

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 22, 1957.

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The SPEAKER—I notice in the Gallery a distinguished visitor in the person of His Excellency the Ambassador for the United States of America in Australia, the Hon. William J. Sebald. The House would be honoured if he would occupy a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. Sebald was escorted by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. O'Halloran to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS.**SNOWY MOUNTAINS AGREEMENT.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier seen the report published in this morning's *Advertiser* of further remarks by the Premier of Victoria, Mr. Bolte, regarding the distribution of waters becoming available for irrigation as the result of the completion of the Snowy Mountains scheme in New South Wales, and has he any further information on the subject?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I saw the report of the remarks by Mr. Bolte, which are probably in much the same category as his previous remarks. Replying to the second part of the question, I have received the following telegram from the Prime Minister:—

Your telegram August 8 *re* Snowy Mountains agreement. I appreciate your desire to satisfy yourself that the contemplated Snowy Mountains agreement between the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria does not impair South Australia's rights in River Murray waters. The only reason why the proposed agreement has not been communicated to you is that an agreed text and some other related arrangements have not been approved by all the Governments concerned. Immediately such a text is available and other arrangements completed a copy of the agreement will be forwarded to you. Meantime I repeat the assurance given you in the Acting Prime Minister's letter of July 5, 1956, that nothing is further from the minds of the parties to the proposed Snowy Mountains agreement than to adopt any course as between themselves that would impair in any way the rights of South Australia, a partner with them in the River Murray Waters Agreement. Since that date the draft text has been further revised to make clear the intention in this regard.

That is the latest information I have on the matter, and it appears to me that the telegram is entirely satisfactory if the Prime Minister means the same thing as we mean.

Mr. O'Halloran—Provided you see the agreement before it is signed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I want to do so in any case. It all hinges on the words "the rights of South Australia." We are not concerned if our full rights under the River Murray Waters Agreement are being maintained, but from Mr. Bolte's almost daily statements it would appear that Victoria will get some allocation of the water, and there is no possibility of an allocation being given to Victoria from waters flowing down the Murray which is not an abrogation of the rights of South Australia under the agreement. Though the Prime Minister has no doubt sent this telegram in good faith, I would need that point cleared up before being satisfied.

CLOTHING PRICES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Some weeks ago it was announced in the press that officers of the Prices Department had been instructed to investigate the prices of women's clothing, I think utility frocks in particular. Can the Premier state whether that investigation has been carried out, and if so, the result?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The latest information I had from the Prices Commissioner was that he was still investigating certain items that he had referred to in the press. The result of that investigation has not been forwarded to me, but as soon as it is available I will see (so far as I am permitted under the Act to disclose any information the Prices Commissioner has) that any honourable member interested has a copy.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Recently the Prices Commissioner drew attention to the excessive profit margin being taken by sellers of clothing, and due warning was given to them that inspectors were coming around. As that warning would enable those people to present a totally different picture regarding prices when the inspector came around, will the Premier see that in future no warning is given because that type of investigation throws a totally different light on the need for price control?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It would obviously be impossible for a large store to write down its margins to meet any investigation a Prices Department officer might make. Writing down margins, from previous experience in a large store, would take at least a fortnight and would not be done on the assumption that an inspector was to make a visit. The honourable member need have no apprehension on that matter.

IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier had any further report from the Mines Department in relation to its investigation in the Middleback Range which enables him to give further information regarding the probable quantities of high grade iron ore in those deposits?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The investigation undertaken in the Middleback Ranges is a very extensive one, and quite a number of groups are involved in it. As a consequence, a report is prepared for me every week and is available usually every Thursday, although I have not yet seen this week's report. Summarizing the contents of the reports, the boring programme is being quite successful, and at present a complete revision of the tonnages is being undertaken by the Mines Department. The tonnages are becoming quite substantial, and lead me to believe there is a very large body of ore, particularly just north of the old Iron Knob quarries.

LEIGH CREEK COAL.

Mr. HEASLIP—I have been approached by people in my electorate regarding the purchase for household use of Leigh Creek coal. I understand it is not now available as it was before the opening of the new railway from Leigh Creek. I believe it is very suitable for use in some slow combustion stoves; also butter factories, particularly the one at Orroroo, could make use of it if it were available. Will the Premier ascertain if it can be made available in those areas in small lots of one or two tons?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As the honourable member knows the mine produces coal on a wholesale basis. A train load is approximately 3,500 tons and a truck load about 50 tons. There may be some difficulty in securing small consignments, but I will have the matter investigated. Coal is still being sent to the metropolitan area for retailing, but I am not sure whether it is possible to make it available in limited quantities to country areas.

TREATMENT OF ABORIGINES.

Mr. TAPPING—Recently I received the following letter from a woman:—

Re aborigines: I have here a case which needs to be brought before Parliament . . . I have written to the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford . . . Briefly, the case is—full-blooded aboriginal woman married to new Australian. Four children. They had home at Lyrup. Owing to flood, lost home, everything,

including job. Aboriginal Department takes children away—charge, drinking. Two people are wandering around streets looking for home or someone to befriend them. They are my people: I befriend them. From hearsay they have been sleeping on the banks of the Torrens and anywhere.

As this woman has written to the Premier, can he say whether he has any report on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I remember receiving a letter about two days ago and have forwarded it to the Aborigines Department for inquiry. I believe that probably these people are not under the control of the department. A Commonwealth law provides that where a white woman marries a black man she takes his nationality and becomes protected under the Act, but where a black woman marries a white man she becomes eligible for Commonwealth social benefits and does not come within the scope of State legislation. I will let the honourable member have a report as soon as the people concerned can be traced.

MASTITIS IN CATTLE.

Mr. FLETCHER—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 6 relating to the incidence of mastitis in dairy cattle?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, I have a lengthy report which I do not propose to read in full. I will make it available for the honourable member's perusal if he desires. Summarized, the position is that the most recent survey undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the incidence of mastitis was in 1954. It revealed, as one would expect, that in the drier areas the incidence was not very high, whereas in the higher rainfall areas, particularly on the Murray swamps, it was fairly high. The report states that with the free availability of penicillin this disease does not cause so much trouble in the industry as previously, and is not regarded so seriously by dairymen. In addition, the number of veterinary practitioners in the country has increased and a fuller service of that nature is now available. The article the honourable member referred to is attached to this report.

BARLEY PRODUCTION.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—According to a recent report in a Queensland newspaper the chairman of the Barley Marketing Board (Mr. P. D. Crotty) said that because of the recent rain a record planting of at least 200,000 acres in Queensland was expected this year. He went on to say that the harvest was expected

to be more than 5,000,000 bushels, whereas ten years ago Queensland produced only about 115,000 bushels from 3,000 acres. He added that the swing to barley had been largely due to the development of a profitable export trade with Japan and that the board had already supplied new growers with sufficient seed to plant 50,000 acres. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what effect this is likely to have on the barley industry in South Australia?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The production of barley in the two main producing States of South Australia and Victoria has reached very much higher figures than a few years ago. The overseas market has shown a remarkable ability to absorb increased production of high quality barley. The Australian Barley Board, which is constituted by the States of South Australia and Victoria, faced what appeared to be very serious problems this year in the disposal of surplus barley. The home consumption of barley has remained fairly static at around 7,000,000 bushels yearly, whereas the production in the two main States, at any rate, has gone up to well over 30,000,000 bushels. In addition to the heavy surplus for export the board was faced with the problem created by the Suez dispute and the consequent increases in freight, up to double in most cases, on consignments for overseas destinations. I am happy to report that in spite of these difficulties the board has been able to make excellent selling progress and I believe has practically disposed of its entire stocks. I speak now about two or three weeks behind actual events. A report from the board came to me late this morning which I have not yet had time to read. As the board has practically disposed of its surplus stocks, it would indicate that the overseas market is capable of absorbing any production of 5,000,000 bushels plus or minus without any difficulty. The additional production in Queensland would certainly have no adverse effect on the production and marketing of barley in South Australia.

FLOOD RELIEF.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—On July 23 I asked the Minister of Lands a question with regard to payments to settlers on the flooded areas along the River Murray. The Minister replied that arrangements had been almost completed for payments to be made during August. Can the Minister give any further information on this matter?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It is true that I informed the honourable member that pay-

ments would be made during August, but on checking up with the secretary yesterday I was informed that that had not been possible this month but that the payments would certainly be made in September.

BUSINESS DIFFICULTIES OF INVALID.

Mr. HAMBOUR—One of my constituents is so stricken that he is incapable of signing his name or even understanding what is put before him. He has an insurance policy due for payment that his wife desires to collect on, for she needs the money, but the company cannot pay out until the insured is able to sign a receipt clearing the company of its liability. This does not seem likely as the man may linger on in that condition for a year or two. Will the Premier see whether there is a way to deal with such cases?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will give me the name and address of the person concerned I will.

MARKET CHARGES.

Mr. RICHES—When the Markets Clauses Act was before the House last session and an amendment was moved giving the market authorities the right to review charges made to people purchasing fruit in the market I raised some doubts on the matter and the Premier assured the House there would be no undue increase or differentiation in charges. Now, however, it has been brought to my notice that fruit merchants from Port Augusta and Whyalla have had their charges increased substantially. Mr. Karavas of Whyalla is paying £300 a year for the right to enter the market and buy fruit, and Mr. Cardassis of Port Augusta, I am informed, has found the fees excessive and been forced to leave the market and load in the street. Will the Premier investigate the charges for the purpose of seeing that the reasonable requirements of northern fruiterers are met and that any charges levied are considered reasonable by the Prices Department or some other authority?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The accounts of both market companies were examined recently and, considering the capital invested, the dividends paid by them are significantly small. Indeed, if they were to sell their properties and cease to conduct a market they could get a much greater return for their capital, but that would be a great blow to the industry.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, 1936-1956. Read a first time.

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 Augst 21. Page 432.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I oppose the Bill and support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Yesterday afternoon and evening we heard some remarkable statements from members on the Government benches. Having listened most attentively I venture to say that not one of them, apart from the Premier, mentioned the clauses of the Bill. The others seemed to spend their time attempting to condemn the Australian Labor Party and castigate the President of the Party, which we deprecate very much. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that the members of the Party on this side had been told by the President, Mr. Bannister, that we must oppose the Bill, but that is not the case because we are carrying out a plank of our policy that was adopted in 1955. Indeed, when this Party went to the people in 1956 that was one of the planks we expounded. As 50,000 more South Australians desire this Party than the Government Party it is proof beyond doubt that the people want long service leave as enunciated by our Leader. Therefore, I hope that the member for Torrens will be reassured regarding the action we are taking today.

Mr. Coumbe—But you cannot deny that what I said was right.

Mr. TAPPING—It was entirely wrong. I repeat that our attitude is based on what was decided in 1955. I feel that members supporting the Government merely skated over the Bill and that they are not enthusiastic about it. At first, they refrained from speaking and then those that rose to speak merely attempted to condemn the Labor Party. If it is claimed that we are following the policy of the Party I suggest that members on the other side are merely following the Premier and are not keen on this legislation.

The member for Torrens referred to another matter that has also been referred to by other members opposite, namely, the card voting system used by the Convention of the Australian Labor Party. This system enables every person attached to a sub-branch or union to exercise his vote through his delegate.

Mr. Millhouse—Does it work out that way in practice?

Mr. TAPPING—Yes. All members of the Party have a vote by virtue of the fact that the delegates have been elected by the rank and file. If members opposite want me to refer to the way the Liberal and Country League select candidates for Parliament, I say that they are sometimes selected by about 120 voters, whereas our candidates may be selected by as many as 60,000. Therefore, my Party is far more democratic than the L.C.L. The member for Torrens also said that it was no wonder my party had been in opposition so long, but that position is the result of the electoral system. The honourable member said he knew something about the metal trades organization, and I believe he does. He said that members of the union and others concerned in this industry to whom he had spoken were behind the Bill, but he did not give us the full story. He did not say that early this year the metal trades employers went to the Arbitration Court with a log of claims on long service leave. The claim was eventually disallowed by the court and the Privy Council, but I shall quote one of its clauses to give some idea how they would affect the worker. It states:—

An employee shall be entitled to the long service leave on ordinary pay in respect of continuous service with one and the same employer prescribed in these provisions. The amount of such entitlement shall be eight weeks' long service leave on ordinary pay on the completion of 25 years' continuous service with the one employer.

If the court had accepted that provision a man would have to work for one firm for 25 years before qualifying for long service leave. The member for Torrens said that the Bill was a good one, but he did not say that his own people in the metal trades industry preferred something much worse. Therefore, he speaks with two voices. Actually, he stands for a qualifying period of 25 years.

Mr. Coumbe—I did not advocate that.

Mr. TAPPING—The honourable member's association did. I was disappointed with the speech given last night, by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). When he first came

here he impressed me as an intelligent member who would give close attention to all matters before the House, but last night he did not refer to one clause in the Bill. He merely attempted to castigate the A.L.P. and mentioned Mr. Bannister's name many times. That must mean that Mr. Bannister is a very important man. He is leading a Party which has democratic ideals. The Labor Party as well as the Liberal Party has an annual convention, and the members of those Parties should stand up to their platform.

Mr. Brookman said that if the Bill were passed the employers would have to pay, but it will be the consumers, who I do not think will object if the workers receive credit for their services. Under clause 4 if a man is absent from work more than 15 consecutive days on account of illness or injury, other than injury arising out of and in the course of his employment, the continuity of his services will be deemed to have been broken. This is unfair. A man may be absent for three or four months or more because of a road accident and therefore would have no claim under the Bill.

Mr. Brookman—What do you suggest?

Mr. TAPPING—It is not for me to offer any suggestion, but I am bringing the matter forward and asking the Premier to make it more elastic. Clause 8 provides for payment in lieu of leave. Under the New South Wales law this is not permitted, and if it became law here it would defeat the purpose of long service leave, the object of which is to give the worker some respite for services rendered. I hope the Premier will consider this matter and bring the provision into line with the one in New South Wales. Speakers on this side of House have said that public servants are given 13 weeks long service leave after 10 years of service. Electricity Trust employees are given a similar period of leave after 10 years, but after those 10 years they get an extra week's annual leave, making three weeks. If this Bill is passed I take it they will get four weeks annual leave. The staff men at the trust get four weeks annual leave after 10 years service. The Electricity Trust has proved its worth to the State. Over the last two years it has made remarkable profits over working expenses, despite giving these rewards to its employees. The Housing Trust gives its employees 13 weeks leave after 10 years. Why is there discrimination in connection with long service leave? The New South Wales Act has many virtues and if Parliament adopted them it would not go far wrong with its legislation.

I was disappointed early in this debate that Government supporters were not keen to speak, and later when they did they got away from the Bill and condemned the Labor Party.

Mr. Hambour—There are some good ones to come.

Mr. TAPPING—We are looking forward to that and hope it will make the tone of the debate on the other side much higher than it has been. I oppose the Bill and support the amendment.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—This Bill has much to commend it. Its provisions are sound and realistic, and will ensure worthwhile benefit to employees without inflicting undue hardship on employers. Its proposals in many respects are novel, differing from plans already in operation here and in other States. The fact that it does differ from other schemes in no wise detracts from its value, rather to the contrary. This State has, particularly in the past couple of decades, had a character and individuality essentially its own with policy arising therefrom ensuring advantage to our living standards and the State's economy generally. It is a good thing to see this originality retained in this legislation.

It is obvious that careful consideration has been given in the provisions of the Bill to cushion the impact of liability on employers, and quite rightly. The liability to be incurred should not cause violent repercussions to our economy or lead to sharp price rises. A most important aspect of the legislation is that it carries no vicious element of retrospectivity, yet confers immediate benefit on a large section of the 125,000 men and 50,000 women employed in private industry. The absence of harsh retrospectivity terms in itself renders the scheme possible. The position is very different when one views the terms of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

It is very illuminating to hear opposition members glibly advocating three months' long service leave after 10 years' service. I wonder if any thought has been given to the ability of industry to pay and continue to provide employment. This is the crux of the whole matter. What can industry afford to pay? Many very desirable social measures have to be rejected or deferred because the economy cannot afford them. More harm can be done to the economy of a country and to real standards of living by excessive loading of costs of production. An irresponsible generosity can inflict ultimate hardships rather than confer real benefits. In the incidence of liability arising retrospectively it is the small industrial units,

in the main family concerns, which would suffer the greatest and most damaging impact.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Older industries suffer more than new industries.

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes. It could well be fatal to the ability of the unit to continue in business. This is no exaggeration. I have in mind some old-established country firms whose entire staff would immediately qualify for three months leave under the amendment. Their eligibility in many cases would be achieved through the kindly consideration of the employers who through a personal interest in their employees' welfare have on many occasions refrained from retrenching during slack periods. The cost to industry generally could have a most adverse effect on its ability to remain competitive in many rising markets for the products of both our primary and secondary industries.

By comparison with the amendment the relatively small burden arising from retrospectivity under the Government measure provides one of the most realistic and enabling features of the Bill. Industry can budget ahead for a known liability, which liability will not be a crippling one. The general principles of the Bill are good. In the eighth and in each subsequent year of a worker's continuous service he becomes entitled to one week's long service leave, which may be taken in leave, in cash or under certain conditions of agreement be allowed to accumulate. In this regard I cannot agree with Mr. Tapping who objects to the workmen having the freedom to choose between taking the leave or the cash. It is a matter for the individual workman to decide himself.

Mr. Frank Walsh—If you carry that to its logical conclusion—payment instead of leave—there is no real concession. It is a monetary consideration. The purpose of long service leave is to give a concession to employees in industry.

Mr. LAUCKE—I believe the employee should be free to please himself. This, in my opinion, is a generous provision, and is not unduly harsh on the employer under existing economic conditions. The definition of "worker" is wide and generous. Under this definition a worker is any person employed under a contract of service, and that includes apprentices. This will be an excellent incentive to youths to appreciate the value of choosing a trade wisely and then staying put. It should generally encourage a smaller turnover in labour. The legislation marks a major step forward in our industrial legislation, is wide in appli-

cation and has the attribute that it is temperate. I support the Bill and oppose the amendment.

Mr. BYWATERS' (Murray)—I oppose the Bill and support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I have been in this House only a short time, but during my sojourn here I have endeavoured at all times to be constructive in my arguments. I dislike people who in debate, quite without reason, criticize and cast aspersions against people who are not here to defend themselves, and I was very disappointed to hear members opposite making abusive statements about a person who was, after all, carrying out his duty.

Members interjecting—

Mr. BYWATERS—These interjections bear out the fact that when people have no argument of their own they have to resort to abuse, and that is the crux of the argument we have heard from the members for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I was rather surprised at the way Mr. Millhouse debated this matter yesterday because I expected something better from a man with his legal knowledge.

I oppose the measure and wholeheartedly support the amendment and have no desire to register a silent vote. If you, Mr. Speaker, were called upon to give a ruling at any time you would give it, and we as a body would accept it. That is all that the President of the Australian Labor Party did. He gave his ruling, which could have been disagreed with by the members of the convention, who represented the whole of the Australian Labor Party, the group that was instrumental in putting me here, and I support its policy because of that. We have seen crocodile tears shed by members opposite because we are not supporting their Bill. We know that quite frequently they have had to rely on the support of members of my Party to get Bills carried in this House, but on this occasion the Government has to rely on its own members to get the Bill through. The Government has 20 members and has the power to carry the Bill without any help from this side. If the Government members are concerned about our actions in opposing the Bill it is only because they are not happy about it and are not prepared to support the Premier. If the Bill is defeated, the blame will be theirs because they are members of the Government Party. We are members of the Opposition and have the right to vote against this measure; we do not have to take the crumbs thrown to us.

Mr. Millhouse—Why not put your own views?

Mr. BYWATERS—I am expressing my own views. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) made the best contribution to this debate of any Government member. I do not subscribe to his views, but at least he tried to justify the Bill without putting in any dirt, and I admire him for the fair way he tackled the matter. He stated that industry cannot afford to pay, but that is not the first time that this statement has been put forward. Even though I am a relatively young man, I can remember that when it was suggested that the working week should be reduced from 56 hours to 48 hours we were told that industry could not afford it. We are now enjoying a 40-hour week, but industry is still able to carry on. I think it is quite within the ability of industry to pay for long service leave. We have heard the opinions of some Government members, and at least they appear to support the Bill. We have also heard Opposition members opposing it and stating what they really believe in, but I would be interested to hear the views of the Chamber of Commerce. I know that the Premier is aware of its views because the Chamber has approached him on the matter. Perhaps at a later stage he will place those views before us.

If this Bill were true to name it would provide three weeks' annual leave to employees in private industry, and then it would have the wholehearted support of members of my Party, because we believe that private employees should have the same privileges as Government employees. After five years' employment by the Government, and in many cases by private employers, employees receive three weeks' annual leave. As far as I can see, the main point of this Bill is to provide an extra week's annual leave for workers. I believe in equality in all things. I have drawn attention to the fact that people in the country are penalized by having to pay more for commodities than people in the city, and I am opposed to this because I believe that all people, whether in the country or the city, should enjoy the same privileges and pay the same prices. I believe the same applies with regard to Government and private employees and that is why I oppose this Bill. The Labor Party has something better to offer and I hope it will not be long before a Labor Government is in a position to legislate for the benefit of employees.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I support the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition. I have never heard such unfair tactics in any

debate as I have during this. I doubt if the Premier is sincere in presenting this legislation. I believe he introduced the Bill only to give his members an opportunity of unfairly and unjustly criticizing members of the Australian Labor Party. I was surprised at some of Mr. Millhouse's statements. He did not deal with one clause of the Bill and his only direct comment on it was "I support the Bill." He criticized the President of the Labor Party for doing his duty. I was at the conference referred to and the President was asked his ruling on a certain matter and he immediately gave it.

Mr. Millhouse—After he had been locked up.

Mr. STEPHENS—Don't tell untruths. That is untrue and the honourable members knows it. If he persists in his present attitude I may tell something about him and a little book he wrote and which he was asked to withdraw.

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. STEPHENS—The honourable member was told that he was not preaching the policy of the Liberal Union because the Liberal Union does not believe in democracy. He was criticized for advocating something democratic and he will not deny it. He has complained about Mr. Bannister giving a ruling, but only yesterday after he had been called to order and the Speaker had given a ruling he respected that ruling. He did not abuse the Speaker for giving his ruling. Why does he want to abuse Mr. Bannister?

Mr. Millhouse—I did not abuse him. He may be a very nice bloke for all I know.

Mr. STEPHENS—Then why did you speak about him as you did? I have been in this House for a long time and am one of the oldest members here. I have never heard more unfair, unjust or unkind remarks than were uttered by some members opposite yesterday.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Was the *Advertiser* report of the conference true or false?

Mr. STEPHENS—I do not know whether the press report was correct, but my Party is not ashamed to let the *Advertiser* or the world know what happens at its meetings. The Liberal Party, however, is not prepared to let the *Advertiser* in at its meetings. I am satisfied that this Bill has not been treated seriously by members opposite. They regard it as humorous, but it is no joke to the workers. While it was being discussed yesterday they laughed and joked and when speaking did not refer to the Bill but indulged in abuse. I respect any chairman of any meeting and abide by his ruling. Mr. Bannister was only carrying

out his duties in giving a ruling and any person at that conference could have challenged it.

Mr. Hambour—We have not blamed Mr. Bannister.

Mr. STEPHENS—Were you here yesterday?

Mr. Hambour—State one bad thing that was said about Mr. Bannister.

The SPEAKER—Order! I would ask the honourable member to address himself to this question through the Chair and not to address members opposite or any other member of the House in the second person.

Mr. STEPHENS—I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I would ask all members to accept rulings from a chair. This legislation has been discussed publicly at Wallaroo by members opposite, but they have not been able to mislead the people, as will be obvious soon. A certain senator made personal statements against the Labor Party candidate for that electorate and I am only sorry that he did not remain for the remainder of the campaign because the longer he remained the more votes Labor would have secured. Our candidate is one of the most highly respected members of the community and it was ridiculous for the senator to refer to him as a dangerous man. If that type of criticism continues the Liberal candidate will not only be defeated but will lose his deposit.

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member must deal with the subject before the House and not give a dissertation on the political situation at Wallaroo.

Mr. STEPHENS—I support the amendment. I hope the Bill will be defeated, because we have had enough of this. One or two members have stated that industry cannot afford to pay for long service leave. Many years ago I conducted a case before the State Arbitration Court on behalf of a section of the workers, and Mr. Boykett and other members of the Employers Federation said then that industry could not afford an increase in wages or a shortening of hours. One of the witnesses at that hearing said that if industry were called upon to pay for an increase in wages or a shortening of hours businesses would go out of existence, but Mr. Justice Gordon did not agree with him and said that it would be a good thing for the State generally if some businesses were to close down, for although it might cause some temporary inconvenience it would not be long before others started. Even though employers claimed they could not afford to pay for these things, I have not heard of any of them dying of starvation or lining up to

receive relief, and over the years the weekly hours have been reduced to 40 and the £2 3s. weekly basic wage has been increased to what it is today.

All those employers who claimed they could not pay are now in a sound position. We have seen only recently where one employer was in serious trouble with the taxation authorities, and the figures disclosed showed his enormous profits. One can look at the newspaper at any time and see reports of the big dividends companies are paying, and that is proof that they are well able to afford long service leave. I have had a business connection with the same industry as my friend, the member for Barossa. Very few people in his industry have gone out of business, and most of them are very prosperous.

Mr. Shannon—Unfortunately, we have passed our costs on to our overseas consumers who will not now buy our products.

Mr. STEPHENS—I admire the member for Barossa for the way he dealt with the matter; unlike other members, he did not abuse people who were unable to defend themselves, and he was the only member opposite who really advanced any argument in support of the Bill. I was disgusted with a lot of the remarks made by some members. I know this Bill is going to be passed.

Mr. Hambour—How do you know?

Mr. STEPHENS—I know, and so does the honourable member, but he will not admit it. Whenever the Premier suggests something, it has to be agreed to, and it has always been the same. I have known this House to pass Bills which subsequently were rejected in another place, and on each occasion the Premier has later said that he will still get them through; something is said to members in another place and the Bills then go through. Members opposite say what a wonderful job the Electricity Trust is doing for decentralization, but many of them objected to its formation. The *News* has already told members that the Premier is going to close the debate this afternoon and the Bill is going to be passed. We know that the Government has the numbers, but we also know that when the vote is taken it will not represent the opinion of the majority of the people. I represent four times as many people as some members who have spoken this afternoon.

Mr. Hambour—That is too bad for them.

Mr. STEPHENS—That is a disgraceful state of affairs; this is called a democracy, but the honourable member knows there is no democracy here at all, and while we are under this dictatorship I do not see much hope for it. I know

that not only trade unionists but many others are beginning to feel that the Bill will get them nowhere. They also feel that arbitration will get them nowhere because we cannot get a decent arbitration system. The workers today have no say in the laws of the State. We know that when the Premier speaks and cracks the whip there is a scuttle behind him and Government members do what they are told. I expect to see the Bill passed and the amendment defeated, but I will vote for the amendment because I think it is right.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—Much has been said about who is responsible for the attitude of the Opposition, but I do not think it really matters because the Leader of the Opposition accepts full responsibility for the attitude of the men behind him, and I accept that. We have before us a Government proposal and an Opposition proposal. I will deal firstly with the Opposition proposal for 13 weeks' leave after 10 years' service; that is what they want inflicted on the economy whether it can stand it or not. It is true that many industries could possibly afford it. It is also true, however, that there are many that could not stand it. I will not support retrospectivity.

Mr. Lawn—Are you opposing the Bill?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Of course I'm not. Just keep your ears open.

The SPEAKER—Order! I drew the attention of the honourable member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Stephens) a little while ago to the fact that the House was being addressed other than through the Chair and that members should not be addressed in the second person. I ask the honourable member for Light to follow my earlier advice.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, Sir. Honourable members must be aware that the number of employees with 10 years' continuous service would vary from 20 per cent to 70 per cent of the total employed. Surely honourable members opposite must realize the impact that the amendment would have on smaller, privately-owned firms that carry on from year to year. I would oppose the amendment under any circumstances because of its retrospectivity. The Bill provides for one week's leave after seven years' continuous service, and regardless of what members calls it, that is a week which, converted into pounds, could represent anything from £15 to £50, for many people in the higher salary groups support Labor; yet the Leader of the Opposition says he would accept full responsibility for throwing out the Government Bill and denying his supporters the right to that money.

Labor members are opposing the Bill with tongue in cheek for they know that Government members are too honourable to let them carry the baby by defeating the Bill. They know their supporters will not be denied this money because they know that when a Liberal member says he will support a Bill he will do so regardless of the consequences. Taking the extreme view, Opposition members could not successfully introduce a long service leave Bill of their own for another three years, and then they would probably have to wait another three years before getting control of the Upper House, but I believe their dream of office to be like that of Kathleen Mavourneen; they will never occupy the Treasury benches. Yet they are prepared to deny their supporters this money while they sit tight on what they call a principle—a principle that has been decided outside the House. Admittedly, members opposite are party to the decision to support that principle; indeed, Mr. O'Halloran said he led the movement, and I accept his assurance. Be that as it may, are members opposite justified in denying their supporters this reward? Have they assessed in money terms what their opposition to the Government's Bill will cost their supporters?

Many workers in Wallaroo and other places do not enjoy long service leave today, and the opposition of members opposite to this measure could mean the loss of hundreds of pounds to some workers. Labor members say they look after the workers, but in this instance they are relying on the honesty of Government members. They remind me of a cocky on a perch that keeps repeating the words, "We won't support it," all the time knowing that Government members will vote for the Bill.

Mr. O'Halloran—"I thank Thee, Lord, that, I am not as other men."

Mr. HAMBOUR—I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition is an oddity. We will not find his like anywhere, but as I greatly admire him, far be it from me to speak derogatorily of one so intelligent. On this measure, however, I cannot follow his reasoning for he and his supporters apparently want to deny the workers something I believe they should receive. The benefit under this Bill could amount to hundreds of pounds in some cases, yet Opposition members have the effrontery to say they oppose it. I for one shall be happy to see a vote taken and their opposition recorded. I assure members that I am honourable enough to vote for this Bill and not take advantage of Labor's attitude, which is impossible to understand.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I have been a member of this House for many years and at times have heard it said that Parliament, when dealing with local matters, becomes a little dull, but in this debate we have heard lively, enthusiastic speeches and thrusts by one side against the other. In considering the legislation it behoves us to look in retrospect at the issues involved. Labor members are fighting for a principle and want the people they represent to get what, in their opinion, is the best long service leave possible. On the other hand, the Liberal and Country League is trying to implement a long service leave principle which, as recently as 1954, was absolutely opposed by the Premier. Now, however, there has been a change of front and it is interesting to read the following remarks of the Premier, referring to a High Court decision, at page 908 of *Hansard* (1954):—

I may say that the Arbitration Court frequently imposes industrial conditions on the State Government itself. When this was challenged in the High Court it upheld the right of the Arbitration Court to do it. If the State Government is bound by Arbitration Court awards I believe that when the matter of long service leave comes before the High Court again it will say that this a matter entirely outside the jurisdiction of the South Australian legislature.

Later he said:—

There can be no question in my mind of the competence of the Arbitration Court to deal with industrial disputes between parties registered in that court. That principle was not questioned until recently when decisions on industrial matters were made by politicians in the eastern States. By that most meddlesome innovation politicians in Parliament have adjudicated, and in this case propose to adjudicate in industrial matters, thereby taking those matters out of the hands of the court and bringing them within the realm of politics.

That statement was made by the Premier as recently as 1954. The Premier, on behalf of his Party, realizing that there is a swing of public opinion towards some degree of long service leave has taken the initiative by introducing this Bill. The member for Light (Mr. Hambour) touched on the point that I intended to bring forward and I support him when he said that some small industries will be seriously affected by the provision of 13 weeks' leave after 10 years' service. My opinion has been reached after consulting prominent people in my electorate, the people who run factories and workers, many of whom I have known for a great number of years as employees in industry. To sum up, the people working in factories in Waikerie, Loxton, Karoonda, and other places are natur-

ally anxious to see some principle of long service leave established and on that account I welcome the opportunity of having something to say upon it. While it may be perfectly true that the bigger industries, such as the motor body building firms, may be able to absorb the impact of 13 weeks long service leave without any great effect upon them it is undoubtedly true that this provision, particularly with its retrospective effects, will have a terrific impact upon some of the smaller establishments.

By sounding out public opinion and by summing up the Bill and the Leader of the Opposition's amendment, I have reached the conclusion that I cannot support the amendment. I am anxious to see some attempt to establish the principle of long service leave and the Bill is improved with the Premier's announcement that it will be retrospective to July 1. This will give employees who have had seven years' service the right to one week's long service leave after July 1, 1957, and the next year and each succeeding year they will have an additional week.

Mr. O'Halloran—They will not have an additional week, but will have the same week each year.

Mr. STOTT—They have to qualify by seven years' service and each additional year they will get a week.

Mr. O'Halloran—But not an additional week each year.

Mr. STOTT—The Premier's proposal would not have been of much value without the retrospectivity. It has become an accepted principle in industry that employees with long service are entitled to some reward for the part they have played, and although the Premier in 1954 was inclined to leave the matter to the Arbitration Courts it seems to me that we have to follow the lead of the other States in laying down a principle. For that reason I intend to support the Bill.

We have heard a lot of speeches on this measure and some have been most amusing. We have heard a good deal about what will happen in the Wallaroo electorate on August 31. Quite a number of speakers hardly touched on the meat of the Bill, but we will know the result of the by-election on August 31 and probably this Bill will have become an Act by that time. We ought to get down to the Bill itself and either support or oppose it according to principles. I do not blame the Australian Labor Party for all of the heat that has been engendered by members on their own side who are fighting for the maximum

long service leave, but in my district I believe the impact would be too severe and therefore I cannot support the Leader of the Opposition's proposed amendment and will support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I had not intended to speak, but in the course of this debate we have been told by members opposite that we on this side are dumb, that we are not free, that we cannot talk if we want to because we are under dictation. I just cannot understand how members could reach that conclusion. I have found out in the course of my life that often one talks too much, and in this case I believe there has been too much talk, not about the Bill, but about things which have no connection with it. It is one of the strangest debates that I have heard or taken part in. We are considering a Bill put forward by an L.C.L. Government which hands out a lot of benefits to the workers—though there is nothing strange about that, I will agree, because it is often done by an L.C.L. Government—and the employers are the people who will have to pay for them.

Mr. Corcoran—They will pass it on to the consumers.

Mr. HEASLIP—However, we find that the Labor Opposition is hoping that this Bill that offers so many benefits to the working people will be defeated and that has come, not from one member, but from every member opposite who has spoken. That is the strangest thing and I cannot understand it. The Party that sets itself up as doing all the good things for the working people is trying to defeat something that will be of such great benefit to those people.

I have been told that I am not free, that I cannot vote or talk as I wish, but I would not belong to any Party or organization in which I was not free; I would get out at once. I have never been tied in any shape or form as a member of the Liberal and Country League. I am free to talk and vote as I think right. My only master is the people who elect me. I am not accountable to anyone else and if they do not like me they can put me out again; no-one else tells me what I am to do. Another strange thing is that the Opposition in this place has been dictated to, for it has been told how it is to vote. In principle, I am opposed to employers being compelled to grant long service leave: I am opposed to compulsion of any type if it is not necessary; but I believe it is necessary to compel employers to reward those who have been employed for many years. It seems that many members have not a clear picture of the Bill, for they

say it only provides for another week's annual leave, but that is not the case. It provides a reward for people who have served an employer for at least seven years. If an employee wants to take a week's pay instead of a week's holiday, why should he not get it? Opposition members are not as close to the people as they claim to be. They do not understand what the workers desire, and they do not understand the economic situation. I have talked to many workers, and most of them say they can use an extra week's leave each year, but would not know what to do with three months' leave.

Mr. Riches—Three months in a lifetime!

Mr. HEASLIP—The honourable member wants three months after 10 years. Those people would not have enough money to go on an extended holiday or a tour overseas:

Mr. Stephens—Give them the money.

Mr. HEASLIP—Opposition members want to give them three months' holiday, but these people ask me what they are going to do with it. They tell me that after a fortnight's holiday they have spent all the money they can afford and do not know what to do with the rest of their time. There is nothing worse than idleness, which can be more boring than anything, and all workers know that. If they had three months' leave they would probably look for another job for that period, but members opposite would be opposed to that, and they are also opposed to payment instead of leave. They also say that a qualifying period of seven years is not long service leave, but that 10 years is. What difference does a period of three years make? I point out that industry will not have to carry the burden of long service leave; the consumer will have to carry it, and the consumer is the worker. Australia cannot consume all the goods manufactured in this country, so we must look for overseas markets if we want greater industrialization. How can any industry compete with other countries overseas when our costs are mounting all the time? If we do not expand our overseas markets we cannot bring out more migrants and we cannot have more industries. Indeed, we may have unemployment if we place more burdens on industry. We on this side of the House do not want unemployment. We are doing our best to provide employment, and this State, under the Playford L.C.L. Government, has the best employment figures of any State. It seems that the Opposition is trying to do something to create unemployment because they want to so load industry that our manufacturers will not be able to export and carry on production. For those reasons I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I am sure we are all indebted to the honourable member who has just resumed his seat for his contribution to this debate. We are glad that he did not tell us all the things he could not understand because that would have taken much time. However, I hope to be able to help him understand some of the problems that seem to be worrying him. As I understand the Bill, and the events which led to its introduction, it seems that there are many men in industry who feel that they require, in these days of concentrated nervous tension, an extra week's leave each year, particularly those who are limited to two week's annual leave. I ask honourable members to place themselves in the position of a young man who is setting out in employment with the knowledge that under the law, as it exists, as long as he works he will never be able to have more than two weeks' respite from work at any one time. That applies to the bulk of workers in private industry today, and the young men who qualify themselves as tradesmen look for something better. The war has brightened their outlook and encouraged a desire to travel, and under present circumstances we are saying to our young men that as long as they live they will never be able to leave their place of employment for more than 14 days at a time. This position has been faced up to by others in the community, and in some respects the Government has granted three weeks' annual leave, but many are still tied down to 14 days. So, we have this claim that they need an extra week's annual leave, and that is a claim which the Government and industry some time or other have to meet.

Alongside with this scheme is another—at the end of 10 years' service men in industry should be entitled to long service leave so that if necessary they can travel once during their working life-time, if not twice, with their wives and families to places which they could not visit in 21 days. I do not think it is an unreasonable request for men in industry to expect as we progress. In the guise of meeting one of them, the Premier has introduced this Bill, with which he thinks he is going to satisfy both requests. It will not provide one week's additional leave for everyone in industry, but limits it to those who have given seven years' service. It is classed as long service leave, and the Premier thinks he is answering both requests in the one piece of legislation. He really believes that people in industry are not sufficiently alive to their own requirements that they are prepared to accept that as an answer to

their demands. The men have met and decided that this is not acceptable.

Clause 15 gives the answer to one phase, in that it provides that it does not apply to Crown employees, the reason being that they are already covered by general schemes for long service leave which are more beneficial than those set out in the Bill. A carpenter, a patternmaker or a boilermaker who has passed through a trades school and served his apprenticeship is entitled to the same kind of leave whether he works for the B.H.P. or the Commonwealth Railways at Port Augusta. One has been awarded three weeks' annual leave and three months' long service leave after 10 years, and the other is in the position that so long as he lives he will never be able to be away from his job for more than 14 days at a time. Therefore, can these men be blamed for thinking that they are entitled to comparable benefits with those provided for other sections?

Recently I attended a naturalization ceremony and heard new Australians being told that in taking the Oath of Allegiance to the Queen it was no longer an oath given in an atmosphere where we believed in the Divine right of the Monarch, but rather that we believed in the Divine right of the common man, that all men were equal before the law and all men were equal in the eyes of the Throne; and that we must see that the rights of the common man are protected equally before the law. However, we have the administration saying that a carpenter working in private industry cannot be regarded as the equal of a carpenter in the Government service. So, the Bill specifically excludes all Government employees. We say that similar provisions to those operating for the Public Service should apply to all those engaged in other types of industry. I remind members that the American Declaration of Independence provides that:—

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

Members opposite would say those in private industry are not equal to those in the Public Service.

Mr. Hambour—Don't be silly.

Mr. RICHES—I have not heard the honourable member say that South Australia cannot afford long service leave or three weeks' annual leave to public servants. That issue is only raised when other men in industry are affected. How can he draw a line of distinction between one carpenter and another or one clerk and another? The Premier has

charged us with not having trumped up anything new. We have not pinned our faith on something extravagant. We are adopting existing practice in this State and asking that it apply to all workers and not a chosen few. It has been said that the attitude of Labor members will deny to workers any benefits that might be obtained under this Bill. Even if it wanted to the Labor Party could not deny anything to the workers because 20 is still a larger number than 16, and any legislation passed or defeated in this Chamber is the full responsibility of the Government and no one else. On its own the Labor Party cannot defeat a Bill any more than it can get one of its resolutions carried. It rests with the Government whether or not a Bill is passed or defeated. We have asked that this Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for three months' long service leave after 10 years' continuous work. Government members have spent much time in telling us that this would throw great responsibility on to small employers and put them out of business, but has that happened in the other States?

There is nothing in the Bill to say that it will take effect immediately. The Labor Party's Bill in 1954 met the position adequately and it can be just as adequately met now if this Bill were withdrawn and amended accordingly. The measure provides for only one week's additional leave after seven years' service in industry, which cannot be regarded as long service leave. It is provided that if a workman does not take the one week when he is entitled to it, it can be allowed to accumulate, but only if the employer agrees. The employee cannot determine when he will take it; it must be taken at the discretion of the employer. The scheme is not good enough. This is the truth. As a people we are trying to ensure for all people the divine right of the common man. These things should be available to men as a right and not as crumbs from the rich man's table, or something granted gratuitously by a Liberal and Country League Government, as mentioned by Government supporters. They should not have to put up with a measure which gives them nothing but one week's additional leave, and which has nothing to do with long service leave. Also, it applies only to men who have had seven years continuous employment.

At this stage of the debate it is probably useless asking Government supporters to have another look at the Bill but the Opposition wants it withdrawn and another introduced more

in keeping with what men in industry sincerely believe to be their right. It has often been the practice of the Government, before introducing legislation affecting any section of the community, to refer the matter to the interested people for comment and advice. This measure has been referred to nobody and it satisfies nobody. Men vitally concerned have expressed their disappointment with it and are behind the Opposition's request for it to be recast to meet the reasonable demands of workers. It has been said that members are being dictated to by a person outside Parliament, and that Government supporters are as free as the air to speak and vote on the measure as they desire. Are we to understand that when the Premier, before an election, gives an undertaking on behalf of the Liberal and Country League nobody need take any notice of it because members of the Government Party are free to accept or throw it out? Or are we to take it that when the Premier gives an undertaking he is speaking for his organization and Party and that the pledge will be honoured? We have an extraordinary state of affairs, and it should be carefully noted by the people. We have been told also that when the Premier says something it is only an expression of his own views and that the men behind him in Parliament can either vote for it or defeat it as they think fit.

On this side, when the Leader of the Labor Party makes a pledge to the people that something will be done if Labor is returned to office we are all expected to honour it. We are expected to honour any promise made on our behalf, whether by our Leader or by ourselves. We are not bound to anything else. How can democracy work in any other way? How can people ever express a view on a subject unless the promise made is honoured not only by the leaders but by those on whose behalf the promise is made? Nobody on the Labor Party side is empowered to make a promise unless the matter has been discussed by the people and decided by vote. As soon as the Premier announced that he would not introduce long service leave but fob off men in industry with one week's leave a year, men in industry met and decided it was not acceptable and that they would ask for leave according to their right. That was to be our policy and we decided to stand by the pledge. That is the situation, and there is nothing sinister about it.

When referring to the introduction of this measure a short time ago, the Premier said

that when it came before the House we would see democracy at work at its best. I honestly thought he was referring to a decision that had been made on this side of the House; I never dreamt that he was going to give us the demonstration we had last Tuesday, when not one member of his Party spoke, although we have been told since that they are free to vote as they wish. I have never seen regimentation like this anywhere, not even in a school. It was a most extraordinary situation. One promise the Premier kept was the promise to show us democracy at work, but it is not the kind of democracy that we choose. I hope that even at this late stage the Government will have regard to the pleas made sincerely on behalf of men in industry, that this Bill will be withdrawn and re-examined, that the Government will give to the people in industry a Long Service Leave Bill, and that it will concede that industry can afford it. I hope also that it will grant an additional week's annual leave, something that workers have been seeking so long.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I feel that I should not cast a silent vote on this Bill. I have been on both sides of the picture in my past experience as a worker and as an employer, so I want to speak from that angle. I support the Bill and oppose the amendment; as my view is that we should start somewhere. Let me take members' minds back to the time when we were endeavouring to get national insurance. I am quite sure that if we could have agreed and had introduced national insurance when it was suggested, and had improved on it from Parliament to Parliament, we would have had something much better than we have today. That is my attitude on this measure. The Bill, as drawn, does not completely satisfy me, but let us start somewhere.

Mr. Davis—It would not satisfy you as a worker.

Mr. FLETCHER—Like the honourable member, I had to be satisfied with very little when I was a worker. As an employer I have had the experience of granting men a fortnight's annual leave, and some of them went to work for my opposition instead of having a holiday. If they are granted three months' long service leave the same thing could happen. In many cases the workers would have a holiday, but some would take other work. I do not think this sort of thing is now as rife as it was years ago, but all members will remember that a few years ago, when engine drivers were at a premium, some left one firm and went to

another because they could get £1 a week more. That also happened in the shearing industry, and we must try to avoid that under this legislation.

Mr. John Clark—Many people have three months' leave now, but that does not happen.

Mr. FLETCHER—It happens in many places. If a man employed in a dairy factory in my district were given three months' leave he might go immediately to work for the opposition. I have been surprised at the attitude adopted by both sides of the House, and I point out that if there had been an Independent standing at Wallaroo the Liberal and Labor parties would have been exchanging preferences. With these few remarks I support the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I thank the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) for indicating the method by which his Party arrived at a decision before any announcement was made for the electors' benefit in the way of a promise. He said they consulted the people, but I would like to ask who were the people consulted. Can I name one or two whose names appear in the press frequently, and who appear to be somewhat in the nature of consultants in this matter? These men are Mr. Bukowski, Mr. Schmella and Mr. Bannister, and they are the ones who discuss high policy. Is that the approach? It appears to me from all the evidence we have that the people referred to by Mr. Riches in this context are a very select group; a group, generally speaking, not known to the rank and file of the electorate. The electors would not even recognize them if they met them in the street, let alone have any voice in placing them in a post where they would have some voice.

Mr. Riches—There were 300 there, all directly elected by the public.

Mr. SHANNON—What a large percentage! An article in the *Advertiser* of June 17 has been widely quoted and I do not intend to weary members by making additional references to it. However, it was evident that one member of the Opposition in this Chamber—a great personal friend of mine—sought and got direction from Mr. Bannister as to what he should not do when this matter was before the House.

Mr. Riches—You know that that is a lie, don't you?

Mr. SHANNON—I do not.

Mr. Riches—I am telling you now that it is.

The SPEAKER—Order! I have drawn honourable members' attention frequently in this

debate to the fact that Standing Orders provide that interjections are out of order and at the present time I am unable to hear the member for Onkaparinga.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is one honourable member justified in saying that another honourable member has told a lie?

The SPEAKER—If that remark was directed to an honourable member it was out of order.

Mr. RICHES—I frankly admit that when the honourable member for Onkaparinga made a certain statement I said that that statement was a lie.

The SPEAKER—If that is the position, I ask the honourable member to withdraw his remark.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is there any statement before this House to which any member has taken exception and, if so, what is it?

The SPEAKER—The Premier asked on a point of order whether a statement by one honourable member that another honourable member's statement was a lie was in order, and I asked the honourable member for Stuart whether he had referred to a statement by the honourable member for Onkaparinga as a lie and, if so, would he withdraw it. It is out of order to call another honourable member a liar or describe a statement that he has made as a lie.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have listened carefully to this debate and I did not hear any member call another a liar. I merely desire to know the statement to which an honourable member has taken exception.

The SPEAKER—My attention has been drawn to a statement made by a member of this House concerning a statement made by another member. I asked the member for Stuart whether he said that a statement by the member for Onkaparinga was a lie and, if so, to withdraw.

Mr. RICHES—I will adhere to your ruling, but before I withdraw I ask leave to explain what I did say, because I want you, Sir, to know what it was.

The SPEAKER—Order! If the honourable member made the alleged statement I must ask him to withdraw unconditionally, and he can then further explain the statement if he wishes.

Mr. RICHES—In deference to you, Sir, I withdraw, and I exercise my right to make an explanation. The member for Onkaparinga said that a member of the Opposition at a

conference asked for a ruling and was given a ruling and was dictated to as to how he should vote. I said that that was a lie.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member has withdrawn his remark and I ask the honourable member for Onkaparinga to continue the debate.

Mr. SHANNON—Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a storm in a teacup and I am not concerned about it.

Mr. RICHES—You ought to be concerned about the truth.

Mr. SHANNON—Yesterday a member referred at length to a cartoon in a leading newspaper by that clever cartoonist Norm Mitchell. May I suggest an even more appropriate cartoon. I visualize an old-fashioned coach driven by a benign, pipe-smoking old man. The coach is being pulled by 14 men dressed in the garb of the day which is very little over nothing. As they proceed along the highway they approach the multitude and the driver seeing the multitude in the distance, exclaims, "Woe unto me. Tom has stolen a very juicy joint out of the larder of the Labor Party." He prepares with this juicy joint a dish of delectable quality appealing to the appetites of the multitude. Unfortunately this tasty dish is not quite so palatable to a certain tribe led by one named Moxham, but it does have a wide appeal to the multitude. The driver, seeing his slightly embarrassed position with regard to these good folk, applies what is commonly called a paper frill to a French outlet and adds three green peas—all he had—one from Adelaide, one from Enfield, and the other from Norwood—and then serves the repast to the multitude. However, not being pleased with it, he decides he would like to join the multitude and sup at the Premier's table. I have no doubt at all that were it not for certain directions issued by people not elected to a responsible office that would be the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition. I may be incorrectly informed, because, after all, the press has been charged with being untruthful because I was quoting from the press of June 17. My experience is that the press is very reliable; it may occasionally get facts slightly tangled, and it may have done so on this occasion. I apologize to the press if I am wrong. I believe the Leader of the Opposition hinted that it might be a wise approach to this legislation if a basis for compromise could be arrived at, an approach for which the Leader is noted and for which I give him full marks. I have had some experience of his great gifts.

Mr. O'Halloran—I do not compromise on principles.

Mr. SHANNON—He has on many occasions through compromising, secured advantages to the people he represents. He suggests that it might be wise if we could arrive at some common ground or compromise whereby the workers would get something out of this Bill, a little more than what he thinks the Government is prepared to give.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not make any such suggestion.

Mr. SHANNON—That suggestion appears very evident in the press report. If the Leader of the Opposition suspects me of misquoting the press, I assure him that I have a very high regard for him and I am not suggesting for one moment that he is out of character; in fact, he is right in line with his normal practice in dealing with legislation in this Chamber. The comments which I read in the press immediately pictured to me the very approaches the Leader would normally make on any topic. It is a very common-sense attitude to say "Can't we do something to get something out of the wreck?" I will return for a moment to the cartoon I referred to earlier. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) was in the cortege and in fact was one of the leaders in the team that drew the coach. He appealed to the High Priest from Hindmarsh: "What about me, what do I get?", and the High Priest said "I have prepared a place for you; you shall be on the left-hand side of St. Peter in order that you shall not be out of place." I think he will remain on the left-hand side permanently. I do not think there is any doubt that certain aspirations are unlikely to be achieved until unity once more prevails in the Opposition ranks, and at the moment that appears to be quite impossible.

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask the honourable member not to pursue that subject further.

Mr. SHANNON—Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will not do so. I had a hunch that the Leader of the Opposition had once more been inveigled into a position with regard to long service leave in which I have seen him on previous occasions when motions have been presented in this Chamber which quite obviously he was not particularly happy about; he has been once more spurred from the rear to take an action which in his own calm judgment he would have decided was better handled in another way. He would get much more if left to his own native intelligence to handle problems instead of being spurred on by up and coming nobodies who do not know as much as they think they know.

Had the Leader been left to his own resources to handle this matter in his own inimitable way he might have got a lot more for the people he represents than he is likely to get by these bludgeoning methods—I suggest that is the only appropriate term to use—which I am pleased to say is not the usual method of attack with regard to a Bill. It has obviously been done that way for publicity purposes, and those of us who have listened to the debate realize that the publicity has relation to a date not far distant from now.

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The debate, strangely enough, has scarcely dealt with any of the provisions of the Bill. Members opposite have not discussed the Bill in the sense of analysing or understanding its provisions. They have been at some pains to try to justify the move by the Leader of the Opposition and their opposition to the Bill, which so manifestly gives a tremendous benefit to employees throughout the State. It is very hard for anyone to adopt the attitude that if they cannot get roast turkey and champagne they will refuse anything.

Mr. Lawn—This is only bread and water.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In this instance it is a little easier because the roast turkey and champagne are not being lost by members opposite but by people who have not had an opportunity to express their views on the matter. There was a time when the Leader of the Opposition stated that the Opposition stood for the greatest good for the greatest number; that was always the Opposition's cry. When it comes to this Bill, which undoubtedly gives much more total benefit to a greater number of people, the Opposition is at some pains to show that it should oppose the Bill and that it is not doing so at the direction of any outside authority. With one or two minor exceptions, the clauses of the Bill have not been discussed.

Let us look at the history of this legislation. Long service leave legislation was first introduced into this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran). He noticed that some of the eastern States had provided for long service leave by Act of Parliament, and his Bill was similar to the legislation in other States. The Government, however, refused to accept his Bill. Firstly, it contained a provision for 20 years' retrospectivity, a provision I hope this Parliament will never accept. Secondly, it was uncertain whether this State had power to pass legislation on long service, for the Victorian law

was being challenged in the courts. Indeed, it was only recently that it was validated by the Privy Council and, consequently, the validity of State long service leave legislation upheld, provided that it was in no way contrary to an award of any industrial tribunal.

That was the first long service leave legislation in this State, and that Bill provided for 13 weeks' leave after 20 years' service, not after 10 years' service. It contained many provisions similar to those in the present Bill, although from the point of view of the worker, some were not nearly so generous. By and large, however, it copied fairly closely the provisions of legislation passed in the eastern States. True, it is not possible to copy precisely the legislation of the eastern States because each State Parliament has passed a different Bill on long service leave. For instance, the qualifications, including the period to be served, are somewhat different. The Western Australian legislation is still to emerge, but generally speaking, the legislation of the three eastern States and Tasmania provides for 20 years' retrospectivity and 13 weeks' leave after that period. In one instance the terms of service are wide, in another narrow, but the qualifying period in all the eastern States is 20 years and the period of leave 13 weeks.

Immediately the Privy Council gave its decision the topic of long service leave became important and, even before a deputation from the Trades Hall had waited on me, the Government had discussed it because industrial workers in this State could obviously not be expected to work under conditions so dissimilar from those in other States where the total benefits would be so much greater. As was to be expected, however, it was not long before the Trades and Labor Council sent a deputation asking that long service leave legislation be introduced.

I heard their case, which was put forward with moderation. It was that this Parliament should legislate for 13 weeks' long service leave after 20 years' service in accordance with the legislation operating in some other States. The deputation even went further than using the words "in accordance with other States." Mr. Bannister went to the extent of setting out what he wanted: 13 weeks after 20 years' service, similar to the leave enjoyed by employees in other States. Those were his words.

The composition of the deputation was interesting: Messrs. A. J. Shard (President), R. Bishop (Secretary), F. Birrell (Vice-

President), L. Johns (Secretary of the Tramways Employees Union), and Mr. R. E. Bannister (Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union). So we heard Mr. Bannister, with other representatives from the Trades Hall, requesting 13 weeks' long service leave at the end of 20 years' service.

I told the deputation that Cabinet had already considered the matter and I would be able to reply, probably within three weeks, because this important matter had already received some consideration. In fact, I made an announcement much earlier because it came to my notice that a number of employers with employees of long standing were beginning to retire those employees because they desired to avoid the payment of long service leave. I told the deputation that one of the provisions operating in some other States would receive tremendous political opposition in South Australia and that I would oppose it myself because I did not think it was justified in any way. I referred, of course, to the provision for 20 years' retrospectivity. I pointed out that if one Parliament could give benefits retrospectively for 20 years, then another sort of Parliament could take away those benefits retrospectively for 20 years, and I saw much political difficulty in that provision.

That sets out fairly and squarely the history to that stage. We then had the duty to see whether it was possible to design legislation that would give the South Australian worker a benefit equal to that obtaining in other States, at the same time avoiding the provision that would be so politically and legislatively obnoxious to many members. We had seen from the debate on the Bill introduced by Mr. O'Halloran that 20 years' retrospectivity had no attraction to this Parliament. Members opposite know that that is true and that retrospectivity in any legislation is always looked at critically. Let us consider the alteration of conditions over 20 years. Twenty years ago the basic wage was probably no higher than £3 15s., yet today long service leave in respect of that period would be taken at well over £12 a week.

Another point gave the Government even more concern: that the 20 years' retrospectivity would fall extremely lightly on the new industries in this State, but extremely heavily on the very type of industry we had been trying to encourage—the small country industry where the employee takes a job when he leaves school or finishes his apprenticeship and then stays with that firm.

Mr. Hambour—And probably his father before him.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. Immediately the Government started to investigate this we came up against the fact that 20 years' retrospectivity would close up a number of industries because they were struggling and badly placed economically. Still another provision has created extreme difficulty in the other States, but has to be inserted in the legislation if it is to be any good. This is a provision to prevent the employer from dismissing his employee, because the moment there is a large accumulation of leave there is a motive for displacing the employee; he may be getting a little older; someone more attractive may come along and there is always a motive for displacing the employee who becomes entitled to long service leave. In the other States, therefore, an attempt was made to prevent men from being dismissed, and I draw attention to a stop press item in the *News* only tonight. Under the heading "Three Hundred Men March on Metters" the following appears:—

More than 300 men marched on Metters Ltd. Foundry at Alexandria, Sydney, blocking all entrances to the works. Ugly scene developed when truck driver drove into men. One of them struck heavily on chest and leg, but uninjured. Men demanded payment of long service money to 240 sacked men, all with more than 20 years' service with company, who were sacked with 60 others following earlier standing down of 700 men.

That in itself shows the type of problem that crops up when there is a long accumulation of long service leave. There is always the problem of protecting the man in his job and the employer in what is, after all, his inherent right to decide whom he shall employ.

Having these things in mind the Government set about trying to provide for a scheme of long service leave which would give equal or greater benefits—and I want to emphasize that—to the workers of South Australia, but which would not have associated with it those political and economic problems that I have mentioned. After much consideration the Government decided to shorten the qualifying period to seven years and, having done that, to accept retrospectivity in regard to that period.

Mr. O'Halloran—There was some doubt about that stage of the journey.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There was never any doubt. The amendment of which I have given notice provides for something totally different. The employers have shown that for the purpose of this long service leave it would be advantageous if as

many employees as possible could be bracketed in the financial year, and all that the amendment does is to lay down when the Act comes into operation. For the purposes of computing leave it shall be as from July 1 of this year, so that all persons who have seven years' service will be able to get their one week's leave in this financial year. It is much simpler for the companies for taxation purposes, and it is purely an administrative measure though it does, perhaps to the extent of two or three weeks, benefit the employee. The leave provided for by the Government is, in point of fact, much more generous than has been provided in the other States. At the end of 20 years the employee will have 13 weeks leave due to him, which would be equivalent of the provision in the other States, and indeed somewhat more generous because he will get it earlier, or be able to draw on it as he goes along as he desires. The reduction of the qualifying period means that more will become eligible. I heard the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who gave a very thoughtful speech, say that under the 20 years provision nine per cent of employees might qualify whereas on the seven years basis he said, I think, that it would be 33 per cent. I have had investigations made of two or three firms and although there will be some variation between firms, by and large the investigations confirm the figures he mentioned. As regards some types of employees few indeed would qualify under the 20 years provision. That would apply particularly to female workers.

The Government, having announced its intention of bringing in this Bill which gives the full 13 weeks for 20 years service and which at 25 years goes ahead of the other States, immediately found opposition beginning to arise. This opposition is nothing more nor less than political; all members know it is political. They have only to read the reports and discussions to know that. All that our friends opposite are trying to do is to keep open a political sore in the hope of creating discontent, in the further forlorn hope—although I fail to follow their reasoning—that thereby the Opposition will gain some political benefit from denying the workers long service leave. Every member of the Opposition knows that the Parliamentary system under which we live has always been and always will be a system of compromise. It is never possible to attain Utopia at one stroke. The history of the emancipation of labor in Great Britain shows that the big advances that have been made in industrial conditions were never

made in one fell swoop, but as the result of steady pressure over long periods. At one time we celebrated Eight Hours' Day by a public holiday. That, of course, has long since been forgotten. Now we call it Labor Day because it became so much out of date that it ceased to have any validity as a celebration of Eight Hours' Day. All legislation is progressive—

Mr. O'Halloran—Not all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The legislation the Leader is proposing is not progressive. He says, "If I cannot get the lot I will have nothing," well knowing that he cannot get it anyhow. The Australian Labor Party Convention held an important meeting, and at that time the Government's decision on long service leave was known.

Mr. Lawn—They told you what they thought about it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A special resolution was passed and then we suddenly heard about this local rule to which I have referred. The interesting thing is that the very man who came along as one of the original deputation asking for 13 weeks' leave after 20 years' service was the man who gave the ruling to members opposite that they must oppose anything that did not give 13 weeks' leave after 10 years. Have honourable members ever heard so much political humbug? If members opposite are to be ejected from the Party if they do not vote against the Bill, as I believe they would be, one would think that the president, who had advocated before me something totally different, would also be up for some inquiry before the stewards. The A.L.P. Convention determined the policy of the Party and instructed my friends opposite how to vote.

Mr. O'Halloran—They did not do any such thing.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have before me a newspaper cutting which has the heading "A.L.P. Ruling Tonight." I was not invited to address the meeting, but according to the press report Mr. Bannister, before he could give this important ruling, had to take time off to study Standing Orders. One member opposite was so uncharitable as to suggest that he should be locked up while he was doing it. Anyway, this gentleman had come to the Government with a plan for 13 weeks' long service leave at the end of 20 years.

Mr. O'Halloran—He went to the Government in his capacity as a representative of a trade union.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am just coming to that. Having decided that members opposite had to vote for nothing less than 13 weeks' leave after 10 years' service, the Trades and Labor Council then reconsidered the matter and said, "No, this is going too far; we stand by our original 13 weeks' leave at the end of 20 years." If I were in the position of members opposite I would be doubtful what the position was, because I would have thought that the Labor Party, with its tradition of trying to provide amelioration for workers in industry, would be prepared to accept something that is infinitely better for workers than anything introduced in this House with any chance of success for the last 20 years. The member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) drew attention to clause 4 (1) (b) of the Bill: He thought that the 15 days stipulated might result in some hardship. The paragraph states:—

Absence of the workers 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.

Of course, if the absence resulted from an injury arising out of the worker's employment, there would not be any limit on the period of absence. At one time the Leader of the Opposition introduced a Bill on long service leave and copied the general provisions of the legislation of the eastern States, but what do we find there? Let us see what his Bill said, and then compare it with the present Bill, which shows how far the Government has gone in trying to improve the conditions of workers in South Australia. The Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition stated:—

Any absence from work of not more than 14 days in any year on account of illness or injury.

When I examined that provision I realized that many people who normally have fairly good health could not qualify. The provision of 15 consecutive days in any one period means that there may be a number of periods of absence in a year, so this Bill is infinitely more liberal. I hope that it will be passed, for it will give tremendous satisfaction to workers. Some members opposite tried to make a point about accumulation of leave. They have the idea that they are looking after the worker's interest if they compel this leave to be accumulated and if they compel leave to be taken as leave and not as payment. I have given some attention to the origin and purpose of the long service leave provisions in the Public Service Act. They were inserted on the same basis as they were in the other States.

It was not given as a right but as a reward for good service, but even to this day it can be taken away for dereliction of duty if Executive Council considers that satisfactory service had not been given. I have had many discussions with Mr. Hunkin, a former Labor member of Parliament who ultimately became Public Service Commissioner, on the origin of the legislation. It was introduced because, after a person had been working for a considerable period, he became somewhat stale on the job, and the idea was that under those circumstances he would have leave and come back refreshed to carry on.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—But what do we find? Public servants on no account, if they can avoid it, ever take their long service leave during their period of service, but fight in every possible way not to take it until they retire. At Executive Council meetings every Thursday we have a schedule of those applying for the monetary equivalent of long service leave. If a person receives it as a retiring allowance he pays tax on only 5 per cent of the total, but if it is taken as honourable members opposite say it should be taken he pays income tax on the whole amount. Actually, when these members think they are doing something in the interests of the workers they are actually doing something entirely detrimental to them. The idea would be for the employer and the employee to agree upon a deferment of leave, but that raises many problems if it is to be provided for by legislation. We could have the position—I hope we shall not—where an industrial firm, having deferred leave for a number of years and having a very large amount of liability to its employees, suddenly goes insolvent. That immediately raises the problem of protecting the workers. Another trouble relates to Commonwealth taxation laws. It provides for an allowable deduction of any amounts paid during the year, but not of any deferred payments.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you mean that it does not allow for the accumulation of leave where it is granted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If accumulation is granted by the employer only payment for the leave taken is allowable; otherwise there is no taxation redress.

Mr. Hambour—The employer pays the tax on it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. Honourable members opposite glibly say, "If

we don't get what we want we will have nothing," but I remind them that the matter has been receiving the closest attention of the best experts. When the Bill reaches Committee the Government will be prepared to consider any amendments to improve it, because it believes that a Bill that can be improved is always better than one which is passed through without any Committee attention. That is one of the weaknesses which applies so much in the National Parliament where all the debate is on the second reading and the clauses go through slap bang. Committee is surely the important stage. I thank honourable members for their attention to the measure.

The House divided on Mr. O'Halloran's amendment:—

Ayes (12).—Messrs. Bywaters, John Clark, Coreoran, Davis, Jennings, Dunstan, Lawn, Loveday, O'Halloran (teller), Riches, Stephens, and Tapping.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Geoffrey Clarke, Coumbe, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), and Mr. Shannon.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens, Fred Walsh, and Frank Walsh. Noes—Sir Malcolm McIntosh, Messrs. Bockelberg, and Quirke.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.
Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the second reading.

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Geoffrey Clarke, Coumbe, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), and Mr. Shannon.

Noes (12).—Messrs. Bywaters, John Clark, Coreoran, Davis, Dunstan, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, O'Halloran (teller), Riches, Stephens and Tapping.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Malcolm McIntosh, Messrs. Bockelberg and Quirke. Noes—Messrs. Hutchens, Fred Walsh and Frank Walsh.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.
Bill read a second time.
In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 27, at 2 p.m.