of two country members to one city member. Now the honourable member says that people in the country get less for their produce if it is killed in the country, and if that is correct who is responsible for that state of affairs. There are more country members than A.L.P. members, and if they are looking after the interests of country people why have they not rectified this state of affairs? He went on further:—

Because of continual strikes and go-slow methods of men at the Metropolitan Abattoirs producers are losing more than they would by the establishment of country abattoirs.

There is a direct contradiction of the statement to which I have just replied. Which is the public to accept? In view of statements of this kind it is little wonder that the public ridicules Parliament. Secondly, the honourable member did not know what he was talking about when he mentioned go-slow methods and continual strikes at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. He gave no figures to prove there have been continual strikes there. He, and other members opposite, are great supporters of incentive and bonus payments and profit sharing, but the employees at the abattoirs work under piece work methods, so it would not be in their interests to go slow. The slower they go the less money they get, and the faster they go the more money they get. I do not agree with the principle of piece work, but members opposite do, yet the member for Rocky River says the employees at the abattoirs go slow. Apparently he does not know that they are on piece work, otherwise he would not be so stupid as to make those statements. Then he said:—

Since that time we have had 43 industrial disputes there. Until today there were 42, but today's *News* states in headlines, "Trouble threatens again at the Abattoirs."

Until last week the employees had been getting their slaughtering done by about 3 p.m.

Mr. Heaslip—With how many rejects?

Mr. LAWN—I understand there were only 53 rejects in over 8,000 stock slaughtered last Saturday. That is less than 1 per cent. I think that the percentage increased when the management said the line should finish at 4 p.m., which means that it is the management that has slowed down the line.

Mr. Heaslip—No.

Mr. LAWN—It was not the men who adopted a go-slow policy, but the management. The men want the line to finish as soon as they can. The sooner they finish the sooner they can knock off. During the recent negotiations between the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, the Abattoirs Board and the men the management said it did not want to take back 12 of the men employed during the last season because they were unsatisfactory. The Premier and the Minister were told that those men were never informed that they were unsatisfactory. When they were paid off they had a clean sheet and they believed they could be re-employed. The Premier and the Minister agreed that the men should have been told if they were not satisfactory at the time they were paid off, not subsequently. If the management wants to make an alteration in its policy it should tell the men why. The Premier, the Minister and the board agreed that that would be a good thing, but yesterday week, without consulting the men, the board said it wanted the line to finish at 4 p.m. The present dispute was brought on entirely by the board. Had it told the men of any problems it could have discussed them with the men in an effort to find a remedy. Probably an amicable arrangement could have been effected. I understand that the men guarantee that they can reduce the percentage of rejects and still finish about 3 p.m. Without consulting the men the board said that the line shall finish at 4 p.m. That is evidence that the board slowed down the line, not the men.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—I do not think you have the facts right.

Mr. LAWN—I got them from the people at the conference. If the board did not give an undertaking that it would consult the men I say that anyone responsible for managing a department as large as that controlled by the Minister of Agriculture would say it would be preferable for the management to consult employees before making a decision.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—The employees have a representative on the board.

Mr. LAWN—They may have, but I do not know how far all these matters are discussed

by the board. The member for Rocky River said:—

If that representative is doing his job he must surely report to the union what takes place at the board's meetings. The position is impossible, and that man should be removed from the board.

The Minister, by saying that the men have a representative on the board, implies that they could find out from him what the board proposes, yet the member for Rocky River says he should not report back the board's decisions. Industry works much more smoothly when the management advises the employees of its intentions. In many instances the management's proposals have not been implemented, or have been modified, after consultation with the men.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—One of the conditions of settlement of the recent strike was that the board would have the control of the speed of the chain, but the moment the men get back to work they will not accept it.

Mr. LAWN—My point is that it was stupid of the board to say one Wednesday morning that the men should finish at, say, 6 o'clock, instead of 3 o'clock.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—Not 6 o'clock.

Mr. LAWN—It could say that, on your argument. The Minister said the board could control the speed of the line, which means that the board could say tomorrow that it will finish at 6 o'clock.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—No.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, because the board can determine the speed of the line.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—You are saying that the board will do something ridiculous.

Mr. LAWN—It did yesterday week.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—At what time do other workers in industry knock off?

Mr. LAWN—The member for Rocky River also said:—

Mr. Jennings said he hoped that the union would have the recruiting of these new employees. As a primary producer I certainly hope it will not, and I do not think it will. Surely, if someone is paying men to do a job he should have the right of selection.

Mr. Heaslip—Don't you think so?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member suggests that the Abattoirs Board has not the right of selection.

Mr. Heaslip—It has not.

Mr. LAWN—I shall let the House judge. During the last killing season the board told the union it wanted 60 men. The union went

through the lists of those who were available for the jobs. Those men were notified by the union, which sent 60 names and addresses to the abattoirs. The officer who selects the labour then interviewed the men and engaged them. That shows the union does not select the men. That system has worked well and has assisted the board.

Mr. Heaslip—Who caused the strike?

Mr. LAWN—All members know that the management sacked two union representatives, and the honourable member should have learnt that once an employer sacks a union representative he is asking for a strike. When the two men were sacked the board knew there would be a stoppage of work. The board decided to “pull a dispute.” I think I have made it clear that the management selects the men.

Mr. Heaslip—They do not sack them?

Mr. LAWN—Yes, over 100 were put off last year and the board said that it did not want 12 of them back this year.

Mr. Heaslip—They all go on strike if the board sacks some men.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member does not know what he is talking about. That is a most irresponsible interjection. I hope the object of the Bill is not as has been suggested, to provide for some future period when the abattoirs are shut down owing to a stoppage.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 22. Page 864.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—The motive for the Bill mentioned by the Minister in his second reading speech is one which can be accepted by all members. We appreciate the need to protect a Government department and its officers concerning any action taken by a person in damaging, removing or interfering in any way with any survey pegs or marks. It can be reasonably claimed that such offences are usually committed by irresponsible persons, mainly youths, who do not give serious thought to the result of their actions. The Bill is necessary because the present law does not give sufficient power for certain aspects to be dealt with. Therefore, it commends itself to me in that respect. I am at a loss to understand the need for the words in clause 3—

“survey mark” means peg, picket, beacon, mark or thing of any kind placed on any land for the purpose of marking a survey of any

kind or for the purpose of indicating a boundary on any land.

The words I question are “for the purpose of indicating a boundary on any land.” I question the need for these words, because this power could be a little dangerous as the wording in another clause provides that the allegation of any complaint shall be *prima facie* evidence of any offence alleged. An old post on a boundary fence may have been broken down or become dilapidated and someone may remove it, not knowing it was a boundary mark, and then it could be claimed that it was an offence under the Act. A person may even remove an old post to boil his billy.

My other criticism concerns clause 4 (1), which deals with penalties. It is true that the original Act provides for a penalty not exceeding £20 and this has operated since 1892. To accept the two and a half times formula in this regard may be all right up to a point, considering the changes in money values—perhaps it could even be increased five and a half times compared with money values in 1892. However, this clause provides for a penalty of £50, there being no provision for any lesser amount to be considered. The original Act provided for a fine “not exceeding” £20, but no similar provision is made in this Act in relation to the fine of £50 mentioned. Therefore, in Committee I should like the Minister to consider making an alteration in this regard to provide for a penalty “not exceeding £50.” If an offence were considered trivial, then the magistrate could impose a lower penalty. I do not like the following wording in subclause (2):—

In proceedings for an offence against subsection (1) of this section, the allegation in the complaint that any peg, picket, beacon, mark or thing of any kind was a survey mark shall be *prima facie* evidence of the matter so alleged.

It means that on the statement of the property owner or of anyone associated with the department it could be alleged that a certain peg was a boundary mark or survey peg, when in fact it may not have been so. Therefore, I ask the Minister to consider a correction in this regard so that the onus is not entirely thrown on the accused person to prove his innocence. I should think that subclause (3)—“In this section ‘interfere with’ includes damage, destroy or remove”—is redundant. I do not know the real object of including it. If anyone could damage, destroy or remove a post of any kind without interfering with it he must be Mandrake. I support the second reading and urge the Minister to consider the points I have raised.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—Like Mr. Walsh, I favour the Bill because I do not like to see the wilful destruction of survey pegs. Not long ago I heard of a case of a young man who had bought a block of land and the builder had laid the foundations and proceeded with the construction when it was found that someone had deliberately shifted the survey pegs, and as a result there was much trouble. Although we want these things prevented, I do not like to see in an Act the provision now suggested. I should like to see the word "deliberately" included before "interferes" in line 2 of subsection (1) of new section 34 to make it read—

Any person who, without lawful authority, deliberately interferes with any survey mark shall be guilty of an offence.

It would be possible in a newly-surveyed area for a motor or a horse rider to accidentally displace a survey peg. Some survey pegs I have seen are not even painted white or with a number to indicate that they are survey pegs. I am also opposed to the provision in subsection (2) of new section 34—

In proceedings for an offence against subsection (1) of this section, the allegation in the complaint that any peg, picket, beacon, mark or thing of any kind was a survey mark shall be *prima facie* evidence of the matter so alleged.

That is going over the fence. We want the public to observe our laws, but we should make laws which can be understood and not set a trap for someone. If a person deliberately removes a survey peg he should be dealt with, but if he accidentally knocks over a peg he should not be penalized. It is largely a question of administration. In the case to which I referred the peg was removed, I believe deliberately. If that were so I would like to see an action brought, but children playing may remove a peg and put it back in the wrong place, yet under the clause the parents could be fined. If a person is guilty of wilfully removing a peg he should be prosecuted, but an innocent person should not be penalized. In most cases the onus of proof is on the plaintiff and I do not see why it should not be under this legislation. I support the Bill and trust that it will be amended as suggested by the member for Thebarton (Mr. Fred Walsh).

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 4, at 2 p.m.