

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 21, 1957.

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### ROAD TO NORTHERN TERRITORY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Works any further information to give on a question I asked recently relating to the suggestion that the North-South Road between South Australia and the Northern Territory might be resited?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I said when the honourable member asked his question that I thought it was entirely rumour, and the report of the Engineer-in-Chief is as follows:—

There is no proposed alteration of the route of the Main North-South Road nor has any consideration been given to any change in the last few years. I have heard rumours of a change of route, one of which concerns extending the road from William Creek to Coober Pedy and thence northward, and another that the route near the Northern Territory Boundary was to be altered to line up with a new road being constructed by the Commonwealth Authorities. There is no substance in the rumour of the William Creek-Coober Pedy link and an investigation made into the rumoured change of route near the Northern Territory boundary showed that the road being constructed by the Commonwealth would meet the South Australian section of the road at the border.

#### SMOKING IN FOOD SHOPS.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Has the Premier, as Acting Minister of Health, yet received an opinion on the question I asked recently about the advisability of prohibiting smoking in food shops?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received a report, but have not got it with me. I will bring it down in due course.

#### TRAFFIC LIGHTS AT HILTON.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently on behalf of the West Torrens Corporation concerning the installation of traffic lights at a junction in Hilton?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Through my colleague, the Minister of Roads, I have received the following report:—

As stated, the Highways and Local Government Department has previously advised the Corporation of the City of West Torrens that it was not prepared to recommend financial assistance for installation of traffic lights at

the junction of Rowland Road and Hilton Road with the Main South Road. The Highways Department must concentrate on road construction rather than traffic control, which function is specifically vested in the Local Authority and the Commissioner of Police. In view of the limited funds available for roadworks, Departmental assistance for traffic lights has to be restricted to complex intersections involving arterial roads and costly installations.

#### NORTH ADELAIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CUMBE—Negotiations have been proceeding for some time for the acquisition of additional land to provide further recreation space for the North Adelaide primary school. As the acquisition of this land is linked with further building extensions in the area, I ask the Minister of Education whether he will investigate this matter promptly? It also involves the welfare of hard-of-hearing children at the new centre there, as I understand that part of their training includes playing with children who have normal hearing.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have already investigated the matter, but the problem concerns not only the possible acquisition of additional land but also the acquisition of some houses and their demolition or conversion to other purposes. I am sympathetic to the request in general, and in particular because it concerns the special classes for deaf or hard-of-hearing children, and I will take up the question again and confer with the honourable member.

#### SEWERAGE OF VALE PARK.

Mr. JENNINGS—Some time ago I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding the sewerage of Vale Park and pointed out that the area had recently been sewered with the exception of one street that could not be sewered until there had been a subdivision of a certain property. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have obtained the latest information. There has been no change in the circumstances concerning an extension of sewers to properties in Doreen Street. The work has been approved and as stated in my letter to the honourable member dated 18th June, 1957 pending the subdivision of Mr. Nadilo's land, the department has no option but to defer the construction of the sewer. The Town Clerk, City of Enfield, advised the Engineer for Sewerage recently that negotiations are proceeding and it is hoped that Mr. Nadilo will subdivide his land at an early date. As soon as this happens, the work can proceed.

**BUSH FIRE PRECAUTIONS.**

Mr. BROOKMAN—The Bush Fires Act prescribes that stationary engines in the open and tractors, in certain conditions, shall be provided with an effective water spray, an efficient spark arrestor and a shovel. It is fairly clear that the Act is being contravened in many cases because it is difficult to find any place on a small tractor to put a knapsack, let alone a shovel as well. Even if one could find an efficient carrier for this equipment, it is generally true that the equipment is made of galvanised iron or thin copper material that would probably buckle or chafe quickly when carried over rough ground. The difficulties are so great that I think there are many contraventions by people who would not wish to break the law. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider what I have said and refer my question to the proper authorities with a possible view to approaching tractor manufacturers to see whether they can install equipment on tractors suitable for carrying knapsacks and shovels, and other manufacturers to see whether they can improve the type of knapsacks available so that it will not easily be damaged when carried on a vehicle?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The matter mentioned in the first part of the question has already been given some consideration. Representations were made, I think, about eight or nine months ago, and I got in touch with the tractor manufacturers' organization asking whether they would provide such brackets on tractors as standard equipment and, if not, whether they would provide them as extras? The organization replied that the matter was receiving favourable attention so that useful work has been done there. As to the second part of the question, I think there are one or two firms in this State who supply most of the knapsacks used in firefighting, and I will take up with them the question of making the knapsacks more suitable for carriage on vehicles.

**DEBT COLLECTING AGENCIES.**

Mr. LOVEDAY—Can the Premier say whether the Government has yet made up its mind regarding the registration and licensing of debt collecting agencies in connection with a suggestion I made in a question on July 31?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The Government is still getting reports on the matter. Personally, I do not believe that legislation will be introduced this session.

**BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Can the Minister of Education say whether the Belair primary school has been completed and, if so, when it will be ready for use?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The school has been completed and will be ready for use and occupation at the beginning of the next school term on September 17. Last month I approved a suggestion made to me by the Director of Education that interested parties be consulted as to the possible retention of the old Belair school for those children who live in the immediate vicinity and any others who desire to attend it. This morning I received a report that the head teacher had sent a circular to the parents on the matter, and that the replies from the parents indicate that 274 children wish to attend the new school and only eight the old school. The retention of the existing premises for school or other purposes is still under consideration.

**RESIDENT MAGISTRATE AT PORT PIRIE.**

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Minister of Education received a reply from the Attorney-General to the question I asked yesterday about a resident magistrate at Port Pirie?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, I have received the following reply from my colleague:—

This matter has been raised on numerous previous occasions and last year by Mr. Riches, member for Stuart, when he was advised that all the present magistrates have been engaged on the basis that they will reside in Adelaide. There is no doubt that if applications were called for a magistrate to reside in a country area the field of applicants would be very limited. It is preferable for magistrates to reside in Adelaide because (a) they are available to assist in other districts and (b) it is most important that they should be able to use the facilities provided by the Supreme Court library in connection with their work.

The above system has worked very satisfactorily and no serious complaints have been received regarding it.

**WALLAROO BULK HANDLING.**

Mr. HEASLIP—South Australia Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is making headway in the erection of the terminal at Wallaroo, and it is reaching the stage where it will be ready to receive wheat in the coming harvest. There is considerable apprehension in the district as to whether the Government undertaking will be ready to move wheat from the silo to the ship once the wheat is put into the silo. Can the Premier say how

far the project has progressed and give an assurance that it will be ready in time for the coming harvest?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know the installation will be available for the coming harvest. Some considerable time ago tenders were called for the work. Money has been provided on the Estimates and I understand a tender was let subject to the installation being available at that time. As far as I know there is no difficulty in the matter.

#### SHEARING AT ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 6 regarding the Roseworthy Agriculture College and shearing that takes place at weekends?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received the following report from the secretary of the college:—

In the absence of the Principal, on leave, I submit the following report on the matter of "Shearing at Roseworthy College," which was raised by Mr. Bywaters, M.P., in Parliament on August 6, 1957. A few years ago some of the neighbouring farmers, who had experienced difficulty in obtaining shearers and classifiers for the shearing of their comparatively small flocks of sheep approached the students with a view to their undertaking the work in their own time. A number of the boys who were especially interested in sheep husbandry agreed to do this. The college encouraged these students to gain this additional practical experience by making available the college wool shed and plant at a reasonable charge. It is not practicable for the college to permit of specialization in any section of the students' training and for this reason the opportunity for the enthusiasts to gain practical training, in addition to that which the college can provide, is welcomed.

#### DETAINING DEFENDANTS IN GAOL.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Education obtained a report from the Attorney-General regarding the question I asked yesterday about detaining defendants in gaol whilst attending a court hearing?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. I referred the matter to the Attorney-General who has forwarded the following reply:—

The matter raised by Mr. Riches has been considered on previous occasions and each time it has been decided not to alter the present procedure. The important aspect is that the granting or refusal of bail during the trial is entirely in the discretion of the presiding judge. It is felt that it is better to leave a judicial discretion of this sort undisturbed so that the judges may exercise their functions in the way they regard as best calculated to do justice.

#### AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE STUDENTS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Agriculture give any information about the comparison between the number of students taking agricultural courses this year and previous years, about which I asked a question recently?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received a report from the Director of Agriculture. It sets out a rather extensive table, which shows the number of students who entered the course in each of the years from 1950 to 1957, and the number who graduated in the ordinary degree only. The total number who entered the course during those years was 128, and the number who graduated and were awarded a degree 61. If the honourable member desires the figures for the individual years, which are not significant in themselves, they are available.

#### WHEAT QUALITY.

Mr. LAUCKE—I refer to recent criticism by Tasmanian importers of wheat from this State that shipments from Port Adelaide—which would be wheat grown in the Adelaide division of the railway system—have been low in protein content, low in strength and of poor baking quality. As the Adelaide division embraces our higher rainfall areas, which areas normally produce wheat of lesser protein content than our drier areas, the growing of certain varieties of inherently low quality protein undoubtedly aggravates the deficiencies in overall quality. In view of this will the Minister of Agriculture consider either placing an embargo on the sowing of varieties such as Ghurka, Glclub, Pinnacle and Quadrat, or inaugurate an intensive campaign to seek the voluntary rejection by farmers of such varieties for seeding?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This question, of course, raises a bigger question which it is beyond my capacity to answer. I have not seen specific complaints from Tasmanian millers about the quality of our wheat this year. I am not suggesting that those complaints have not been voiced, but this year, when our average yield per acre was very high, owing to excellent rainfall and seasonal conditions, the protein content of the wheat in South Australia has been lower on the average than for many years. That might explain why wheat from the Adelaide district, which is normally comparatively good, has fallen below the desired standard.

I do not know whether it comes within the province of the Department of Agriculture to impose an embargo, but I assure the honourable member that it has been the department's policy over the years to encourage the growing

of wheats of high quality. Our whole breeding programme at Roseworthy and also, I believe, at the Waite Research Institute, has been devoted to this purpose and no wheats have been released from those sources which have not been of reasonably good quality for milling purposes.

Mr. Stott—What about millers giving higher premiums for good quality wheat?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—All these matters have been discussed, debated and argued by authorities, greater and lesser, over the Continent and elsewhere, for many years. I reiterate that it is the department's policy to encourage the growing of better wheats. Some wheats which are not always of good quality will, in some circumstances, produce a much higher protein content than under other circumstances. The whole question is fraught with great difficulty and I can give no assurance other than that the department encourages the sowing of high quality wheats.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister representing the Attorney General a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning announcements of appointments of justices of the peace?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received the following report from the Attorney-General:—

At the present time the procedure regarding the appointment of Justices of the Peace is as set out by Mr. Jennings in his question. Those applicants who are appointed are advised directly by the Attorney-General because the Oath of Office has to be sent to them for execution, together with the Certificate of Appointment, and the appointees, of course, are not able to act until the Oath of Office is taken by them and subsequently returned for filing in the Attorney-General's office. Members are advised of all appointments made. Where an application is declined, a letter with a carbon copy is sent to the member. This is done because all applications for appointment must come through the member for the district and, since the applications come *via* the member, it has been the practice to advise the member of the result. This practice has worked well for many years and there does not appear to be any reason for altering it.

#### DOCTORS' POST-GRADUATE SALARIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Can the Premier say whether any decision has been made regarding claims by medical men who are doing their immediate post-graduate service at public hospitals for increased salaries?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter is under consideration by the Public

Service Commissioner. As a matter of fact, the Commissioner submitted a report to me but I did not transmit it to Cabinet because it contained what I regarded as one or two anomalies and I have referred it back to the Commissioner for re-consideration. I think the matter will probably be dealt with in the forthcoming week.

#### WIRTHS' CIRCUS.

Mr. LAWN—Yesterday, in reply to a question I asked relating to the collection of money by Wirths' Circus on Sunday, the Premier among other things, said that if any money was collected last Sunday it was collected unlawfully and the Government had no control over it. I had suggested that it be donated to charity. If a person robbed a bank or took money illegally he would be required to refund it, but in this case the Government apparently does not propose to take any action. If it did I think the court could direct what should happen to money so collected. As it does not intend to prosecute will the Government consider making representations to Wirth's Circus to donate the money to some charity?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The Government has no grounds upon which to refer that request to the proprietor of Wirths' Circus. This case and the suppositious case referred to by the honourable member are completely dissimilar. One is an illegal action, whereas the other arises from persons paying a small sum to see some animals. The latter would be an infringement of the Places of Public Entertainment Act, but it is not a robbery or the taking of money from someone by force. It was probably an unwitting infringement of an Act that is quite frequently infringed and in respect of which the Government often sends out warnings to people.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT RULES: SETTLING OF BETS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I move—

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of the amendments of rules of the Betting Control Board made under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1956, on January 10, 1957, and laid on the table of this House on February 5, 1957, be disallowed.

This new rule 60A, one of the rules made under the Lottery and Gaming Act, states that a bookmaker or his course agent may settle debts made on a race-course or trotting ground in accordance with

Part IV of the Lottery and Gaming Act on the premises of a club registered under the Licensing Act and specified by the board. Section 37 of the Lottery and Gaming Act states that the board may make rules as to all or any of certain matters. I take no exception to what was done by the Betting Control Board in this instance, for it had full authority under the Act, but is it desirable that the board should make a rule contrary to the spirit of the legislation? In section 4 of the Act "public place" is defined as meaning, *inter alia*, "any premises in respect of which a licence granted under the Licensing Act, 1932, is in force."

The legislation gives the Betting Control Board power to make rules, and one rule provides for the issue of certain types of licences, such as bookmaker's course licence, bookmaker's town licence, a grandstand licence, and licences for the derby and the flat. These licences expire on July 31 each year. Rule 33 states:—

Every licence shall terminate immediately the holder—

- (a) becomes licensed under the Licensing Act, 1932-1945, to sell liquor; or
- (b) becomes employed in selling liquor by retail either in premises in respect of which a publican's licence is in force or in premises in respect of which a wine licence is in force and in which liquor is sold for consumption on those premises.

Section 38 of the Act provides:—

No licence shall be granted to any person who holds any licence for the sale of liquor under the Licensing Act, 1932, or who is employed in any capacity by any such licensee.

When that provision was enacted did not Parliament intend that bookmakers should not practise on licensed premises? I understand that when a bookmaker becomes licensed he is entitled to become a member of the South Australian Bookmakers League Inc., which leases premises in a building at 45 Flinders Street, Adelaide. Further, all bookmakers in the classes referred to in Part II of the Betting Control Board rules are entitled to form a bookmakers' association and in addition join the Bookmakers Club; also bookmakers' clerks are entitled to become members of the Bookmakers Club.

All bookmakers, as members of the S.A. Bookmakers Club may attend at 45 Flinders Street, and make their settlements in the basement. For this service different charges are imposed: some bookmakers pay only the ordinary charge for the service, but other are provided with a table and pay a little extra for that accommodation, and no objection is taken to that. I do not know whether the Grand-

stand Bookmakers' Association approached the board for the concession referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of the latest amendments of the board's rules, but I understand that the Association applied to the North Adelaide Cycling Club in Grenfell Street and that its application was refused.

I do not question the sincerity of the members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee in their attitude towards these amendments, but I ask what evidence they had before them before making their decision? Would they not have been well advised to ask a representative of the board whether the Grandstand Bookmakers' Association had applied to the North Adelaide Cycling Club, whether the application had been refused, and whether that refusal had prevented their occupying the premises of that club? Before making this rule, did the board consider whether it was in the interests of bookmakers generally? Possibly it thought that as it had done so much in the interests of bookmakers the rule would pass unnoticed. Is the matter still open, or does it mean that the board has now no authority to approve a particular club and the application therefore lapses? As I have had no legal training I am not in a position to answer that question and will not offer an opinion, but it requires a comprehensive inquiry. Bookmakers are entitled to consideration and Parliament should say whether they should have licensed premises in which to settle bets. Bookmakers have often been generous in relieving cases of hardship and in subscribing to charities, and if they are prepared to extend Christian charity so frequently the House should give them generous consideration.

The Betting Control Board has issued bookmakers' licences as follows:—Grandstand, 42; derby, 52; flat, 49; special country licences, 36; and betting shops, 8. People who bet fairly heavily may not desire to carry large sums on them, so they have a nod bet, which is recorded. Many of these people also attend a trotting meeting on the same night. I understand that the Inter-Dominion Trotting Championship will be held in Adelaide this season, but of the 42 grandstand bookmakers licensed for racing only eight will have a trotting stand licence. Of the 52 licensed derby bookmakers 28 will operate at trotting meetings, but they will have a trotting stand licence, and seven flat bookmakers will have a trotting stand licence. Apparently because of the apathy of the licensed grandstand bookmakers the Betting Control Board has had to seek the assistance

of nine other applicants who will be permitted, without having any other licence, to have a trotting stand special licence. Of the 49 flat bookmakers who are licensed for racing seven will have a trotting stand licence and 21 will remain on the flat, and 17 special licences will be issued to bookmakers for the trotting season. There will be 213 bookmakers registered in South Australia, but fewer than one-fifth of that number desire to have this special approval to which I am objecting on principle. I believe in the principle of one in, all in.

Many people go to the trotting after the racing to recoup what they lost in the afternoon or to take a chance and see whether they can win some money so as to be on the credit side after having paid the betting tax. Those people will have a selection from only eight licensed grandstand bookmakers to make their investment if they desire to settle their bets in this approved club.

Mr. Riches—Where do they settle now?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—At 45 Flinders Street, Adelaide, where the bookmakers' club meets in a basement. I do not think there is much room for complaint about settling. I cannot help it if the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Fletcher) has not had an opportunity of collecting there. I have not had occasion to go there to collect.

Mr. John Clark—You never win.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Even if I have a small win I find I am not any better off because I have to pay the winnings tax, which is known as the Playford tax. Parliament should decide whether provision should be made for the Bookmakers' League to have a licensed club. Last year's Betting Control Board report showed that bets made with bookmakers amounted to £30,018,756, and that the average bet was £2 5s. The total revenue received by the Government through the operations of bookmakers was £682,887. The people who collect this money for the Government should receive some consideration. I suggest that the Bookmakers' League be given the opportunity to have licensed premises for settling purposes, and, if this is not granted, that Parliament prepare the way for the league to take its chances during June, 1958, in the holding of a local option. If it should be successful it should be able to state a case before the Licensing Court to see if its premises measure up to the requirements of the Act. There is now a new rule which provides for bookmakers having course agents. Some bookmakers have six clerks working for them and any one of those clerks could be approved

by the board as a course agent. Grandstand, derby and flat bookmakers must provide a guarantee, but that is not to apply to course agents. It is undesirable for the new rule to operate until a proper investigation has been made. I do not think Parliament intended that a small number of people should usurp a benefit to which a larger number of people are entitled.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DECENTRALIZATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

That in view of the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area of South Australia, an address be presented to the Governor praying His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) Whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works, establishments for treating hides, skins, etc., and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts; and
- (b) What other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country; and
- (c) What new industries could be established in country districts; and
- (d) Whether more railway construction and maintenance work could be done at country railway depots; and
- (e) What housing provision should be made to assist a programme of decentralization; and
- (f) What amenities, particularly sewerage schemes, are necessary to make country towns more attractive.

(Continued from August 7. Page 288.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Last week when I obtained leave to continue my remarks I was pointing out that Mr. O'Halloran was under a misconception when he moved the motion. It says that there has been a concentration of population in the metropolitan area, and I was pointing out that he was not complaining about that concentration but that the general increase in population had been greater in the metropolitan area than in country. In point of fact, there has been a big increase in population in country areas. I was setting out to have included in *Hansard* without reading a list of the types of investigations being undertaken by the Government in the interests of developing industry in rural areas. I ask leave to have that list so included.

Leave granted.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIA—DEPARTMENT OF MINES.

INVESTIGATIONS OF MINERAL DEPOSITS, WHICH HAVE BENEFITED SECONDARY INDUSTRY IN RURAL AREAS, SINCE NOVEMBER, 1938.

Mineral.	Location.	Type of Investigation.	Remarks.
Asbestos.....	Williamstown....	Geological and Metallurgical ..	Investigations incomplete.
Barytes .....	Oraparinna .....	Geological and Mining .....	S.A. Barytes, Ltd.
	Quorn .....	Metallurgical .....	S.A. Barytes, Ltd.
	Willunga .....	Mining and Drilling .....	L. G. Abbott and Co.
Brick Clays ...	Lobethal .....	Geological .....	Onkaparinga Brick and Sand, Co.
	Nuriootpa .....	Geological and Ceramics Research	Kreig's Nuriootpa Brickworks
	Port Elliott .....	Geological .....	Arcadia Brick Co.
	South Hummocks .....	Geological .....	Walleroo Silica Refractories
	Cherryville .....	Geological and Boring .....	Wunderlich, Ltd.
	Bordertown .....	Geological .....	
	Woodside .....	Geological and Ceramics .....	Fireclay—P. Moroney
	South Australia .....	General survey of industry .....	
Building Stone .	Auburn .....	Geological .....	Slate quarry
	Mount Gambier .....	Mining and Geological .....	General survey of district.
	Angaston .....	Mining .....	Marble—Habichs Monumental Works
	Cowell .....	Geological .....	Marble deposit
	Ashton .....	Geological and Mining .....	Sandstone—The Building Stone Co.
	Morgan .....	Geological .....	Limestone
	Ashbourne .....	Geological .....	Marble—Mount Magnificent
Clay, white ....	Woocalla .....	Geological .....	S.A. Potteries, Ltd.
	Oodnadatta .....	Geological .....	Coward Cliff deposits.
	Williamstown....	Metallurgical .....	Australian Paper Manufacturers.
	Williamstown....	Geological and Mining .....	Australian Industrial Minerals
	Birdwood .....	Geological and Metallurgical ..	Jarvis Industries, Ltd.
	Booleroo Centre..	Geological and Ceramics .....	
	Port Augusta ...	Geological .....	Sunman deposit—Welland Potteries
	Longwood .....	Metallurgical .....	S.A. Silicates, Pty., Ltd.
	Ardrossan .....	Geological, Mining and Metallurgical	Pine Point Clay
Felspar .....	South Australia .	General Survey of Resources ..	
	Gumeracha .....	Geological .....	S.A. Silicates Co., Pty., Ltd.
Graphite .....	Port Lincoln District	Geological, Mining and Metallurgical	Uley Graphite—S.A. Graphite, Ltd.
	Tumby Bay Area	Geological, Mining and Metallurgical	Koppio Graphite—Western Carbon Co.
Gypsum .....	Lake MacDonnell	Geological .....	Waratah Gypsum Co.
	Lake MacDonnell	Geological .....	Colonial Sugar Refining Co.
	Marion Lake ... }	Geological and Mining and Metallurgical	Stenhouse Bay—Waratah Gypsum
	Snow Lake ... }		
	Cookes Plains....	Geological and Metallurgical ..	—
	Tickera .....	Geological .....	—
	Lake Fowler....	Mining and Metallurgical .....	S.A. Gypsum Co. and Aust. Salt Co.
	Craigies Plain....	Metallurgical .....	Dry Creek Plaster Co.
	Balaklava .....	Mining .....	F. Ingham and Co.
	Kangaroo Island	Mining and Metallurgical .....	F. Ingham and Co.
	South Australia .	General inquiry on plaster manufacture	—
	South Australia .	General survey .....	—
	Moonabie .....	Geological .....	B.H.P.—Whyalla
Hematite .....	Williamstown....	Metallurgical .....	—
Iron Ores .....	Middleback Range	Extensive geological and geophysical surveys both within and outside B.H.P. leases. Drilling outside B.H.P. leases for reserves of both high and low grade iron ores. Ref. Geol. Surv. Bull., No. 33.	

INVESTIGATIONS OF MINERAL DEPOSITS, WHICH HAVE BENEFITED SECONDARY INDUSTRY IN RURAL AREAS, SINCE NOVEMBER, 1938.—*continued.*

Mineral.	Location.	Type of Investigation.	Remarks.
Limestone and Marble	Angaston .....	Geological and Mining .....	{ I.C.I. Alkali Ltd. S.A. Portland Cement Co.
	Angaston .....	Metallurgical .....	Hydrated Lime, Ltd.
	Wardang Island .....	Geological and Metallurgical ..	B.H.A.S.—Port Pirie
	Paris Creek .....	Metallurgical .....	—
	Murray Bridge ..	Metallurgical .....	Hydrated Lime, Ltd.
	Gulf St. Vincent ..	Geological and Mining .....	Shellgrit resources
	Point Turton ...	Geological .....	B.H.P. Co.
	Mount Gambier ..	Metallurgical .....	Hydrated Lime, Ltd.
	Mount Gambier ..	Metallurgical .....	For Whiting Manufacture
	Hallett Cove ....	Geological and Drilling .....	S.A. Portland Cement Co.
	Klein Point ....	Geological, Mining and Drilling	Adelaide Cement Co.
	Mount Torrens...	Metallurgical .....	Hydrated Lime, Ltd.
	Rapid Bay .....	Mining and Drilling .....	B.H.P. Co.
	Ardrossan .....	Geological, Mining .....	B.H.P. Co.—Whyalla
	Wool Bay .....	Metallurgical—Calcining traver-	Wool Bay Lime Ltd.
Coal .....	Yorketown .....	tine limestone	—
	Kapunda .....	Metallurgical .....	—
	South Australia ..	General survey of resources....	—
Coal .....	Leigh Creek .....	Mines Department investigations	Electricity Trust of South Australia
		have extended over 15 years	
Coal (Lignite) ..	Moorlands .....	Geological, Drilling, Mining	{ Brown coal—Undeveloped Brown coal—Undeveloped Brown coal—Undeveloped Brown coal—Undeveloped
	Clinton .....		
	Inkerman .....		
	Balaklava .....		
Magnesite .....	Port Germein ....	Geological .....	B.H.P. Co.
	Port Augusta ...	Geological, Mining and Metallurgical	B.H.P. Co. and G. Cardassis
Manganese ....	Copley .....	Geological, Mining and Drilling	F. H. Faulding Co.
	Pernatty Lagoon ..	Mining and Metallurgical .....	—
	Blinman .....	Geological, Mining and Metallurgical	—
Phosphate Rock	Angaston .....	Geological and Metallurgical ..	Klemms (Moculta) deposit
	Kapunda .....	Geological, Metallurgical and Drilling	St. Johns
	Kapunda .....	Geological, Metallurgical and Drilling	Toms
	Kapunda .....	Geological .....	St. Kitts
Nickel .....	Mount Davies ...	Drilling in progress for South- western Mining Co., in the extreme North-west of the State	—
Refractories....	Olary District ...	Geological .....	Morialpa Sillimanite
Road Metal and Ballast	Radium Hill.....	Geological .....	Kyanite
	Tantanoola .....	Geological .....	Dolomite—For railways ballast
	Mount Gambier ..	Geological .....	Volcanic deposit as quarry stone
	Tanunda .....	Geological .....	Road metal for Highways and Local Government Depart- ment
	Kapunda .....	Geological .....	Quartzite
	Mount Compass ..	Geological .....	Road metal for Highways and Local Government Depart- ment
	Burra .....	Geological .....	Dolomite for Highways and Local Government Depart- ment
	S.A. General.....	General information on resources etc.	—



**INVESTIGATIONS OF MINERAL DEPOSITS, WHICH HAVE BENEFITED SECONDARY INDUSTRY IN RURAL AREAS, SINCE NOVEMBER, 1938.—continued.**

Mineral.	Location.	Type of Investigation.	Remarks.
Rutile .....	Williamstown ....	Metallurgical .....	From Mount Crawford Clay— Aust. Ind. Minerals
	Moana .....	Metallurgical and Drilling ....	Beach Sands—S.A. Rutile Ltd.
Salt .....	Meningie .....	Mining.....	{ Australian Paper Manu- facturers Mulgandawa Salt Works
	Port Augusta ...	Mining and Boring .....	Solar Salt
	South Australia .	General Survey of Industry ...	—
Sands—Foundry	Lake Bonney ...	Metallurgical .....	—
	Stirling .....	Metallurgical .....	—
	Cape Jaffa .....	Metallurgical .....	—
	Birdwood .....	Metallurgical .....	—
	South Australia .	General Survey—Mining .....	—
Sulphur .....	Nairne .....	The major sulphur bearing deposit in South Australia is the pyritic schist being mined at Brukunga by Nairne Pyrites Ltd. Departmental assistance to the establish- ment of the mine has included— (a) Geological investigations (b) Diamond drilling (c) Assessment of reserves (d) Metallurgical investi- gations	—
	Port Pirie .....	Investigation of sulphur bearing gases at Port Pirie smelters for manufacture of sulphuric acid	Broken Hill Associated Smelters
Talc .....	Gumeracha ....	Investigation of the three major deposits in South Australia was done by the Mines Department, the work being described in Bulletin No. 26 of the Geological Survey. Mines are operating at Mount Fitton, Gumeracha and Tumby Bay. (Geological Metallurgical and Mining investigations).	—
	Mount Fitton		
	Tumby Bay ...		
Uranium .....	Radium Hill.....	Investigation of the davidite lodes at Radium Hill has led to the establishment of a mine and township, producing uranium concentrates of immense importance to the State.	Capital expenditure £4,248,000 Employees—467 (staff and daily paid). Population of township—900.
	Port Pirie .....	The Port Pirie Uranium Treat- ment Plant resulted entirely from Mines Department studies of extraction methods, conducted at Thebarton. The plant was also designed there and erected to recover uranium oxides from Radium Hill concentrates	Capital expenditure £1,555,000 Total Employees—168.
	Mount Painter ..	Investigations of the Mount Painter uranium deposit occupied years, from 1946 to 1950. The work was of great importance, but has not yet led to the establishment of a producing mine	—

INVESTIGATIONS OF MINERAL DEPOSITS, WHICH HAVE BENEFITED SECONDARY INDUSTRY IN RURAL AREAS, SINCE NOVEMBER, 1938.—*continued.*

Mineral.	Location.	Type of Investigation.	Remarks.
Uranium— <i>contd.</i>	Crocker Well ....	Geological, mining and metallurgical investigations have been in progress since 1951, and are still in progress	—
Water .....	Various .....	By both geological work and by boring the Department has rendered assistance to many industries in meeting their requirements of groundwater	—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When members study this list they will see that it extends over an extremely large range of matters, many of which are of great importance to the State. It may be well to indicate to members an example of the type of investigation carried out. Incidentally the example I shall cite relates to an electoral district in which members opposite have some interest at the moment. I am afraid, however, that it will not be a permanent interest. The Opposition's interest in this electorate, of course, prompted the present motion, which can be regarded as a stock in trade motion that is brought out, not necessarily every year, but on appropriate occasions to emphasize how anxious members opposite are to ensure that there is decentralization in the particular district in which they happen to have a fleeting interest at that moment.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is better to have a fleeting interest than no interest, like the Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Members opposite have frequently suggested that when an ore body is discovered, the Government takes credit for its existence. That is not the position, but the Government does claim some credit for undertaking the investigations that disclosed the body of ore and for the initiative that brought the discovery about. While mining operations have ceased in the Moonta area the Mines Department has never agreed that all copper deposits there have been found and exploited. It takes the logical view that where a large deposit of rich mineral extends over such long distances with so many offshoots to the lodes it would be surprising if some area of considerable importance had not been overlooked. In association with that general policy the Government has provided tens of thousands of pounds

over the years in extensive drilling operations to locate new copper-bearing lodes. When those drilling operations were not successful geophysical methods were tried, and after they failed the Government still did not agree that the whole area had been exploited, and an officer was sent overseas. The following is a report from the Director of Mines concerning this investigation:—

The rich copper lodes of the Moonta-Kadina area were originally discovered by a sort of geochemical method. It is claimed that an observant prospector noticed a greenish colouration in the flame while burning some scrub, and found on digging that the particular bush was growing on a copper lode. None of the ore bodies of this district outcrop, all are covered by limey travertine or soil to depths up to 20ft. Hence it has always seemed likely that in spite of the intensive pitting and prospecting of the early days some lodes must have remained undiscovered.

Many methods have been tried by the Government over the years, in attempts to solve this intriguing problem. From a study of the old mine records, the geological pattern of behaviour of the known lodes has been elucidated and possible repetitions or extensions of the lodes studied. In addition, several geophysical methods have been tried. Much diamond drilling of the targets suggested by these methods has been carried out, but without success. In 1954, the Government sent one of its officers overseas to study the latest developments in mineral prospecting techniques, and on his return established a geochemical prospecting section in the Mines Department early in 1955.

Members probably have not had an opportunity of visiting the laboratories of the Mines Department, but if they are interested I shall do everything possible to facilitate such a visit. It would take a full morning, but the officers would be available to explain what is taking place and what investigations are being made. Members would get much useful information, and if they communicate with the

Government Whip the visit can be arranged. The report continues:—

Geochemical prospecting is a refinement of the art of "loaming" well known to gold prospectors. It depends on the principle that a metallic ore body buried beneath a soil cover will normally enrich the soil with the particular metal. The geochemical prospector is equipped with a rapid, cheap, but extremely sensitive method of soil analysis, and he then proceeds to systematically collect soil samples. As soon as he finds one with abnormal metal content (in this case, copper) he closes in on it by more intensive sampling and finally outlines the possible ore body by what is known as a geochemical anomaly.

The Moonta area was chosen for the initial work of this section because of the failure of all other methods, and because, too, of the large potential prize. The work commenced here nearly two years ago and has made steady progress. There have been great difficulties, however, occasioned by the particular conditions and it has taken perseverance and a high sense of optimism to overcome them. The most serious has been the thick mask of hard limestone which overlies most of the country. It was soon discovered that it was necessary to collect soil samples from beneath this limestone layer, and this in turn, required a power auger. It was finally determined that samples must be taken as close as possible to bedrock, which in the average case is in excess of 14ft. below surface—no longer a simple soil sampling process.

After running numerous trial traverses across the known lodes, the present anomalies were discovered and delineated east of Elder Lode. In the course of the survey 410 boreholes were sunk by power auger or by hand, to depths up to 20ft. and 1,150 samples were analysed. A total of 5,100ft. of borg was completed. Diamond drilling to test the significance of the anomalies is now commencing.

That is an example of the type of work being undertaken in the interests of developing the State's resources, particularly in our outside areas. A large percentage of our land is not suitable for agriculture because of lack of rainfall. About 90 per cent of our total area is unsuitable, and that emphasizes the problem of establishing a balanced population. We can only settle population in the extremely dry areas if mineral deposits of sufficient worth are discovered there. It is quite obvious that with no sources of fresh water available, and with the high cost of carting water long distances, it will be impossible to establish large concentrations of population in areas with a rainfall of less than six inches, particularly when it is realized that associated with a six-inch rainfall there is an evaporation rate of about six feet. Under these circumstances high population density cannot be achieved, although it may be achieved under the abnor-

mal circumstances prevailing at such places as Woomera or Broken Hill.

Mr. O'Halloran—All those things could be the subject of inquiry.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When the Leader reads the information that I am incorporating in *Hansard* he will see there is no need to appoint a Royal Commission to conduct an investigation because such an investigation has been going on continuously for the past 15 years. It has been suggested that housing in country districts should be investigated, but I have a document showing the magnitude of the housing programme in country areas up to June 30, 1957, and as it is lengthy I ask that it be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST.

#### Number of Houses Completed in Country Areas as at 30/6/57.

Location.	Number.
Alford . . . . .	1
Aldgate . . . . .	1
Allendale East . . . . .	1
Angaston . . . . .	131
Balaklava . . . . .	5
Barmera . . . . .	68
Baroota . . . . .	1
Belair . . . . .	1
Beltana . . . . .	2
Berri . . . . .	52
Birdwood . . . . .	8
Blanchetown . . . . .	4
Booleroo Centre . . . . .	2
Bordertown . . . . .	20
Brinkworth . . . . .	1
Burra . . . . .	8
Bute . . . . .	16
Ceduna . . . . .	6
Clare . . . . .	28
Cleve . . . . .	9
Cobdogla . . . . .	1
Cooks Plains . . . . .	2
Coomandook . . . . .	1
Cowell . . . . .	6
Crystal Brook . . . . .	48
Cummins . . . . .	7
Curramulka . . . . .	1
Eden Valley . . . . .	1
Elizabeth . . . . .	1,571
Eudunda . . . . .	7
Frances . . . . .	2
Gawler . . . . .	158
Georgetown . . . . .	1
Gladstone . . . . .	30
Glencoe West . . . . .	5
Glossop . . . . .	2
Greenock . . . . .	6
Gumeracha . . . . .	17
Hallett . . . . .	2
Hamley Bridge . . . . .	5
Happy Valley . . . . .	2
Hawker . . . . .	2

Location.	Number.	Location.	Number.
Hilltown . . . . .	1	Riverton . . . . .	20
Hope Forest . . . . .	1	Robe . . . . .	5
Hope Valley . . . . .	1	Robertstown . . . . .	5
Jabuk . . . . .	1	Roseworthy College . . . . .	2
Jamestown . . . . .	24	Saddleworth . . . . .	6
Kadina . . . . .	22	Salisbury . . . . .	1,080
Kalangadoo . . . . .	3	Snowtown . . . . .	9
Kapunda . . . . .	20	South Para . . . . .	27
Keith . . . . .	52	Spalding . . . . .	4
Kelly Caves . . . . .	1	Stansbury . . . . .	12
Kimba . . . . .	6	Stenhouse Bay . . . . .	8
Kingscote, K.I. . . . .	14	Streaky Bay . . . . .	5
Kingston, S.E. . . . .	16	Strathalbyn . . . . .	30
Kybybolite . . . . .	1	Struan . . . . .	1
Lameroo . . . . .	7	Swan Reach . . . . .	2
Laura . . . . .	4	Tailem Bend . . . . .	21
Leigh Creek . . . . .	62	Tantanoola . . . . .	1
Lobethal . . . . .	16	Tanunda . . . . .	9
Loxton . . . . .	109	Tarpeena . . . . .	1
Loxton North . . . . .	2	Thevenard . . . . .	5
Lucindale . . . . .	12	Thorndon Park . . . . .	1
McLaren Flat . . . . .	1	Tintinara . . . . .	3
McLaren Vale . . . . .	16	Truro . . . . .	4
Mannum . . . . .	79	Tumby Bay . . . . .	17
Maitland . . . . .	30	Turretfield Experimental Farm	2
Meadows . . . . .	7	Victor Harbour . . . . .	14
Melton . . . . .	2	Waikerie . . . . .	42
Meningie . . . . .	9	Wallaroo . . . . .	66
Meribah . . . . .	1	Wanilla . . . . .	2
Millbrook . . . . .	2	Warooka . . . . .	3
Mil Lal . . . . .	2	Whyalla . . . . .	616
Millicent . . . . .	57	Whyte-Yarcowie . . . . .	1
Minlaton . . . . .	15	Williamstown . . . . .	6
Minnipa . . . . .	1	Willunga . . . . .	5
Monash . . . . .	2	Wilmington . . . . .	1
Moorook . . . . .	1	Wirrabara . . . . .	1
Mount Barker . . . . .	72	Woodside . . . . .	6
Mount Bold . . . . .	1	Wynarka . . . . .	1
Mount Compass . . . . .	12	Yacka . . . . .	1
Mount Gambier . . . . .	704	Yankalilla . . . . .	6
Mount Pleasant . . . . .	2	Yatala . . . . .	3
Murray Bridge . . . . .	104	Yorketown . . . . .	12
Myponga . . . . .	6	Yumali . . . . .	1
Nairne (Brukunga) . . . . .	67	Yunta . . . . .	1
Nairne Township . . . . .	11		7,830
Nangwarry . . . . .	20	Rural dwellings . . . . .	224
Naracoorte . . . . .	63	Soldier settlement . . . . .	851
Nildottie . . . . .	1	Emergency dwellings, trans-	
Nuriootpa . . . . .	44	ferred from metropolitan	
Orroroo . . . . .	2	area—	
Owen . . . . .	1	Berri . . . . .	13
Parafield . . . . .	2	Mypolonga . . . . .	3
Parndana . . . . .	16		*16
Paskeville . . . . .	3		
Peake . . . . .	1		
Penola . . . . .	46	Total . . . . .	8,921
Peterborough . . . . .	30		
Pinnaroo . . . . .	6	* Removed from metropolitan area for flood	
Port Augusta . . . . .	551	relief.	
Port Augusta West . . . . .	100		
Port Broughton . . . . .	2		
Port Elliott . . . . .	1		
Port Lincoln . . . . .	278		
Port Neill . . . . .	1		
Port Pirie . . . . .	639		
Port Vincent . . . . .	2		
Quorn . . . . .	10		
Radium Hill . . . . .	143		
Rendelsham . . . . .	1		
Renmark . . . . .	63		
Renmark North . . . . .	1		

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That disposes of two arguments.

Mr. O'Halloran—That's what you think.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the Leader studies these documents he will see that this matter has been considered for many years and needs no Royal Commission to inquire into it.

Mr. Bywaters—You haven't got very far.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We have got a long way in the honourable member's district. Indeed, we have built 104 houses in Murray Bridge, which is equal to the total built in country areas by all Labor Governments that have held office in South Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—Nonsense! More than 100 were built at Peterborough by the Gunn Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They were built for railway employees; whereas I am talking not about houses for Government employees, but about houses for the workers in industries to which the Leader has referred.

Mr. O'Halloran—How many were built by the State Bank in those years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a list signed by the manager of the State Bank so that the Leader may see that in the last three years of Labor reign in this State only seven were built for the whole State, and that was at a time when labour and materials were plentiful.

I now turn to the decentralization of industry. One industry which, on the face of it, it would be possible to decentralize is the killing of meat. The Government has always felt that bringing all stock to the metropolitan area for slaughter should be avoided if possible because such a practice is not without some element of cruelty. Further, we have been able to get a fair measure of decentralization in certain processes associated with primary production. At present South Australia has two main slaughtering establishments: the more important at Gepps Cross, the other at Port Lincoln. I am not referring, of course, to two or three small undertakings manufacturing small goods, nor am I forgetting such establishments as the Noarlunga meat works.

Experience in other States has shown the existence of problems associated with decentralization. For example, during the first world war several slaughter houses and freezing plants were established in country districts, but most of them ran into difficulties. One problem was that whereas the killing season was short, interest had to be paid on the capital cost of the establishment for the whole year. If four months' use could be made of an export abattoirs the management was doing fairly well, but overhead costs were extremely high. Secondly, much seasonal labour had to be provided. Thirdly—and this factor applies even more forcibly today—meat

killed for export had to be sold to the abattoirs much more cheaply than that sold for local consumption because it had to compete with meat from many other countries. For these reasons a country export works could not pay, and cannot pay today, the same prices for stock as one established in the metropolitan area. Taking the district at which this motion is directed—

Mr. Jennings—That's a guilty conscience, isn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, merely the truth. Some years ago I received a deputation from that district that was introduced by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. R. S. Richards). It comprised representatives of the three associated towns and asked that a meat-freezing plant be established at Wallaroo. I said the Government was sympathetic to the project and would finance it on one condition: that the stockowners in that area would assure the Government that their stock would be available for the freezing works. Members will realize it would be entirely unrealistic to establish a works if the Government were not sure how many clients would patronize it, for it would cost perhaps several hundred thousand pounds and without some assured trade would be unsound. Although that statement was made publicly and printed in the local press the assurance was not forthcoming.

More recently the Government received an offer from a private firm to establish a meat works in that area. The firm said it would require protection from competition from another freezing works within a radius of 60 miles and we said we would introduce the necessary legislation. The firm said it would require finance to assist the project and we arranged with the State Bank for £200,000 to be made available. A senior officer of the firm was sent overseas to investigate the type of plant to be established, but he reported that the overseas market was not favourable for export meat. The firm then asked that a quota of its meat be permitted to come into the metropolitan area and the Government agreed. When asked what quota was necessary, the firm said 50 per cent of their killing or 7 per cent of the total meat consumption of the metropolitan area, whichever was the lesser. Again the Government agreed, but when the firm went further into the project it found out it was not feasible.

I repeat that the Government would support the establishment of a meat works in a country district by any reputable undertaking

provided it fulfilled certain necessary obligations. Firstly, it should be 80 miles from the metropolitan area. Secondly, the Government would protect it from competition within a certain radius to enable it to function successfully. I would suggest a radius of 60 miles, but that might be subject to slight modification. Thirdly, the Government would be prepared to consider giving an industry financial assistance and also a quota of sales in the metropolitan area. Those advantages have already been offered.

Mr. Riches—Are you prepared to offer them anywhere?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have already stated that the industry would have to be established 80 miles outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Riches—I think you might get a taker.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I should be pleased to have a taker, but that offer has been made on numerous occasions. It was made to the Kadina Meatworks, which bought a property to commence operations but did not continue. That offer is being made at present to an enterprise that is considering going to the South-East. It is an offer of protection from competition and of financial assistance to establish the industry. It will enable the industry to have a share of the higher-priced local market. I think it is a fair offer and I do not know what more we can do. We do not need Royal Commissions to go into this matter. We have always said to industries coming to South Australia that we will give special assistance in housing if they are prepared to go to the country.

Mr. Hambour—And electricity.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We try to make water, electricity and transport available all over the State. As regards housing, we undertake to make houses available only for key personnel if overseas companies establish in the metropolitan area. They must show that these people have certain skills that makes it necessary to import them. However, if companies will establish in the country we make special provision for the housing of employees. One industry was interested in commencing at Whyalla, and the managing director (Sir Claude Gibb) said it would be necessary to bring out skilled personnel from the Old Country, but he doubted whether they would come here. The Tourist Bureau made a colour film of the hospital, schools, and beaches and other amenities of Whyalla. It also showed the types of houses that would be provided and, as a consequence, the indus-

try was established at Whyalla and there was no difficulty in inducing employees to come from England. The Government has been able to establish many industries in the country, so it is not necessary to have a Royal Commission to establish the fact that the Government is anxious to assist industries in the country.

I do not wish to deprecate the work of Royal Commissions. Many matters have been settled as a result of their appointment. They have done excellent work, particularly on questions that may be regarded as involving political considerations, for they can take evidence on a rather different basis from that normally taken in law courts. A Royal Commission would only report on matters that are already under the continuous attention of the Government and on problems which are already being solved with a certain amount of success at least. I have with me another list that I desire to make available to honourable members. It refers to many people who have had material assistance in the establishment of industries, but as it deals with the private business of certain companies I am not prepared to have it inserted in *Hansard*. If any member wants to see this document it will be made available to him.

Mr. Riches—Have those people been helped by the Industries Development Committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, or by direct assistance from or action taken by the Government under certain Acts of Parliament. For instance, co-operative movements have been assisted in commencing operations in the district of Chaffey. Sometimes the Government makes money available to the State Bank to assist important industries. The Government has helped cold storage concerns throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges, milk processing plants, co-operative stores and packing sheds, co-operative fish freezing works, and has provided loans for boats under the Advances for Settlers Act, and assisted scores of other industries. This year's *Loan Estimates* provide money for a continuance of that policy. If members will bring to me any problems associated with establishing industries in their district the Government will examine them and help will be given if possible. If the Government is not able to assist the member will be told why, and he can then, if he desires, take other action in this place.

Under these circumstances I believe that a Royal Commission would not solve anything and would result in unnecessary expense, and I therefore oppose the motion.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support the motion. The Premier spoke at length in opposing the appointment of a Royal Commission. He said he was not opposed to appointing a Royal Commission when necessary, but that it was not necessary to have a Royal Commission to inquire into the decentralization of industries and population. However, I am afraid his remarks will not convince the people who live in the country or the State generally, especially when they realize that over 60 per cent of our population reside in the metropolitan area. I was disappointed that the Premier said that this matter had been brought before the House because of the Wallaroo by-election. I refute his statement because this suggestion was put before the Labor Caucus before the tragic death of Mr. Heath. Therefore, it was not the fault of the Opposition that this motion coincided with the Wallaroo by-election. The Labor Party has committees that inquire into and make suggestions on various matters, and I am a member of the rural committee, which referred the subject matter of the motion to Caucus for consideration. I was sorry that the Premier tried to make political capital out of this issue, for I am certain that is what he tried to do. He also said it was a hardy annual introduced by the Opposition according to whim. We will continue to bring it forward because it is a plank of our platform. It is not done every year, but at some time in each Parliamentary period. We make no apology for drawing attention to the position.

The Premier has had recorded in *Hansard* much information for us to peruse and I shall be glad to read what the Government has done about decentralization. I do not doubt its integrity in trying to do what is best in this matter, but its actions have not met the position, and something additional is needed. Royal Commissions are appointed from time to time to investigate matters and one should be appointed to deal with the subject of decentralization. Since I have been here whenever the Opposition has brought forward a matter it has not been accepted by the Government. Everything we have introduced could not have been detrimental. Ours is a progressive Party and we have made progressive suggestions, but because they have come from the Opposition they have been knocked out. Over the years it has been shown that a number of the suggestions knocked out have been later introduced by the Government. Whenever the Government has put forward a progressive

suggestion it has been supported by the Opposition; sometimes it has been necessary to get the vote of the Opposition to have it accepted. It is time that the Government changed its attitude on this matter. At least some of the members of the Government Party should support the motion. We want some form of investigation and suggest a Royal Commission.

It is essential to gather all the facts and information about decentralization. Last week the Premier said the Leader of the Opposition wanted to tell industries where to go, but there is nothing further from the truth than that statement. We want to encourage industries to go to the country, and there are various ways of doing that. The following is an extract from the 1956 edition of an *Official Handbook of Britain*, dealing with the action of the British Government in assisting industries to go to the country:—

Areas in Great Britain where there is likely to be a special danger of unemployment may be scheduled by the Board of Trade as "development areas" under the Distribution of Industry Act, 1945. The purpose of this Act, and of the Distribution of Industry Act, 1950, is to promote the growth of new industry and the expansion of existing industry in the development areas. The main advantages which these Acts give to development areas are that the Board of Trade may build factories for letting to suitable industries and the Treasury may help by making loans or grants to undertakings which are unable to secure finance through normal channels. The Board of Trade factories are built and managed by Industrial Estate Companies. The directors of these companies are unpaid and are appointed by the Board of Trade, and their capital is provided from Government sources. The companies include North Western Industrial Estates Ltd., North Eastern Trading Estates Ltd., Scottish Industrial Estates Ltd., Wales and Monmouthshire Industrial Estates Ltd., and the West Cumberland Industrial Development Company Limited.

There are development areas in the following parts of England and Wales—the mining and coastal areas of Northumberland and Durham, West Cumberland, South Wales and Monmouthshire, Wrexham, South Lancashire, Merseyside, and North East Lancashire which became a development area in March, 1953. In Scotland the industrial area in and around the Clyde Valley, the Dundee area and part of the highlands have been scheduled as the Scottish development area. The Government cannot direct a firm to go to any particular area or site. But, in addition to the special powers in scheduled development areas, the Board of Trade has statutory powers under the Town and Country Planning Acts, 1947, to ensure that new industrial development throughout Great Britain is carried out consistently with the proper distribution of industry. A certificate to this effect is necessary before planning consent may be given by a

local planning authority for a new industrial building or extension with an area of over 5,000 square feet.

New industrial buildings and extensions of over 5,000 square feet completed in Great Britain between the beginning of 1945 and the end of 1954 totalled nearly 216,000,000 square feet. Of this total 33 per cent was in the development areas which have, by contrast, 18 per cent of the country's insured workers in manufacturing industry. Government assistance is not limited to development areas. It is given to other areas of high unemployment not listed as development areas. The Buckie-Peterhead area in north-east Scotland, which is heavily dependent on the fishing industry and has a hard core of unemployment, is not a development area, but arrangements have been made for it to receive help through the Development Commission. The commission has agreed to consider sympathetically requests for help in building small factories for industrialists who are prepared to go there.

The Distribution of Industry Acts do not apply to Northern Ireland because the matters they deal with are, under the Northern Ireland Constitution, the concern of the Northern Ireland Parliament, which has passed legislation to encourage industrial expansion and diversification. The Northern Ireland Government builds factories and provides grants and loans for new industrial undertakings. As a result of these efforts over 170 firms have started production for the first time in Northern Ireland or have expanded their employment since 1945 with Government assistance, and are already providing employment for nearly 26,000 workers. The United Kingdom Government also helps Northern Ireland, in the same way as it helps development areas in Great Britain, by giving preference in the matter of Government contracts.

This shows that there has been a decided effort to assist in maintaining and gaining employment for country people. Factories have been built in order that industries may be established with the minimum of delay. Great Britain realizes that there has been too big a concentration around industrial areas and that there is a need for decentralization. During the war it was seen how necessary it was for people to go out into the country.

We should adopt what older countries have found to be necessary and we should do it now while the opportunity presents itself. A concentrated effort has been carried out for the establishment of a satellite town at Elizabeth. The Premier says we cannot tell industries to go to the country, but I have received an attractive brochure which has these words on the front "Prosper in Elizabeth, South Australia's newest completely planned city and community." They draw attention to the new town. There is also a sort of an aerial photograph of the possibilities of the new centre. Inside the brochure there are details

of what is available in the area. It points out the advantages of industries going to Elizabeth. It is a well-planned brochure and I commend those responsible for its publication. It is an effort to encourage people and industry to go to Elizabeth, and what can be done for that town can be done to encourage people and industry to go to country areas like Murray Bridge. People would be interested in going to these other places if they knew the potential, but unfortunately we have no-one to sell anything on their behalf. Industrialists from elsewhere do not know one spot from another in this State and in order to get them to come here we must place before them all the potential. In this regard there are places along the River Murray and elsewhere.

I have brought this matter up before and it has not been because of the Wallaroo by-election, but because of the needs of the district. There is an opportunity to take industry into the country and relieve the city of congestion. At all times the people from Murray Bridge advertise the possibilities of their area. We have established communities and amenities, and upon them we should build. We frequently hear mention of the shortages of schools and houses in the metropolitan area. In many country areas schools are being closed because of lack of population. At Kanmantoo a school building is now being used on occasions as a hall. That school was closed because the town population shifted to the metropolitan area and those students who remained were transported to a larger school.

Mr. Hambour—Don't you believe in consolidation?

Mr. BYWATERS—There are arguments for and against consolidation, but in the instance I am quoting the school was closed because of the shift of population. It is tragic to see country towns decaying because of such drifts to the city. This afternoon the Premier mentioned the number of houses that have been built at Murray Bridge in recent years, but during the Address in Reply debate he indicated that in the last 21 years the population of that town had increased from 4,300 to 5,000. That is nothing to be proud of: rather should we be ashamed. Murray Bridge has great industrial potentialities, but its population has increased by a mere 700 in 21 years and that is one reason why this whole problem should be examined by an expert committee.

Mr. Brookman—What industries would you force to Murray Bridge?



Mr. BYWATERS—The Opposition would not force any industries there. We ask for an inquiry into the whole problem. That inquiry would reveal the possibilities and potentialities of all country towns, including Murray Bridge. It could make recommendations to certain industries and encourage their establishment in country centres and provide financial assistance too. Admittedly a number of houses have been built at Murray Bridge, but they are not occupied by young people. People with families have moved from Murray Bridge and the increase in population there is due mainly to the influx of retired farmers. As in many country towns, frequently one person occupies a house. We want young people at Murray Bridge.

The Premier referred to the Wallaroo electoral district. On Monday I was at Moonta and I there saw a school which at one time accommodated 1,500 children but now has an enrolment of 67. That situation has arisen because there is nothing in the town to keep the people and they have drifted to the city and to other larger towns. In the course of my visit I met many women who were virtually grass widows: their husbands worked on the highways as far away as Rhyne and Port Wakefield and only returned to their homes at the week-end. When children leave school at Moonta they seek employment in the metropolitan area because there are no industries at Moonta for them. Parents naturally worry about their children and there is disruption in the home life. Ultimately the parents shift to the city in order to exercise proper parental control over their children.

No doubt I will read in *Hansard* what the Premier said was being done to attract industries to the country, but let us consider what has happened in Queensland. There are many cities on the coast with populations of 40,000 to 50,000 and in the interior there are several large towns. Toowoomba, 90 miles from Brisbane and connected by a narrow gauge railway line, has a population of 40,000 and one industry alone employs over 1,000 men. Such population centres have been established in Queensland as a result of good government. In South Australia we have good ports, but they have small populations. Wallaroo is one of the finest ports in the State, but industries are not being attracted there. It is possible that a port could be established at or near the Murray mouth, but because the Premier does not regard that favourably he will not have the proposal investigated nor will he make representations to the Federal Government in

respect of it. If a Commission were appointed all these matters could be thoroughly investigated and industry could be advised of the potentialities of our country areas. I support the motion.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—To the uninitiated this motion would read well. However, after listening to the Premier, one would have thought that the ideas of members opposite would have been deflated. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) rose with his usual confidence and little material and theorized at length. He completely discounted the work of this Government over the past 20 years, yet the Government has an unsurpassed record of industrialization not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the State.

Mr. Davis—Tell us where.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Port Pirie is the most ungrateful person in this House. He is completely negative.

Mr. Corcoran—What is wrong with a Royal Commission to investigate this problem?

Mr. HAMBOUR—What more could it do than the Government has done? This Government is the most select group that has been elected by the people of the State.

Mr. Davis—What has the Government done in the country?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Premier has produced voluminous records which can be read later in *Hansard*. However, I am afraid the member for Port Pirie is suffering from such a degree of senility that he will be unable to read everything the Premier said proving what the Government has done. The honourable member has the effrontery to ask what the Government has done in the country. If he examines a map and studies the towns from Leigh Creek through Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie as far south as Mount Gambier he will realize what the Government has done. In a broadcast the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) had the effrontery to say that the Playford Government had done nothing. Members opposite are completely negative, and I suggest the word "nothing" eminently suits them. It would ill become me to repeat what the Premier has said. If members opposite had paid attention to him they would know what they are now asking me. When Mr. Bywaters was speaking only five members opposite were listening. That shows the value of his remarks: his own colleagues would not listen. Government members at least had the decency to provide a quorum, suffer though we did. We

suffered throughout his address, but his colleagues failed to make the necessary appearance.

Mr. O'Halloran—I didn't think you were so unclean.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Leader says I am unclean, but I really think that Mr. Bywaters, whether his address was good or bad, merited more than five listeners from his own Party. It is rather silly to suggest that I tell the Opposition what the Government has done. The Premier spoke for an hour in presenting his report on the State's activities, and if members opposite had listened—

Mr. John Clark—You realize that members are sometimes unavoidably absent from the Chamber?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am not saying that members cannot sometimes leave the Chamber, or should not.

Mr. John Clark—I think you were reflecting on those who were absent.

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Murray only had an audience of five of his colleagues, yet because I draw attention to that I am called unclean.

Mr. Jennings—I think you will live to regret saying that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Maybe I will live to regret many things.

Mr. Davis—Tell us something. Tell us what has been done in the country.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If members opposite feel so impotent and unqualified to make some contribution to decentralizing our population that they have to resort to the appointment of a Royal Commission I feel sorry for them. The member for Murray, Mr. Bywaters, compares South Australia and Great Britain and read at length from a book concerning the Government of Great Britain and its efforts towards decentralization, but not one word did he utter about what the Playford Government has done towards decentralizing industry.

Mr. Davis—I thought you were going to tell us that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Members on this side do not indulge in needless repetition. The Premier has given complete information and if honourable members have patience they may read it in *Hansard*. It is not fair to compare South Australia with Great Britain for not only is the population of this State

about 800,000 as against 50,000,000 in Great Britain, but the situation of industries in both countries cannot be compared. Every member opposite admits that this Government cannot direct an industry to a certain district.

Mr. Davis—It can recommend it, though.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Surely the honourable member takes the Premier's word when he says that no opportunity has been lost to direct firms to areas outside the metropolitan area and that they have been given inducements to do so. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) wishes to use the word "recommended," but what sort of contribution is that to this debate? Mr. Bywaters spoke about empty country schools, but every member should know that it has been the policy of the Playford Government to consolidate schools and that that policy has necessitated the closing down of many small schools.

Mr. John Clark—Mr. Bywaters made it clear that he did not refer to schools closed for that reason.

Mr. HAMBOUR—He referred to many schools that had been closed, but I suppose that over the years hundreds of schools have been closed and the buildings are now vacant. I understood, however, that that policy was supported by Labor members. Members opposite who are old enough will remember that in the 1930's under the marginal lands scheme many holdings had to be brought together to give a reasonable living to the people remaining on the land. I believe that scheme was successful and that those people were given a decent living; but in many cases it reduced the population of the district by 60 per cent or 70 per cent for where there were previously, say, three holdings, only one remained. Consequently today there are many empty buildings in those districts, but is it suggested that people be put back on to those properties to bare the earth through erosion and over cultivation? Certainly, we have empty houses and barns in some districts, but I predict that in another decade they will be eliminated because what was once barren ground is becoming good pasture land because it is not being over cultivated. Members opposite have asked for a concrete proposition, but I believe the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) has put before the Government a scheme that would be fruitful—a cannery on the river.

Mr. John Clark—We were talking about that before he was born.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That country has much to commend it, but I believe that if a project is uneconomic it should not be proceeded with,

otherwise it will become a burden on the taxpayer. A committee of experts is inquiring into all aspects of the proposition to which I have referred, and any worth while proposition put forward by any member will be inquired into. This Government has never refused to investigate any such proposition. The proposed cannery warrants reasonable consideration because it concerns the primary production of the district. Members opposite may advocate subsidies and self-containment and say, "Never mind about the cost"; but they must appreciate that the cost must eventually be met from the pocket of the primary producer.

Mr. Corcoran—Talk about the motion.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) says he is worried about decentralization but I remind him that he has timber mills and a cellulose factory in his district. Surely he appreciates those industries and the fact that they have been put there almost completely by this Government. If so, where is his gratitude?

Mr. Corcoran—This Government did not put those industries there although it may have rescued one of them when that industry was financially embarrassed. How can you justify your opposition to the motion?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I answered that question earlier. We are the elected representatives of the people; we should know our own district, and we should place before the Government any proposition we consider will be beneficial to the economy of the State generally and to our district in particular. I will not support any project that is uneconomic. In my district an industry has been established with the help of this Government on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee, and I am grateful to that committee and the Government for the support given. I believe that that industry will grow. It is up to each member to make his contribution by finding out all about his district.

Mr. Davis—We may bring a proposition to the Premier, but what consideration do we receive?

The SPEAKER—Order! There are too many interjections. The member for Light is speaking and I ask members opposite to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The motion is highfalutin; it reads well and is good political propaganda. I do not doubt that Opposition members will read it to the electors of Wallaroo

and say that Government members have rejected it. Indeed, that may be the only reason for Mr. O'Halloran moving it. The proposed Royal Commission is to inquire into and report on whether industries ancillary to primary production should be established in country districts, but every member knows the opportunities existing in his district and the Treasurer has been most sympathetic to any approach made. Another task of the Commission would be to inquire into what other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country, but surely, with a little co-operation from some of our enlightened members representing the metropolitan area, private industries could be approached and faced with the suggestion that they go to the country. In that case, I could assure them of accommodation in the country districts.

Mr. Jennings—They can have one of mine.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member has no say in it, but he may use his influence. The Commission would also inquire into what new industries could be established in country districts, but country members know what industries could be established there and as finance becomes available, they will go there. The fourth suggested task of the proposed Commission is to inquire into whether more railway construction and maintenance work could be done at country railway depots, but we have a Railways Commissioner and a highly efficient railways administration, which surely should not be told what repair work they can do in the country. The fifth subject of inquiry by the Commission would be the provision of housing, but the Premier has stated in this debate that he will provide housing the moment arrangement can be made for the establishment of an industry in a country district. Finally, the Commission is to inquire into the necessity of amenities, such as sewerage schemes, in country districts.

Mr. Davis—What has the Government done about that?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The sum of £24,000,000 has been provided on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. O'Halloran—Only £6,000 of that is for country sewerage.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Before I get a sewerage scheme for my district I want a few more important things done. Since I became a member little over 12 months ago my district has been given additional water supplies, serviced with electricity, and new roads are being made. Those are the three things I

want. Other members may ask for what they like; all have the opportunity to speak on behalf of their districts and if their case is good it will be considered by the Government. I believe the Leader of the Opposition has moved the motion merely because it reads nicely. No-one is keener on decentralization than I am, if we can get the population out, but we must get them out economically in the interests of the districts we represent. I am capable of looking after the interests of my district and I trust other members can do the same. I oppose the motion.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

# METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is a short Bill which provides for the repeal of sections 34 and 35 of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act. Section 34 provides that disputes between the board and its employees (as represented by their association) shall be referred to an arbitrator and that the decision of the arbitrator shall be final and not appealed against within 12 months. Section 35 defines a strike and provides penalties for individuals and associations guilty of an act in the nature of a strike. In justifying our desire to have these sections removed from the Act, I would point out that they were both inserted in this legislation in 1911 before the Industrial Code was enacted in 1912 and although similar but less severe provisions were subsequently included in the Code, these provisions have been retained in the Abattoirs Act ever since.

We consider both these sections superfluous and one of them (section 35) unnecessarily severe. Section 34 is superfluous in view of the fact that the Industrial Court, to which the employees of the Abattoirs Board are amenable to these matters, has power to call compulsory conferences of the parties to any dispute. No special provision for this purpose in the Abattoirs Act seems necessary. Section 35 is superfluous for the same reason—there being already provision under the Industrial Code for the definition of strikes (and lockouts) and for the imposition of penalties. In addition, section 35 is discriminatory in that it provides penalties twice as severe as are provided under the Industrial Code for individuals or associa-

tions doing any act in the nature of a strike. The maximum penalties under the Abattoirs Act are a fine of £1,000 and, in the case of an individual, imprisonment for six months. The corresponding maximum penalties under the Industrial Code are a fine of £500 and imprisonment for three months.

We do not, of course, approve of the penalties provided under the Industrial Code and we have endeavoured to have the whole Division of the Code referring to strikes and lockouts deleted. But in view of the fact that the Government does not agree with us on that matter, it could at least place the employees of the Abattoirs Board on the same footing as to disputes and strike penalties as all other employees under the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court. That will be the effect of the proposed amendments if they are accepted. I stress that last point because it is the most important argument in favour of the Bill. Why should the workers at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs be subject to special provisions about penalties that do not apply to other workers? All other workers are amenable to the Industrial Code. If they break the law they are subject to the penalties prescribed in the Code, but the workers at the abattoirs are subject not only to the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court, but also to the jurisdiction of the Abattoirs Board. So far as I know, sections 34 and 35 of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act have **never** been used since the Industrial Code, as we know it, was drafted. That shows conclusively that they are superfluous and should be repealed, and while they remain they have a certain intimidatory effect.

I remind members that about two years ago there was a dispute at the abattoirs between the men and the management, and the board threatened the men with prosecution under these provisions. Fortunately, wiser counsels prevailed, and I think the wisest counsel was that of the then Minister of Agriculture (the late Hon. A. W. Christian) who could see that the use of the penal provisions of the Abattoirs Act would not only provoke bitterness that would take years to die down, but also cut right across the principles of British justice. Members of the Opposition believe in industrial legislation and in conciliation and arbitration for the settlement of industrial disputes, but we place the emphasis on conciliation. That is why in the last session we sought to remove the penal provisions from the Industrial Code. We failed, but I trust that

Parliament will take a different view on this occasion and remove those two superfluous sections from the Abattoirs Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 7. Page 292.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The Bill purports to deal with holidays. It is a short measure, and the material provision is clause 3, which states:—

The following section is enacted and inserted in the Principal Act after section 3a. thereof:—

3b. After the passing of the Holidays Act Amendment Act, 1957, the several days mentioned in the third schedule shall be bank holidays.

If one looks at the third schedule one will find, strangely enough, that only Saturday is mentioned. Therefore, the Bill proposes to compulsorily close all banks on Saturdays. As I understand the second reading speech of the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) the Bill has been introduced because the Arbitration Courts have not granted an application from bank officers for a five-day week, with Saturday closing. The courts have held that they have no power to close banks on a Saturday, and the contention is that they have no power therefore, to grant a five-day week for bank employees. There have been a number of decisions by the Arbitration Court on a five-day week. Some have been in relation to banks, others in relation to retail stores, and I do not think that the Arbitration Court has power to close any premises on a week day. Provided the law does not provide otherwise, the court has the power to say how many hours shall be worked in a week, how many shall be at normal rates and how many at penalty rates, and what the penalty rates shall be. I cannot follow the honourable member's argument that the Arbitration Court is not empowered to grant a five-day week. That does not necessarily mean that the court may say that a bank must close on a Saturday, but that it may prescribe the hours any one worker may work on a Saturday.

I cannot follow the honourable member's argument why we should place banks in a different category from retail stores. I do not think the Arbitration Court has the power to close an industry in daylight at any particular

time. What particularly intrigued me were the following remarks by the honourable member:—

What were the objections put before that Western Australian committee? The first allegation was that Saturday morning closing of banks would strike at the worker because, it was said, he would not be able to deposit money in, or withdraw money from, his savings bank account on Saturday morning; but today savings banks have a myriad agencies and do not ordinarily rely only on their bank offices. For instance, the Savings Bank of South Australia has an agency in practically every grocer's and chemist's shop, and a customer may transact his business in such places at any time the shop is open. A depositor of the Commonwealth Savings Bank can do business at post offices during money order hours. A depositor of the State Savings Bank going to shop in Rundle Street on Saturday morning could go to the nearest agency; there is one in Myer's for instance. If this Bill becomes law that facility will still be available to him. It may be contended that the wording of the Holidays Act is such that agencies would have to close if this Bill became law, but I do not agree, nor do counsel whose opinion has been taken on this matter; only the banks would have to observe the bank holiday.

The member for Norwood conceded that it might be necessary for some people to go to a bank or have banking facilities on Saturday, but he said, in effect, that it was not necessary for banks to be open for those people as they could go to Myer's or practically any grocer or chemist shop and transact their banking business. That opens up one or two matters which are most intriguing. The first deals with the Holidays Act, which makes it clear that when a bank holiday is ordered by Executive Council it becomes a public holiday, and on that day the banks must close. Eminent counsel have advised that this provision applies to all banks except the Commonwealth Bank, which is not bound by State legislation. Whether that opinion is correct or not remains to be seen. It has not been tested and probably never will be. The honourable member has a reputation as a legal man and I ask him whether or not it is a fact that if it is unlawful for a principal to do something it is also unlawful for the agent to do it. If that is not a general principle of law it should be. For some reason not explained to us the honourable member wants to close the banks on Saturday mornings and to get around the Holidays Act by having the agencies in grocery and chemist shops doing the business. He said:—

For instance, the Savings Bank of South Australia has an agency in practically every grocer's and chemist's shop, and a customer may transact his business in such places at any time the shop is open. A depositor

of the Commonwealth Savings Bank can do business at post offices during money order hours. A depositor of the State Savings Bank going to shop in Rundle Street on Saturday morning could go to the nearest agency; there is one in Myer's, for instance. If this Bill becomes law that facility will still be available to him.

He wants to make it unnecessary for bank officials to work on Saturday mornings by sending customers to other people. I cannot believe that it is a function of Parliament to close down a business on Saturday mornings in order to put more work on to others. Mr. Dunstan gives final directions as to where the people can do their business. I have grave doubts whether any member can justify such a move or whether an agency could conduct business at a time when its principal is prevented by law from doing it. If there were a test I do not think the Bill would have a bearing on the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. Dunstan—It closes in Tasmania.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That may be done by arrangement, but I have seen an opinion by eminent counsel which said that the Commonwealth Bank was not subject to any State law, because under its Constitution the Commonwealth had the power to make banking laws. That bank has extended its hours of business to meet the convenience of customers. It is undesirable by Act of Parliament to legislate against the public interest. The Arbitration Court has consistently taken the view that in all awards the public interest must be paramount. When this matter was brought to my notice by deputation I inquired whether banking facilities were wanted on Saturday mornings, for if they were not it would be sheer capriciousness to keep the banks open. An inquiry in 1954 showed that 34 per cent more Savings Bank business was done on a Saturday morning than on an average week-day morning. A recent inquiry showed that the percentage was being maintained. Inquiries show that commercial firms and retailers are opposed to the proposal. I could not find much objection from the managers of trading banks. Some of them said that if the law wanted them to keep their banks open they would stay open, but would close them if the law said they had to be closed. In country areas, where Saturday is not an early closing day, much banking business is done and there would be difficulties if the banks had to close. Section 4 of the Holidays Act says:—

The Governor may, from time to time, as he may think fit, by proclamation published in

the *Government Gazette* appoint a special day to be a public holiday or bank holiday in any year either (a) throughout the said State or (b) within such district or locality as is specified in such proclamation, and such day shall in such year be a public holiday accordingly.

It seems that by proclamation, and without any alteration to the Act, Executive Council could give effect to the honourable member's proposal. In these circumstances I suggest that he withdraw his Bill and then when it becomes necessary Executive Council could take the proper action, but until such time as that is necessary no action will be taken. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I did not intend to speak on this Bill until I was provoked to do so by the puerile nonsense that has come from the Premier. I wish we could get from him definite support or opposition to a matter rather than his looking for loopholes. He tries to pull a Bill apart and if he finds something in it with which he disagrees, as he sits down he signifies opposition to it. If he agrees with the principle of a Bill he should agree to the second reading and then suggest appropriate amendments in the Committee stages. Of course, no Bill has ever been introduced from this side of the House which has been acceptable to the Government.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—I thought you had a Bill passed.

Mr. JENNINGS—I did, but I am unique. The Premier spoke about the Arbitration Court, but I recall that recently he was speaking about meddlesome politicians introducing industrial legislation and he changed his opinion then. Let us hope he will change his opinion on this matter because as far as the Arbitration Court is concerned the points made last week by the member for Norwood are perfectly valid. The fact is that banks have to remain open on Saturday mornings now because of Commonwealth legislation. The only way they can be exempted from that is by amending the Holidays Act. This is obvious from the following extract from a judgment of Mr. Justice Neville in the Western Australian Supreme Court:—

Well, we are all of a clear opinion on this point. I do not think there is any doubt that this Court has jurisdiction to fix the hours of employees in banks, even although under the Commonwealth it is, if not legally, practically necessary for banks to be kept open on Saturday mornings, and it might be, as Mr. Adams suggests, legally necessary for them to do so, but where, as here, it seems certain that any award made by this court of a five-day week would only result in extra overtime

being paid in that the employers would be forced to keep their businesses open despite the court award. We are all agreed that the court, even although technically it may have jurisdiction, would not, except in very exceptional circumstances, make any such order.

Commonwealth Conciliation Commissioner Portus said:—

It appears to me that if a five-day week is to be prescribed for the banking industry, it should be prescribed by Parliament as Tasmania has done by closing banks on Saturdays. This completely vindicates the statements made by Mr. Dunstan last week and which the Premier attempted to answer today. The Premier queried whether the Commonwealth Bank would be covered by State legislation. I agree that there is certainly a doubt about that, but in Tasmania where banks are closed by legislation on Saturday mornings the Commonwealth Bank closes. Surely it is reasonable to presume that if other banks close on Saturday the Commonwealth Bank would, by agreement, come into line. The Premier made an issue of agencies—chemists and groceries—being open on Saturdays. However, the point is that they are not open as banks, but merely to accept deposits and to pay out some money.

Mr. Hambour—What do you think that is?

Mr. JENNINGS—It is not banking in the normal sense. It is precisely the same as getting a cheque changed by a publican or storekeeper. It is interesting to note what applies in respect of some Government undertakings. Many of my constituents would like to pay rent to the Housing Trust or pay their electricity accounts on a Saturday morning, but they cannot do so.

Mr. Shannon—I hope you are on the side of your constituents.

Mr. JENNINGS—Not in this matter, because I know they get on perfectly well without being able to do that. They would like to do it on a Saturday morning and some would like to do it on a Sunday or at midnight, but we do not prescribe conditions that will meet all possible contingencies.

Mr. Heaslip—You do not consider your constituents at all.

Mr. JENNINGS—I think they are quite satisfied with me. I challenge the honourable member to resign from Rocky River and nominate for Enfield. I think the levity being shown during this debate illustrates conclusively that the Premier's arguments are not valid. Surely we could get along all right if banks were closed on Saturdays mornings, and why shouldn't they be? Why shouldn't this section of the community enjoy a privilege

which is granted to almost every section of the community? There is nothing preventing them except the passage of this legislation and I hope it will not be long before, as a result of Mr. Dunstan's efforts, they enjoy the same privilege as other members of the community with the exception of shop assistants and members of Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Treasurer—

That this Bill be now read a second time—which Mr. O'Halloran had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after "that" with a view to inserting "this Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for three months' long service leave after ten years' continuous service."

(Continued from August 20. Page 361.)

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Bill because as far as I can ascertain it is entirely acceptable to the majority of people in my electorate, including employers. I had intended to follow the Leader of the Opposition yesterday but was told that he would speak for an hour and 30 minutes and when he sat down early I was not ready to proceed. I am certain the objections voiced by members opposite are not a true reflection of the feelings of the people who will ultimately benefit from this legislation. It was suggested that long service leave was designed to give those entitled to it a rest, but in the last week I have heard of two instances where persons elected to receive pay in lieu of long service leave and immediately resumed their normal employment or sought other employment.

This Bill will enable a person after seven years' employment to take one week's leave, to let it accumulate or to accept the money in lieu thereof. I think that is a good provision because it will enable the employee to make his own selection. The Premier said that this Bill has wide implications. That is true, and my main concern was to ascertain the attitude of my constituents. There are no secondary industries of any note in my electorate, which is devoted almost entirely to agricultural and rural pursuits. Those people employed in Commonwealth and State departments are already provided for in their awards, but this Bill will permit associated rural workers—such as those in cheese and milk factories and stock and station agencies—to enjoy long service leave. After communicating with a number of employees

engaged in different types of employment in my district I am convinced that this Bill is acceptable to all of them. From my inquiries I believe that this Bill will benefit many people in my district who have been engaged in their present employment in the post-war period, therefore the seven years' retrospectivity means that they will benefit immediately. The Bill will provide an incentive to rural workers to continue in their present employment and this should be a great benefit because there is no incentive at present to stay in the one job for long. This should pay great dividends to the farming community.

The opposition to the legislation voiced by members opposite does not ring true, and I do not think they have considered the benefits it will confer on the types of workers I have mentioned. I have spoken to workers in the building and dairying industries in my district, and one man representing about 30 workers told me that all those men, who incidentally were union members, were perfectly satisfied with the Bill. Last Monday evening I talked to workers at a local dairy factory and they told me the same thing. That is the general opinion through my district: the Bill confers a benefit and gives the worker a choice on the method of taking the leave.

I have heard no objection to the legislation from employers. I believe the cost of the leave to small industries in my district will be somewhat compensated for by greater continuity of employment and lower turnover of labour. An experienced hand is much more valuable to an employer than a casual worker who does not desire continuity of employment. Whichever method of taking the leave an employee avails himself of he will receive a benefit. I believe that the effect of the legislation on the economy of the State is cushioned by the provisions of this Bill and ample protection is provided for the employee as to employment by the penalty clauses. There is much scope for amendments to the Bill, and I will consider any that may be moved.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I address my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, and Government members, particularly the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) who has just broached the sound barrier. It was good to see that the Government was at last bringing its big guns into action on this vital Bill. I trust that my first remarks will not be regarded as the beginning of a fairy tale, but members must remember that horrifying truths are sometimes contained in fairy tales. Once upon a time we had a Parliament freely elected and

democratic; it was free to debate a measure on its merits. Indeed, I believe we are at present free to do so, but apparently the members who comprise this House are no longer willing to freely debate a subject on its merits.

There was a time when we could expect that members would rise to their feet and cut to shreds a Bill when they found themselves capable of doing so, or hold their tongues if they were incapable of cutting it into shreds. In those days such debating was encouraged and enjoyed, and debates stimulated all members. I sincerely believe that on the white hot anvil of debate the Bills were hammered out so that Acts passed were for the benefit of the State. Questions were then debated on their merits, which is as things should be whether they are raised by the Government or the Opposition.

This Bill as introduced by the Government has no merit in it. On the other hand, my Leader has moved an amendment that I believe has merit. Be that as it may, until Mr. Jenkins spoke Opposition members had been denied the opportunity of hearing Government members support the Premier, and I believe that to be unfortunate. The conditions of free debate where members speak their feelings have apparently departed—most unfortunately—from this Chamber, and with other members I cannot but wonder whether this heralds the shape of things to come. Are we moving along the perilous descent to dictatorship? Will the time come when in this State a Parliament is no longer necessary? I am reminded of some words spoken by Lord Acton: "All power corrupts, but absolute power corrupts absolutely." That statement must strike a chord in the hearts of people who hear it, but I trust that the state of affairs envisaged by Lord Acton is not coming closer to the people of South Australia. I am afraid, however, when I see a measure introduced by the Government and Government members sit silent while only Opposition members speak on it. I regret this state of affairs, particularly because this year, with due pomp and ceremony—certainly with pride—we celebrated the centenary of responsible government in this State.

Mr. Lawn—Not responsible government—Parliamentary government.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—We were supposed to be celebrating responsible government. This measure has been introduced by the Government and an amendment moved by the Leader



of the Opposition, and we are debating both. Government members apparently have no arguments for their own Bill.

Mr. Lawn—They are not enthusiastic about it.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so. Apparently they sit palsied in their seats. I was therefore delighted to see Mr. Jenkins rise this afternoon and I hoped he would speak at some length.

Mr. Lawn—He was bulldozed into it.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Government members may need a long time to recover from yesterday's stupefied and petrified state. That is the most charitable attitude I can adopt toward them. Maybe this afternoon and this evening many pearls of wisdom will fall from their lips, but only if the Premier graciously permits them to speak. It appears to me that the course of this debate is a deliberate negation of what man has struggled for over the past 2,000 years—a democratic Parliament expressing opinion for and against. Admittedly, no member is compelled to speak on any Bill, but surely on legislation such as this, which has been on the Statute Books of most of the other States for some time, members have a duty to their constituents to contribute something to the debate other than the plain "yea" or "nay" or crossing the floor when the vote is taken.

People in South Australia are handicapped more than those in other States, and one of the greatest handicaps is that they are headlocked, legroped and hamstrung by an incredible electoral system that I am sure they will not submit to for much longer. I believe they will throw off their bonds and renew their freedom not only to elect the Government they want, but to reject the Government they do not want. We can take a slight consolation from one fact: all dictators from Nero to Hitler have perished eventually through their own egotism, and history gives us grounds for hope for the future.

Mr. Hambour—What about Franco?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It has been said that the mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small, and Franco is not dead yet. I believe he has something coming to him. Of course, much depends on one's definition of a dictatorship, but I think we have something in this State that makes it easy to realize just what the word means. I was delighted to see in this morning's press that the Premier at least was prepared to take up the cudgels in defence of his so-called Long Service Leave Bill.

I was pleased to see that although his colleagues were suffering yesterday from creeping paralysis the Premier was prepared last night at Wallaroo to talk about long service leave, even if he put his foot in it right up to the elbow!

Mr. Davis—He only tried to mislead the people.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I believe he did so in a vain attempt to fan the dying embers of his brand of Liberalism, but I am pleased that he spoke on L.S.L. and not only on L.C.L. at Wallaroo, although I think his Bill is hopeless. I could not attend the meeting last night, so I am relying now on press statements, but there were many other Labor supporters to help to make the meeting at Wallaroo, though I doubt whether I would have been more impressed with what he said than were the majority of those present. I understand from a communication I had today from Wallaroo that most of them went to jeer and did not remain to praise him. I found from this morning's press report that the Premier said some surprising things. For instance, he is reported to have said:—

A.L.P. opposition to the Long Service Leave Bill was having the effect of stimulating opposition from among the employers.

I point out that the employers will not have a bar of his Bill. An article appearing in tonight's *News* under the heading "No bid against Leave Bill" states:—

The South Australian Employers' Federation was not being encouraged by the A.L.P. to oppose the Government's Long Service Leave Bill, the Federation secretary, Mr. G. H. Pryke, said today. Indeed, the Federation was not a force working against the Bill, he said.

I would have been astonished if the A.L.P. was capable of influencing the Employer's Federation to take a stand against anything. Obviously, it is not doing so. I do not think that one person in the Premier's audience last night could possibly have swallowed that, although I may be wrong because I did not have the pleasure of hearing the Premier.

Mr. Hambour—It would have been a pleasure.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Possibly, because I like listening to a good speech that is well delivered and it would have been a pleasure for me to hear one of the Premier's occasionally excellent speeches.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you sure it was?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I do not know because I was not there. Even if the Premier's statement was correct—and I am prepared to grant that some members of the Employer's Federation might have at last realized that the

A.L.P. knows what it is talking about when speaking on industrial matters—does it matter? The Premier has a majority not only in this Chamber but in another place, and surely his supporters will vote for a Government Bill which is heralded by the Premier as an important one. We wonder whether it hurts the Premier's vanity to have the weight of public opinion increasingly against him, even though he has the numbers here to put through Parliament whatever he wants.

I was intrigued this afternoon by a cartoon that appeared in the *News*. It was amusing and instructive, and showed the Leader of the Opposition complete with pipe but with one weapon he never carries—a gun—but it showed the Premier with a whip which he had obviously been cracking. Perhaps the person who drew that cartoon was present yesterday and was impressed by the fact that all the speeches on this Bill were delivered from the Labor benches. The report of the Premier's speech at Wallaroo last night consisted of only a few lines in the *Advertiser*. That report appeared at the top of the page, because the newspaper thought the Premier was entitled to that position. However, most of that page and other pages were devoted, quite rightly, to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and my colleagues who spoke yesterday afternoon. The room necessary to report the remarks of other Government members was found on page 31 of the *Advertiser*, but there were only 30 pages in the paper.

I have already suggested that the Premier's remarks last night at Wallaroo were the result more of hurt vanity than anything else, but he was obviously worried by the certainty of losing the seat. He could not have failed to notice the lean to the Labor Party and the support for the able candidate who is carrying its banner at Wallaroo. For once the people of that district saw the Premier as we have seen him in this Chamber. The velvet glove was removed from the iron hand, the mask slipped from the face of innocence, and the smiler with the knife was revealed. We have had experience of that here, particularly when industrial legislation has been before the House, but we will not put up with it again. The people at Wallaroo saw the real Premier, the one not often seen in public but unfortunately known only too well by some members here. We know his attitude of "Take this, or you get nothing."

Mr. Dunstan—Take this, or you get worse.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That may be right. For instance, we can recall landlord and ten-

ant legislation and other measures, but that attitude of the Premier's will bluff us no longer, and I do not think it bluffed the people at Wallaroo. According to the press report, he said last night:—

If I cannot get this Bill through the present session of Parliament I am quite certain no other legislation of its kind will ever have a chance of being passed in Parliament as at present constituted.

I ask members to notice particularly those last four words. The Premier has a majority in both Houses, so this legislation must pass if his supporters vote for it. What is he worrying about? I thought yesterday afternoon, when Government members did not rise in support of the Bill, that the Premier had said "Thumbs down, shut up," but I am starting to wonder after reading what he said at Wallaroo. I am wondering whether the Premier has doubts about getting the support of his members. They certainly have not stated their attitude, except that the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) told us forcibly where he stood.

Mr. Hambour—You are going to vote for the Bill, aren't you?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—No. The Premier's supporters have not spoken, or perhaps they are not in a fit state of health to speak.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Or perhaps they are incapable of speaking.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I hesitate to say that, but we can take a guide from speeches made on a long service leave Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition in 1954. That was a real long service Bill, but only three members on the Government side spoke. The Premier gave it much attention and opposed it. The Minister of Agriculture (the Hon. G. G. Pearson) was then a private member and he spoke on that Bill. I must admit that he expressed some slight leaning towards the principle of long service leave. It made a most interesting contribution to the debate. The ex-member for Burra also spoke. Naturally most members on this side had something to say on the Bill but when the vote was taken all Government supporters opposed it. In the light of that, the Premier may have some doubts as to the attitude of members of his Party on this Bill, particularly in view of their silence yesterday, but I do not think so. The vote in 1954 was as it always is when the Opposition introduces a Bill or a motion. There is always opposition when something comes from this side, whether it is good or bad.

Mr. O'Halloran—All things we introduce are good.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I fully agree with that statement. I wonder whether the attitude of Government members will be any different on this subterfuge. Formerly they had no interest in long service leave. Now there appears to be a real interest, but it is only an interest that has arisen because of circumstances since 1954. We must not make a mistake on this issue. Government members will support the Bill, and the Premier knows that. What he said at Wallaroo last night was another big bluff—do this or else. However, it was a type of window dressing not normally indulged in by him. In public he is generally a skilful window dresser; there is none better. No doubt the Premier was reported correctly by the press. I have great faith in the press, particularly when they report the Premier. Let me return to that barefaced admission by the Premier at Wallaroo last night. He said:—

No other legislation of its kind will ever have a chance of being passed in Parliament as at present constituted.

For years we have been trying to convince the Premier that the constitution of our Parliament is hopelessly wrong, and I got a thrill when I read this morning what he said about the composition of Parliament. We have often seen the Premier speak with a twinkle in his eye and obviously gloating over the set-up which keeps him where he is, but I cannot remember him ever previously doing in public what he did at Wallaroo. We have been saying for years that, as at present constituted, no Labor measure will get through Parliament without Government support. All members know that is true. The Premier was good enough to raise the matter of the constitution of Parliament during this by-election campaign—a particularly one-sided campaign. The result on voting day will be similar to the foregone result when Port Adelaide football club played South Adelaide last week. I am optimistic that it will be so.

The SPEAKER—The statement the Premier is alleged to have made was not made in this House. The honourable member must confine himself to the Bill and the amendment moved by Mr. O'Halloran.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Mr. Speaker, would I be correct in saying that the legislation passed in this House depends to a great extent on our electoral system, which makes possible a predominance of members of one Party in this Chamber?

The SPEAKER—The honourable member must not debate the electoral system or the way in which this House is constituted.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—We find that it is most difficult for the will of the people to be put into operation in this Assembly. I intend to link up my remarks.

The SPEAKER—Order! I would like the honourable member to link up the matter immediately. I think he is trying to get there by devious means.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I believe that if all the people had the opportunity to express their opinion they would be entirely opposed to the Bill. They do not like the Bill and it is only because the system does not allow them to have a majority in this House that their opinion cannot be strongly expressed here. Many people have expressed this view and the Premier has always refused to admit it publicly. He did admit it last night at Wallaroo, but it was done only to bluff the electors. He will find that they will not be bluffed. I believe their minds have already been made up. They made them up right from the time the Australian Labor Party announced its candidate, who is an outstanding exponent of real Australian Labor Party principles, and a man who will in the near future be an asset to this House. I trust I will not be guilty of transgressing the Standing Orders. I have no desire to do so, except inadvertently. In 1954 the Leader of the Opposition introduced a Bill for real long service leave and not this present half-baked idea of extended annual leave. On October 6, 1954, the Premier said:—

I am in what I regard as the box seat for I do not have to put forward any alternative, although I may later.

This is it, for apparently after mature consideration in his box seat he has introduced this apology for a Bill in place of the measure introduced originally by Mr. O'Halloran. I remember that at that time the Premier reflected on the carefully considered measures that the Leader of the Opposition always introduces. Unfortunately all these carefully considered measures meet with the same fate because of Government opposition, but that is a matter I cannot discuss in this debate. Apparently this Bill is all the Premier has for us, after he has given the matter long and mature consideration. All we have is an extension of annual leave, which is a sop to be thrown to the people. I do not know whether they will accept it.

Mr. Lawn—Has anyone accepted it?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Apart from the member for Stirling I do not know of any member on the Government side.

Mr. Lawn—The Premier said some employers were opposed to it and that some of his supporters would oppose it.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is the inference to be drawn from the Premier's remarks. I do not think they should be taken seriously and I do not think they were taken seriously by the Wallaroo people. Up to the present in this debate we have had to listen to a Labor monologue. In the past we have heard Government members compliment the South Australian workers. We have been told that they are wonderful workers, and I entirely endorse that opinion. This Bill is the reward that is being doled out to them with a niggardly hand. Some members may ask what the Labor Party wants. We want industrial harmony, and efficiency in industry to continue, but we want justice as well. That has been too long delayed in this State. We have waited a long time for it and many people, because of rumours and the legislation passed in other States about long service leave, expected something to be benevolently given to them. They have waited for it with keen anticipation. Apparently we have to wait much longer, and lag behind the other States. This is by no means unusual. It has been said often in this House, and rightly so, that as far as industrial legislation is concerned South Australia is not a starter in the race. We are always well behind the other States. It may be asked why this Bill was introduced. In 1954 the Bill presented by the Leader of the Opposition was virtually treated with contempt.

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

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Before the tea adjournment I began my remarks in the style of a fairy tale. It was intended to be a serious fairy tale, indeed a grave one, and in fact most fairy tales are serious because usually they have implications written into the story as has this Bill. I hope that members fully realize those implications. During the early part of my remarks I had something to say with regard to the cartoon published in the *News* today, and on looking at that cartoon again one thing struck me forcibly, and that is that so many of the people in these cartoons by Mitchell, which are usually very good, use primitive weapons. For instance in the cartoon there is a coach upon which appears to be a large sack—much too small, in my opinion—

labelled "Long Service Bill." The coach also has a label "Tom and Co." I am not certain what that means, but from what I have seen in the House up to date the "and Co." should not be there. It is a primitive coach, and on looking at the wheels I have a feeling that it is not destined to go very far, because it does not appear to be very safe. We find in the foreground a gentleman who looks to me like Simon Legree, but on looking at the countenance I believe it is intended to represent the Premier. In these enlightened days a whip can be classed as a primitive weapon.

In the right foreground of this cartoon we find two gentlemen apparently engaged in a game of chance. One of them is tossing a penny and seems to be scared that he is going to lose it. He is labelled "employers," and that well might be in character. The gentleman with him is labelled "L.C.L."; he has his mouth wide open which is a most unusual thing for anyone with such a label, particularly in the light of what happened in this Chamber yesterday. I understand that the orders of the day have been altered so far as whip cracking is concerned, and the Premier has come back from Wallaroo and said, "Boys, we can't possibly win it; let your head go tonight and talk." I could be wrong, of course, but I prophesy that tonight we will hear certain speeches from Government members, or at least members who sit on the Government side of the House, on this Bill.

Returning to the cartoon, there are two other gentlemen in the left foreground. One has a pipe and a mask, which he never wears, but at least he is armed with a modern weapon, certainly one which is past the bow and arrow and shanghai stage. The gentleman labelled "employers" has a shanghai and a couple of stones lying behind him, but at least he has had the good sense to discard them. The gentleman labelled "A.L.P.", who bears a certain resemblance to the Leader of the Opposition, is armed with two guns, one in his mouth, and one in his right hand. The only other gentleman left in the picture is labelled "unions," and the horses' eyes seem to be directly fixed on him. He apparently has a concealed weapon, because his hand is hidden by the bulk of the Leader of the Opposition. I assure members of the House that the artist who drew this has certainly equipped the gentleman labelled "unions" with a modern weapon. I notice that both this concealed weapon and that held by the Leader of the Opposition are pointed directly at the left breast of the gentleman who looks like Simon Legree. I commend the artist for

this cartoon, and possibly the original of it could be presented to me.

Mr. Shannon—You might not think that if you knew what Mr. Mitchell meant by it.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I trust we shall have the opportunity of hearing the honourable member because, to be candid, I thought that he would possibly be the last member in this House to rise to his feet on such a debate as this. If I am wrong about that I shall be the happiest man in this House. Now that the censorship has apparently been released, I am looking forward to hearing Government members speak tonight, and really let their heads go. That is a pleasure which we have been waiting for for a long time. In the course of a speech before an adjournment it is not always easy to get right back to the point.

Mr. Hambour—Which point?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I regret the interruption. Some of my colleagues on both sides of the House certainly do their best to put a speaker off the point. However, I am happy to say that normally members on this side have a point firmly fixed in their mind and endeavour to keep to it. I am delighted to hear the rumour that Government speakers are to enter the fray tonight.

Mr. Lawn—They have given Wallaroo away.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It will be a change from the Labor monologue we have heard up to date. I admit that it has been a particularly good monologue, or should I say "series of solos." I presume from what was said in regard to the motion by the Leader of the Opposition in 1954 that we can expect unqualified disapproval by members of the Government of any form of long service leave. Over the years we have had a surfeit of kindly remarks with regard to the wonderfully happy spirit in industry in this State. I say a "surfeit" not because I believe the remarks are not entirely justifiable but because I believe they have normally been made by some Government members with their tongues well and truly in their cheeks, in fact half way down their throats. I entirely endorse those remarks. Fortunately I have had the opportunity to travel over a good deal of Australia, and I can safely say that the Australian worker is one of the best in the world. It is good to say that and really believe what I am saying. The workers are entitled to a just reward for their services, and this Bill shows in some detail the reward they are going to receive here.

We of the Labor Party most certainly want industrial harmony in this State; we want peace in industry, and we want efficiency. We

want all these things to continue, but we also want the justice to which we are entitled, but which has not been meted out to the workers. For a long time we have been lagging behind other States in long service leave, and we believed the Government had been put into a position that it must give it. This is not really a reward, but a just benefit to which the workers are entitled. Some workers have asked me in the last few weeks why this Bill was introduced by a Government of the political complexion of the South Australian Government. I think the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) yesterday summed up the reason fairly accurately when he gave a report of a meeting between representatives of the Trades and Labor Council and the Premier. I think he said that the Premier had said that he was in a cleft stick. Apparently that cleft stick may have had some influence on his decision to introduce this Bill. Of course, we must remember that the Premier spoke the truth when he said he was put in a cleft stick position, as other States have already introduced long service leave. It was well known that Western Australia expected to do so, and it was common knowledge that the validity of its Long Service Act, although challenged, had been completely upheld, so to defend his own ego the Premier decided that we must have at least something that purported to be long service leave. Unfortunately, what we have is an L.S.L. Bill with far too much L.C.L. wrapped up in it, and the result has been that we have had submitted to us what is perhaps accurately described as the Premier's brain storm—what is purported to be a Long Service Leave Bill.

Although we were not told this in the second reading speech, its object is to give the people a token Long Service Leave Bill, and they are expected to grab the scrap in both hands with joy. They are then expected devoutly to thank the benevolent Premier, and in unison sing songs to Caesar in thanks for what they are given. We of the Labor Party, and I am sure the majority of the people, cannot feel inclined in that direction at all. In fact, it is our endeavour not to allow this sleight-of-hand trick to succeed without at least unmasking just what is behind the legislation. Quite a number of us have aimed to expose the faults of this crossbred animal with all the faults of its parents, and not one of its virtues, if any.

This legislation is regarded by many people and by me as an insult to the intelligence of the citizens of this State. Let us examine what the so-called Bill does, and for the benefit of

some members who have shown that they either lack the comprehension or concentration to understand it, I will put it very simply. The measure simply extends annual leave from 14 days after 12 months' service to 21 days after seven years' service. What a gift that is from the benevolent Premier, and what a great illusion!

Mr. Lawn—The Trades Hall movement has for a long time been asking for 21 days' leave after 12 months.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It has. Let us see what the Bill ignores. It ignores the fact that the people of South Australia are capable of thinking for themselves. Let us stop for a moment to see if we can work out just who does like it. The unions certainly do not want this legislation, because it is not long service leave, and the A.L.P. certainly does not like it. Earlier in the debate we had the innuendo thrown at us—although it was not an innuendo but a plain accusation—that we are tied and told we have to take certain action on the Bill. The action we have taken was decided by a democratic meeting of delegates who voted on this issue, and I am very proud to say that I voted the same way as the result of the vote, and agreed with it. As I said earlier today, we are fed up with taking the scraps that the Premier is prepared to throw us from his table. We believe in the policy we advocate, and as far as I am concerned it would not have mattered what the vote was, this still would have been my attitude. The unions do not like this Bill, the A.L.P. does not, and I do not think the employers like it. Judging by the cartoon in today's *News* they do not know where they are. They are throwing a penny in the air, and it looked to me as if they were more interested in losing the toss. Judging on the evidence given in the House during the last two days, apparently Government supporters do not like the Bill either, since the handcuffs have been unlocked and they will now speak, but I am open to correction about that. If I find that contrary to principle, they support the Bill, I will be the first to admit I was wrong. Even if they do support it, that does not say they are in favour of long service leave, because the old principles of long service leave which have been fought for and obtained in so many places are not in the Bill as introduced by the Treasurer.

I said earlier that the Bill discounts the intelligence of the people of South Australia. We are told by implication "I am the Premier. I am above reproach. I can get away with anything." However, I think this Bill will prove that it is not so. The Government may

get away with it in this House and have it passed, but I do not think it has any chance of converting the people of South Australia, including the workers, who have long waited for a Bill to give genuine long service leave. I question whether it will convert them to the belief that this is the long service leave that their leaders and they themselves would desire. So, the amendment was moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Simply stated it means that the Bill should be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for 13 weeks long service leave after 10 years' service—real long service leave and not this freak we are given in this legislation. It might be timely if I say that the public for years have regarded long service leave as a right which workers should have, and not a gift. All other States have it, or very soon will. I believe, and other members on this side certainly do, and I hope some members on the other side also believe, that this is a right justly earned—an entitlement. On behalf of the workers of South Australia I resent the patronizing idea of what is proposed for the workers under this legislation.

Let us remember that long service leave has long been included in Arbitration Court awards, and that Government servants and others have been granted it for a long time after 10 years' service. We have been accused of crying for the moon when we seek long service leave after 10 years, but public servants have had it for a long time. The time will come, whether we are crying for the moon or not, when the workers of this State will receive their full and just long service leave after 10 years. I hope the time will come when they will receive it even after a shorter period. We realize that many thinking employers have accepted it for years and granted it to their workers by agreement. The situation today is that many people already enjoy long service leave, and all we want in our amendment is for all to enjoy what is generally the accepted meaning implied by long service leave.

What a chance the Premier had with this Bill, and what a chance he has missed. He would have made a name for himself for all time with the workers. In fact, I think he has done that already in this legislation, but in a different sense. I am reminded of what the Premier said when speaking in 1954 on the Long Service Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. He spoke about "meddlesome politicians." This Bill is a notable example of the damage that can be done by meddlesome politicians. This is certainly "meddlesome" legislation. Apparently, the

Government was not prepared to accept the chance offered, and instead we have what many people would regard as a confidence trick, the sort of thing suitable to come only from the showman's booth, and a pretty poor showman's booth at that.

I will sum up why we oppose this legislation. Firstly, we believe it is a subterfuge and that all it does is to increase annual leave to some employees by one week after seven years' service. Secondly, we do not like it because we know that originally the Government had no intention of making the proposed additional leave cumulative, but suddenly it got a brain wave—an afterthought—to make it possible for leave to accumulate if the employer and the employee agreed. One might well ask what would be the result. The answer is simple—it would certainly prevent employees from taking the leave in any other way than as annual leave. That certainly is not long service leave. The legislation is actually a complete reversal of all the accepted principles of long service leave in Australia. I believe, with other members of the Opposition, that if the Bill is passed it will possibly retard for years the possibility of real long service leave being introduced in South Australia. Conversely, I believe that if it is defeated, as I pray it will be, it could well hasten the introduction of a real long service Bill, if not by this Government, then by one really interested in everybody as regards true long service leave. I have been emboldened to speak so long because I have been trying to strike a blow for justice. I compliment members opposite, who, if not capable of talking, are at least capable of sniggering and jeering—not usually accepted as a particularly good argument even in high school debates, although possibly it is here. I can hardly blame them for that type of argument because they have been given a notable example of it on their side of the House.

We believe that 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years is the only real long service leave and we propose that our legislation should be not the worst in Australia, as it will be if this Bill is passed, but the best. The Leader's amendment is designed to give every member the opportunity of providing South Australian workers with what they are justly entitled to. I entirely oppose the Bill and wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I wholeheartedly support the Bill and oppose the Leader's amendment. This is one of the most far-reaching measures introduced into this House.

It will apply to all workers, whatever their trade or calling and whatever their location and will apply to primary and secondary industries and to unionists and non-unionists. It is a good Bill and is progressive industrial legislation conferring certain benefits on South Australian workers. One could be pardoned for thinking that it would have received the wholehearted and unstinted support of the Labor Party which so often calls itself the workers' Party, but that is not the position. We find that rather than allow the Government to do something tangible for employees and obtain some credit for it, the Labor Party has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude. In other words, it says "If we cannot do it we will try to stop you at all costs." That is apparently what is happening.

Yesterday, we listened patiently to some extremely weak and tedious speeches from members opposite—in fact, they were pathetically weak. The amendment was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, but his own Party members were not ready to support him. It was apparent that they were fiddling and fooling around because they did not know what to do and as a result they criticised Government members for not speaking on an amendment they had introduced and which we had not had an opportunity of seeing before its introduction. It was extremely bad management and the Opposition was stalling. The Government has introduced this Bill but the Opposition—the so-called champions of the workers—is opposing it and has made no secret of its opposition. Let us examine their reason. I submit that it is because they have been told to oppose it. Who has told them? Certainly not the Leader, because yesterday the member for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) in reply to the interjection, "Do you get your instructions from the gallery?" said, "No, and I do not get any instructions from my Leader." That was a most amazing statement.

Let us trace the announcements on and history of this measure. On April 26 the Premier announced his intention to introduce this measure and outlined its broad principles and in the *Advertiser* of April 27 the following appeared:—

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) said he was pleased to learn that the Government intended to introduce a Bill providing long-service leave for all workers not at present entitled to it. When the Bill was introduced, he would see that it was considered by the Parliamentary advisory committee to determine the attitude of the Opposition to the machinery provisions of the Bill.

However, I refer to the following statement in the *Advertiser* of June 17:—

Labor members of the State Parliament must completely and uncompromisingly oppose a Long Service Leave Bill that does not conform to Labor's policy.

That statement was not made by the Leader of the Opposition but by Mr. R. E. Bannister, the incoming president of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party when asked to give a ruling by Mr. Fred Walsh, M.P. —in another capacity—as to whether Labor members in this House would be bound by his decision to oppose this measure. When Mr. Bannister said he would have to consider the matter and give his ruling the next day, Mr. Walsh said, "I hope they lock you up tonight while you consider your decision so they cannot get at you." Mr. Bannister went on to say:—

In effect, this ruling means that Labor members must oppose the second reading of the Bill. In the Committee stages they must not accept nor seek any amendments. They must also oppose the third reading.

That was a definite instruction to members as to how they must vote. Let us examine the implications of that ruling. The ruling was given to elected members of Parliament by a body which is not responsible to the electors and not elected by the people.

Mr. Riches—But it is the people.

Mr. CUMBE—Perhaps it is the new type of democratic socialism we have heard so much about. I emphasize the point that here are members of a responsible Parliamentary Government who are being told by an outside body not responsible to the people how they must vote in this Chamber. Opposition members are playing at politics in this matter by putting expediency before principle. Their action is a deliberate attempt by the Labor Party to bid for office. The decision to oppose the Government's Bill has been made by several ambitious men who want to disregard its advantages to the workers in this State.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—What would be the position if Labor became the Government? It would receive a different instruction each day.

Mr. CUMBE—That is so. Although I do not criticize the action of Labor members in holding a convention, I point out that a certain group dominated the recent convention through the card system and decided to oppose the Government measure at all stages so that it could not become law. This constitutes a deliberate attempt by the Australian Labor Party to gain power. If this measure is defeated it will

go to the people before the next election and tell them that South Australia is the only State without long service leave legislation and that the only way to remedy that state of affairs is to put Labor in office.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It's contempt of Parliament.

Mr. CUMBE—It could be. Since this measure was first announced by the Premier I have taken the trouble to inquire among many of my friends who are trade unionists. Although I have not picked out any group particularly, I must admit that most of them have worked under the Metal Trades Award.

Mr. O'Halloran—Don't you agree with the metal trades employers?

Mr. CUMBE—The Leader may draw whatever conclusion he wishes, but he has had his say and I am now having mine. The great majority of the men I have spoken to favour this Bill. I believe Opposition members realize that; indeed, in their hearts most of them would probably prefer the Government Bill, but they dare not say so. They should do a little heart searching.

Mr. Stephens—That is not true.

Mr. CUMBE—They have been talking with tongue in cheek for the last few days, but they should face up to realities and have the courage to tell their masters in Grote Street that they are going to vote on their own conscience. Why don't they do so?

Mr. O'Halloran—Because we will not rat on the platform we were elected on—not as you do!

Mr. CUMBE—I believe that the Australian Council of Trade Unions is a very responsible body in most matters, and it has been urging the adoption throughout Australia of the uniform long service leave principle of 13 weeks' leave after 20 years' continuous service; yet an amendment was suddenly introduced yesterday asking for 13 weeks' leave after 10 years' continuous service. How will this local rule tie up with the A.C.T.U. view?

Mr. O'Halloran—It will tie up with the Public Service rule.

Mr. CUMBE—I suggest that the amendment is a deliberate attempt to get over the Trades Hall ruling to oppose the Government on this measure and is therefore a means of saving face. Labor members have been told to oppose the Bill and the amendment was moved at the last moment in such great haste that even Opposition members were unable to talk on it yesterday.

Mr. O'Halloran—They made a good effort.



Mr. CUMBE—If that is the best they can do it is no wonder they have been in opposition for so long. Let us look a little more closely at the amendment and the effect it would have on the business life of this State. The 10 years period would mean the ruin of most small industries.

Mr. Hambour—The very people they are supposed to support.

Mr. CUMBE—Yes. Today we heard much about decentralization, and I suppose that many small businesses, particularly in the country, would have to close very soon after the introduction of three months' leave after 10 years' service.

Mr. Shannon—The small industries that are struggling would be strangled.

Mr. CUMBE—Yes, and I suggest that in a devious way the Opposition is out to shut down the little private enterprise man who employs non-union labor. The implementation of the amendment would certainly create much unemployment and push up production costs, particularly of consumer goods. We hear the Labor Party calling itself the friend of the workers, but if it is a real friend of the workers why doesn't it support this Bill?

It is amazing that most of the discussion on the Bill has been confined to clause 6, which sets out the principle of one week's leave after seven years' continuous service. We have heard little about any other provision, yet under this Bill many more people will benefit more quickly than under any other scheme operating in Australia. It is estimated that of all industrial workers in factories in this State at present only 9 per cent would qualify under a provision for 20 years' continuous service, whereas 33 per cent would qualify under the seven years provision, which proves that more workers in this State will benefit more quickly than in any other State. If Opposition members defeat this Bill, how will they explain, prior to the next election, that one-third of the workers have been denied this immediate right? In opposing the Bill the Labor Party is denying the workers the benefits they would get from this Government measure. The Bill is far more beneficial and generous to employees than it is to employers. It lays down penalties if employers do not comply with its conditions. It states that service shall be regarded as continuous even if it is interrupted for certain reasons. I draw particular attention to clause 4, which states:—

(1) For the purposes of this Act the continuity of a worker's service (whether before

or after the commencement of this Act) shall not be deemed to have been broken by—

- (a) absence of the worker from work for any cause by leave of the employer;
- (b) absence of the worker from work for not more than 15 consecutive working days on account of illness or injury other than injury arising out of and in the course of the worker's employment;
- (c) absence of the worker from work on account of injury arising out of and in the course of the worker's employment;
- (d) interruption or termination of the worker's service by the employer with the intention of avoiding obligations in respect of long service leave;
- (e) interruption of the worker's service arising directly or indirectly from an industrial dispute, but only if the worker returned to work in accordance with the terms of settlement of the dispute;
- (f) the dismissal of the worker, if he was re-employed by the same employer within two months after the dismissal took effect;
- (g) the standing down of the worker on account of slackness of trade, but only if the worker returned to work within 14 days after receiving from the employer an offer of re-employment or notice to resume work.

Those absences will not affect continuity of service for the purpose of this legislation. Absence on military service is also covered and the rights of apprentices under this legislation are safeguarded. They are most generous provisions. Most apprenticeships, especially in the metal trades industry, are for five years, and an apprentice only has to work another two years before becoming eligible to participate in the benefits laid down under the Bill. This measure is more generous than those in other States. After seven years' service an employee will become entitled to a week's leave. If he allows his leave to accumulate he will be entitled to 13 weeks after 20 years, and 33 weeks after 40 years, compared with 26 weeks under the legislation of other States. This is a most progressive Bill and one of the most far-reaching ever to come before the House because of the great number of people affected. If it is defeated it will be on political grounds only and not on the merits of the Bill, and the blame will be entirely at the door of Labor.

Mr. Loveday—What about our 1954 Bill?

Mr. CUMBE—The honourable member may talk about that Bill if he wants to. Labor will have to answer to the people if the Bill is defeated by members opposite. The Opposition is putting politics and expediency before

the betterment of its supporters. If members opposite defeat the measure they will once more draw attention to the fact that the workers are beginning to realize that most of the benefits they get come from the present Liberal Government. We must either support the second reading or the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Labor members are opposing the Bill because they have been instructed to do so, not by the Parliamentary Labor Party, but by an outside body. That is a travesty of the system of responsible government that we enjoy. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill and trust that the amendment will receive the fate it deserves.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent)—This is not a long service leave Bill, and we must decide to support the second reading or the Leader of the Opposition's amendment. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) made a mouthful about what Labor members have done and what they have not done. He said much about the merits and demerits of our action in abiding by the decision of a conference he referred to, but we do not want any instructions from him. If public servants are entitled to three months' long service leave after 10 years' service, why are not people in private industry entitled to the same? No Government member has attempted to answer that. If the amendment is carried we shall at least have consistency and not discriminate between public servants and workers in private enterprise. There should be no discrimination. The member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) emphasized that the Labor Party stood for justice for those who have served their employers down the years. It amuses me to hear the emphasis placed on what the workers will suffer if the Bill is defeated. As the Government has a majority in this House how can anyone anticipate that it will be defeated? It cannot happen if members opposite stand behind the Government. As far as I am concerned they can please themselves how they vote, but my conscience would not allow me to support a Bill such as this.

Mr. John Clark—You could not support it.

Mr. CORCORAN—I could not, whether the conference to which the member for Torrens referred supported it or not. I point out that it was a democratic conference set up on a democratic basis. Every person present represented some sub-branch of the Labor Party. The discussion on this measure did not last for just a few minutes. We deliberated over the matter for a long time and everybody knows

the decision. I supported the move: I would not think of doing anything else. Do members opposite forget that seven years must pass by before any leave can be granted under this Bill, and by that time many people will have reached the retiring age and get nothing. Fate may decree that during those seven years Labor will occupy the Treasury benches and it will certainly provide the workers with proper long service leave. The people should not blame Labor if this Bill is defeated. It should not be said that we do as we are told. We decide a matter after it has been properly discussed.

Mr. Heaslip—You are free to vote as you like!

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes, and so is the honourable member, but I know how he will vote. If the same loyalty to the Premier exists in another place as exists here there is no doubt about the fate of the Bill. It will be passed, so don't try to demoralize us by saying that if it is not passed the Opposition will be to blame. The workers will have to wait seven long and weary years before getting an additional week's leave.

Mr. John Clark—They may get it in money.

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes, and that will defeat the purpose of the Bill. Under our proposal after 10 years the worker will get his long service leave. What is wrong with that? A public servant gets long service leave after 10 years and what is good for the goose should be good for the gander. If it is good for the public servant it is good for the workers in private industry, and if Labor has its way the workers will get it. Our 1954 Bill met the same fate as all Bills introduced by this Party. There always seems to be something wrong with them according to the Premier, who always tries to find faults in them. If this Bill goes through tomorrow it will not take effect for seven years.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—It comes into effect immediately.

Mr. CORCORAN—It takes effect immediately but the workers have to wait for seven years.

Mr. Lawn—It goes back seven years.

Mr. CORCORAN—We would not support it if it went back 17 years. I emphatically oppose the Bill and wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—Mr. Corcoran wanted to know what is wrong with the Opposition amendment and the answer is that it is a red herring, whereas the Bill is an honest and effective attempt to improve

employment conditions in South Australia. The workers will not have to wait seven long and weary years. The honourable member will be pleasantly surprised to know that the scheme will operate from July 1 last. After more consideration of this matter he must be a little more cheerful about it. The Bill will be welcomed by the people in South Australia. The only extraordinary characteristic about this debate is the amount of sham we are getting from the Opposition who have been delivered to the steps of Parliament House bound and gagged. They are still bound and gagged. Mr. John Clark referred to the electors as being headlocked, leg-roped and hamstrung, but that is a good description of the members of his Party. The Opposition members are smiling bravely, for they are under a severe threat to oppose the Bill. They would like to support a measure of this sort, but they are absolutely powerless.

Mr. Davis—Thousands of people are enjoying long service leave now.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Opposition members are under a threat of ruthless liquidation. They are not allowed to support the Bill, and the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) clearly demonstrated that fact. It must be rather humiliating to the Opposition to have to stand up and pretend, by moving what can only be described as a red herring amendment, to talk down a Bill which they really should be supporting. To the other mysterious policy of the Labor Party has been added the rider that they shall oppose long service leave. This Labor Party consists of the greatest centralizers in the State, and indeed they stand for the abolition of the State Parliament. They now have a policy of opposing long service leave, a policy which was forced upon them at the conference of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party. It would be preferable if Labor members were honest and admitted what they really felt. Not one of them has had the courage to stand up and say what he really thinks about the Bill because he would become a martyr very quickly. From time to time people in the Opposition Party speak their minds, such as the member for Adelaide in the Federal Parliament who I expect will be dealt with very soon. However, there do not appear to be any signs that the member for Adelaide in the State Parliament (Mr. Lawn) will do the same.

I was rather impressed in a critical way by the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) in his speech tonight. He used flowery words

about the passing of democracy and that sort of thing, but his remarks could easily be very accurate if they were directed slightly away from the point he was trying to make and directed at his own Party. He made the greatest of mis-statements, and by doing so tried to get away with it. He quoted Lord Acton's remarks about absolute power corrupting, but I remind him that Lord Acton also said that nothing is so dangerous as wrong-headed efficiency, and those are remarks which fit the member for Gawler's speech a good deal better.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is that what the honourable member is suffering from?

Mr. BROOKMAN—The member for Gawler made a bold attempt to shift the blame from his own Party to someone else. This measure will greatly improve employment conditions in South Australia, and in my opinion it is a big advance in that respect. Over a long period of years working conditions have been improved until they have reached the very high standard that they are today. This measure will add further to the stability of employment and will provide a good incentive to workers to remain in the industry in which they are employed.

Mr. Lawn—Who is responsible for the improvement?

Mr. BROOKMAN—The Government.

Mr. Lawn—This Government is only following other Governments.

Mr. BROOKMAN—This Government is now being opposed by the unfortunate members of the Opposition who cannot say what they think. I commend the employers, who after all are going to pay for this.

Mr. Lawn—Where does the employer get his money?

Mr. BROOKMAN—We heard all that the other day.

The SPEAKER—Order! I remind members that Standing Orders provide that interjections are out of order.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The employers realize that this measure will add to the stability of employment and will be a good measure for the State. They are taking a broad-minded view in this matter, and generally speaking are supporting the Bill; they have various suggestions for improvements and there are dozens of different theories as to the best way of implementing it. It takes a fairly broad-minded person to agree to something which

will cost him money, and consequently I think that we can be proud of South Australian employers. The Bill can be discussed more advantageously in Committee and I will say no more about it at this stage except that I strongly support the second reading.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I oppose the Bill.

Mr. Brookman—You have to.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I thank the honourable member for his interjection and will say something about that. Yesterday we had the spectacle of members opposite sitting mum on this issue because apparently at that time they thought those were good tactics. They then saw what members on this side were doing to them, so they now have the new tactics which are that they will get up but not talk about long service or explain the measure or answer criticisms. They do not explain how it is that they have the extraordinary mental agility to call annual leave long service leave. They do not explain anything relating to that, but merely get up and accuse the Opposition of red herrings and of having been brought here bound and gagged and delivered to the steps of Parliament and told what they must do. I will inform members opposite what has happened as far as the Opposition is concerned, because it is evident that they need a little instruction on this matter.

For some time we have had in this Parliament a curious tactic indulged in by the Premier, but undoubtedly for a while it had political appeal. He came here and put up a measure that made things a little bit better for workers than they were before, although far worse than any industrial legislation anywhere else. When members from this State go to other States and talk about industrial legislation in this State, the people gape in amazement that things could be so here. He brought in legislation that would be a crumb and then let it be known to the Opposition that if it had anything to say—"meddle" is the word he is fond of using—the workers here would not get anything. At times he has gone further and has said, "If you dare move amendments and propose that something better be done for the workers here, I will make it worse for them." That is what happened in the Landlord and Tenant legislation last year, when he said, "Because you have moved an amendment I will make it worse," and make it worse he did. When I protested, members opposite were amused at what I said would happen, yet as a result the Premier had

to call Parliament together again in a few weeks to provide the safeguards that I said he was not providing, and to prevent the things I said would happen, but which the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said would not happen. He is smiling bravely now, but he cannot get away from that. The Premier said, "If you meddle in this legislation you will not get anything." He stood there, in effect, a brave man giving something to the workers, and he allowed his back benchers to get up and abuse it, hoping that he would get the measure through with the votes of the Opposition so that he could pose as the best Labor Premier this State has ever had. That was very simple, but members on this side have got tired of this sort of thing, and we took him at his word. We were not told at our conference what to do, but at that conference we said, "We are not going to stand for this sort of thing any longer. Let us take the Premier at his own word," and I was one of them who said it. If the Premier believes in the principles he has enunciated, let him take the responsibility for putting the Bill through the House, but we are not going to be put before the people of South Australia as advocating something we do not believe in.

Mr. Hambour—Let us have a vote on it now.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have a few more things the honourable member may not wish to hear, but he is going to hear them before we take a vote. The Premier, of course, was very distressed at this turn of events, so we saw another of his little threats when the press came forward and said that if the Opposition members meddled with this sort of legislation the workers would not get anything. We were not taken in by this bluff any more than we were taken in by the Landlord and Tenant Bill bluff. The Premier then had to do something else, so he announced in the Governor's Speech that the Government might do something for long service leave. Then the Wallaroo by-election came along, and the Premier decided he had to do something quickly. However, the electors there are not impressed, as Government members will discover on August 31.

At Wallaroo the Premier, feeling that perhaps this legislation was not receiving quite the treatment he had hoped, said, "This is the only legislation of this nature that Parliament as at present constituted will pass." Apparently he was apologizing for this wretched piece of work and saying "Forgive me for what I say, but this is the most I can get through at the moment, because I cannot get anything else through the Upper House." I gather from members opposite that that is

what the Premier believes, and that is the effect of his remark. Why does he not take himself at his own word, because I can remember vividly what he said here during a previous debate. During the Address in Reply debate in 1955, he made some quite rude remarks about the inflation that faced the Government in Western Australia because price control legislation had been refused by the Upper House. When this was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier quoted figures of the cost of certain items in Western Australia, after which the Leader of the Opposition said "Was price control dropped, or was the Government defeated?" The Premier then said, "Does the Leader think the Government would not put its policy in operation? Is that the policy members opposite stand for? If a Government cannot, it has no right to occupy the Treasury benches, because if it does it has to take the responsibility for the laws." Let the Premier take the responsibility for this Bill, and if he cannot get the legislation through the Upper House, let him resign and adopt his own precepts; and let a Government take office that is prepared to take responsibility for its policy.

Mr. Cumber—What policy?

Mr. DUNSTAN—The policy of three months' leave for 10 years' service, and that is no red herring. We are putting up, in a perfectly proper manner as prescribed by Parliamentary precedent, the alternative that we believe is the best thing for any long service leave scheme. That is what we are prepared to vote for, and if members opposite are prepared to vote for it let them support the amendment. There are two alternatives—to vote for the Premier's plan or the Opposition's plan. We are not prepared to vote for the Premier's plan, but we are prepared to vote for ours, and that is the only one we will vote for.

Mr. Hambour—Being retrospective does not bother you?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, as I shall explain later. Let me turn to the legislation as it stands. The member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) said that this measure has widespread popularity with the people of this State. I have addressed a few meetings on this matter, and I would need a magnifying glass to discover the support he mentioned. No doubt he can inform me where it comes from. The employers are not keen to have this passed, as many of them already have better schemes; certainly those in my district have better schemes. Let us now

look at the trades unions' attitude. The Trades and Labour Council does not want it. That organization thinks the proposal is useless and an obstacle to obtaining the thing it wants. We have had plenty of publicity about employee's organizations affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council, and we know they do not like the Bill, but what about the associations not affiliated with it? I have here a copy of the representations made by the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations to the Premier upon this matter, and let us see what they had to say about it. This organization represents the Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draftsmen of Australia, the Australian Bank Officials Association, the Australian Insurance Staffs Federation, the Federated Clerks Union of Australia, the Gas Industry Salaried Officers Federation, the Health Inspectors Association of Australia, the Municipal Officers Association of Australia, the Municipal Tramways Trust Salaried Officers Association and the Trustee Companies Officers Association. It was not exactly an unrepresentative body of the executive staffs.

Mr. Hambour—All on the receiving end.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Of course they are. All those entitled to long service leave are on the receiving end. The fact is that members opposite do not want anything which will make employers pay for this long service leave.

Mr. Hambour—It is retrospective.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Retrospectivity does not come into it at the moment. Seven years' retrospectivity is no satisfactory basis. However, it is not only that they object to, but they object to one week's annual leave being given to them in lieu of long service leave, and having to undergo a long qualifying period to get it. Let us have a look at what these people had to say to the Premier. They said they were not associated with party politics and that they were approaching the matter on behalf of their members in a non-partisan way and then added:—

The Government's proposals, as you have stated, do give a greater entitlement than long service leave legislation of other States, but this is prospective in the extreme. It will be 1983 before any South Australian who works for 20 years with his employer would get a greater entitlement than applies in the other States. Your promise of greater benefit is clearly for future generations and will bring no comfort to those who may reasonably anticipate their working life will end prior to 1983.

The following is the comparison—  
An employee in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania would receive as follows:—

With 20 years' service retrospective to 1957 . . . . .	13 weeks
With 20 years service 1957 to 1977 . . . . .	13 weeks

26 weeks

Under South Australian proposal— Retrospective qualifying period 7 years 1950 to 1957 . . . .	Nil
With a further 13 years service 1957 to 1970 . . . . .	13 weeks
With a further 13 years service 1970 to 1983 . . . . .	13 weeks

26 weeks

Persons who would retire at 65 in 1983 are now aged 39 years, so no such employee can contemplate receiving any greater entitlement than those applying interstate. For those now aged under 39 years and all future employees, they cannot contemplate getting this prospective advantage until 26 years hence if now less than 39 years of age, or until after completing 26 years of service in the case of future employees.

The Association cannot accept nor support a system of long service leave which denies entitlement to those with present lengthy service and who in many cases are on the eve of retirement and would receive little or no benefit from the Government's proposals. It is the contribution of these senior employees to industry which has resulted in the advance in our social conditions to the stage where Parliament itself proposes to give legislative effect to a great new social reform.

The Association says it is morally wrong that these employees whose service has made this advance possible for the whole community should in fact themselves be deprived of its benefit either wholly or in part. The Association has given consideration to the point that the counting of retrospective service would provide too heavy an impost on many employers. We do not agree with this contention. We say that the cost of one week's extra leave in 1958 for every employee who has completed seven years' service will throw a greater immediate and continuing yearly impost on employers than an orderly coming in of leave taken after the completion of 20 years' service.

Then the Association makes an analysis of the evidence given in the recent State clerks' case in the Industrial Court and gives the following information regarding employees with more than 20 years service as clerks in the following firms:—International Harvester Company, four out of 30; Apac Industries Ltd., none out of 42; I.C.I., one out of 56; Perry Engineering Company, five out of 61; Adelaide Chemical and Fertilizer Company, three out of 41; Kelvinators, two out of 136; Cockings Carriers Limited, none out of 23; Actil (not

established until 1942), none out of 29; British Tube Mills, none out of 153; S.A. Salvage Company, none out of 16; and Austral Sheet Metal Works Limited, one out of 20, making a total of 16 out of 607. It cannot be suggested that these firms will face a colossal burden.

Mr. Hambour—That is for 20 years' service.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes.

Mr. Hambour—You are talking of 10 years.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am mentioning their representations. They say the minimum they were prepared to agree to was an amount comparable with what exists in the other States. We say that that is not a sufficient minimum, and that this State can afford to give three months after 10 years instead of three months after 20 years. They point out that a true long service leave scheme comparable with those in the other States would not impose any unreasonable burden upon employers here, as compared with the Premier's scheme. That, of course, is quite unsatisfactory to them. The association then deals with the possibility of making the scheme provide for additional retrospectivity, which the Premier has refused, and then goes on to say:—

We desire to make it plainly clear that the association does not accept that a week's leave a year is long service leave and we say the law must provide for the leave to be accumulated and the basis must be 13 weeks leave after 20 years service. The anomalies to industry of a scheme in this State so out of harmony with the general concept of long service leave could be disastrous.

We point out that many firms—indeed the largest employers—operate in more than one State and there are staff transfers from State to State. Most employees associated with the association now have three weeks annual leave and they want long service leave after 20 years service, not four weeks annual leave. Some of our members now have four weeks annual leave and likewise the prospect of another week's annual leave is unappetising—genuine long service leave after 20 years service is the call of our members.

A grave problem would arise from the proposal to grant a week's extra leave annually in establishments which have an annual close down for annual leave purposes. These firms would have their staff absent for varying periods which made the carrying on of their businesses impossible. We sincerely trust that it is not to be contemplated that in these circumstances employees entitled to two weeks leave only would be stood down while other employees had this extra week's leave. We also express opposition to any proposal (except in the case of employees termination or death) that the leave should be paid for, but in fact not taken.

It would be most improper for the Government to give legislative approval of such a practice.

If the Government is not agreeable to amend its proposals to provide the points mentioned herein which when compared with interstate legislation would preserve distant prospective advantages but deny immediate retrospective advantages, we indicate that we cannot accept or support the Government's plan.

We have to face the fact that in South Australia it is time we legislated for long service leave. The Premier is cognizant of the fact that the general public is demanding long service leave and comparability of long service leave. It demands a scheme of true long service leave and not annual leave. Indeed, the High Court of Australia has seen fit to make a pronouncement upon this particular matter because it is clearly pointed out in the case of *Collins v. Charles Marshall Pty. Ltd.* that annual leave is an entirely distinct conception from long service leave. That was the case that finally went to the Privy Council and which the member for Adelaide has mentioned. However, the Premier has seen fit to try to confuse annual leave with long service leave by bringing in an annual leave scheme with a qualifying period and calling it long service leave. It is not long service leave at all. It does not provide a period of rest after long service and that is what long service leave is. Long service leave is not an extra week's holiday, but a period of rest—an extended period—and something a man can look forward to after giving long and faithful service to an employer. That is what the people are demanding, but not getting, in this legislation.

The introduction of long service leave provisions of this nature simply provide an obstacle to the true attainment of three weeks' annual leave because they provide a qualifying period to get it. They also provide an obstacle to long service leave because once this scheme is operating it will be difficult to secure an alteration to institute a proper long service leave scheme. In consequence, it is a bar to the things my Party stands for and that is why we are determined to oppose the measure. It does not give any substantial advantage to the people but is an obstacle to securing those advantages which it is my Party's policy to secure. If the Premier wants to put this confidence trick over the people let him and his members stand up and be counted for it. Let them go to the polls and take the responsibility for it. Then the true position will be obvious to the people and everybody will know what everybody stands for. We are determined to stand for our policy and the Premier should take the

responsibility for this and not make us the guys for putting through something that represents an obstacle to the attaining of real and substantial advantages to the South Australian workers. I do not think I need add that I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I desire to emulate the member for Norwood who has preceded me, but only by explaining my position at the outset. I support the second reading of the Bill and oppose the Leader of the Opposition's amendment. I do not desire to emulate Mr. Dunstan further because he was following, it seemed to me, a tradition which has, unfortunately, come into the Labor Party lately of not expressing their own opinions but of echoing the opinions of some person or body outside the House. Unless I am much mistaken, on this occasion Mr. Dunstan seemed to read his speech from a letter or memorandum from the Salaried and Professional Officers Association of South Australia. I do not know why he dragged that association into this. I wonder why he did not go to the fountain-head of the Labor policy (Mr. R. E. Bannister) who has already told him what to do. Unfortunately it is obvious in the case of Mr. Dunstan and all members opposite who have spoken that Mr. Bannister did not give them sufficient material to enable them all to make different speeches. I shall have a little more to say about Mr. Bannister later.

I believe that it is desirable to introduce long service leave in this State. In fact, it is inevitable that it must come. The system embodied in this Bill is, on the whole, in the best interests of the State and is the best scheme which can be worked out for this State. Frankly, I do not like the idea of retrospectivity, but in this measure it is cut to the minimum conducive with the concept of long service. It is a matter of balancing one against the other and in this Bill I believe that has been done as satisfactorily as possible. However, I was pleased to hear the Premier say that the Government is willing to consider any suggestions as to the contents of the various clauses and I hope when the Bill gets into Committee—if it gets that far—to make some suggestions which may improve the working of this scheme. I have been interested in following the debates and questionings and eventual decisions which have been made by the Labor Party in respect of its attitude to long service leave. It was a mortal blow to the Labor Party when this matter was raised at this time—a time when the Party throughout

the Commonwealth is torn by internal dissension.

Mr. Stephens—Wishful thinking.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—How can the member for Port Adelaide say "wishful thinking" after what happened in Victoria and Queensland and is happening in the Federal sphere and will undoubtedly happen eventually in this State? Nobody but one who is entirely blind to the position could make such an interjection. It must have been a mortal blow to the Labor Party to have this further thorn thrust in its side at this time because the actions and attitude of the A.L.P. in this State are a perfect example of the whole trouble with the Labor movement in Australia. The fact is that no longer are Labor members of Parliament masters of their own houses. They must obey dictation from outside. That has been illustrated in South Australia on this question. The same principle has wrecked the Gair Government in Queensland and it is rather interesting to think of what has happened to that Government. Further, it is interesting to reflect on the fate of such people as the Leader of the Queensland branch of the Australian Labor Party before the recent election (Mr. Duggan), his deputy (Dr. Dittmer) and Mr. Frank Forde. This process is happening in one State after another and it is also interesting to try to fit the Duggans, Dittmers and Fordes into the personalities of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party.

That is the position in the Labor Party today and it is a tragedy that this should have to occur here to show South Australians that the position in this State is the same as in others. It is a tragedy that the national Opposition should be weak, divided and indulging in undignified, repulsive quarrelling within its own ranks. That is a bad thing for the people of Australia and it is about time that the lesson was rammed home so that people in South Australia and other States may be in no doubt on what is happening to the once great Labor Party, now divided into several sections—Australian, Anti-Communist, Democratic—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member should get back to the Bill and the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am about to link up my remarks, Mr. Speaker, with the policy of the Australian Labor Party in this State on long service leave. The reports of the debates at the recent convention make interesting reading, for they give a slightly different picture

from the apparently united front presented in this House. I am sorry I was not at the convention so as to be able to give a first-hand account of what happened, but I refer to the report contained in the *Advertiser* of June 17, 1957, which states:—

A ruling will be given at tonight's convention of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party on how members of the State Parliamentary Labor Party should vote when the proposed Government Bill on long service leave comes before State Parliament this year. This was stated by the convention chairman and president-elect (Mr. R. E. Bannister) after a lively and sometimes heated three-hour debate yesterday.

Apparently Mr. Bannister made that statement after a lively and sometimes heated three-hour debate; this apparent unanimity was all too absent at the convention. Then the convention adopted the recommendation of the Australian Labor Party executive as to what should happen, yet now we hear it is Australian Labor Party policy. In fact it was the recommendation to the convention that members opposite were so proud to attend.

Mr. John Clark—It has been our policy for years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—If that is so, why was a lively and sometimes heated three-hour debate necessary?

Mr. John Clark—It was a debate on tactics.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The convention adopted the following recommendation of the Australian Labor Party executive:—

That the Parliamentary Labor Party press by all means at its disposal for a long service leave Act to conform with principles laid down by the State platform of the Australian Labor Party irrespective of any proposed Act introduced by the State Government and any alleged threats made by Government members of Parliament.

At that time they were frightened of threats.

*Members interjecting.*

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Mr. Clark's statement that it was a debate on tactics does not tie in with the report.

Mr. Dunstan—You were there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am only trying to unravel the tangle. It is a tragedy that the Labor Party should have got itself into this position.

Mr. Dunstan—Thanks for your sympathy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The honourable member always has it. The report continues:—

When the Australian Labor Party executive's recommendation was carried, Mr. J. F. Walsh, M.P., sought a ruling—



that is where the tactics came in—after the lively three-hour debate—

on whether this meant members of the Parliamentary Labor Party could, under no circumstances, support the Government Bill.

I do not want to read anything into that, but it sounds the sort of question that would be put by a person with some doubts on the matter. At least that is the interpretation I would place on the remark. The report continues:—

“Does this mean that we must speak and vote against the second reading of the Bill?” Mr. Walsh asked.

The Chairman—Yes.

Mr. Bardolph, M.L.C., subsequently asked the Chairman to reconsider his ruling.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—More honest doubts?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes; it does not sound like the unanimity that we have heard about in this debate. The report continues:—

He (Mr. Bardolph) said Labor M.P.'s would attempt to amend the Bill in committee.

Mr. John Clark—We won't.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No, because Mr. Bannister, the master, has spoken.

Mr. Lawn—You are jealous now because you have some competition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I will say something about that later.

Mr. Lawn—You were not allowed to speak on this Bill until Wallaroo had been given away.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I will have something to say about that, too. Apparently Mr. Bardolph's suggestion that Labor members attempt to amend the Bill in Committee and vote against it if this failed was not adopted, for the report continues:—

The chairman then indicated that because of the procedures involved—

we know all about that now because of the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition—he would consider the matter further and give a ruling tonight.

He meant the Monday night. The report continues:—

Mr. J. F. Walsh—I hope they keep you locked up till then.

The implication behind that is better left unsaid.

Mr. John Clark—Let's have it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am too charitable to members opposite to be drawn on that one. The report continues by discussing another altercation between a member of the Federal Parliament (Mr. Clyde Cameron) and the State Opposition Leader that was not on long service leave, but before you call me to order,

Mr. Speaker, I point out that Mr. Cameron said, concerning long service leave:—

Precisely the same thing is happening on the question of long service leave. It has been hinted that if the Opposition does not accept what Sir Thomas Playford is prepared to dole out, the workers will get nothing at all.

I call attention particularly to this point, and this is continuing the remarks of Mr. Clyde Cameron:—

The Labor Party is in the same quandary as before in that it has to decide to accept what is offered, or hold out and lose everything.

He said that the Labor Party was in a quandary, and it is still in a quandary before the people of South Australia on this point.

Mr. John Clark—Next year I will give you a full report of proceedings.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Thank you, that will be even more valuable. We come now to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, which were quite different from those he made in this House. He said:—

On this question of long service leave the Parliamentary Labor Party would go into the House prepared to support Labor policy.

That is the policy which required three hours' debating. I draw particular attention to Mr. O'Halloran's next remark because it again is entirely different from the front he has put up here on this measure. He said:—

But the policy-makers should consider whether, in the event of a reasonable compromise being reached when the Bill was in Committee, it should be rejected outright by the Opposition or the concessions allowed to stay.

In other words, at that time, if my interpretation of the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition is correct, he was suggesting that some compromise would be a good idea in Committee, which is a far cry from what he has been obliged to say in this House. I wonder what decided the convention against that course? This is interesting, and there is a clue to it in the next paragraph of the report, which states:—

Mr. Dunstan, M.P., said the Labor movement was playing into the hands of the Premier by accepting “crumbs.”

One can almost hear the member for Norwood in his usual rhetorical and effective style making an impassioned speech against the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that some compromise should be accepted. He used the word “crumbs,” a rather high-flown term, but typical, I suggest with great respect, of the

rhetoric of the honourable member. Apparently on this occasion he, and those of his opinion, won the day because we see an outright rejection now of the whole content of this Bill by his Party and this so-called unanimous front put up by members opposite.

Mr. O'Halloran—You would be surprised to learn that I supported that resolution.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I would be amazed.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition had a talk with Mr. R. E. Bannister about it.

Mr. O'Halloran—I took the leading part on that point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—All I can say is that it does not seem like it from the newspaper's report. The only other part of this report to which I desire to call attention—and I do so to elucidate the views which have been expressed here and to explain the quandary in which the Labor Party finds itself—is a paragraph under a heading "Vital Rule." Its states:—

Earlier yesterday it was made clear that Caucus decisions were binding on Australian Labor Party members of Parliament provided they did not conflict with decisions which had been made by the Central Executive or other authoritative Australian Labor Party bodies. I stress that not the policy of the Party, but Caucus decisions were binding. Next day the *Advertiser* published another article on the attitude of Labor to the Government's long service leave proposals. This newspaper is widely read by the people, and I am mentioning these matters so that no-one will lose sight of what took place a couple of months ago. This is what appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 18 after Mr. Bannister had given his ruling:—

Labor members of the State Parliament must completely and uncompromisingly oppose any long service leave Bill that does not conform to Labor's policy.

They are doing that and I congratulate them on it. The report goes on:—

This ruling was given by the new president of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party (Mr. R. E. Bannister) at last night's meeting of the State Convention. Mr. Bannister had closely studied Parliamentary procedure before giving his ruling. In the second column of the report there is a heading "No Discretion Allowed," and under it was published the following.

The convention's ruling leaves Labor members of Parliament without any right to use discretion. They have been instructed to

fight the Government's Bill from the outset and try to force their own amendments through.

The word "instructed" was used, a word often applied to members on this side of the House. All I can say is, congratulations to the Australian Labor Party for carrying out their instructions so faithfully.

Mr. O'Halloran—We are being consistent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—What have we had on this Bill?

Mr. John Clark—Nothing from Liberal and Country League members yesterday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—A little while ago the honourable member was saying he had heard nothing from us, but now that we are speaking we are getting nothing but interjections. I shall now call attention to a few of the tactics used in this debate and members opposite said it was tactics that were discussed at the convention. We began yesterday with an amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the only time when his instructions would allow him to move it at all. He could not do it in Committee.

Mr. Lawn—Then we had silence from the Government side.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes, and did not that give the Opposition a nasty surprise? Labor members were probably disappointed that Standing Orders were suspended to allow the amendment to be moved.

Mr. Lawn—What did the *Advertiser* say about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I was here, and do not have to rely on newspaper reports. I saw the perturbation of members opposite. Apparently the fortnight allowed since the Premier's second reading speech was not sufficient for members opposite to prepare their speeches. We had a speech from the Leader of the Opposition in accordance with his instructions from Mr. Bannister. After this convention we can only call the members of the Australian Labor Party in this Chamber the 15 Bannister puppets.

Mr. O'Halloran—They are better than the 21 Playford puppets.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Let me say something on that. We have heard that pretty often in this debate. Members opposite always use it as a fill-in when they have nothing better to say. That and the electoral system are stock in trade for them when they are caught on the hop. Let us say something about the so-called 21 Playford puppets. It is an untrue statement and is resented by members on this side, but even if it were true how much better

is it to be puppets of a Parliamentary leader than puppets of a man at the Trades Hall who is responsible to no one. It is sheer hypocrisy for them to speak about dictatorship when they take their instructions from Mr. Bannister. This is what we have heard in the debate. We heard it first from Mr. Lawn because he was the first Opposition member caught unawares and without having his speech prepared. This has been a hot potato for the Labor Party for a long time. Mr. Lawn usually makes a powerful and fiery speech but there was none of that yesterday. He used all fill-in material. The same thing came from Mr. Jennings. It was all fill-in material interspersed with expressions of great annoyance that members on this side were not playing ball to give them time to prepare material.

Why should members on this side stone-wall a Bill when they entirely agree with it? There is no reason at all for that. It was sheer pique and laziness on the part of members opposite. They were not prepared to go on. It was their amendment yet they were not ready to discuss it. Mr. John Clark suggested that the Bill should be defeated and that that would hasten the introduction of a scheme by a Government interested in the true concepts of long service leave. I fail entirely to see why the defeat of this Bill would hasten

such a scheme. If the Bill were passed and by some strange act of fortune the Labor Party took office it could repeal the legislation and replace it with what it wants. The workers would then at least have something, but members opposite are trying to prevent them from getting it. They are prepared to deprive the workers of any advantage at all in this matter.

If we asked the ordinary working man whether he would prefer three week's leave instead of a fortnight, after seven years, what would he say? He would say he would rather have the three weeks. Whatever we may think of long service leave, members opposite are, by a purely selfish Party view, depriving the workers of something offered to them by the Government. It is a foolish and short-sighted attitude. I do not believe that the people will be taken in by such arrant selfishness at the dictates of Mr. Bannister, whom we do not know, and who is not responsible to the electors. He is an irresponsible outside official. I support the second reading and oppose the amendment.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 22, at 2 p.m.