

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 20, 1957.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS.

#### SNOWY MOUNTAINS AGREEMENT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—This morning's *Advertiser* contains the following report under the heading "Vic. Snowy Water Share Doubled":—

Victoria would receive an extra 100,000 acre feet of water a year under the Snowy Mountains Agreement the Premier (Mr. Bolte) announced tonight.

Victoria's original share was 100,000 acre feet a year, but the Commonwealth had agreed to increase this to 200,000 acre feet, he said.

This was a major victory to Victoria and would mean additional development in irrigation districts along the Murray.

Has the Premier any further information concerning his request that water be made available to South Australia out of the additional supplies that will result from the completion of the Snowy Mountains scheme?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I saw the article referred to and it raises one or two interesting points. The victory that Mr. Bolte claims has taken place has apparently taken place before the battle has been joined, so the announcement of a victory may be a little premature. If it is a victory, however, it would be interesting to know at whose expense it has been gained; if at South Australia's, we shall be much concerned. The Prime Minister has not yet replied to my telegram on this matter, nor has a copy of the curious document containing the agreement under which people are to get all these benefits been supplied to us; but the matter has not been overlooked by this Government and in due course we will be able to make a pronouncement on it, which I think will have the support of the House in its entirety.

#### INFLUENZA EPIDEMIC.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—This morning's *Advertiser* reported the attendance figures at some schools yesterday following on the current outbreak of influenza, but I point out that the enrolment at the Forbes primary school is 1,692 and not 1,092 as reported. More than half the scholars of that school were absent yesterday, and I ask the Minister of Education whether he is still of the opinion that it is unnecessary to close any schools in order to prevent the spread of the epidemic,

and whether, if any schools are closed, the school buildings will be fumigated?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Firstly, I do not intend to make one order closing all departmental schools. We have about 735 schools and infant departments, and it would be improper, in my view, for me to do that. I am the only person who has the right to close a departmental school and I am prepared to consider closing any particular school if representations are made to me, but not for headmasters or other persons to act or purport to act on their own authority, as has been done in one or two earlier instances. The Forbes school is one where many children are absent and also many attending. I am trying to obtain the best advice from local health officers and also the Central Board of Health; I will then discuss the matter with the Director and the Deputy Director. I cannot take the matter any further than that, but it will not take me long to arrive at a decision on Forbes or any other school, either metropolitan or country, once I receive the necessary information.

#### EDUCATION WEEK.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I heartily congratulate the officers of the Education Department, other prominent educationists, teachers, pupils and the public generally, on the outstanding success of Education Week. Can the Minister of Education say whether it has been decided to make Education Week a regular event, and if so, how often it is expected to be held?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I thank the honourable member for the compliment he has paid those responsible for Education Week, which I think may be claimed to have been an outstanding success. No decision has been made concerning its repetition, but it will probably not be repeated for a considerable time.

#### LIBRARY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. JENKINS—In my district there is a library which is not under the control of any council, but recently about £3,000 was spent on its reconstruction and efforts are being made to increase the number of books for the convenience of the public, particularly children. Last year one corporation donated about £50 to the library and a further £50 this year for books for the children's section. Can the Public Libraries Act be amended so that donations such as these may be subsidized by the Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The case the honourable member mentions was brought under my notice some time ago. The Libraries Board did not recommend a subsidy in that case because the library was not under the direct control of a district council. The Government believes that is a technical objection and does not stand for it. To enable more books to be made available an amount will be placed on the Estimates this year for the Libraries Board so that books may be made available to libraries such as the one mentioned by the honourable member. These books will be circulated and will be supplied on loan.

#### WIRTHS' CIRCUS.

Mr. LAWN—I understand that Wirths' Circus was permitted by the Adelaide City Council to erect its tent and other equipment in the west parklands and that the animals were to be on show, particularly for children, on Sundays. However, I understand that the circus charged for admission to see the animals (adults 1s., children 6d.), which I understand is a contravention of the Entertainment Act. This matter was ventilated before the City council yesterday and I understand that the council said that charging for admission must not happen again. I believe this matter has also been before a Government inspector who polices the Act, and I ask the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, whether any action has been taken or can anything be done about the money collected last Sunday afternoon, such as forwarding it to the Children's Hospital or the Spastic Children's Home?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I understand that a charge was made last Sunday for admission to the ground to inspect the animals. The circus proprietors have been told that as the circus has been registered as a place of public entertainment the charge for admission is against the law and that if any charge is made in future action will be taken against them. If any money was collected last Sunday it was collected unlawfully, and the Government certainly has no control over it.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. JENNINGS—I think that most members have been sent a notification from the Attorney-General that certain persons have been appointed Justices of the Peace, together with a letter to be forwarded to unsuccessful nominees. It always seems that a member is notified after those appointed have been notified, but those who are not appointed have to be told of the fact by the member, so on that basis the Attorney-General cannot lose. I

think that either members of Parliament should be entitled to notify directly the persons appointed, or the Minister should notify directly those not appointed. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General take up this question with his colleague?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I appreciate the difficulty to which the honourable member refers as I have had experience of it myself in the past. There may be a good reason why the present procedure is followed, but I will take up the question with my colleague.

#### DETENTION OF JUVENILES.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In last Sunday's *Mail* appeared a report that a boy aged 16 was sent to a reformatory by a magistrate after he had made it quite clear that he had no wish to send the boy there. As the Welfare Department was not ready to proceed in this case it sought a remand of two weeks and the magistrate had no option but to send the boy to the reformatory. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General take up this case to see that the boy will not be kept in a reformatory for that period and what can be done if an incident of that type recurs?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to take it up with my colleague.

#### TUG-BUILDING INDUSTRY.

Mr. TAPPING—I understand that the Federal Government's policy is to subsidize by 33½ per cent the building in Australia of vessels of 500 tons register or more. I understand that the tugs that may be built at Port Adelaide will be smaller than that, so I ask the Premier whether the industry will benefit from a subsidy or can arrangements be made to assist it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not know whether the company concerned has applied to the Commonwealth for a subsidy. It certainly has not approached my Government on the matter. For all I know the company may have already concluded arrangements with the Australian Shipping Board for a subsidy.

#### TANTANOOLA-COMPTON ROAD.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about work on the Tantanoola-Compton Road?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Through my colleague I have received the following reply:—

The Commissioner of Highways has advised that the Tantanoola-Compton road is being

developed as a forest road, £7,500 having been allocated towards this project during the current year. It is anticipated that it will be completed in approximately two years. The distance saved by taking this route as against the main South-Eastern road would be approximately  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles.

#### ART OF SPEECH.

Mr. CUMBE—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 25 about including the subject art of speech in school curricula?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received the following reply, dated August 15, from the Secretary, Public Examinations Board:—

Your letter of August 1st asking that the Board of Public Examinations re-consider its decision not to accept Art of Speech as a subject for the Intermediate and Leaving Examination Certificates was read at the recent meeting of the board. The board unanimously agreed to re-affirm its previous decision. I was also asked to emphasize the fact that the majority of the members of the board who made this decision are either head masters, head mistresses or other representatives of the Education Department or private secondary schools.

The previous decision referred to by the secretary was contained in the following letter, dated July 8:—

The Board of Public Examinations at its recent meeting considered your letter of March 7 regarding the introduction of Art of Speech as a subject for the Intermediate Certificate. The board has considered this matter previously. On a previous occasion it appointed a sub-committee to consider the matter and adopted the report of the sub-committee "that while it is most desirable that correct speech should be encouraged, much of the matter in the Art of Speech syllabus is already necessary or desirable in preparing candidates for the examinations in English literature; and what remains in which the chief aim appears to be the dissemination of a standard English enunciation through phonetic instruction does not form a subject in which it is desirable to institute public examinations." The board at the recent meeting decided to re-affirm its previous decision.

#### RADIUM HILL URANIUM DEPOSITS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier say whether there has been any further development at Radium Hill, or any further substantial discovery that will enrich the field?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. I reported to the House some time ago that a duplication of the uranium-bearing lode had been found south of the previous main lode. Recently another further significant discovery was made north of it. The ore appears to be

quite rich and is shallow under the surface soil. It is not quite identical with the other occurrences in as much as the uranium, instead of being a separate lode, is distributed through the main country rock. It has been proved to extend over a considerable distance and because it is so shallow it will probably be a quarrying rather than a mining proposition, at least at the start. I regard it as a most important find. Anything disseminated through the general rock of the country is much more likely to be widespread, and because it is so accessible it enables mining to be undertaken as soon as any adjustments to the treatment plant necessary to handle a slightly different type of ore can be made. Every one of these finds means that the life of the field is being greatly extended. Now it appears as though a permanent field is likely. Whereas when we started to mine we had a limited amount of ore in front of us, today, after opening up the mine, we have a much better future. It seems that it will be a long-time activity and one that will grow in importance.

#### RESIDENT MAGISTRATE FOR PORT PIRIE.

Mr. DAVIS—The *Recorder* at Port Pirie runs a column on happenings of 20 years ago. On Monday last I noticed in it that the then member for Port Pirie, the late Andrew Lacey, asked the Government to appoint a resident magistrate at Port Pirie, and that the reply was that the Government was giving the matter further consideration. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General ascertain if the Government has finished its deliberations on the matter and if so what was the decision?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—It is not quite so simple or so humorous as the honourable member may consider it to be, for there are good arguments in favour of resident magistrates in the country and equally good, if not better, arguments against it. The matter was aired in this House a couple of years ago at some considerable length by the honourable member for Norwood, the former member for Torrens, and others. It is not a matter of procrastination but whether it is a wise thing to do. I will be pleased to take up the matter again and bring down a reply.

#### STOLEN MOTOR CARS.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 24 regarding the incidence of stolen motor cars in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have a report which the honourable member can peruse. The relevant portion is as follows:—

It is my opinion and the generally accepted police view that the penalties prescribed by the Road Traffic Act in this respect are adequate. It is a matter for the court to determine in the circumstances of each case, penalties which it considers adequate. I am, however, of the opinion that there should be some legislation to provide for the high cost to the Police Department in recovering these vehicles, being recovered from offenders when convicted.

#### DETAINING DEFENDANTS IN GAOL.

Mr. RICHES—A number of Port Augusta residents have reported to me that recently a well-known and well-respected citizen of that town was involved in a motor accident and subsequently charged in the Port Pirie court. He was released on bail and appeared at the last session of the Supreme Court, when the hearing was part heard and he was again released on bail. Concern has been expressed at the fact that during the court hearing this man, who has not been and may not be found guilty of any offence, was compelled to stay overnight in the Port Augusta gaol. People are asking whether this was necessary as they consider it wrong in principle. Can the Minister say whether it is necessary under present law to detain a man in gaol during a court hearing and before a conviction and, if so, will consideration be given to altering the law so that the injustice may not continue?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—This matter has in recent years been the subject of debates in this House and correspondence in the press. The Attorney-General made a public statement on it during the past year. I shall be pleased to refer to him the honourable member's question and explanation and bring down a reply.

#### TRAMWAYS TRUST RUNNING COSTS.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. What is the revenue per vehicle mile from trams, fuel buses, and trolley buses, respectively?

2. What is the running cost per vehicle mile of each of these types of vehicle?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The General Manager, of the Municipal Tramways Trust reports:—

1. Separate revenue for each type of vehicle is not kept, owing to the use of various types of vehicles on the same route.

2. Running cost, including depreciation, but excluding interest, per traffic mile is:—Trams, 78.44d.; trolleybuses, 56.21d.; fuel buses, 51.63d.

#### RE-POSSESSION OF PREMISES.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. How many applications for possession of premises in accordance with the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, 1942-1956, were heard by courts in the metropolitan area for the year ended December 31, 1956, and for each of the months since?

2. How many of these applications were granted?

3. How many eviction orders were issued for each of the periods mentioned above?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The replies are:—

1. (a) 1956, 413. (b) 1957, January, 29; February, 28; March, 24; April, 33; May, 30; June, 23; July, 29.

2. (a) 1956, 360. (b) 1957, January, 26; February, 26; March, 24; April, 30; May, 23; June, 20; July, 27.

3. (It has been assumed that the term "eviction orders" refers to warrants for possession.) (a) 1956, 69. (b) 1957, January, 8; February, 7; March, 8; April, 7; May, 6; June, 6; July, 6.

#### DEMOLITION OF DWELLINGS.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—How many dwellings have been demolished in the City of Adelaide for each of the years since and including 1950?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The City Council advises as follows:—

Year ended June 30.	Number of Dwellings.
1950 .. .. .	2
1951 .. .. .	1
1952 .. .. .	7
1953 .. .. .	15
1954 .. .. .	28
1955 .. .. .	54
1956 .. .. .	86
1957 .. .. .	53

Eight-year total .. .. . 246

#### MENTAL PATIENTS.

Mr. Tapping for Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice)—

1. What was the total number of inmates of mental hospitals in South Australia at June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, respectively?

2. Of each of these totals what percentage were post-war migrants?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. 2,520 as at June 30, 1956; 2,554 as at June 30, 1957.

2. It is impossible to give an accurate answer to this question. The hospital does not have the data necessary to distinguish individuals who might be included under the very broad heading of migrants.

#### PICHI RICHI PASS ROAD.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Was an application made in 1955 through Sir Philip McBride to the Commonwealth Government for £100,000 for bituminizing the Pichi Richi Pass road?

2. If so, was any money received?

3. If not, what was the Commonwealth reply?

4. What is the present policy of the Government in respect of this road?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. A request was made to Senator MacLeay by the Premier.

2. No.

3. The Town Clerk of Quorn and the Leader of the Opposition were advised in March, 1956, of the Commonwealth's reply, which was to the effect that as the road concerned did not come within the category of a strategic road or road of access to Commonwealth property, or likely to serve Commonwealth purposes, Commonwealth assistance could not be provided.

4. The present policy is to reconstruct sections of this road as soon as funds are available. During the current year, £8,000 has been allocated for the reconstruction of Madman's Bridge on this road. After this bridge has been reconstructed, consideration can be given to the provision of further funds for the commencement of reconstruction for the purpose of sealing.

#### STIRLING NORTH-QUORN ROAD.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Was a grant made available for commencement of bitumen work on the Stirling North to Quorn Road last financial year?

2. If so, was any of this grant spent?

3. What happened to the unexpended balance?

4. When is it proposed to commence this work?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The Commissioner of Highways reports—

1. The reconstruction of a section of the Port Augusta-Quorn Main Road No. 40 was listed in the works programme for 1956-57, but no grant was made.

2. No money was spent on this road, apart from normal maintenance funds, during last financial year.

3. Expenditure of the £8,000 listed in the works programme for the Port Augusta-Quorn Road was deferred due to the necessity for urgent work along the River Murray following the floods.

4. It is proposed to commence work this year to the extent that £8,000 has been listed in the works programme for 1957-58 to reconstruct Madman's Bridge.

#### PORT AUGUSTA POLICE STATION.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. When was the Port Augusta Police Station built?

2. Is the building considered adequate to meet the requirements of this centre?

3. If not, will consideration be given to the building of a new police station?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. 1883.

2. No.

3. Consideration is being given to the desirability of rebuilding the police station which may necessitate the partial demolition of the existing premises. Meanwhile, plans are being prepared for additional office and cell accommodation.

#### COUNCIL DRAINAGE SCHEMES.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Has the Government agreed to subsidize or financially assist metropolitan councils in implementing drainage schemes?

2. If so, what schemes have been approved?

3. What is the basis of Government assistance?

4. From what fund is the assistance to be paid?

5. Is the Government prepared to give similar assistance to country municipalities?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1 to 4. A Bill dealing with this matter will be before Parliament this session.

5. In a suitable case, "Yes."

#### GOVERNMENT OFFICES AT PORT AUGUSTA.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. When is it proposed to commence the erection of a new Waterworks Office at Port Augusta?

2. Is it proposed to so plan the building that other Government offices may be accommodated there if the need should arise?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Plans and specifications are being prepared,

and if approved, work may commence late this year. There is no intention to accommodate other Government offices.

#### PORT PIRIE RAILWAY SERVICES.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. When is it expected that the cafeteria car will be restored to the Adelaide-Port Pirie Express?

2. When is it expected that the Bluebird rail cars will be introduced on the Adelaide-Port Pirie railway service?

3. Will due consideration be given to operating the cars on a time table suitable to cater for the reasonable needs of Whyalla, Port Augusta, and districts?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. It is anticipated the cafeteria car, which has been undergoing overhaul, will be returned to traffic within a fortnight on the East-West express between Adelaide and Port Pirie Junction.

2. Although extensive investigations have been made into the practicability of introducing a rail car service on the Port Pirie line, a final decision has not been reached. The volume of mail, parcels, baggage, and other traffic handled by the existing passenger service presents a number of problems which have not yet been solved.

3. In the event of a rail car service being introduced between Adelaide and Port Pirie, due consideration will be given to the reasonable needs of other districts consistent with the provision of services to townships en route between Adelaide and Port Pirie.

#### PORT GERMEIN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—When is it expected that a supply of electricity will be available for Port Germein?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The General Manager, Electricity Trust, reports that a detailed survey of requirements will be made in October, 1957. A quotation for supply will then be submitted to the applicants, and if it is accepted, work should be completed within 12 months.

#### RAILWAY PASSENGERS AND INSPECTORS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—

1. How many passengers were carried by the South Australian railways for the year ended June 30, 1957?

2. How many inspectors are employed by the department?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. 17,406,168.

2. Five ticket examiners and four traffic inspectors.

#### TRAMWAYS PASSENGERS AND INSPECTORS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—

1. How many passengers were carried by the Tramways Trust for the year ended June 30, 1957?

2. How many inspectors are employed by the trust?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The General Manager of the trust reports:—

1. 62,190,000.

2. 64 (plus six in training for impending retirements, etc.).

#### LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 6. Page 275.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an amendment without notice.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I take it that this motion is moved in connection with Standing Order No. 296, which, referring to the motion "That this Bill be now read a second time," states:—

To such question the only amendments which may be moved shall be:—

(1) To leave out "now" and to add "this day six months"; or

(2) In the form of a resolution, of which notice has been given, strictly relevant to the objects of the Bill.

I take it that the honourable member is now moving to suspend Standing Orders for the purpose of moving under paragraph (2) of that Standing Order, because he has not given notice of the amendment he proposes to move.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Then the Government does not oppose the suspension of Standing Orders, as it is only a technical question that would come up for discussion in any case by his giving notice for the next day of sitting, but, Mr. Speaker, I want your ruling whether we may discuss the motion of the honourable member before it is carried.

The SPEAKER—I have counted the House, and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion of the Leader of the Opposition.

Motion carried.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I thank the House

for giving me the opportunity to move my amendment, whatever may be its fate. The motion moved by the Premier and now before the House is:—

That this Bill be now read a second time. I now move the following amendment:—

To leave out all words after “that” with a view to inserting the words “this Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for three months’ long service leave after 10 years’ continuous service.”

The SPEAKER—Having read a copy of the amendment, I consider that it is in order and that the matter may be debated in the Chamber.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I rise on a point of order, because I do not want to interrupt the Leader’s second reading speech. I take it that the debate will take the form of a debate on the motion “that the Bill be now read a second time,” otherwise the Government will take an adverse view of the amendment if it is desired merely to prolong the debate by having two debates on the second reading.

The SPEAKER—The debate will now range over the subject matter of both the Bill and the amendment.

Mr. O’HALLORAN—We oppose this Bill for several reasons, and it is difficult to say which of them is the most vital or the strongest, but, taken together or separately, they completely justify our opposition. In the first place, the Bill, like its sponsor, is sailing under false colours. It is not really a Bill to provide for long service leave and it is extremely unlikely that any long service leave will accrue, as such, under it. All the Bill does—and, I believe, all it was ever intended to do—is to increase by one week the annual leave of some employees in private industry after they have worked with the same employer for a period of seven years. Originally, the Premier had no intention of making this additional leave cumulative. As I interpret his first announcement on the subject, it was to the effect that after seven years’ service with the same employer, workers would become entitled to an extra week’s leave; but when he saw that this proposal was not being received as favourably as he had expected, he decided, as an afterthought, that it would be possible for the leave to accumulate.

However, he has apparently not taken kindly to the idea of accumulation, and now that we have the Bill itself before us, we see that it prescribes a condition which, I think, will tend to prevent employees from taking the proposed additional leave in any other way

than in yearly instalments. The Bill provides that unless the employer agrees to allow the employee to accumulate the leave, the employee must take it as it accrues—that is, each year; and I feel sure that the employer will normally insist that the employee shall take his leave each year. That indeed, is the basis and spirit of the Bill. The imposition of any condition tending to prevent an employee from accumulating his long service leave is a contradiction of the basic principle of long service leave; and, peculiarly enough, in this case the only provision that could have justified the Premier in calling the leave long service leave would be a provision specifically safeguarding the employee’s rights in this connection.

Except for the fact that the short title of the Bill alleges that it is a Bill to provide for long service leave, no-one would really think it was such. As the writers of fiction would say, any resemblance between the principle of long service leave and the provisions of this Bill is purely coincidental. I said that this Bill, like its sponsor, is sailing under false colours. I shall have more to say about the false colours of the sponsor in a moment. We oppose the Bill not only because it is not a long service leave Bill but also because it will, if passed, very considerably retard the progress we hope to make towards achieving a scheme of true long service leave. We oppose it because it represents the level to which the Premier has been prepared to stoop in introducing it. The Bill is perilously close to a confidence trick; and it is remarkable that even the Premier should be so egotistical as to think that no-one would see through it. Let it not be thought that, in opposing the Bill and drawing attention to the objectionable features and to the objectionable motives prompting its introduction, we seek to delay (or that, in fact, we will delay very long) a benefit which we feel should be conferred upon all workers, namely, three weeks’ annual leave; but, rather, we wish all to know that we seek to secure, in the shortest possible time, the benefit of true long service leave for those workers to whom that benefit was denied by the L.C.L. Government three years ago when I introduced Labor’s Long Service Leave Bill and is being denied now in the Premier’s Bill.

We on this side of the House are unequivocally in favour of long service leave in its true sense, and if a Labor Government were in office—and in power—it would have no hesitation in legislating for it without any subterfuge, disguise or hypocrisy. I am speaking

of long service leave in the sense in which anyone who cares to give the matter the slightest consideration would understand it—that is, leave in respect of long service, leave to be enjoyed as such and to be of sufficiently long duration as to be worth-while. It may well be that if we succeed in defeating this bogus long service leave Bill, we will hasten the time when less favoured workers will be entitled to enjoy not only longer annual leave (which, in effect, the Premier is offering now) but also long service leave in the true sense of the term. At any rate, I think we can safely say that the present Government will never of its own accord grant that to the workers. In this connection, all I ask is that, no matter how much or how often they have been deceived in the past by the Premier's promises, announcements and reversals, they will at least see through the supreme deception that he is attempting to perpetrate now. If they can do so, and if they stand behind us in this struggle to establish a principle, I have no doubt that their good sense will be rewarded not only in the achievement of this particular benefit but also in the promotion of fair and just government in general.

Let us consider the steps leading up to the introduction of this Bill. Everyone knows that the accredited representatives of the trade union movement waited on the Premier in an attempt to persuade him to introduce long service leave legislation. They made no secret of the fact that if the South Australian Parliament passed legislation similar to that already passed in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania, it would be a step in the direction of achieving uniform conditions throughout Australia, under which all employees, whether under State awards or under Federal awards, would enjoy the benefit of long service leave. These representatives were naturally anxious that this desirable state of affairs should be brought about, and, of course, they were perfectly justified in doing whatever they could to bring it about.

It will be remembered that the validity of the Victorian Long Service Leave Act (as to its application to workers under Federal awards) had been challenged before the Privy Council and the Privy Council, in effect, had declared that as the Federal Parliament had not legislated for long service leave and the Federal Arbitration Court had not included it in any of its awards, the Victorian Act was valid in respect of employees working under Federal awards. (There was, of course, never any question as to the validity of its applica-

tion to workers under State awards). No-one, I think, would claim that the Privy Council's decision has made secure the long service leave rights conferred by State Acts on workers under Federal awards. As a matter of fact, we may say that, in view of all the circumstances, the whole position regarding long service leave is uncertain and unsatisfactory. For one thing, if and when the Federal Court (or Commission, as it is now called) makes an award, which could, of course, prescribe conditions differing from those embodied in State legislation or deny long service leave altogether, there could be greater confusion and even chaos, and the very principle of long service leave in industry could be endangered. There could even be serious industrial unrest.

In view of all these circumstances, it was not merely expedient and desirable, but essential, in the interests of industrial welfare and social progress that the Government of this State should introduce legislation similar in principle to the legislation passed in other States. Of course, we would not have expected the Government to propose provisions as favourable to workers as the provisions of other State Acts, but it was eminently desirable that at least the accepted and conventional conception of long service leave should be embodied in our legislation. And—who knows—a Federal award as favourable as the provisions of other State Acts might have eventually shamed the Premier into providing for similar benefits for South Australian employees under State awards.

The point is, however, that if the Premier had acceded to the request of the Trades and Labor Council and had thus been instrumental in placing on the Statute Book an Act comparable with the Acts already passed in other States, he would have made a worthy contribution to social progress, he would have assisted materially in the solution of the particular problem involved in the achievement of uniform and just long service leave provisions throughout Australia, and he would have shown himself to be the statesman that he is unaccountably alleged to be. But what was the Premier's response to the representations of the Trades and Labor Council? Under the pretence of admitting the principle of long service leave, he now proposes to give additional annual leave to workers who remain with their employers for seven years or more. How can anyone honestly regard seven years as long service for the purpose of long service leave?

Even in the Public Service (which can be regarded as the best of all possible worlds in



this connection) the minimum period of service is 10 years, and, as far as this State is concerned, that minimum is of comparatively recent application. It was not so long ago that a public servant in South Australia had to serve 20 years before he became entitled to long service leave. There is, of course, no objection to shortening the minimum qualifying period from 20 years to 10. Ten years is still a relatively long time. In any case, no-one would suggest that we should go back to the old harsh conditions on which long service leave used to be granted before the 10 years' minimum was introduced. But surely there is a practical minimum below which long service leave granted in respect of it would be a misnomer. The normally accepted concept of long service leave is that it is leave granted to an employee as a reward for long and faithful service. It is leave which an employee earns because, among other things, he has resisted inducements to desert his employer and because, generally speaking, the longer he remains with his employer, the more efficient and useful he becomes.

Conditions governing long service leave in the Public Service are fairly well known, but for the benefit of those who are not familiar with them, and for the purpose of emphasizing the absurdity of the so-called long service leave provisions of this Bill, I will briefly outline the relevant provisions of section 75 of the Public Service Act. The long service leave entitlement created by 10 years' service is 90 days, which, on a purely arithmetic basis, is equivalent to nine days' leave per year. Of course, the public servant is not entitled to take any of this leave before he has completed his 10 years' service, but as soon as he has completed 10 years' service he may, according to the exigencies of the service, avail himself of the whole of the leave for which he has thereby qualified.

In effect, the Public Service Act provides that a Government employee may not take his long service leave except as such. He cannot, of course, take any of it before it is due. For example, he cannot take any of the leave accruing in respect of his first 10 years' service before he has actually completed that period of service. He cannot take any of his long service leave in anticipation, as we have seen the Premier's scheme, if it is to be regarded as a long service leave scheme at all, would permit and even encourage. Moreover, I think the Government employee would find it difficult to obtain permission to take out his initial entitlement a week at a time even

after it had accrued. In general, long service leave, as provided under the Public Service Act, would be taken in sizeable amounts, whether it is the first instalment due in respect of the first 10 years' service or whether it is leave subsequently accumulated in respect of service beyond the first 10 years, and there is a not unnatural tendency for Government employees to take their long service leave at retirement or relatively late in their service.

The Public Service Act lays down that long service leave accruing in respect of service beyond 10 years can only be taken immediately before retirement or resignation, after the completion of 15 years' service, immediately after leave taken in respect of the first 10 years' service or when required because of invalidity. These provisions obviously express the intention that long service leave shall be *bona fide* long service leave and not partly one thing and partly another, or one thing at one time and another thing at another time, as the Premier's long service leave would be. I draw honourable members' attention especially to the fact that after completing the qualifying period of 10 years, a Government employee is not entitled to take subsequently accruing long service leave year by year.

The provision that an employee may receive payment instead of taking the actual leave from time to time is also an objectionable feature of the Bill. It entirely destroys the meaning and sense of long service leave. I am inclined to think that many employers will want to avail themselves of this alternative and may persuade their employees that it is in their interests to take pay each year instead of leave each year, or even deferred leave. The intrusion of this expedient will tend to substitute an annual industrial bonus for the long service leave that the Bill should provide for; and, of course, those employees who progress to higher jobs during their service will find themselves worse off, even in terms of money, if they have agreed to accept payment from year to year instead of taking their leave (or payment) later on.

This leads me to a consideration of the function and purpose of long service leave. Long service leave is not merely leave granted in respect of long service. It is leave granted for the purpose of enabling an employee to enjoy a considerable period of leisure, during which he may have real respite from his labours, travel or occupy himself in whatever way he pleases other than in working.

Again, where the employee takes his long service leave on retirement or just before he is due to retire, that leave gives him an opportunity to adjust himself to circumstances associated with his retirement, circumstances which usually include very considerably reduced income. It is, or it may be, very desirable that an employee should be able to look forward to a period of leave which, to all intents and purposes, he cannot avail himself of before the lapse of a considerable time, and thereby gain confidence for the future. If all goes well, he can enjoy that leave as it is intended he should, and if he, because of any misfortune, does not so enjoy it, he has had the satisfaction of knowing that his family will receive some benefit.

Apparently, the seven year period seemed to the Premier to be a convenient period on which he could compromise. It was not as retrospective as 20 years and, by comparison, therefore, not nearly as reprehensible as the corresponding provision in my Bill! Then again, thinking in terms of additional annual leave, as he no doubt was, he also thought a qualifying period of seven years was fair enough in view of the fact that daily paid Government employees become entitled to three weeks' annual leave after five years' service. It would have been very impolitic, of course, to place these two classes of employee on the same footing in this respect!

As to retrospectivity itself, if it was the degree that the Premier objected to in my Bill he could at least have moved an amendment providing for a shorter period of previous service to count for the purpose of computing long service leave entitlement. The fact that he did not do so indicated that he objected not only to retrospectivity but also to long service leave itself. Of course, the Premier thought he was explaining his objection to retrospectivity in reference to the liability of private employers, when he justified the Government's retrospective action in increasing superannuation pensions. "When the Government," he said, "brings down legislation which places a liability on it and is to operate retrospectively, it feels justified in doing so because it can meet the commitments." But what does this mean? How is the Government in any better position than private industry to undertake additional responsibilities of this kind? The only means the Government has of financing its obligations is increased taxation in some form or other. It is not the Government's money that is being spent. And how does industry finance similar obligations?

Obviously, such obligations become an expense of industry, which is passed on. Criticizing my Bill in 1954 the Premier said:—

It is one of the worst examples of class legislation that we have seen in this House for some time . . . It puts all the obligations on the employer and none on the employee.

He was not, I think, referring especially to the retrospective provision, but was expressing his opposition to the proposal to provide for long service leave by legislation. He made a special point of the fact that the Commonwealth Arbitration Court had power to grant long service leave for workers under Federal awards, and I assume his argument would have applied to the Industrial Court for workers under State awards if he had thought it expedient to mention those workers. At the time, however, he was counting on the possibility that the Victorian Long Service Leave Act would be declared invalid as regards workers under Federal awards. He also went on to say that the Federal Arbitration Court had imposed industrial conditions on the State Government which were held to be valid but that he entirely disagreed with that position.

The burden of the Premier's remarks on that occasion was that a State could only legislate for workers under State awards and yet he was endeavouring to justify opposition to my Bill because it provided for workers under Federal awards as well. Thus he was denying the benefit of long service leave not only to workers under State awards, for whom the State Parliament had an undoubted right to legislate, but also for workers under Federal awards, for whom as it subsequently transpired, the State Parliament had a right to legislate at least pending Commonwealth action. In any case, the Premier was prepared to deny, on the specious argument of non-application to workers under Federal awards, the benefit of long service leave to workers under State awards.

Apart, however, from the Federal complications necessarily involved in the granting of long service leave, the Premier's remarks on legislation as a means of granting it, indicated that in 1954 he was strongly opposed—indeed, entirely opposed—to such legislation and not merely to the legislation we proposed. On that occasion he said that the competence of the Federal Arbitration Court (and, presumably, the State Industrial Court) had not been questioned until "decisions on industrial matters were made by politicians in the eastern States." "By that meddling innovation," he went on, "politicians in Parliament have

adjudicated and in this case propose to adjudicate in industrial matters, thereby taking those matters out of the hands of the court and bringing them into the realm of politics."

In view of the Premier's present Bill and the political motives which have prompted him to introduce it, the statement that he made then appears as a most glaring example of political hypocrisy: or, if he is right now in providing by legislation for a questionable species of long service leave and, virtually, invading the preserves of the Industrial Court in the matter of annual leave, how wrong was he when he professed to deplore the intrusion of Parliament into the province of long service leave proper? And what further did the Premier say on the subject in 1954? "The Bill before the House," he said, "has much political background associated with it, and it would be the worst possible occurrence for the industrial worker to have his conditions fixed by persons having political considerations uppermost in their minds."

I pass over as unworthy of any serious consideration the Premier's quibbling criticism of the qualifications of continuous service which were included in my Bill, and I mention that criticism merely to draw attention to the parallel, or practically parallel, provisions contained in this Bill. Here again, provisions which were the acme of injustice three years ago appear to be quite fair and reasonable now. The fact is, of course, that they were never anything else but fair and reasonable.

Another reason the Premier gave for opposing my Bill was that the long service leave proposed therein was not in accordance with the long service leave provisions in the Public Service Act. He complained that the proposed long service leave had not been tied up with satisfactory service nor with continuous service. I have already dealt with the "continuous service" aspect. Regarding "Satisfactory service," which we are to assume is the fundamental basis of the Public Service scheme, I merely say that normally the fact that an employee has remained a long time with his employer is *prima facie* evidence of satisfactory service. As for the fact that long service leave is "only granted when approved by His Excellency in Executive Council," the Premier's reference to this condition only went to show how weak his case against my Bill was. However, if this particular objection was valid, he could have moved for the inclusion of a provision which would have ensured that an employee could only become entitled to long

service leave if he really deserved it. In any case, what similar safeguard has the Premier included in his own Bill? One would have thought that if the Premier objected to my Bill on the ground that it was not in accordance with the Public Service scheme, he would have insisted on something like the conditions of that scheme in his own Bill. One would have thought that if it was not the Premier introducing this Bill!

I have pointed out that daily paid Government employees received three weeks annual leave after five years' service (as well as long service leave on the same conditions as officers of the Public Service); and this five-year qualifying period has probably influenced the Premier in prescribing a seven-year qualifying period for long service leave for employees in industry, thereby emphasizing the absurdity of calling that leave long service leave.

In the course of my criticism I have referred to one or two provisions in the Bill itself—the provisions which I consider as fundamental and as expressing the real principle of the Bill. There are, however, other provisions which I feel I should mention. In providing that employer and employee may agree on a number of matters, such as whether the leave will be taken annually or allowed to accumulate, whether pay will be taken in lieu one year and perhaps not the next, etc., the Premier has also provided considerable scope for disagreement between the parties. Litigation could arise as to what was agreed upon as well as to the interpretation of other provisions. There could also be a good deal of practical confusion because conceivably some employees may, pursuant to the Bill, be working under some deferment plan while some may be taking their leave each year, some every two years, some every three years, etc., although, as I suggested earlier, most employers will prefer to cut the Gordian knot and compel their employees to take the leave each year. Clause 12 (2) provides that the Public Actuary is to determine whether any long service leave scheme now being applied by an employer is "not less favourable than that prescribed by this Bill," but I suggest that the Public Actuary will find great difficulty in doing so for the simple reason that long service leave schemes in industry are nothing like the scheme provided for in the Bill.

If the Premier is prepared to withdraw this Bill and redraft it so that it provides for three weeks' annual leave for all employees not now enjoying that benefit and at the same time remove all the trappings that

merely disguise the real effect of the Bill, I have no doubt that members on this side of the House would be pleased to support it even with the seven years' qualifying period.

I repeat, however, that we stand for long service leave in its true sense and, since the issue is really that of long service leave, I have moved that the Bill be withdrawn and re-introduced to provide for three months' long service leave after 10 years' continuous service, which is the policy of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I am surprised that no Government member is prepared to answer the Leader of the Opposition. In 1954, in opposing the Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier commenced by congratulating him on an excellent speech, but then criticized the various clauses. Ignoring for the moment the contentious part of this Bill—one week's long service leave after seven years' service—the ancillary provisions of this Bill are almost identical with the provisions of the Leaders' Bill which the Premier criticized so strongly. The Premier opposed long service leave in 1954 because at that time the High Court was considering the validity of State Parliaments legislating to provide long service leave, and said that the Grants Commission would not make any contribution to the State because of legislation affecting private employers, but only as affecting State undertakings. He also said the question of long service leave was not a matter for meddlesome politicians to determine. The Victorian legislation was contested before the High Court and found to be valid by the unanimous decision of the seven judges who heard the case. The case went to the Privy Council which, also by unanimous decision, ruled that it was valid for a State Parliament to adjudicate on this question. As a result, the Trades and Labour Council of South Australia approached the Premier and asked that the South Australian Government legislate for long service leave, all other States without such legislation having indicated that they would do so. Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and Tasmania have legislation providing for 13 weeks' leave after 20 years' service. When the deputation from the Trades and Labor Council met the Premier he told it he was in a cleft stick, meaning that South Australia was the only State out of line and that his Government would be forced to introduce long service leave legislation. Then he sought

the best way to enact long service leave legislation without actually giving the worker long service leave, and he could not have chosen a better method than this Bill of ostensibly giving the worker long service leave and at the same time making sure he would not get it. The leave granted by the Bill is not long service leave in the sense accepted by Australian workers and other State Parliaments. In my opinion—and I am supported by eminent legal men—if contested before the High Court it would be held to be invalid.

Mr. Hambour—Why?

Mr. LAWN—In support of my argument I refer to volume 92 of the *Commonwealth Law Reports*, which contains a report of the legal challenge to the Victorian long service leave legislation. The judgment of six of the seven judges refers to the provisions of the metal trades award given by Conciliation Commissioner Galvin and states:—

One is a clause which deals with the payment of wages; another is a clause, which under the heading of "Contract of Employment," provides that an employee not attending for duty shall, subject to an immaterial exception, lose his pay for the actual time of such non-attendance; and another is a clause making elaborate provision for annual leave. The period of annual leave is to be 14 consecutive days allowed annually to an employee after 12 months' continuous service as an employee on a weekly hiring.

At page 554 the judgment continues:—

Annual leave is an entirely distinct conception from long service leave.

At page 563, Mr. Justice Taylor states:—

The provisions of the award and of the Act have already been analysed and the opinion expressed that there is no conflict between their respective terms. I agree with this conclusion basing my opinion upon the view that the award does not in any way deal with the subject of long service leave nor can it be regarded as an exhaustive declaration of the conditions binding upon the parties with respect to service and employment in the industries specified in the award. At the most it is exhaustive only so far as it purports to deal with those matters which were in dispute between the parties and it is quite silent on the question of long service leave. It is, I think, quite clear that the Act does not purport to, or in fact, cover any part of the ground covered by the award and in so far as the respondent's argument is based on the contrary proposition it must fail.

The court said, in effect, that had the Victorian legislation dealt with the provisions of the metal trades award, including annual leave, it would have been held invalid, and I point out that the Bill before this House merely extends the period of annual leave after seven years' continuous service from 14 to 21 days.

Three years ago I refuted the Premier's statement that the Victorian legislation would be held invalid, and my opinion was subsequently supported by both the High Court and the Privy Council. In view of the court's decision on that legislation, I prophesy that, if this Bill becomes law and is challenged, it will be held invalid because it merely extends the period of annual leave, a provision already contained in awards of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Court and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of a State Parliament.

In his efforts to delude the workers the Premier has produced what may be termed a bastard Bill: it has no parents, no heritage, and no relation of any kind anywhere in the world. It is the result of the Premier's effort to produce something which he knows in 12 months' time will be found by the High Court to be invalid. He will then tell the people that his Government did its best to give them long service leave. Today he merely wishes to give the Wallaroo electors the impression that his Government desires to legislate for long service leave. That must be the case because no Government supporter is prepared to speak this afternoon. True, one was listed after the Leader of the Opposition, but he did not rise to speak, and I rose only because he did not. Government members led us to believe that they wanted to debate the Bill, but apparently none has the courage to speak on it because it is not a long service leave Bill. I spoke because the Speaker was about to put the amendment to the House.

Mr. Jenkins—I waited for my name to be called.

Mr. LAWN—Since the honourable member has drawn attention to the fact that he was the member listed to speak after Mr. O'Halloran, I say that he remained seated while the Speaker was putting the amendment to the vote, although he knew as well as I did that he was down to speak after Mr. O'Halloran, and that the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) was to follow him. When it seemed that the Speaker was about to put the amendment I got up and drew the Speaker's attention to the fact that I wanted to speak. Indeed, I believe the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) actually voted.

Mr. Shannon—Yes.

Mr. LAWN—Mr. Jenkins did not take his place as a speaker, and I believe that Government supporters generally are not keen on the Bill. Now, however, Mr. Jenkins or some other

Government member will probably follow me as I have drawn attention to the attitude of Government members generally. I have said that you are not keen on debating the Bill.

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member must address himself to the Chair and not speak to members opposite.

Mr. LAWN—If Government members thought this Bill was the best in the Commonwealth why did they not speak on it? No doubt they will now, but I believe they would not have done so. Some Government members seem to think this Bill is a joke, but I do not agree with them. I read in the press from time to time about politicians, matters of expediency and pre-election promises. I remind members that for six years I have been asking questions about concession rates for pensioners travelling on public transport and that for five years the proposal has been rejected out of hand, but only two weeks ago when I asked about it the Premier informed me that it would be considered by Cabinet. Why? Because of the Wallaroo by-election. Why has the debate on the Loan Estimates been interrupted to enable the debate on this Bill to proceed? Because of the Wallaroo by-election.

This Bill is being treated as a joke by Government members, but no Government should treat such a serious matter as a joke and introduce legislation merely because it suits it politically. His Excellency's Speech, which was written by the Premier and his advisers, stated that the Government "might" introduce a long service leave Bill; yet now, following on the unfortunate death three weeks ago of the member for Wallaroo, the Government rushes ahead with this legislation. The Treasurer has always told the House that the Government desires that the Estimates be discussed expeditiously because it wants money, and this year is no exception because the money is needed; yet the debate on the Loan Estimates has been interrupted in order to put this Bill before the House and give the electors of Wallaroo a false sense of security.

I point out, however, that I have campaigned in the Wallaroo electorate for four days and have heard no reference to this Bill; but the people there have discussed the principle embodied in Mr. O'Halloran's amendment. Further, unless three of our biggest manufacturing concerns change their attitude on this question, thousands of employees in this State will demonstrate in favour of the amendment.

Only three years ago the Premier was opposed to the principle of long service leave for workers in private industry, yet now he introduces this Bill. Why? Not because he is considerate of the rights of employees in private enterprise or because the Government wants to give some reward for long service, but so that it cannot be said that the Government is the only one in the Commonwealth that has not attempted to legislate for the benefit of these people. The South Australian Government has always been backward in introducing legislation for the benefit of workers. Our Workmen's Compensation Act is no better than what Western Australia had under a Liberal Government, and the Acts of the other States have always been better than ours. This State is always last in everything, as it was in introducing the 44-hour week and later the 40-hour week, and payment for public holidays.

The Bill does not provide for long service leave, but only for an extension of annual leave. On more than one occasion the Trades and Labor Council has approached the Government for three weeks' annual leave for Government employees. About two years ago the Premier agreed to give 21 days' annual leave to Government employees after they had completed five years' service. By this Bill he is now saying to employees in private enterprise that they also can have 21 days' annual leave after seven years' service, and that is not long service leave. The principle of long service leave is that an employee should be given adequate rest to recuperate after long and faithful service to an employer. If the Opposition had introduced a Bill to provide for 13 weeks' long service leave after seven years' service the Premier would have said worse things than I have in criticizing his Bill. We say the qualifying period should be 10 years because that is consistent with the period that has to be served by Government employees. It is just as important for people making motor cars to get long service leave as it is for Government employees to get it. Members opposite drive around in motor cars.

Mr. Hambour—Don't you?

Mr. LAWN—I have been trying to buy one for the last six months, and I do not know whether I shall ever pay for it, but those who make motor cars are just as entitled to long service leave as those who make our railway cars. I have been secretary of the union that represents people who make railway cars, motor cars and aircraft. Because those in the railways work for the Government they receive

13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years' service, but union members who work in private enterprise making motor cars or aircraft do not receive such leave. Is there any justice in that? The Premier has never attempted to say why there should be any discrimination. There should be no discrimination at all, and that is how employees view this bastard Bill which has been introduced by this dictator, a man who has been prepared to defy all the precedents set down by other States and the Commonwealth. The Government is so opposed to any progressive legislation to improve the conditions of the worker that the Premier is still prepared to introduce a Bill which denies the principles of long service leave to employees.

However, next year the Governor's Opening Speech, which is prepared by the Premier, will say that South Australian employees produce more *per capita* than those of any other State, yet our industrial legislation and Workmen's Compensation Act are the worst in the Commonwealth. This Government is sitting pretty under the dictatorship it enjoys under our electoral system. But for that the Government would go out by the will of the people. On August 31 the people of Wallaroo will tell the Government that they do not want its long service leave Bill, and they will endorse the amendment moved this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. I support the amendment and hope there will not be many members on the Government side not prepared to speak because they haven't the intestinal fortitude to do so.

Mr. RICHES—Mr. Speaker, I ask for your ruling at this stage on whether the debate is actually a debate on the second reading of the Bill. I understood from your reply earlier to the Premier that the debate would proceed as a second reading debate. When you attempted to put the motion that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the motion I heard an interjection from a member opposite, "We are not going to speak on this amendment because it is not worth speaking on. We will merely vote it out." Would it be possible for the debate to continue after the motion now before the Chair is put, and is it a fact that if the Premier addresses himself to this debate again he automatically closes the debate and that ends the debate on the second reading?

The SPEAKER—As I pointed out earlier, this debate covers the whole range of the Bill itself and the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. When the debate has been concluded the question will be put,

"That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the motion." Assuming that is carried, there will be no further debate and Standing Orders 208 and 209 will apply. The question will then be put, "That the Bill be read a second time," and that will be put without any further debate. If the Treasurer speaks he closes the debate.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I was astounded to hear it said from the other side of the House, "We will vote it out because it is too silly." Members opposite always consider that anything introduced in the interests of the worker is foolish. I never expected anything in the nature of a long service Bill from this Government. A few days ago I heard the Premier say over the air that Labor members would oppose his Bill, but it does not follow the principle of long service leave. Thousands of workers are now enjoying the benefit of three weeks' annual leave, and if the Bill is passed those not getting three weeks will merely get one more week's annual leave. Workers are entitled to some recognition by way of more leisure after serving in industry for 10 years.

Another objection is that many employees will not benefit by the Bill because its operation will not be retrospective. Some have been serving in industry for 50 years, and they will have retired before the qualifying period of seven years expires. That is not just. Every man who has given 10 years' service should be given a holiday of three months. This legislation is worse than that of any other State, but we could not expect anything better from the Playford Government. At one time I thought the Premier might be thinking on different lines. He did not say that he would alter his Bill, but he said he would give it further consideration. I thought he would introduce legislation similar to that in other States. If he ever thought he could influence the Wallaroo electors by introducing this Bill he has another think coming. I know the feeling in the district. Private employers give their employees long service leave and although it does not conform with all Labor wants, it is better than the Premier proposes. Private firms and councils give their employees long service leave after 20 years, and some after 10 years. Surely the Government could provide a similar benefit. Many workers have spent all their working life in industry and are entitled to a reward. If members opposite were honest with themselves they would agree.

Mr. Speaker, it is the practice to give you the names of the speakers on various Bills. Today one member of the Government Party was to speak after the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether the whip was held over him, or whether he funkcd, but he did not speak then. I thought that he might speak after Mr. Lawn, but he went to the Premier for instructions, and is still dumb.

Mr. Jenkins—Do you get your instructions from the gallery?

Mr. DAVIS—No, and I do not get any instructions from my Leader. We can say what we think is necessary in the interests of the workers. I have been in this House too long—

Mr. Jenkins—Yes, too long.

Mr. DAVIS—I have been here too long for the honourable member. He does not like to hear the truth about the conditions under which men work. Members opposite will not vote according to their conscience, but according to instructions, which are that the amendment must be defeated. I hope members opposite will sooner or later realize their responsibilities to the people and introduce decent long service leave legislation. I intended to speak at length on this matter, but I had to fill the gap when members opposite refused to speak. If they think the Bill does the right thing for the workers let them speak in support of it, but they cannot support it because they know it is unjust. They know what should be given to the workers. The master class always knows what is good for its followers, but we know of the hardships in industry and the reward that workers should get. In many instances working conditions are detrimental to the health of workers, which is all the more reason why they should get three months' long service leave after 10 years. I have worked in various industries over many years and I know what it must mean to an employee to have a rest from work after 10 years. Many men have died from the effects of their work, but if they had had three months' rest after 10 years they would not have died so soon. I doubt whether members opposite think of the health of the workers. In any case they do not give the matter much consideration. They regard industry as a means of getting more profits for the owners. The people responsible for making the profits are not considered. Earlier someone said that Opposition members had to do what the Leader of the Opposition said, but Labor members as a party decide on policy and what should be

done. Everybody knows the policy of the Australian Labor Party includes the provision of decent long service leave. After about 18 months the electors will realize there is no hope of getting decent long service leave until Labor holds the reins of government.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—This can scarcely be called a debate. The Government has introduced a Bill which it regards as important, but after its introduction Government members haven't the guts to speak in support of it. The master has spoken and his supporters sit behind him like dumb, driven cattle. My conference instructed me to support our policy on long service leave and I voted in support of that instruction. Give me credit when I honour a pledge I voluntarily gave. Condemn me when I break a pledge. I am astonished that the Premier introduced this Bill, for on October 6, 1954, when speaking on a Bill introduced by Mr. O'Halloran for long service leave, he said:—

There can be no question in my mind of the competence of the Arbitration Court to deal with industrial disputes between parties registered in that court. That principle was not questioned until recently when decisions on industrial matters were made by politicians in the eastern States. By that most meddling innovation politicians in Parliament have adjudicated, and in this case propose to adjudicate, in industrial matters, thereby taking those matters out of the hands of the court and bringing them within the realm of politics. At present there is no outcry from the workers against the decisions of the politicians, because they have decided in a manner partial to employees. It is, however, a most dangerous precedent because if Parliament can hand out privileges under such legislation as this it naturally follows that it can take privileges away from the workers.

It is remarkable that after making such a statement only three years ago the Premier should introduce this Bill. I do not know whether he has reconciled himself to being a meddling politician, but apparently he has decided it is now right to introduce legislation of an industrial character. Three years ago he held up his hands in horror and described the Bill as the worst type of class legislation. I hope that before this debate is over some Government members will be persuaded to inform us why the Government has chosen to introduce this type of what it euphemistically calls long service leave. The Premier certainly did not do so in his second reading speech, and now that the gag is on Government members we are not likely to hear it. I thought it was a flu epidemic that was

raging in South Australia, but apparently it is more in the nature of a lockjaw epidemic. As there is nothing to condemn in what Government members have said—they have said nothing—it is opportune to say a few words about the measure itself and have our opinions recorded in *Hansard* for the benefit of Government members, since apparently our words are not penetrating the ear plugs that have purposely been put in on that side of the House.

Mr. O'Halloran—They are deaf as well as dumb.

Mr. JENNINGS—It would seem so.

Mr. Hambour—Is it annoying you?

Mr. JENNINGS—Not in the least, but I wish honourable members would show some interest.

Mr. Hambour—Our turn will come.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes, in about 18 months' time. The Government will get a blood transfusion, incidentally, on August 31.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. JENNINGS—Most members have received voluminous correspondence about this measure. However, in 1954, the Premier said, in effect, "This is class legislation. I oppose it because I have got a sheaf of letters from employers who oppose long service leave and therefore the people of South Australia do not want it." The Opposition was astonished at that time because it imagined employers would have rushed to write letters to the Premier favouring long service leave. I would like to quote from some of the correspondence I have received. I propose to quote firstly from a source which is not pro-Labor: the gentleman—if I can so describe him—being a columnist for the *Advertiser* and a man who gives commentaries over the air at night. Mr. William Waymouth is an admitted anti-Labor voter. He wrote:—

After a series of alarms and excursions, countless apologia and endless diversionary measures, the State Government has at last accepted in principle a little matter which affects about a quarter of a million workers in South Australia—long service leave. So far so good, but when you analyse Sir Thomas Playford's initial statement on the subject you begin to wonder: how far? With employees of seven years' standing, or if in the public service, unquestionably sitting, on an equivalent basis with people who have served 20 or 25 years with one organization, it would seem that a better title for this measure would be the Short Service Leave Bill. As in other measures introduced by the Playford Long Parliament, the stress has been on compromise. You can see those chaps at the Treasury Buildings saying: "Appease their demands, and quieten our own consciences!" . . .



This so-called long service leave measure offers no rewards to the real long service man. He is not protected. This measure is designed to protect the employer. Sir Thomas Playford himself implied that if long service leave had too long a retrospectivity, industry would suffer because of employers' difficulty in meeting its demands. But surely in the years when long service leave has not applied, employers have had plenty of time to protect themselves against that grey dawn when they awoke and found it in operation. It seems to me unspeakably inequitable that a man who has given 20 or 25 years' faithful and loyal service to a company should be placed on the same footing as people who have served only slightly more than a quarter of that time.

That, of course, is precisely what this legislation provides. The article continues:—

It is more than inequitable. It's outrageous. After all, most men and women, unless they marry, stay in one employment for seven years. It is a minimum term of service. About the only employees who don't serve so slight a period are those whose eyes turn overseas, or those who are to all practical purposes unemployable.

Whatever way you like to look at it, this middle of the road measure is not fabricated to help the people it is theoretically designed to help. And I hope that when it reaches Parliament the Opposition Leader, Mr. O'Halloran, and his Party, with whom I am not usually in political agreement, give it the works.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is what we are proceeding to do.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes, and we are not getting any lubrication from the Government. Mr. Lawn pointed out that this Bill actually provides merely for an extension of annual leave. It will not be long before three weeks' annual leave applies generally throughout the Commonwealth. Already many industries provide it. I need only instance the oil industry, Gas Company, Electricity Trust, the Government, insurance companies, banks, *The Advertiser*, and shipping companies, which all provide three weeks' annual leave for their clerical employees. Airways companies, incidentally, provide four weeks' annual leave. So far as long service leave is concerned, the oil companies provide three months after 20 years' service, the Broken Hill Associated Smelters three months after 20 years, wool companies the same, the Gas Company six months after 20 years and the trustee companies and insurance companies three months after 20 years. Those provisions also apply to clerical employees.

It will be seen that the pattern of long service leave throughout Australia is in accordance with what has already been done by agreements under awards in South Australia. In all States where long service leave exists it

follows the pattern of a proper and decent respite from work after long and faithful service. I do not know whether the Premier introduced his hotch-potch system as a result of collusion or not, but knowing the Premier and the Metal Trades Federation I presume that it was done by collusion, for once this confusion was introduced into the issue because of an entirely different concept of long service leave, the employers were enabled to go to the Arbitration Court with a log of claims which will have the effect, if granted, of reducing the long service leave entitlements of workers under Federal awards in all States, despite the better legislation that has been enacted in those States. I believe that was done deliberately. The employers will be able to go to the court and ask for a log of claims on long service leave—even though the court has previously never adjudicated on this question—and as a consequence reduce the entitlement of workers in other States and cut the ground from under the feet of any proper move made in this State for some form of long service leave that would conform to the general pattern throughout Australia.

A few moments ago I referred to the correspondence members had received on this issue. The personnel officer of one of the big manufacturing companies in Adelaide has written as follows:—

The Premier's proposed legislation on what he chooses to term long service leave is so fraught with inconsistencies and injury to genuine long service employees, that I feel you will already be alive to its shortcomings—without receiving letters such as this. The fact that I have found no-one who can see any real virtue in what he proposes is indicative that the Premier has not been advised wisely.

The writer does not realize that the Premier cannot be advised. His letter continues:—

What more significant pointer in this direction does anyone need, than the fact that both union and employer organizations are voicing protests. Let us examine salient points of what the Government proposes. Up to date, the term long service leave has, without exception, been associated with the principle of a comparatively long "break" or furlough, with pay, after an extended period of continuous employment with the same employer. Everyone knows that this principle applies to the State Government employees under the Premier's own control. Other States have introduced by legislation, long service leave along the conventional lines and, with a few slight variations, past years of service by employees with their current employers is included in accruing leave due. With all this established it is past normal comprehension that one State of the Commonwealth should suddenly

introduce a principle that is as remote from the conventional pattern as the poles. Do not let the Premier say that, because his proposals do not follow convention, they are necessarily wrong, because whether the conventional pattern is right or wrong there is at least one very sound reason for as much uniformity as possible within the Commonwealth.

Many employers have interstate interests. In the years to come and with the growth of the nation these numbers will increase. With plants in several States, interchanging of personnel is taking place all the time. It is true that from a legal standpoint the long service leave provisions cannot travel interstate with these people, but employers have to be practical and they recognize the need for preserving accrued benefits of service in each State. Let us be practical. How can this be done when one lone State has an entirely different set-up from the rest? If the Premier had been "blazing the trail" with retrospective service not counted, the position might have been different in what is claimed by the Premier to be the most prosperous State.

The Premier gives his proposal the name of "long service leave." Having in mind all the precedents now established to influence our thinking we will be faced now with the ludicrous spectacle of a young man of 21 years of age receiving "long service leave." By joining a firm at 14 years of age and remaining there seven years he will have qualified and be receiving an extra week's leave per annum. Long service leave? I ask you!

Whilst on the subject of one week's "long service leave" per annum after a seven-year qualifying period, let us work out how this can be done. From inquiries it appears that somewhere about 50 per cent of employees will be entitled to participate immediately.

That is presumably one of the reasons why the Premier has introduced this type of legislation. The letter continues:—

If the Premier imagines these people will have the leave rostered throughout the year, is he aware of the annual close-down provisions of various awards. These clauses were designed to overcome the chaos which resulted from rostered annual leave disorganizing production, whilst the plant and machinery was never stationary long enough for major overhauling. The Premier's legislation and its one-week's leave cannot be married to the two weeks' leave provided in awards, so it appears that employers will be back where they started, and employees will also have their rostering troubles of not being able to have their "long service leave" when they want it, but when the employers can best let them have it.

On the other hand, if 13 weeks' long service leave is to be taken after, say, 20 years' service, employers feel their men are being rewarded for something really achieved; there is better opportunity to organize efficiently for the work of these absentees to be carried on, and employers recognize what excellent opportunities of practical training 13 or more weeks offer for under-studies and young executives to handle more senior positions.

B1

I do not wish to quote further from that letter; I think members who listened will agree that it was not written by a person who would normally vote Labor, but its logic cannot be gainsaid by anyone in the House.

Last Friday night the Premier made a broadcast that seemed to illustrate his attitude towards the truth, which I think could be described as his neglect of, or disrespect for, the truth. It could also be described as his complete estrangement from the truth, because he certainly was not circumscribed at all by the truth. He said that the Labor Party would oppose his long service leave legislation because it had been instructed to do so by the executive of the State Labor Party. That is not the truth, and I do not think he is as ignorant as all that.

Mr. Millhouse—Tell us what is the position?

Mr. JENNINGS—He also said that the Labor Party was deliberately opposing something that would be in the interest of the workers. That should be the last thing that he would worry about. In answer to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), a democratically-elected conference of the Australian Labor Party decided the attitude its representatives should take in Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse—Are you talking about the Democratic Labor Party?

Mr. JENNINGS—I am talking about the only democratic Labor Party, which is the only Labor Party. That conference decided the attitude its members should adopt in this Parliament, and we are following it. All the people at the conference helped to decide our policy. That is an entirely different proposition from the Liberal Party conference held during Show Week—I think we could call it Sideshow Week—when many people blow off steam knowing they are completely impotent, because what they decide does not cut any ice with the Government. The people in the Liberal Club building and the Government can do what they like without any hindrance from the official organization. We do not work that way. We consider ourselves a democratic Party, and we are elected to Parliament on a policy. We do not take orders before we come in here, but we come here because we believe in a certain policy, we voluntarily join our organization and we are elected because we believe in it. We then honour the pledge we make.

Mr. Brookman—If you were instructed to support the Bill, would you do so?

Mr. JENNINGS—If that happened, and I did not believe in the Bill, I would resign.

Mr. Hambour—You would have to resign or you would be expelled.

Mr. JENNINGS—I would not. Members opposite cannot ever hope to understand the honour that binds members of the Labor Party. We are bound by a pledge that to us is sacrosanct. Members opposite are in a remarkably fortunate position in that they can come into Parliament supporting what is loosely described as a policy, but they can never be tied down because there is no such thing as a Liberal Country League policy, so how could they breach it? We are also in a very fortunate position, but in a much more constructive way, because we have a policy in which we believe, we let our democratically-elected organization adjudicate on it, and accept the majority decision. When it gets to the stage that our consciences cannot support something agreed on by our Party, if we have any decency at all we will reesign from the Party rather than ruin it because of something we do.

Mr. Corcoran—What is wrong with the policy of the Party?

Mr. JENNINGS—There is nothing wrong with it. We are talking about issues wide of the Bill, but we have to do so because nobody opposite is discussing the Bill, and there cannot be a debate in complete vacuum. The real crux of the matter is this: the Government is quite satisfied to give to its own employees three months' long service leave, paid by the taxpayers, after 10 years, but it is an entirely different proposition for big private employers represented by members opposite to pay for long service leave. Although they are prepared to allow the taxpayers to provide an amenity they consider just, they are not prepared to put the people who provide the money for their election campaign and their Party organization in the position of having to provide for a similar amenity out of their profits. I hope that by stonewalling somewhat I have given some members opposite the chance to reconsider whether or not they will speak on this measure. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—In supporting my Leader's amendment I wish to deal with the history of the introduction of this Bill. When it was first mooted and we learned from the press the tentative proposals, the Premier clearly had in mind a Bill he intended to call a Long Service Leave Bill. Subsequently he learned that the Australian Labor Party would take a definite line on the

measure and that he would be unable to rely on the support of members on this side to get his Bill through this House or another place. Then we read, as a consequence of that, the statement in the Governor's Speech that a Long Service Bill might be introduced this session. Obviously there was no intention to introduce this Bill in any hurry, but since then the Government has been faced with a by-election at Wallaroo and has introduced what it is calling a Long Service Leave Bill. Silence reigns supreme on the Government side and members opposite obviously do not intend to speak in this debate.

Mr. John Clark—They may speak later after mature consideration!

Mr. LOVEDAY—One would have thought that as their Party was introducing the Bill their minds would be so full of its advantages to the workers that they would not need hours to ponder its merits or demerits, but early this afternoon it was obvious that Government members would allow the measure to go to the vote without speaking on it. Not even the employers who usually stand behind the Liberal and Country League Government think this is a good Bill. In fact I have discussed it with some and they think it is a measure to forestall the granting of three weeks' recreation leave to the worker in the near future. Further, they regard it as having no similarity to any other Long Service Leave Bill. It simply does not answer the description of what is usually considered long service leave legislation.

Government employees in this State enjoy three months' long service leave after 10 years' continuous service as well as three weeks' annual leave after five years' continuous service, and those provisions are interesting in view of the contents of this Bill. The condition of seven years' continuous service in the Bill has no doubt been included to obviate the possibility of any alleged connection between Government employees' annual leave and the provisions of the Bill. Anything that makes for discrimination between two large sections of wage earners is a bad thing and must cause a measure of envy on the one side and a feeling that one service is better than another and entices people into it. It is therefore rather interesting to notice that, although many supporters of the Playford Government are always complaining about the number of unproductive people in the public service, this Government introduces a measure the provisions of which are in no way equal to those enjoyed by public servants. In other

words, Government employment will still remain more attractive than private industry.

The Premier is never tired of praising the wage earners of this State for their productive efforts; he always holds them up as an example to workers in other States; he talks about the industrial peace that prevails in South Australia; yet our workers are always the last to receive the benefits of progressive industrial legislation, and only receive them when progress can be held up no longer and when the pressure of public opinion is so strong that it cannot be resisted.

I now turn to the remarks of the Premier in 1954 when speaking on Mr. O'Halloran's Long Service Leave Bill. Referring to the competence of the Arbitration Court to deal with industrial disputes, he said:—

There can be no question in my mind of the competence of the Arbitration Court to deal with industrial disputes between parties registered in that court. That principle was not questioned until recently when decisions on industrial matters were made by politicians in the eastern States. By that most meddlesome innovation politicians in Parliament have adjudicated, and in this case propose to adjudicate, in industrial matters, thereby taking those matters out of the hands of the court and bringing them within the realm of politics. At present there is no outcry from the workers against the decisions of the politicians because they have decided in a manner partial to employees. It is, however, a most dangerous precedent because, if Parliament can hand out privileges under such legislation as this, it naturally follows that it can take privileges away from the workers.

What a different attitude the Premier adopts today when he introduces legislation that will do the very things that he said on no account should be permitted. Later in the 1954 debate he said:—

The Bill before the House has much political background associated with it, and it would be the worst possible occurrence for the industrial worker to have his conditions fixed by persons having political considerations uppermost in their minds.

That is possibly one of the most interesting statements he made in that debate, for no-one will deny that the present Bill is being introduced with political considerations uppermost in the mind of the Government. The Premier continued:—

The Bill is not in keeping with the legislation governing the long service leave of Government workers; its approach to the problem is entirely different.

Yet today we have a Bill that in no way measures up to the provisions enjoyed by public servants. The Premier has made a complete

*volte face* in introducing this Bill, but no doubt we will hear some peculiar explanation of his changed attitude later.

One of the most interesting clauses of the Bill is that relating to the manner in which the leave to which the worker is entitled, including any leave that has been postponed, shall, unless it is postponed to a subsequent year, be taken by agreement between the worker and his employer. Let us visualize what an employer is likely to do under such circumstances. For the sake of keeping his records easily his most probable line will be to ask the employee to take his leave every year. Any employer with a large number of employees regards the simplification of office records as a most important factor in the economical running of his business, and I feel certain that the larger employers particularly will say that the leave must be taken every year. One has only to discuss the question of records with any large employer to see how concerned he is about their simplicity. He objects, for example, to supplying extra information about the contents of the pay packet and any request in this direction is always strongly resisted. He will regard this clause as one under which he may take the easiest way out and insist that the employee take the week's leave every year. That only reinforces our view that this legislation will, in effect, mean the provision of three weeks' annual leave and that it does not resemble in any shape or form long service leave as we generally understand it. I do not think one can stress too much the importance of that aspect because anyone with industrial experience knows full well that the attitude of the large employer will certainly be to take the line of least resistance on that point.

Supposing an employer is willing to come to some sort of agreement, he will have the situation where he has to employ a staff especially to keep the records of the different things his employees are doing because, under the Bill, they may accumulate leave for a period, and take it in a different manner thereafter. Indeed, the confusion that will arise because of that provision could be endless.

Mr. O'Halloran—If it suits the employer the employee may take pay in lieu of leave.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Yes. We have strenuously opposed that practice and we oppose it now for good reasons. If that provision becomes law the employer may grant his employee a straightout money bonus and that would defeat the whole object of long service leave.

Then there is the situation that will undoubtedly arise where a worker changes his employment. He will have a different set of provisions if he is under a Federal award than if he were under the hotch-potch that is served up to us today. No attempt has been made by the Government to line up this legislation with long service leave provisions in other spheres. It strikes out on an individual course that can only be detrimental to industrial relations in this State and in other States, whereas the aim today should be to achieve uniformity in industrial considerations, not to make them even more diverse in their application.

Mr. O'Halloran—You could not make this uniform with any other system in the world.

Mr. LOVEDAY—No, because it is not a long service Bill and therefore it is impossible to line it up with the true application of long service leave in any other State. The silence of members opposite on this measure is remarkable in view of one Government member's statement recently that his Party was becoming the Party looked to by workers of this State as representative of their ideals. Indeed he said the workers were supporting his Party. The amazing thing is that Government members have nothing to say about this legislation, which has such widespread industrial significance. Surely, if the Government is bringing down something of such great appeal to the workers as members opposite think, they should be telling us all about its advantages. Apparently they are silent on this issue and cannot find anything good to say about the Bill, but when they go to Wallaroo in the next week or so they will presumably hold forth about its virtues when there is no one to quote the Premier's remarks of 1954.

Mr. Frank Walsh—What about the industries in Wallaroo?

Mr. LOVEDAY—I presume there are not many employees in industry at Wallaroo because industries have been straying from that area. We have heard so much about this Bill and the great benefits that it will bring to the wage earner that I am surprised we have nothing better than the legislation now before us. Other States have given workers the benefit of long service leave for years. The Government had plenty of examples to follow so it is surprising that we should get the hybrid arrangement now before us. The Government has no excuse for not selecting the best legislation of the other States. Indeed, this State has the opportunity of being in the

lead in this field. The Bill pleases nobody, not even employers.

Mr. O'Halloran—Our amendment would be a striking advance.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Undoubtedly, and it would satisfy wage earners because they would be brought into line with Government employees. We must keep modern conditions and thinking in mind when considering long service leave. The Bill has nothing to commend it and offers little hope for the future. I wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. If it is carried this State will be setting an example to all other States on long service leave, and it is time we did so. South Australia has been lagging in industrial legislation for many years—for as long as we have had Liberal Governments—and there is no reason why we should not make a change for the better. I hope members opposite will not continue to follow the policy of always being last in legislating for the benefit of workers.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I support the amendment. Perhaps an article that appears in today's *News* accounts for the long silence of Government supporters. It seems that the Government has already decided that the Bill will come into operation as from July 1, and that all Government members agree on this. In all my years as a member of Parliament I have never known a debate to take a turn such as this one has. I agree entirely with my colleagues' remarks that this Bill does not provide for long service leave, but for an additional week's annual leave. Clause 6 (2) states:—

The amount of long service leave to which a worker is so entitled shall be seven consecutive days in the eighth and in each subsequent year of his continuous service with his employer.

Opposition members believe that the Bill should contain provisions in line with those of section 75 of the Public Service Act. That is why I entirely agree with the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Bill should be re-drafted so as to provide for 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years' service. Let us look at conditions in industry in recent times. Australia is a growing nation, but in 1939 many people were unemployed. Then we became involved in a world war. Everyone had to do everything possible to support the fighting forces. The Labor Party even agreed to wage pegging and the direction of labour. Some people were compelled to remain in industry, for their services were considered so

valuable that they were not permitted to join the fighting forces. Many joined the Allied Works Council. Some of these were not given the best medical attention and they are paying for that today.

Industrial conditions are changing today, and we must consider the effect on employees. Work is becoming more monotonous as a result of the machine age. Soon we shall have the age of automation, and this may result in even more monotony. Automation plants will be highly intricate, and skilled mechanics will be required to keep them in good repair. We are entering a period when the human element in industry must be considered. Apprenticeship in most industries is over a four-year period, and in some industries it is five years. Under this Bill apprentices must still serve a further two or three years to become entitled to additional leave.

In yesterday's *News* there appeared a photograph of one of our public servants as a result of his connection with the S.A. Co-operative Brick Co. Ltd. I recall that that company was at one time hardly able to meet its obligations, but with the supervision that has apparently taken place under the directorship of this person and others, it has been able to declare a fairly handsome dividend. I am not complaining about that. My complaint is that this Bill does not give full recognition to the people engaged in industry. The amount of money that would be required to provide long service leave of not less than 13 weeks after 10 years in this particular industry would not affect the dividend very much, and it would not be any grave hardship on the shareholders if the dividend were a little less. Any company can include in its income tax return capital expenditure on machinery.

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

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I thank you, Sir, for your courtesy. I am not complaining, but I do point out that some voices carry a long way.

Mr. O'Halloran—Members on this side wish to speak to the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Yes, and I suggest that if members opposite wish to say anything they can speak in the debate. Depreciation on capital equipment is an allowable deduction from income tax, and it often happens that a machine is paid for before its useful life is ended. But what of the human element that has kept pace with that machine? This Bill, as introduced, does not meet with my

approval. If it is good enough to write off the cost of a machine, surely provision can be made for a worker after 10 years of good and faithful service. How much more important is it to compensate the person engaged in the industry? That is the only approach to this very important question of long service leave in industry. All this Bill does is award one week's extra annual leave, and even to qualify for that a person must have completed at least seven years' service. Members on this side say that long service leave is little enough to offer people who for ten years have to punch a clock when signing off and on and in many cases fill in a time book. Surely after 10 weary years of that the employee is entitled to more consideration than an extra week's annual leave, and I maintain that the only way to compensate him is to allow him 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years' service, as section 75 of the Public Service Act does for public servants.

I do not wish what I am about to say to be taken as personal, but it is a sorry state of affairs when Government members remain so silent on such an important measure. The Government has circulated through the press that this Bill will take effect as from July 1. I point out that the whole of July and 20 days of this month have passed, and before the Bill leaves this House it will have been effective for two months without any contribution by Government members in the second reading debate. What makes it worse is that at the moment we have not even an audience of Government members. One would have thought that the Government would give more consideration to such an important Bill. When it does not have the required numbers its members can talk and delay an issue until more members arrive and make it secure again. I did expect that on this occasion there would be more than one speech by Government members and I deplore the attempt to pass legislation through the House under those circumstances. I do not know what will become of our Parliamentary system when this sort of thing happens. It is a crying shame that members opposite are not speaking on this Bill. They have gone on strike and they are practically renouncing the people who sent them here to voice their opinions. Surely there is something more in democracy than contemptible silence by members who support the Government that introduced this Bill. I support the amendment.

Mr. JENKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills.

## LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 8. Page 314.)

Grand total, £24,905,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I propose to deal with the duplication of the railway line from Goodwood to Brighton. Previously we were told the line would be duplicated from Goodwood to Marino, which the Public Works Standing Committee recommended at an estimated cost of £146,000. Twelve months ago an estimate of £373,000 was given for the work between Goodwood and Brighton, but there is no provision in the Loan Estimates for the work to proceed farther. There seems to be something wrong with the estimates of costs and the Minister of Works might be able to ascertain when the work from Brighton to Marino will be done. This will cost many thousands of pounds. The excavation necessary on that section will be more costly than on the Goodwood to Brighton section. Now that difficulties are presenting themselves it seems that the Government has altered its policy and does not intend to go on with the work. A better system of rail transport is necessary in view of the development taking place in the Marino district. The Minister of Education, who represents the area, will agree that at the first open crossing beyond Marino, where an accident occurred last week, the department might spend money to ease the embankment on its property to enable road transport to see whether trains are coming.

The lights and gates at the Emerson road and rail crossing are a credit to the engineers. What was the cost of this work? The storm water scheme is not adequate. Mr. Dunnage, who now represents the area, knows that much of the water comes from the Unley district. This legacy that I left in the Goodwood subdivision is getting more serious every day and until the Unley Council pulls its weight the people in Edwardstown and adjacent areas will be inconvenienced. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Railways to break away from the system of

double road lines at the Emerson Crossing? A person travelling northwards over the crossing and wanting to make a right-hand turn has, according to the marks on the roadway, to move from the single to the double line and, when the indicator tells him, turn right and travel eastward along Cross Road. If he is going southwards he gets on to the double line and waits for the indicator to tell him to make the right-hand turn, but if he desires to do any business this double line amounts to a prohibition. Before these alterations were contemplated business people were encourage to establish premises there, and I believe that one broad line instead of a double would be sufficient to indicate the channelling of the traffic making the right-hand turn in either direction. This is most important for I know there is hesitancy on the part of motorists to cross the double line in order to go to their usual service station. The business community renders valuable service to the travelling public and this particular case is no exception, so I ask the Minister to obtain some information for me on this point. Wherever traffic lights are installed I believe that they are providing improved conditions for the travelling public, but I should like to know why a more reasonable time cycle has not been adopted at the South Road-Anzac Highway intersection where the motorists must guess how to do the right-hand turn. At any place where lights are installed there should be a reasonable period in which traffic can make the turn in safety.

Travelling northwards the next set of lights is met at the Grote Street intersection, and here the motorist wishing to make a right-hand turn has to fight his way through and take his chance, whereas the man travelling southwards and desirous of making a right-hand turn has the protection of lights that give him sufficient time to make the turn. At the Currie Street intersection the motorist who wishes to turn down the Henley Beach Road has to get through the best way he can, whereas the man who desires to make a right-hand turn and proceed towards North Terrace has the guidance of an indicator. To sum up, the Emerson lights are the most effective I have seen and everybody has reasonable time, but there is a different set of circumstances at each of the other places I have mentioned, and in my opinion it is most important that they should be uniform so as to provide the utmost safety for the travelling public.

My next comment relates to the item of £7,000 proposed for the purchase of further

land for the Tonsley spur line. Last year we voted £50,000. The report of the Public Works Committee indicated that this spur line could be built for £157,000 which I assumed covered the cost of acquiring land and building the line. If we are to spend £57,000 of the original estimated £157,000 on land I visualize the cost of this spur line increasing in the same ratio as that of the Goodwood-Brighton line, originally estimated to cost £146,000 but on which £376,000 has already been spent. To put it mildly, I should be very surprised if the Tonsley spur line and all that goes with it could be built for the remaining £100,000.

I believe that the agreement with Chrysler Australia Ltd. provides that the Government will construct the line upon 18 months' notice being given of the company's desire to have it, but I am also reminded of another important industry which is to be established alongside the Tonsley property where Wylie & Company are already preparing for the construction of a new building. I believe that Chrysler Australia Ltd. would call upon the Government to build the line in terms of the agreement provided they could get a fair share of the aircraft construction work, but at present employees are being dismissed on account of the falling off of orders for aircraft. According to the Prime Minister, on his return from abroad, there is no need to borrow money overseas or to import manufactured aeroplanes as he believes they can be built in this country, and I cannot overstress the importance of Chrysler Australia Ltd. being able to get some share in the manufacture of the new aircraft which the Prime Minister speaks about. This is most vital to Chrysler Australia Ltd. and its employees, as we cannot afford to see any section of the plant dismantled. Any representations by the Premier on behalf of the South Australian Government cannot be too strong.

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

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that the engineer in charge of the railway signalling department had to take long service leave because of a breakdown in health owing to anxiety believed to be due to the faulty system then operating. If the system was introduced for steam locomotives travelling at a speed of 30 to 35 miles an hour, which was then stepped up to from 45 to 50 miles an hour, it stands to reason that an alteration is needed. During the last 12 months we have been fairly free of railway accidents, but it was tragic that a valuable officer had to retire

before reaching the retiring age. It would be well if the Minister of Works had another discussion with his colleague to ascertain whether a better system could be evolved. On the question of the signalling engineer and his approach to the Railways Commissioner, he should not be compelled to go through the Chief Engineer, but should have the right of direct approach. It may not be too late for the Minister to ascertain whether a more practicable system could be introduced.

In the Address in Reply debate I mentioned the expenditure on railway rolling stock. I am informed that there is need for uniformity of couplings. If connecting buffers are used on some types of rolling stock, they will not readily fit in with operations when the newer type of rolling stock associated with electric diesel locomotives is used. Much time must be lost in marshalling trains because of the lack of uniformity. I believe that the department could manufacture suitable rolling stock for the transport of loaded semi-trailers, which could be conveyed to the loading yards by a prime mover and picked up at the other end and delivered by another prime mover. This would result in saving much expenditure.

It is proposed to spend £50,000 on a Dental Hospital wing. The Premier, as Acting Minister of Health, has stated that where school children require dental treatment the policy is to advise the parents, who have to fill in a form, which is submitted to the Hospital Board, and in this respect the means test arises. Why should parents be compelled to go through this process before their children can receive attention? It would not be so bad if they did receive attention after their parents had been subjected to a means test, but at present there is a waiting period of two years or more. I should like to know whether the expenditure of this £50,000 will result in the demand being met, considering the number of children now attending school and also the requirements of aged and invalid pensioners. The Dental Hospital should be adequately staffed by competent people. I hope the Minister will be able to supply information during the debate on the Government's intentions as to staffing and equipment.

I intend to ask him what is the Government's policy on the establishment of a clinic at Northfield for the treatment of paraplegics. When Dr. Guttmann was in Australia recently he gave very valuable information during his addresses on the importance of the establishment of such a centre. I will want to know



from the Minister what provision is to be made for the treatment of these people. If a person is subjected to an X-ray examination at the Royal Adelaide Hospital the fee charged appears to be moderate compared with that charged by outsiders. I am concerned about the question of radiology generally. I always believed that the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science was under the direction of the Director-General of Hospitals, but if so, I cannot understand why announcements concerning the workings of that institute are made by Dr. Poynton and not by the Director. The work of the institute is of a specialized nature and very few doctors in private practice undertake it. I believe a departmental head should be responsible for public statements, and not a subordinate.

A considerable sum is proposed for Government buildings and I notice an amount of £30,000 is provided under the miscellaneous items for the Printing and Stationery Department. Last year I was advised that it was the Government's intention to proceed with accommodating the Government Printer in a different building and it was suggested that it might be in Light Square. It is essential that the printing staff be adequately accommodated and I hope the Minister of Works will indicate how much money has been allocated for this purpose. Men cannot be expected to give of their best if heavy machinery on an upper floor interferes with their work on a lower floor.

The allocation to the Education Department covers a number of items, including proposed new schools and additional classrooms at existing schools. It is anticipated that two new schools will be erected in my electorate—Vermont Girls Technical High School and Mitchell Park Boys Technical School. I again emphasize the necessity for providing a wood-work centre at the Ascot Park Primary School, which has an enrolment of almost 1,200. At Forbes, where there are 1,692 enrolments, there is no proper provision for the teaching of domestic science and the girls must go to St. Leonards. The parents of students at that school are demanding to know why increased toilet accommodation is not being provided. It is ridiculous that there should be only one toilet available for 61 female children. I have raised this matter on several occasions, but am disappointed at the Minister's proposal to stagger recess hours instead of providing more accommodation.

The South-Western Drainage Scheme is of vital interest to my area, particularly to those who suffer hardship as a result of the flooding

of their area from stormwaters flowing from the foothills beyond the boundaries of Marion and Mitcham. I understand the entire scheme will cost over £3,000,000, but the provision of one drain that would benefit Marion, Mitcham and Brighton corporations would cost about £344,000. Until that drain is in operation I doubt whether it will be practicable to proceed with the reconstruction of the Marion Road. I hope the Minister will supply further information on this matter when we consider the lines. I have raised several matters which are of vital importance to the constituents I represent and I expect satisfactory replies.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—The more I consider these Estimates the more satisfied I am that they constitute a well-balanced and effective allocation of the limited funds available to the State for the current year's public works and housing programme. The emphasis the Treasurer has laid on the fact that the funds will allow for a carefully controlled programme of works only, underlines the sound approach the Government observes in matters pertaining to State finance. It is always a good thing to look at matters concerning finance coldly and calculatingly, having consideration of what the ultimate effects of any policy could be. With this in mind, I commend the Government in its decision that the State's interests can best be served this year by a strict adherence to a controlled programme. It is better to be realistic and live within our means than to embark willy-nilly on unduly ambitious schemes that would absorb all of our limited Loan moneys before the end of the financial year. However desirable any capital project may be, a State Loan purse emptied before the end of the year could be wasteful of capital expenditure through inability to complete and render serviceable any given project. The repercussions to steady employment could be serious.

It seems to me that in some quarters State finance is viewed as something quite divorced from ordinary personal finance, yet the same fundamental principles apply, and it may not be amiss to restate some elementary but basic rules of economy. Firstly, we cannot consume more than we produce and remain solvent; secondly, in a sound economy, savings are achieved by producing more than is being consumed; thirdly, these savings are available for capital investment; fourthly, if there are no savings the manufacture of capital for works is sheer inflation; and fifthly, any capital work should be capable of producing at least as much wealth as it consumes.

These very simple rules may be regarded as outmoded, but no national economy, or individual economy, has ever achieved firm prosperity without them. It is very much to the credit of the Australian economy that we are financing 70 per cent of public capital works from current income.

I am very concerned at the modern trend that does not encourage thrift in the present scheme of things. Until such time as there is a real broadening of the means test in qualification for social services, there can be no firm incentive to saving. The general outlook and way of living of the average citizen is largely tempered by his assessment of what advantage or disadvantage can accrue from an innate desire to ensure security to himself and his family. If that desire is frustrated by a foreseeable ultimate personal disadvantage, thrift is being firmly discouraged. I am afraid that is now happening.

The Estimates reveal sound investment in essential State projects that will return real wealth or give real service to the State. As we shall have an opportunity to discuss individual lines later, I shall content myself at this stage by commending the Government on the allocation generally and on the clarity in presenting details of all proposed expenditure. I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I am very delighted to learn that at least one member of the Government has recovered from lockjaw, and that I am following a Government member and not a member of my own Party. My mind goes back to the answer to a question I asked last week about the number of unemployed in this State, and I compare this with paragraphs 3 and 4 of His Excellency's Speech, in which he said:—

My advisers are gratified to observe a continuance of the prosperity which South Australia has enjoyed in recent years. The rapid growth of our population is being matched by the development of natural resources, progress in Government undertakings and housing, and increases in production and commerce.

The standard of living is higher than ever, and our citizens are animated by a lively spirit of enterprise and optimism. Sufficient loan money has been obtained to enable the Government to carry on a controlled programme of public works throughout the year without serious disruption.

By his "advisers" His Excellency meant the Government, or really the Premier, who is the Leader of the Government. Without the Premier on the other side there would be nobody there, because he is the only one who

does not suffer from lockjaw. It is fortunate for members opposite that he enjoys good health. In view of the Premier's statement last week about the unemployment position, the numbers given to the press in relation to unemployment and the numbers given to me since my question, it is just as well that there is Loan money available, or God help the people of this State. This Government would not be able to help them. On August 6 the Premier told me that the number of unemployed males had grown from 2,228 in February to 2,261 on July 1, and the number of females had increased from 737 to 1,102 in the same period. In February 556 males and 115 females and in July 1,730 males and 324 females, were receiving unemployment benefits. One day last week I was in the Legislative Council, and I was surprised to hear a Government supporter say that the unemployment position is static.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to the other House.

Mr. LAWN—I have quoted the official figures provided by the Commonwealth Employment Bureau and given here by the Premier, and unless he was prepared to falsify the position he would have given the correct figures. I do not suggest he falsified them, but that the Government members have misled the people by saying that the unemployment figures are static. The figures given prove that that statement is false.

Mr. O'Halloran—Many unemployed are walking the country looking for work.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and they know it is no good registering. I have received a letter from a person who goes to the Commonwealth Employment Bureau every day. He said:—

It would do some members good just to go to Richards Building Employment Office from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. every day of the week just to have a look at the hundreds waiting around the room for their names to be called out to receive another paper and be told to return the same day next week. That goes on month in and month out, and there is the same old story "Nothing doing."

It is all very fine for members opposite to claim that we are living in prosperous conditions, but it is difficult to tell people they are prosperous when they have to go to Currie Street day after day looking for employment, only to be told to come back next week. The figures given are only accurate in relation to those registered, but there are also many who do not go to the office to be registered because they realize it would be useless to do so.

Early this year the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) raised the matter of pensioners being charged for attention at the Royal Adelaide Hospital as inpatients. In reply, the Premier said he felt it was not right for people to make a profit out of sickness, and in general principle I agree with that statement. I inquired of some medical societies how much a pensioner couple would have to pay each quarter and was advised the sum was £2 12s. The day after Mr. Hutchens asked the Treasurer to consider more favourably pensioners who were forced to enter the Royal Adelaide Hospital and were in a medical fund, I drew the Treasurer's attention to the plight of pensioners, saying that a pensioner couple would have to pay £2 12s. a quarter for hospital benefits only. I then pointed out that that amount would have to be paid out of a pension of £4 a week and in two years would total £20 16s. If one of the pensioners were confined to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for one week he would receive £16 16s. from the scheme, or £4 less than the amount paid to it. A pensioner would therefore have to be a member of the fund for three or more years and then be in hospital for only a week to show a profit. If he were in for a month or more he would have to be a member of the fund for some years previously to make a profit. I asked the Treasurer to further consider the matter and he said he would be happy to do so. He even promised to let me have a written reply in due course, and I inferred from his remarks that Cabinet would consider this important question of hospital charges for pensioners; but to my surprise, instead of being told later that after further consideration Cabinet had either agreed or disagreed to the suggestions made by Mr. Hutchens and me, I received the following letter, dated August 1, from the secretary to the Premier:—

With reference to the question which you raised in the House on June 27 regarding Royal Adelaide Hospital charges, I am directed by the Premier to inform you that the Deputy Director-General of Medical Services has now furnished the following report:—With respect to the extract from *Hansard* dated June 27, 1957, concerning the charging of hospital fees to pensioner patients, it is desired to advise that where a pensioner who is in possession of a medical entitlement card as issued by the Commonwealth Social Services Department is admitted to a Government hospital, no charge is made for the accommodation and treatment whilst in hospital unless the patient is a subscriber to a hospital benefits organization. The letter merely sets out the position existing when the Treasurer replied to the member for

Hindmarsh and continues by stating the charges applying to the pensioner who is a member of a medical fund. All that information was known previously, and all the Premier did was to give me a little over a page of foolscap setting out in detail what he had already told the House. That is only one example of the treatment meted out by this dictatorship to one section of the community, and this afternoon we had another example. I now turn to a matter referred to by the Leader of the Opposition earlier in this debate—interest charges. I have looked into the financial workings of our State undertakings, some of which are socialistic.

Mr. John Clark—It is half-baked socialism.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, but the word "Socialism" shocks some Government members and on this occasion it may spur them into taking part in this debate. At page 78 of his report for the financial year ended June 30, 1956, the Auditor-General, referring to the Highways and Local Government Department, states that contributions to sinking fund total £33,018 and interest charges £149,892. He goes on to show that the total interest and sinking fund contributions since July 1, 1926, are £4,127,053 and £896,517 respectively. Over £4,000,000 was paid away in interest, yet over the same period only £896,000 was paid off the capital borrowed. That gives some idea of the intense burden borne by some Government undertakings. At page 97 of the same report the Auditor-General, referring to irrigation and reclaimed areas, states:—

The interest charge was higher by £18,700 and accounted for most of the total rise of £22,500 in expenses . . . Additional Loan funds and the higher Treasury rate were the reasons for a rise of £18,700 in the interest cost. Other expenses rose by £3,800 due to increased salaries and wages.

We always hear a cry from Government members that the basic cause of increased prices is increased wages, but here is a clear example of the real cause of increased prices, for although salaries and wages have risen by only about £4,000, the interest charge has increased by £18,700. The person who has the money to invest is the one who gets the chop.

Mr. Hambour—If a man saves, isn't he entitled to interest on his savings?

Mr. LAWN—I will answer that interjection before I have finished. At page 73 of his report the Auditor-General, referring to the financial results of Harbors Board operations,

states that, after paying £87,000 as contribution to the National Debt Sinking Fund a surplus of £469,044 resulted, but after providing £404,188 for interest this surplus was reduced to £64,856. True, the department showed a surplus on its operations for the year, but look at the huge interest burden it had to bear. Do Government members realize the amount of money we are paying these money bags? The member for Light (Mr. Hambour) wants to know whether they are entitled to it.

Mr. Hambour—If you were Treasurer would you pay interest on the loan?

Mr. LAWN—It will be the happiest day in the lives of the people of this State when a Labor member is Treasurer. Mr. Hambour claims that a man who borrows money should pay back five or six times the amount of the loan in interest, yet the creditor should still be able to claim the repayment of the sum borrowed, but he should look at the figures I am quoting. The major portion of the debt charge comprises interest payment, and the same may be said of the figures for many previous years. I know that Government members do not like being reminded of this for they believe in R.I.P.—rent, interest and profit for the people they represent.

Recently one member referred to a talk over the air on what lies behind turning on a water tap. The person concerned was unable to explain it because he was not a Socialist, but let us see how the Waterworks Department fared for the year ended June, 1956. According to the report provision for depreciation, being portion of contribution payable to the National Debt Sinking Fund, was £282,000, and the surplus on operations was £162,028. The Auditor-General said that this surplus was insufficient to meet debt charges, being interest on loans provided for capital purposes of £1,328,068. It was necessary to repay those who lent the money five times the amount borrowed, because the interest that had to be paid amounted to £1,328,068. If members opposite do not agree to the principle of giving lenders five times the loan in interest payments they should get up and say so.

Mr. Heaslip—We do not say that.

Mr. LAWN—Members opposite agree with the present financial system of borrowing £1,000,000 and paying back £6,000,000. If they deny that they should get up in this debate and say so.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—Those interest payments are for amounts borrowed over many years.

Mr. LAWN—The interest paid is on the actual amount borrowed.

Mr. Heaslip—Not five times what is borrowed.

Mr. LAWN—The people lending the money will receive many times more in interest than they lend. Do members opposite deny that?

Mr. Heaslip—Definitely.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member will have the opportunity to explain it to me. For metropolitan sewers, provision for depreciation, being portion of contribution payable to the National Debt Sinking Fund, was £27,000 for the year ended June 1956, and the surplus on operations was £288,882. That was more than sufficient to meet debt charges, being interest on loans provided for capital purposes, of £238,748.

I shall now turn to the Auditor-General's comments on the operations of the Housing Trust. On temporary housing, the amount contributed to the National Debt Sinking Fund was £149,000. There was a deficit on working operations, after the repayment of that contribution, of £65,227. Last year the Treasurer said there was a deficit of £135,000 on the temporary housing section of the trust's activities. For the last financial year there was a repayment of £149,000 off the principal borrowed, but the interest burden was £69,915. See how the figures change! They do not show five or six times the amount of interest as compared with the principal.

Mr. Hambour—Doesn't time mean anything?

Mr. LAWN—It depends on how much a year we contribute towards paying off the money borrowed. The time factor comes into it, but if we contribute to the National Debt Sinking Fund on the same basis as at present we shall, because of the time factor, pay five times the amount we borrowed in interest and then still have to repay the principal. I have not disputed the time factor. I said that we will repay in interest five times the amount we borrowed, but do members opposite deny that?

Mr. Hambour—Over how many years do we have to pay interest?

Mr. LAWN—I am referring to the Auditor-General's report of 1956, the latest available. It shows that the position of the Housing Trust as regards its activities, other than on temporary housing, is not so unfavourable. Provision for repayment of loans and retirement of assets amounted to £215,976, and

interest on loan capital was £795,657. There the interest amounted to three times the sum repaid. There was a surplus on operations of £222,480. There again we find a Government department showing a surplus after having made its contribution to sinking fund and paying interest. Even after allowing for the loss on temporary housing the trust showed a considerable surplus.

Mr. Hambour—That is good, isn't it?

Mr. LAWN—I am not criticizing the result, but the amount of interest that has to be paid.

Mr. Hambour—What is the answer to it?

Mr. LAWN—I will give it later. Members opposite do not want to speak in this debate. They want to see Government business rushed through and they do not want members on this side to speak, but that is the quickest way to kill a democracy that I know of. As they are supporters of a dictatorship members opposite do not care anything for democratic principles. They do not worry whether the people lose faith in the Parliamentary system because they have a dictatorship here now.

Mr. Hambour—This is the best audience you have ever had.

Mr. Jennings—Better than the Premier has now at Wallaroo.

Mr. LAWN—That is true. There are as many people here listening to me as there were listening to Senator Buttfield and the Attorney-General at Kadina one night last week, but there were 300 at Wallaroo last Friday night listening to the Leader of the Opposition. I shall now turn to the Electricity Trust, which is an undertaking that Government supporters bitterly opposed when it was proposed to take over the business of the Adelaide Electric Supply Co. Ltd. However, they now want to jump on the band waggon and continually ask the trust to supply light and power throughout their electorates. The Auditor-General said that the surplus of this undertaking, after providing for depreciation and meeting interest on debenture capital, was £411,000, an increase of £215,000 over the previous year.

Supporters of private enterprise often talk about wages and costs going up, but it is interesting to note the progress of the Electricity Trust in recent years. The Auditor-General's report said that the overall cost of production (including debt charges) per k.w. hour sold decreased by 0.04 pence to 2.37 pence for the year, making a reduction of 7.6 per cent over the past three years. This is a Government undertaking which supporters of

private enterprise ridicule. They say that Government undertakings are not managed as efficiently and economically as private industry, but the Electricity Trust has reduced costs, despite increases in wages and interest charges. Depreciation charges increased by £171,000 to £1,152,000, and interest charges amounted to £1,888,000, an increase of £291,000. The wages of adult employees rose by 10s. a week, but despite those increased costs the trust was able to reduce cost of production.

Mr. Hambour—You know why?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member will be able to speak later.

Mr. Hambour—The cost of production was lowered because Leigh Creek coal is cheaper fuel.

Mr. LAWN—That is another socialistic undertaking. The Chifley Labor Government told the Playford Government it would make money available to develop the coalfield. The Playford Government is developing along socialistic lines and that is why, according to the member for Light, the Electricity Trust is able to reduce its costs and give the people better service than private enterprise ever did. The Auditor-General reported on the operations of the Leigh Creek coalfield. Depreciation of assets other than working plant (including £22,726 applied in redemption of loans from the State Treasurer) was £99,383. The interest charge on loans was £132,268, and the surplus for the year was £27,124. Private industry would not have made Leigh Creek coal available to the trust at a cheap rate; it would have charged the trust much more than it is being charged now on a State basis and got its pound of flesh. Private enterprise always wants its money back as fast as it can get it while still retaining its capital.

The comments of the Auditor-General in regard to Radium Hill appear on page 112, and I commend his report to all people who say they are opposed to Socialism. Radium Hill is another State undertaking which has not been handed over to private enterprise. Depreciation was £1,417,735, the excess of income over operating expenses £53,235, and interest charges on loans amounted to £360,797, leaving a deficit for the period of £307,562. Here again is a clear example of a State undertaking at Radium Hill showing a surplus of income over operating expenses, but because it has to give these money lenders back their pound of flesh the project shows a deficit of over £307,000. The same applies to the Municipal Tramways Trust.

Interest charges for which the trust is responsible amounted to £128,849 during the financial year, and there was a deficiency for the year of nearly £711,000. The Auditor-General points out that there is provision for depreciation of £196,078. There again we find a huge interest burden. The honourable member for Light is typical of Government supporters who say anything when it suits them, but when it is not convenient they develop lockjaw or are called away to answer the telephone. Without going into departments any further I point out that the railways interest bill amounted to £1,589,250, which is a colossal sum. I believe in the policy of the Australian Labor Party to which I am proud to belong—a party whose members never develop lockjaw when there is an opportunity to expound its policy. Every member on this side of the House has participated in the campaign at Wallaroo. We are going there and telling these people our policy because we have a policy.

Mr. Hambour—You had better not go there.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member has now recovered from his lockjaw. It has been stated that £200,000,000 has been invested in industry in this State, but I am curious to know how the Premier arrived at this figure. Government supporters are not going to Wallaroo because the people there want to know why not one penny has been invested there. I invite them to go there and tell the people why this Government will not encourage the investment of any capital in that town.

Mr. Brookman—What about getting on to the Loan Estimates?

Mr. LAWN—The member for Light put a very pertinent question to me as to whether I believed in paying interest. As Government members admit, members of Parliament do not receive sufficient salary to meet their costs if they live up to their position. Members of the Government claim they have private means, but I am forced to borrow money. I have two special purposes savings accounts and I put an amount away each month to provide for incidental expenses in the hope that I can meet the charges when they arise. I also put an amount in the other account to cover Parliamentary expenses. If I wish to borrow money and those two funds are buoyant, I do so. When the opportunity presents itself I repay that money, and I do not charge myself interest.

Mr. Hambour—I reckon you talk to yourself.

Mr. LAWN—If I borrow money from the member for Light I have on occasions to go outside those accounts; I have to go elsewhere and borrow money for which I have to pay interest. Is not that the position here? We go to private financial institutions or members of the public and ask for subscriptions to our public loans. Why should not we borrow from ourselves instead of going to the private financial institutions? Members of the Government know that this is not a joke. I recently had the experience of thinking I would have to go to a private finance company who were asking 18 or 19 percent interest on money. I was able to arrange the loan from a bank and the rate of interest charged was only six per cent. I point out that that six per cent interest was only payable on the actual money remaining owing to the bank. These private finance institutions which support this Government and are supported in turn by it are asking 18 per cent, and what they did to me is the same as they are doing to other people in our community. And Government members support them! There is no reason why the Commonwealth Government, in consultation with the States, could not agree on the amount of loan money necessary to carry on the works of the various Governments of the country, and then make that money available from the Commonwealth Bank—the people's bank. In that way we would be borrowing from ourselves. If it were thought desirable the States could make their contributions to the National Debt Sinking Fund to repay the debt created, but there would be no need to pay this colossal interest back to ourselves. I challenge the members of the Government, who have been very free with their interjections, to tell me during this debate why in the borrowing of this amount of over £200,000,000 for the States and the Commonwealth we cannot obtain it from the Commonwealth Bank, and repay that without having to pay interest. It is the people's credit when all said and done which is guaranteeing the repayment of that loan. People will not contribute £200,000,000 to finance the loan programme unless they feel that they are going to get their money back. The guarantee that they will do so is the credit of the people of the nation.

Why do we have to go to these individuals to borrow the money required? Why not go to our own bank? I want to know why it will not work. My argument must take combating. I do not think it is possible to logically and fairly deny that we can obtain all the money

required for the public works from our own banks.

Mr. Laucke—Would the money come from the deposits of the people?

Mr. LAWN—All banking inquiries say that the banks do not lend only money belonging to their depositors, because they feel that they can lend ten times as much as the amount of the deposits. They create credit, and it is credit that belongs to the people. Last Saturday's *Mail* contained an advertisement by a private financial institution in South Australia. It was the second I had seen, but it was from a different company. After seeing the advertisement I telephoned a Government bank and a trading bank in connection with interest rates, and I learned that they pay on money lent to them on fixed deposit the following rates:—

	Private. Banks. Institutions.	
	Per cent.	Per cent.
Three months . . . . .	2½	3½
Six months . . . . .	2½	4½
Twelve months . . . . .	2½	5½
Two years . . . . .	3½	6

For five years and over the private institutions will pay 7 per cent: I have no figure for the banks. If a private institution will pay 7 per cent on money lent to it, it is obvious that it must charge 18 per cent on money it lends. Members must agree that there is a racket in connection with interest rates. Members opposite should stop it and see that money is made available at the cheapest possible rates.

Mr. Jennings—They represent the people who get all the interest.

Mr. LAWN—Unfortunately that is so. They support the usurers, the people who live

by lending money. Opposition members are proud to espouse the policy that we put to the electors at election time. It was only after perusing last year's report by the Auditor-General that I realized the tremendous interest burden the people are carrying. I did not think we were paying five times as much in interest as money borrowed.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—Mr. Cahill and Mr. Hawke have to pay the same interest rates.

Mr. LAWN—The Commonwealth borrows on behalf of all the States, and the policy I am criticizing tonight is a uniform one.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Why didn't Mr. Chifley change it?

Mr. LAWN—He tried to. I now want to refer to the water charges on the Murray lands, as disclosed in a report dated November 19, 1951, about the Mannum country lands water supply. The working costs for water were 1/3.79d. per thousand gallons and the interest charged was 7/7.58d. That is typical of what is going on in all State undertakings. The interest rate is a huge burden on the people. The Government should be more honest and admit that it is not here in the interests of the people generally, but purely of those who finance its Party funds, and will do anything to stop people from having a free electoral system to enable them to elect the Government of their choice.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 21, at 2 p.m.