HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 3, 1957.

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

QUESTIONS.

DAWS ROAD REPATRIATION HOSPITAL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On June 25 I asked the Premier a question about the closing of a ward at the Daws Road Repatriation Hospital. Last Thursday's *News* contained a statement from Canberra, under the heading "R.A.H.'s Long Waiting List" that the member for Kingston in the House of Representatives had asked a similar question of the Minister for Health. The report indicated that Dr. Cameron said he had not received any letter from Sir Thomas Playford and would wait until he had one before commenting on the position. I believe that our Premier did consult Canberra, but I ask whether it is a fact that he did so, and has he had any further reply about the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I wrote to the acting Prime Minister on July 4, following up the honourable member's question, and enclosed in the letter a copy of the *Hansard* report of his statement on the closing of the ward. I received the following communication from the acting Prime Minister, dated July 24:—

I acknowledge your letter of July 4, 1957, concerning a question by Mr. F. Walsh, M.H.A., on the closing of a ward at the Daws Road Repatriation Hospital. I shall write to you again concerning this matter.

Copies of the correspondence are available to the honourable member. He will see that, in accordance with the assurance given, the matter was taken up immediately with the Commonwealth. I was surprised to hear over the air the statement by the Minister for Health that he had received no communication. I cannot understand that; either the acting Prime Minister had not passed it on, or it had not been placed before the Minister.

SHOPPING HOURS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—In the last few days there have been various press reports about shops in Melbourne staying open late, especially on Friday nights. A report in this morning's *Advertiser* says that traders here are watching the position with interest. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered the matter, perhaps with a view to amending the Early Closing Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—On the Notice Paper the Leader of the Opposition has an amendment to the Early Closing Act, the second reading of which is set down for tomorrow. The Government has not yet examined the Bill so I cannot express any views on it. The Government does not propose to introduce late shopping on Friday nights or to alter the hours at all.

HARBORS BOARD EMPLOYEES.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier any further information following on the question I asked last week about proposed retrenchments of employees of the Harbors Board?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I received a communication from the Harbors Board to the effect that after certain work had been completed it was proposed by the board to retrench 25 men in the dredging section because inadequate funds did not enable them to be retained. This letter has been examined by Treasury officials and me, and in view of the larger sums of money made available to the board this year, and because in the last two years the board has not spent all its Loan money, I formed the opinion that the proposed retrenchment was being done without full consideration of the position. Under the circumstances, the matter is now being investigated much more closely. I give the honourable member the assurance that there will be no retrenchments until I have had an opportunity to examine the board's programme. I will communicate with the honourable member later. The amount of money voted to the board this year was a substantial increase on last year's vote, and a big increase on last year's expenditure. Under the circumstances I know of no reason for the retrenchments.

PARINGA BRIDGE.

Mr. KING—As the Paringa Bridge is rapidly approaching a condition dangerous to traffic, will the Minister representing the Minister of Highways get a report as to when proper repairs will be undertaken?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes.

TEPKO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS—On July 30 I asked the Minister of Works whether he had a reply to a deputation I led to him concerning extending the hundred of Finniss water scheme to supply residents of Tepko. He did not then have the information, but I understand the Minister of Education, representing him, now has it.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Following the deputation to the Minister of Works, Sir Malcolm McIntosh, from landholders introduced by the honourable member, a visit to the area was made by the District Engineer and the Minister has since received his report, together with full reports from the Engineer for Water Supply and the Engineer-in-Chief thereon. To supply the petitioners would involve the laying of approximately 6 miles of main at an estimated cost of £16,000. The return from rates would be slightly better than that from the hundred of Finnis scheme now being constructed. In view thereof and the fact that the provision of a reticulated supply to the properties in question would allow a marked improvement in working conditions, stock production and domestic amenities and as provision for the extensions was made in this year's Loan Estimates, approval has been given for the work to be carried out. The extension will be laid when some of the approved mains in the area are completed. The Engineer for Water Supply points out that the hundred of Finniss scheme as a whole cannot be further extended to any great extent without overloading it.

QUEEN MOTHER'S VISIT TO AUSTRALIA.

Mr. COUMBE—Some weeks ago it was announced that the Queen Mother would visit Australia next year and doubt was expressed whether her itinerary would include this State. Has the Premier taken up with the Commonwealth authorities the possibility of her visiting South Australia to enable its citizens to meet her?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When it was first announced that the Queen Mother was coming to Australia the Government immediately communicated with the Prime Minister extending an invitation for Her Majesty to come here. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which Her Majesty the Queen named when in this State, has reached the stage of construction at which an opening ceremony could be undertaken, and we thought it would be appropriate if the Queen Mother could perform such a ceremony, particularly as this magnificent hospital is probably the most up-to-date in Australia. There has been no reply to that communication to the Prime Minister, and I did not expect one so soon, because obviously the Palace authorities would have to be consulted and the whole itinerary worked out before any individual acceptances could be made. I have assured the Prime Minister that the people of this State would extend a tremendous welcome to Her Majesty if she came here.

DETAINING DEFENDANTS IN GAOL.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Education received a further report from the Attorney-General concerning the question I asked relating to the detention of defendants in gaol whilst on trial?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. It is as follows:—

My previous reply accurately set out the law on this matter, viz., that whether an accused person be granted bail is entirely at the discretion of the presiding judge; and the practice is that bail is not granted except for special reasons. In the case referred to, no special reasons were advanced by the counsel for the accused and consequently bail was refused. All His Honour The Acting-Chief Justice said was that if the existing judicial discretion and practice is to be altered—and our opinion is that it should not—then it would require legislation to do it.

STEELWORKS FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Can the Premier say whether he was correctly reported in a press statement relating to an approach to an overseas firm for the erection of a steelworks in South Australia? Has an approach been made and if so with what result?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—For some time the Government has been establishing connections overseas with the object of inducing outside capital to undertake development here. No negotiations are yet beyond the stage of preliminary discussions. Overseas firms have requested information concerning the size of the deposits available, possible markets, and the possibility of export in the event of surpluses being created in Australia, and that information has been supplied. We have not reached the stage—nor would I yet have expected to—where any announcement can be made. Generally speaking, there is a fair amount of interest in this proposal, both in Australia and overseas, and I believe we are getting somewhere in connection with it. Every additional ton of ore we discover makes our prospects brighter and the work is being pushed on with that idea in mind.

FREE LIBRARIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice)—

1. What is the proposed capital expenditure for the free libraries which it has been announced will be established at Elizabeth and Marion?

2. Is the Government contributing to this expenditure?

3. If so, how much is it contributing in each case?

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

1. Elizabeth: The South Australian Housing Trust is providing premises in the shopping centre at Elizabeth South free of charge.

Marion: At Marion the library will use accommodation which is part of a community hall project to serve a number of purposes, and no separate cost is available for the portion to be used by the library.

2. No.

3. Nil.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

METROPOLITAN TAXICAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments proposed in this Bill arise from the deliberations of the Metropolitan Taxicab Board which, as members know, is meeting weekly to make preparations to inaugurate the new scheme of taxicab control in the metropolitan area.

The Bill deals with two problems which in the opinion of the Board should be settled before the scheme comes into force, namely—

(*a*) the definition of the respective rights of the Board and councils regarding the appointment and occupation of taxicab stands;

(*b*) the provision of special number plates and registration discs for taxicabs licensed by the Board.

Dealing first with taxicab stands, the present law provides that councils have unrestricted rights to appoint and fix stands, either generally, or for particular vehicles, and to charge fees for permits to occupy stands. The Board has come to the conclusion that the allocation of particular stands to particular taxicabs by councils would cut across the efficient management of the industry by the Board. It is also considered that the Board, because of its special duties in connection with providing taxicab services for the public, should have control over the use of stands erected by councils for use by metropolitan taxicabs.

The effect of clauses 3, 4 and 5 of this Bill, therefore, is to declare that the powers of councils in relation to taxicab stands shall be restricted to a power to appoint and fix the location of stands, and to alter, cancel or remove such stands. The allocation of stands to particular taxis and the general control of stands will be matters for the Taxicab Board.

These amendments of course will only apply to the area in which the Taxicab Board has control. Country municipalities will not be affected by them, and municipal and district councils within the metropolitan area will also retain their full powers in relation to taxicab stands in parts of their areas which are outside the control of the Board.

Councils should not be out of pocket as a result of the amendment, as the Board will take over the policing and regulation of the stands, and the council staff will have no duties in connection with stands, other than that of marking them out, for which the Board will pay a fee to the council. In addition to the matters which I have already mentioned, clause 3 of the Bill provides that every holder of an existing taxi licence which is in force when the new scheme comes into operation will be entitled to a refund or a part of the fee paid for such licence proportionate to the unexpired part of the term of the licence.

Clause 6 excludes taxicabs from certain sections of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1956, and makes the following special provisions apply to them.

Paragraph (*a*).—This provides that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles may register a taxicab for any period not less than one month and not more than twelve months. It is anticipated that all taxicab licences will expire on the same day, and this provision is necessary to enable the Registrar to grant registrations for taxicabs expiring on the same day as their licences.

Paragraph (*b*).—This is a consequential amendment.

Paragraphs (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*).—These paragraphs provide that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles may issue special number plates for taxicabs which, by their distinctive markings, will facilitate the administration of the Act and remove the necessity for the various discs, plates and signs which are at present carried on taxicabs. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has approved a design for the new number plates and has agreed to issue a distinctive registration disc for taxis which will be of great assistance to the board.

Paragraph (*f*).—This paragraph provides that the registration under the Road Traffic

Act of a licensed taxicab shall become void upon the cancellation, suspension or expiration of its taxicab licence. The effect of this will be that in the above circumstances the registration disc may be destroyed, and the number plates recovered by the board, thus providing an effective means of preventing the vehicle from appearing to be a taxicab when in fact it is no longer one.

Paragraphs (*g*) and (*h*) are consequential amendments.

Paragraph (*i*) provides for a refund of registration fee for the owner of a vehicle who, upon taking out a taxicab licence, has to cancel his ordinary registration and obtain a taxicab registration.

Paragraph (*j*) exempts licensed taxicabs from the necessity of obtaining certificates of safety from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Safety inspections will in the future be made by the officers of the board. Taxicabs are also excluded by this paragraph from section 177 of the Road Traffic Act, which requires them to be painted with the name and address of the owner and the weight thereof.

The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has been consulted regarding the amendments in clause 6 and sees no difficulty in the administration of these special provisions for taxicabs.

The amendments to the Act will provide for simplified administration and will eliminate several bad features of the old system of control, in particular, the multiplicity of discs and signs carried by taxicabs, and the necessity for taxi operators to go to various authorities for the right to occupy stands. Another advantage will be the policing of the stands by one authority and the enforcement of one set of regulations in relation to conduct on such stands.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 522.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support the Bill. As a Select Committee will be appointed to examine the Bill, anyone desiring to give evidence on this matter may do so before that committee. I believe the Bill is necessary so that certain powers may be vested in the Renmark Irrigation Trust. I have recently inquired in the Renmark district and been told that the provisions of the Bill are desirable; consequently I do not oppose it.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I, too, support the Bill, the need for which arises from conditions consequent on last year's disastrous River Murray floods. Flood banks had to be placed in certain positions in order to keep the water out and in resiting the banks it was necessary that some be placed so as to do the greatest possible good in saving the settlement in the event of future floods. So far as I can see from a perusal of the original Act, the powers conferred on the trust by this Bill are restricted to the area in which the trust now operates and do not include powers for any other purposes than those envisaged when the original legislation was framed.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Honourable C. S. Hincks and Messrs. Frank Walsh, Bywaters, Hambour, and King; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records and to report on Thursday, October 3.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 522.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—This Bill is unexceptionable. It makes two amendments to the Act, the first being to allow persons who have qualified but not yet received their degrees to practise as veterinary surgeons in the interim. This principle was previously agreed to by the House in the Medical Practitioners Act and could not be argued against. The other amendment is to alter the fees payable to the board. The Auditor-General has pointed out that the fees now payable do not suffice for the board's purposes, and the increase proposed is not such as to raise any great objection. I therefore support the second reading.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I, too, support the second reading. It is a practicable proposal to allow young veterinary surgeons to practise before they have received their degrees. The Minister pointed out that the Medical Practitioners Act had been amended for the same purpose, and as considerable care must have been taken before this was done, because it would affect human beings, I think we can safely apply it to the care of animals. The position regarding veterinary surgeons has been stabilized by the wise administration of the Government and the Veterinary Surgeons Board. The number of veterinary surgeons has increased considerably in the last few years. Instead of having to rely on people who were handy at treating animals but not fully

qualified by university training, farmers now have little difficulty in engaging trained veterinary surgeons, who render fine service. I am pleased at the harmonious relationship between veterinary surgeons employed by the Department of Agriculture and those in private practice. They work well together and there has been a marked increase in their efficiency. Farmers and graziers are reaping the benefit of the wise administration of the Government board and the department.

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

WATER RATES REMISSION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 7. Page 294.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, which will benefit people in my district considerably. Last year I asked several questions about the remission of water rates for people on reclaimed swamp areas, but the answers were somewhat evasive. However, I am pleased that the Minister has taken up this matter with Cabinet and that this Bill will make it possible to remit the water rates of those on Government-owned swamps. Actually, it is only giving those people what in justice they are entitled to. Their properties are lower than river level, so water can be gravitated to their land, and the main service provided is in pumping water off their land. The banks and the channels have to be maintained, so a charge against the settlers is warranted, but this legislation will not apply to their rentals.

The settlers concerned did not receive any service when the Murray flood inundated their properties, so there is every reason to remit the charges payable by them for that period. They usually pay three months in advance, and the Bill provides those who have paid in advance may either receive a refund or a credit against any other account they have with the Government. One unusual feature is that whereas settlers have to pay five per cent interest on their arrears, under this Bill there will be no interest added to the money repaid to them, although the Government may have had it for over 12 months. Generally speaking, there is nothing in the Bill other than giving the settlers something to which they are entitled.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Bill. Mr. Bywaters outlined the need of providing relief to settlers in the flooded swamp areas. As pointed out, there is a difference between the way of getting water in the Upper Murray and in the Lower Murray. In the Upper Murray the water is pumped into channels before reticulation in the irrigation areas, whereas on the reclaimed swamps the water is let on to the land through gates and then drained off into channels and pumped back into the river when not required. This could not take place last year because swamp lands were a number of feet under water. Mr. Bywaters and I asked questions on the matter of remission last year and I am glad that this action is being taken.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the Bill and commend the Government for making this move, which will give much relief to the settlers on areas flooded last year. The Bill is another example of the sympathetic approach the Government has to the problems of River Murray settlers. Following on reports made on this and other matters, the Government has agreed to exercise the powers conferred on it under the Irrigation Act and allow interest to be waived on arrears where hardship has been suffered by the settlers. They will be pleased with the action to be taken under the Bill.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I support the measure because it is necessary in the interests of settlers who experienced disastrous times during the flood. We had the unfortunate spectacle of settlers having their properties completely inundated, yet receiving accounts for water rates. We also saw portions of pipelines under water in some parts being used to supply water for sprinklers on high lands. The Bill does not go far enough. Clause 3 gives the Minister discretionary power to remit the whole or any part of rates payable from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957. Some settlers may be in a similar difficult position next year because of loss of production. Many trees have gone out completely and the settlers may not need water, so the Minister should have power to exercise discretion if, after an investigation, he finds that a settler cannot pay his rates. The Bill provides more or less only temporary relief and the matter should be examined again later. The Minister should have the power to use the discretion should a similar position arise in the future.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Irrigation)—Mr. Stott said that in some cases where trees have been totally destroyed the water rate problem will arise again. If a

case of this sort is brought before the Government there will be no imposition of rates, so the difficulty mentioned by the honourable member will not arise. There has been a similar remission on a previous occasion, but it was not done by legislation. About 1920, I think, an amount was placed on the Estimates for the purpose. Members need have no fears about what the Government will do for the settlers: whatever can be done to assist them will be done.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Remission of water rates."

Mr. STOTT—The Minister has stated that if trees are out of production in an area that area will be declared non-ratable. If, at a later stage, the area is planted with some other crop will it be rated?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 8. Page 301.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—This is a Bill which the Government has introduced as a result of representations made by the Trades and Labor Council; and while we are gratified to see that the Government is at last making an effort to modernize this important legislation, we regret that, as usual, it has not gone nearly far enough in that direction. Except for a slight amendment made in 1940, the Scaffolding Inspection Act has remained unchanged from the time it was passed, as a consolidating Act, in 1934. Even then, it merely incorporated amendments which had been made between 1907 (when the Act was first passed) and 1925, so that one may say the Act has remained practically unchanged since 1925—over 30 years.

In the meantime, however, tremendous changes have taken place in building practice. The large building was the exception when the ideas originally expressed in the Act were dominant, but today larger and larger buildings are being erected and thus the duty of protecting the lives of workmen has become more important and the means of fulfilling this duty more specialized and technical. In general, the Scaffolding Act has not moved forward with the times, and it may not be entirely out of place to suggest that a thorough investigation of the problem, including an examination of the more modern legislation of some of the other States, would be well worth while. Among other things, we feel that the Act should provide for the appointment of properly qualified inspectors and for the employment of certified scaffolders.

One of the arguments the Government has always used in defending the relatively restricted scope of the Act is that it would be too costly to extend its scope, but if by the proper exercise of controls, inspection, etc., we can prevent one fatal accident, the additional expense involved would be justified. In any case, I would point out that the Act provides for the levying of fees, which I understand have not been altered for many years, and perhaps they could be made more realistic. I propose to submit two or three amendments relating to inspectors and scaffolders which have been suggested by my study of the conditions prescribed elsewhere and which the trade union movement wants to have included in the Act.

Before I deal with these matters in detail, however, I would like to refer to a more general matter, namely, the application of the Act itself. This was the subject of the only amendment passed since 1934—that is, the amendment of 1940, under which reference to municipalities and district council areas was removed from section 3 of the Act. About that time the Government discovered that the section had not been drafted widely enough to enable it to proclaim Whyalla as a district to which the Act could be made to apply. Whyalla was neither a municipality nor a district council area. The amendment, of course, did no more than it was intended to do, so that it is still necessary for the Government to proclaim an area before the Act can operate in that area. We think this principle is wrong. There does not seem to be any good reason why the Act should not apply to the whole of the State. As a matter of fact, we have on several occasions endeavoured to persuade the Government to remove the restriction provided in section 3. In 1947, 1948, 1950 and again in 1953 Bills for that purpose were introduced on behalf of the Opposition, but they were all strenuously opposed by the Government and consequently defeated.

I think the idea originally expressed in the restricted application of the Act was that building construction necessitating the use of scaffolding would not take place except in

municipalities and district council areas; and, no doubt, it was considered to be easier from the administrative point of view (and certainly cheaper) to restrict the application of the Act to the more densely populated parts of the State. At best, this section of the Act may be regarded as a means of "catching up" with developments as they arise, but surely it would be better to provide for the same conditions to obtain everywhere, so that there can be no doubt whatever about those conditions. The Scaffolding Inspection Act should apply to all parts of the State, just as other industrial legislation should.

As building operations have become more complex, the risk of accident has become greater, and this makes it all the more important that those employed in erecting or supervising the erection of scaffolding should be competent. But the Act makes no provision regarding the qualifications of scaffolders. As a matter of fact, however, scaffolders are not less important than inspectors; and, as I have said, in some of the other States the relevant Acts or regulations prescribe certain qualifications for both scaffolders and inspectors.

In the regulations made under the New South Wales Scaffolding and Lifts Act the following requirements for scaffolders are set out. In the first place, an applicant for a scaffolder's licence must satisfy the Chief Inspector that he has had at least twelve months' experience in erecting, or assisting to erect, scaffolding for use in building or construction work. In addition, before being licensed, he must pass an oral and practical examination conducted by an inspector on the requirements of the regulations relating to the erection and use of the various types of scaffolding, defects in structural timbers, the use of tubular metal scaffolding and the methods used in the construction of scaffolding. Further, the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the inspector his ability to work and climb at heights.

The Queensland Act provides for a similar recognition of the importance of the work of the scaffolder. A person in charge of the erection or demolition of scaffolding must have been licensed to act in that capacity. Regulation 23 pursuant to section 13 of the Act prescribes the following conditions under which a person may be licensed:—Every candidate for examination for a licence as a scaffolder shall prove to the satisfaction of the Chief Inspector that he has been engaged for at least twelve months in that class of work and that he possesses a sound knowledge of the following subjects:—(*a*) Strength of scaffolding and gear; (*b*) the safe load to put on any scaffolding; (*c*) the different kinds of timbers used in the construction of scaffolding; (*d*) the different methods used in the construction of scaffolding; (*e*) the sizes of timbers required for the erection of scaffolding according to the regulations. I propose to move amendments to the Bill which, if accepted, will enable the Government to make regulations similar to those I have quoted.

In reference to the appointment of inspectors, the Bill proposes to relax the requirements now prescribed in the Act. Instead of insisting on four years' experience in the work of erecting and dismantling scaffolding, etc., the Bill will enable the Government to appoint "suitable" persons as inspectors. I don't know how far this proposed change has been dictated by the dearth of properly qualified persons or how far that has been due to any lack of encouragement that the Government might have offered to potential applicants for appointment; but, on the face of it, the Government's decision is a retrograde step. If anything, the qualifications required should be higher than those implied in the existing provision.

In this connection, I would also like to refer to the Queensland provisions. Section 27 of the Act provides that the Governor in Council "may from time to time make regulations for all or any of the following purposes"—including "the qualifications of inspectors and requiring that before appointment they shall give, by competitive examination, satisfactory evidence of their competency."

Regulation 22, made pursuant to this section, prescribes the following:—

Every candidate for appointment to the position of Inspector of Scaffolding shall be required to comply with the following conditions:—

(*a*) produce satisfactory evidence of his respectability of character;
(*b*) produce satisfactory references in evidence of his experience and competency as a tradesman covering at least seven years since serving his apprenticeship in the building trade;
(*c*) produce a medical certificate that he is not suffering from any infirmity or any affection of the heart likely to interfere with the efficient discharge of his duties;
(*d*) he must be a British subject;
(*e*) he shall pass an examination to the satisfaction of the Chief Inspector to show he possesses the following qualifications:—
(1) a sound knowledge of the Act and these regulations;

(2) a thorough knowledge of all materials used in connection with scaffolding or gear;
(3) ability to construct and to erect various kinds of scaffolding used in connection with building or structural operations;
(4) a sound knowledge of elementary mathematics;
(5) ability to make a good freehand sketch or working drawing of any kind of scaffolding required;
(6) he must obtain 60 per cent of the total number of marks allotted.

I would also point out that Regulation 8 under the New South Wales Act provides that the qualifications of Chief Inspector and every inspector shall be determined by the Public Service Board.

We think an inspector should have had at least two years' experience in scaffolding work, and I propose to move an amendment providing for that minimum period and also for regulation-making powers similar to those mentioned in connection with the employment of qualified scaffolders. What does it matter whether, in the opinion of the Public Service Commissioner, a prospective inspector of scaffolding lacks certain scholastic qualifications, so long as he has a sound practical knowledge of what is required in the erection of scaffolding? Clause 3 (*d*) states:—

At the end of the definition of "scaffolding" the following passage is inserted:—In this definition the word "workmen" means any persons working for reward on scaffolding whether as employees, contractors or sub-contractors.

I have had practical experience of the working of this legislation and know that some sub-contractors have not adequate scaffolding to carry out certain work. Further, the contractor, who is responsible for notifying the Chief Inspector that he intends to erect a building where scaffolding will be needed, may have removed his scaffolding from the site when the sub-contractor is ready to start. In the past that sub-contractor has not been covered, but he will be adequately covered by the definition of "workmen." Section 5 of the principal Act states:—

The Governor may appoint one inspector, and such acting or assistant inspectors as he may think fit, to carry out the provisions of this Act. No person shall be appointed as aforesaid unless he has had at least four years' experience in the erection of scaffolding.

That section is repealed by clause 4, but that clause provides no safeguard similar to that contained in the existing section. The Opposition will move an amendment to provide the necessary safeguard in this respect. A man with a detailed knowledge of scaffolding requirements may not have the necessary scholastic qualifications to pass the test set by the Public Service Commissioner, and he will therefore be overlooked.

Today tubular steel scaffolding is taking the place of timber scaffolding, but there are many pitfalls in the use of the former if it is not up to the required standard. Clause 8 amends section 11, which provides for the general powers of inspectors and refers to the requirements of the regulations in the second schedule. This amendment is of major importance and will be of considerable benefit to workmen if it is administered wisely. It is fair that the Chief Inspector should give notification in writing, but the main consideration should be the safety of those employed on constructional work. Often the workmen have to climb a ladder with a torch in hand to do welding, but no scaffolding has been erected. These workmen may also be in danger from cranes that are swinging overhead. Perhaps the contractor has completed his part of the building, but a sub-contractor may then come along to insert the glass in the windows, but without erecting any scaffolding.

A serious accident occurred on the building being erected at the corner of Pirie Street and King William Street, and it could have proved fatal. The scaffold had been erected on the inside and the bricklayers were doing their work over hand, which is permissible, but then the masons came along to fix the marble veneer on the outside facade. It was therefore necessary to provide a swinging scaffold, which can be adjusted according to the height of the work. Normally, a swinging scaffold affords security to the workmen, and that type of scaffold should have been used on the building that was erected at the corner of Franklin Street and Victoria Square because much of the work should have been done from the outside, but was done by the men hanging over from the inside. They could not do their work as efficiently or as safely as they could have done it by using a proper scaffold. I do not know whether the Act has been administered properly. Before tubular scaffolding came into common use it was not unusual for inspectors to tell a contractor that some of the scaffold poles were only good for firewood and must not be used again. Sometimes these scaffold poles were broken up to ensure that they would not be used again, and the contractors were

told not to use some of their ropes or other gear if they were unsafe.

The department has not had enough scaffolding inspectors. One safeguard is that if a person has to climb a ladder to reach a landing the ladder shall extend at least four feet above the height of the landing, but such provisions are not always observed today. The Government should prosecute those who do not meet their obligations. Most of the best scaffolders have had much experience as builders' labourers, for they can tell whether a scaffold is safe and what load it will carry. Is it because some of these men do not possess the educational attainments required by the Public Service Commissioner that we are short of scaffolding inspectors? At the appropriate stage the Opposition will move amendments to improve the legislation. It is becoming even more important to apply the legislation to the whole State. For instance, silos are being erected throughout the State for the bulk handling of grain, and many of them will be erected in places where the Act does not apply. I support the second reading and hope that the Opposition's amendments will be carried.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the Bill. I have asked questions on the Scaffolding Inspection Act for the past three or four years, and I have stressed that it is not obligatory on a contractor or a subcontractor to erect scaffolding.

Mr. John Clark—Does the Bill provide for that?

Mr. LAWN—No, but I assume that the Government believes that one provision meets the objections I have been raising for some years. However, it falls far short of what should be done. Explaining the Bill the Minister said:—

> Its object is to supplement the measures which have already been taken by the Government, for securing a higher degree of safety for workmen employed in building operations. New regulations respecting tubular scaffolding have recently been gazetted and improvements made in the administration. The scaffolding legislation, however, which is contained in the Scaffolding Inspecton Act of 1934 is not satisfactory.

There have been many attempts by the Opposition to improve the Act, but they have been rejected by the Government. Now the Minister admits that the scaffolding legislation is not satisfactory. I have repeatedly stated that it is not obligatory on contractors to erect scaffolding for section 6 states:—

> Any person intending to erect any scaffolding or hoisting appliance shall, at least 24 hours before commencing to erect the same, give notice in writing to the inspector of his intention and shall at the time of giving notice as aforesaid, pay the prescribed fee.

That is one of the most important sections of the Act, but it refers only to persons who intend to erect scaffolding. It is clear that there is nothing to enforce the erection of scaffolding. Last year I drew the Government's attention to the fact that a building was being erected in Victoria Square without any scaffolding. One workman lost his life, but if scaffolding had been provided he might be alive today. He fell from the building, and because there was no scaffolding he landed on a temporary verandah that was erected just above the footpath. The Premier also said:—

> This Act is a consolidation of several Acts, the principal of which was passed in 1907, and they are characterized by limitations and deficiencies which considerably reduce their usefulness in present day conditions. The present Bill is designed to remedy the defects of the present law.

The Government is trying to secure a higher degree of safety for workers in building operations but greater safety measures should be provided so that it will be compulsory for scaffolding to be erected when new structures of over a certain height are built. Clause 8 deals with the general powers of inspectors. The Government apparently feels that scaffolding should be erected on jobs where it would not have been erected in the past, so this power is given to the inspectors. I am not altogether satisfied. The Premier said:—

> Clause 8 provides for a substantial extension of the scope of the principal Act. At present the Act and the regulations are restricted to ensuring the safety of men working on or in connection with scaffolding. But if men engaged in building operations are not working on scaffolding or gear or appliances connected therewith, there is nothing in the Act to require that any safety precautions shall be taken. It is proposed in clause 8 to enable inspectors to give directions for safety precautions in any case where men engaged in building operations are working in a place where they are exposed to risk of injury from falling or from being struck by moving material whether or not any scaffolding is erected.

I do not know whether this action is being taken as the result of my representations on the matter but I am glad that there is a move to give power to officials to see that there is some scaffolding. The proposal will improve the position, but it does not go far enough. Last session I pointed out that a new building in King William Street had no scaffolding, whereas one in Grenfell Street had a swinging type. Following on these remarks the King William Street job had scaffolding erected.

All new buildings in the city should have scaffolding of some sort: probably the swinging type would be the best because it could be easily altered to the required height. Section 4 of the Act says:—

"Scaffolding" means any structure or framework of timbers, planks, or other material used or intended to be used for the support of workmen in erecting, demolishing, altering, repairing, cleaning, painting or carrying on any other kind of work in connection with any building, structure, ship, or boat, and any swinging stage used or intended to be used for any of the purposes aforesaid; but does not include any steps and planks, and trestles and planks, usually used for painting, paper hanging, and decorating and for riveting iron.

After starting off with a fair definition of "scaffolding" the section states it does not include a number of things. I do not know why decorators, painters and rivetters should be excluded from any scaffolding provisions. The Opposition will endeavour to improve the position and I hope the Government will accept our amendments.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On behalf of Mr. O'Halloran, and at his request, I move—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it has power to consider provisions relating to scaffolders and to the extension of the operation of the principal Act.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Bill recommitted.

(Continued from August 28. Page 501.)

Clause 4—"What constitutes continuous service"—reconsidered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move—

To delete from paragraph (*b*) the words "for not more than 15 consecutive working days"; and in subclause (2) after the letter "(*b*)" to insert "of subsection (1) of this section not exceeding 15 working days in any year of service and the period of any such absence as mentioned in paragraph."

If a worker is absent from his employment owing to illness not arising out of that employment—such as mumps or a broken leg—then only 15 consecutive days of his absence will count towards his entitlement for long service leave, but on the other hand absence for a longer period will not break his continuity of service for the purpose of long service leave.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This clause had caused the Government considerable concern. Whilst it is more generous than similar provisions in other States it could have some unfortunate circumstances associated with it. The amendments provide that absence for 15 consecutive days will not only not exclude a worker from long service leave, but will count as part of his service. Any period exceeding 15 days will not count as service, but will not affect his continuity of service. It will be possible for a workman to be absent for four months and his continuity of service to be maintained. The amendments improve the legislation and I support them.

Mr. LAWN—I support the first suggestion, but not the remainder. The Government was so quick to agree to these amendments that it leaves no doubt that the Bill was framed inadvisedly.

Mr. Shannon—What does the New South Wales legislation provide in this respect?

Mr. LAWN—It provides certain exceptions to which I referred when this matter was debated earlier. If a workman under the New South Wales Act is away through sickness or accident—whether or not the accident occurred at work—there is no break in his continuity of service. At present an employer can legally dispense with an employee's services if he is absent from work through sickness more often than he is at work. Employers have the legal right—and have exercised it—to discontinue an employee's service without giving reasons. I suggest there is no necessity for the second part of the amendments. Under paragraph (*a*) provision is made for a worker to be absent from work for any cause by leave of the employer. An employer may permit a man to be absent from work for any purpose and that man still remains in his employment and his rights to long service leave are not affected. There should be no break in continuity of service when a workman is away through an injury arising from his employment. In other States—and in South Australia when a worker is employed by the Commonwealth—an employee is entitled to workmen's compensation if he is injured going to and returning from his employment. Unfortunately such a provision does not apply in South Australia, except that he is covered if he is conveyed in his employer's vehicle or in a vehicle hired by the employer. If he is using his own vehicle and is injured he is outside the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act and could be excluded from long

service leave. The more we consider this legislation the more obvious it becomes that the Leader's suggestion should have been adopted and the Bill withdrawn and redrafted.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Clause 4 (1) (*g*) refers to the standing down of a worker on account of slackness of trade. In the industry with which I have been associated for many years, in the pre-war period there were times of slackness of trade. If a worker is employed for seven years or more and then stood down for four or five months, is he entitled to claim continuity of employment? This might also be the case in other seasonal occupations.

Mr. COUMBE—I support Mr. Millhouse's amendment, which will enable a number of men, otherwise not qualified, to qualify for long service leave.

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move:—

In subclause (4) to strike out "three" and insert "two."

This will make the period in the subclause uniform with that in subclause (1) (*f*).

Mr. LAWN—Bad as this Bill is, this amendment makes it worse. An employer may not be able to keep an apprentice on after he has completed his articles, and three months would be preferable to two months as a period during which the employer can find a position for him without jeopardizing his continuity of service. The New South Wales Act provides for six months. I see no reason why three months should not remain in this subclause, although I do not consider it adequate. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I cannot understand why Mr. Millhouse desires this amendment. He speaks of uniformity, but it is not a question of uniformity because various periods are prescribed by other clauses. The circumstances associated with apprenticeship are different from those applying to journeymen. The apprentice may reach the age at which his articles expire and his employer's business might be disorganized if he were compelled to continue to employ the lad. If the employer is given a reasonable time he may be able to place the erstwhile apprentice, and the period in this subclause should remain at three months, although I would like to see it longer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—At times I have a great respect for the views of Mr. Lawn and Mr. Fred Walsh. I realize that the hands of members opposite are tied on this legislation: they can do nothing but beat the air by talking. I am always willing to help a lame dog over a stile and in this case I think the Australian Labor Party is very lame indeed. That being so, I ask leave of the Committee to withdraw my amendment so that I may move another to provide for three months instead of two months in subclause (1) (*f*). This will achieve uniformity and perhaps show members opposite my good faith in moving the amendment. It should also meet the objections so ably raised by members opposite.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn. Clause as previously amended passed.

Clause 6—"Right to long service leave"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move to add the following subclause after subclause (2):—

(3) For the purposes of this Act—

(*a*) if a worker has completed seven years' continuous service with his employer at any time not later than the first day of July, 1957, the period of twelve calendar months commencing on the said first day of July shall be deemed to be his eighth year of service;

(*b*) if a worker has completed or completes seven years' continuous service with his employer at any time after the first day of July, 1957, the period of twelve calendar months commencing on the day after such completion shall be deemed to be his eighth year of service.

This amendment clarifies the position concerning the commencement of the legislation. Where a worker has completed seven years' continuous service the Bill will operate retrospectively to the beginning of this financial year. This will have some advantage both to employers and employees. The Bill will operate somewhat earlier than it would if we relied on the usual provision that it shall operate on proclamation by the Governor.

Mr. JENKINS—The Victor Harbour Corporation employs about 20 men under a Federal award which prescribes that they shall contribute to a superannuation fund, but they cannot have long service leave if they are under a superannuation scheme.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 10a—"Continuance of benefits during leave."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move to insert the following new clause:—

10a. (1) Where an employer, as part of a worker's ordinary remuneration, provides for the worker or members of his family any benefits being board, sustenance, lodging or the use of land or premises, the employer shall if the

worker so requests continue to provide such benefits for the worker or such members during any period while the worker is on leave under this Act.

(2) An employer who fails to comply with this section shall be guilty of an offence.

This clause deals with the rights of persons who receive, in addition to a wage, some privileges such as board and lodging. It will ensure that such an employee shall continue to receive board and lodging during his leave.

Mr. DAVIS—I am concerned about a man who normally receives his keep. When he is on leave he should receive the monetary value of his board and lodging in addition to his wages.

Mr. HEASLIP—An employee might elect to live on the premises during his leave. If his leave had accumulated to three months the employer might find it necessary to employ someone else in that period, and he would have to provide another residence. Under the new clause has the employer the right to pay his regular employee an amount in lieu of providing a residence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The new clause merely provides that if an employee gets board and lodging in addition to his wages he may continue to get board and lodging during his leave. Leave can only accumulate if the employer so decides. It would not be worth while for an employer to put an employee out of his residence for several weeks.

Mr. Lawn—What is the position if an employee goes away on long service leave?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The amendment provides that if an employee is on long service leave he shall be entitled to his usual board and lodging if he desires to stay on the premises. If he goes away that is his own business.

Mr. LAWN—A hotel employee receives a certain wage, less a certain amount for board and lodging, but what is the position if he goes away on long service leave? If an amount is deducted for board and lodging the position is absurd. Such a worker in New South Wales would receive payment in lieu of board and lodging while on leave. Under our legislation the employee would receive full payment for a fortnight's annual leave, but for his one week's long service leave he would get less because board and lodging would be deducted.

Mr. DAVIS—If the employer provides board and lodging he is allowed a deduction from his income tax, and the employee has to include the value of his board and lodging in his income. According to the Premier's explanation the employer would still benefit by being allowed to include board and lodging in his income tax return, but the employee would be penalized because he would still be liable to taxation on it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—From what I can gather, the members for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) and Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) are referring to the gross amount of a man's weekly wage. I think the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) knows that awards for people who live in contain provisions for certain specific allowances, so it would not be difficult to aggregate the gross amount to which the employee is entitled.

Mr. Lawn—Does not this Act over-ride any award?

Mr. HAMBOUR—It does not deal with the amount of wages employees receive. The nursing profession has always received board and lodging, and when nurses go on holidays the value of board and lodging is added to the amount they ordinarily receive. This clause ensures that employees will not be penalized. If a person receives £10 a week and keep, and his keep is valued at £2 16s., his actual wages during his absence are £12 16s. In industries where board and lodging is provided by the employer a specific amount is set out for its value.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I fail to see the matter in the same light as my colleagues, the members for Port Pirie and Adelaide. Although I am opposed to the Bill on principle, I can see no objection to this clause. I am quite happy that this shall be at the workers' request. In the determination relating to hotel employees a certain amount has to be deducted for board and for 21 meals a week, but if the employee does not have meals on the premises on his days off he shall be paid a certain amount in lieu thereof. I think that is what is intended in this clause. If an employee goes away he must be paid the full award rate without any deductions for accommodation or meals. I do not think anything that could be done under this Bill would alter the provisions of the award. I am quite happy with subclause (2), which makes an employer guilty of an offence if he does not comply with the provisions of the section.

Mr. LAWN—I am pleased at the attitude adopted by the member for Light (Mr. Hambour), which shows that he is in full accord with the submissions I made. I appreciate that awards provide for wages, hours, annual leave and so on, but I think the

member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) has overlooked the fact that long service leave will be governed by this Bill. Legislation of this sort was the subject of litigation before the High Court and Privy Council, both of which said that it was valid. The Bill will provide power to grant long service leave, and I feel that it will govern the conditions of that leave. If the members for West Torrens and Light are correct, why do other State Parliaments feel it is necessary to include a provision that payment at ordinary time includes an amount for board and lodging? If ordinary pay included all the things mentioned in the award or determination new clause 10a would not be necessary. How would we view argument by counsel that Parliament did not mean the provision to continue if the employee on leave went away from his usual place of employment? If Parliament intends that board and lodging should be continued to be paid it should be stated, but the Premier says the provision will apply only to the employee who continues to live at his usual place of residence. Under such a provision we are depriving an employee of wages that should be due to him. If he does not continue to occupy the premises of the employer he should not be subject to any deduction for board and lodging.

Mr. QUIRKE—Some workers are not covered by the Industrial Code. This Bill says that "worker" means a person employed under a contract of service, so that would cover any contract of service, whether or not the employee was under the Industrial Code. The basic wage today is £12 11s. a week. Some rural workers get, say, £10 in cash and board and lodging, butter, milk, firewood and so on, which is supposed to make up the remuneration to the amount of the basic wage. If such an employee goes on long service leave, what is he paid for the week?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—He is paid his usual wage, plus all the things to which he is entitled under the agreement with the employer.

Mr. Quirke—He gets a cash value for them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. He will continue to get them. If an employee gets £10 a week, plus these other things, and goes on long service leave he gets the £10 plus the other things.

Mr. Hambour—What if he goes away on a holiday?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The house will still be in his possession and he will still have the extra things due to him.

Mr. Hambour—What about keep?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It will still be available to him. Everything available to him normally will be available to him during the week on long service leave.

Mr. DAVIS—It would be unfair for an employee to go on long service leave and lose about £2 a week, the value of the concessions he usually gets. There should be a provision for him to receive whilst he is away the equivalent of those concessions in money. If he does go away how can he get these usual concessions? The Premier's remarks deal with families but there are thousands of single men working on farms who occupy a room, and whilst they are away on long service leave they will have to pay the rent, but whatever is charged for keep should be paid to them.

New clause 10a inserted.

Clause 4—"What constitutes continuous service"—reconsidered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move—

In subclause (1) (*f*) to delete "two" and insert "three".

As I explained when seeking leave to withdraw my earlier amendment, I am doing this simply to help the Opposition meet their objective.

Mr. Davis—Champion of the workers!

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is exactly right. This Party represents all sections of the community, including the workers. We are not ashamed to improve a measure like this for the benefit of a section of the community which, for some unknown reason, the Party opposite claims solely to represent. My amendment will make for uniformity, which was the objective of my original amendment.

Mr. LAWN—In case the honourable member misunderstands the position I want to make it clear that this amendment does not meet the wishes of the Opposition. The honourable member cannot speak on behalf of the Opposition or the working people.

Mr. Heaslip—Then move your own amendment.

Mr. LAWN—Now even the supporters of the Government are treating this Bill as a joke. The Bill was recommitted to consider altering "three months" to "two months" in respect of apprentices, but the Committee decided not to do that. The Opposition did not suggest uniformity either on two months or three, but on six months. As to whether or not members opposite represent the workers, they had a good answer last Saturday. This was about the only thing that the Premier dangled before the electors of Wallaroo, and the people told him just what they thought of it—

the biggest majority against the Government for many years. We do not want either two months or three, but six.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I support the amendment. The member for Mitcham, in the first instance, wished to alter three months to two months in subclause (4) as regards apprentices. When members opposite objected to that he said, "Well, uniformity is what I want" and he asked for a recommittal in order to bring it about by increasing the two months in subclause 1 (*f*) to three months. What could be fairer? He did it purely to meet the wishes of the Committee and in doing so has proved his good faith. He did it also because obviously members opposite are unable to move amendments.

Mr. John Clark—We moved a comprehensive amendment right at the outset.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I think it correct to say that members opposite are not permitted to move amendments to this Bill. Now they say they want six months, but we cannot again ask for a recommittal, so I suggest that the Committee support the member for Mitcham and make it three months all round. It is a reasonable compromise.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

On the motion for the third reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I oppose the third reading.

The SPEAKER—Order! Before the honourable member for Edwardstown continues this debate I advise members that the debate on the third reading must be restricted to the contents of the Bill. There is not the same scope as on the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—From the outset the Opposition indicated that this Bill did not provide for real long service leave. The Leader of the Opposition said:—

> We oppose the Bill not only because it is not a long service leave Bill but also because it will, if passed, very considerably retard the progress we hope to make towards achieving a scheme of true long service leave.

On August 20 the Leader spoke on the second reading. I consulted your list, Mr. Speaker, as to who was to follow him, but was amazed when I returned to the Chamber after a short absence to discover the member for Adelaide speaking. That indicated to me that by hook or by crook this Bill, according to the Premier, had to pass the second reading stage by 4 p.m. that day. The position became embarrassing because it was obviously the Government's attitude that the second reading should be passed without any debate. Five members of the Opposition followed the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER—Order! The debate on the third reading must be limited to the contents of the Bill—the Bill which has been reported to the Chair by the Chairman of Committees. I ask the honourable member to restrict his remarks to it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—What constitutes long service leave? According to this Bill it may be granted after seven years' continuous service. This Bill obviously does not provide for what is normally regarded as long service leave, particularly when compared with Public Service long service leave. Whilst the Bill provides for one week's leave after a seven-year period of employment the Public Service Act provides for 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years. Why should there be any difference between public servants and ordinary workers? Public servants are excluded from the provisions of this legislation. On August 20 there was no mention of the importance of passing the second reading without Government members participating in the debate. Everybody knows that accredited representatives of the trade union movement waited on the Premier—

The SPEAKER—Order! I have pointed out to the honourable member that the debate on the third reading is restricted to certain matters. In his book, *Parliamentary Practice*, Erskine May states that the procedure on the third reading is similar to that described for debates on the second reading but the debate is more restricted at the later stage, being limited to the matters contained in the Bill. I stress again that members who speak on the third reading must confine their remarks to the matters contained in the Bill.

Mr. RICHES—On a point of order, Sir, would you explain whether that ruling is given purely on practice in another Parliament and not based on our own Standing Orders. If it is based on our own Standing Orders, could you indicate which Standing Orders? I submit that under our own Standing Orders there is no differentiation between debate on the second reading and on the third reading.

The SPEAKER—Standing Order No. 1 provides that the practice of the House of Commons is to be followed where there is no specific provision in our Standing Orders, and that practice has always been followed.

Mr. RICHES—I submit that the Standing Orders governing second reading debate is exactly the same as that governing the debate on the third reading.

The SPEAKER—The practice followed here is the practice of the House of Commons. There is no specific provision regarding the rule of debate, and in such a case the practice of the House of Commons is followed. Debate is allowed on the third reading, but it is restricted to the contents of the Bill as reported by the Chairman of Committees to the House.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I take it from your ruling, Sir, that I am not even permitted at this stage to refer to the manner in which this Bill was founded before it was introduced into Parliament. What I intended to say was that certain conferences appeared to have been held between representatives—

The SPEAKER—Order! I have pointed out to the honourable member that he cannot refer to those matters. He can refer to the contents of the Bill as it is now before the House. I think the honourable member will appreciate that the Bill has been fully debated by members on the second reading, and at this stage I cannot allow any further debate not relevant to the contents of the Bill.

Mr. RICHES—For the protection of members' rights in the future, I would like this matter cleared up. I recognize that it is the practice, as stated in Standing Order No. 1, that where there is no specific provision this House follows the practice of the House of Commons. However, I submit that we are governed by our own Standing Orders, under which the debate on the second reading is the same as that on the third reading. It is not a question of Standing Orders not applying because they do apply to this matter, and the Standing Order governing the third reading (No. 325) is in exactly the same terms as the one governing the second reading (No. 295).

The SPEAKER—Standing Order No. 295 says that the Bill shall be read a second time. Standing Order No. 325 deals with the third reading, but does not deal with the ramifications of the debate, and that is a matter of practice. This House follows the practice of the House of Commons, pursuant to Standing Order No. 1 and the debate on the third reading of the Bill is restricted to the contents of the Bill itself. That is made quite clear by the indisputable authority of Erskine May in his *Parliamentary Practice.* I repeat that the debate must be restricted to the contents of the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—With regard to that important clause 6, if I were not in Parliament I could probably conclude my speech in a few words, but in Parliamentary language I say that this is not a long service leave Bill as long service leave is understood by people who have been engaged in industry over a number of years. It is the merits of long service leave that I am concerned with, and I say that long service leave should be awarded in the same way that the Public Service Act awards it to public servants. Clause 6 is not consistent with the wording of the Public Service Act governing the granting of long service leave. The person who is engaged in industry is surely entitled to something better than one week's extra leave after seven years' service. The Bill provides that the leave may be accumulated, but it also provides that an extra week's payment may be taken during the year the leave is due. Members on this side cannot agree to the Bill, which merely gives an extra week's leave to the worker who has been with the same firm for seven years or more. What about the person who has been engaged in industry as an apprentice and has been promoted because of his efficiency? Is an embargo to be placed on his right to long service leave? Should his loyal service be compensated for merely by a cheque for an extra week's pay each year?

Why are Government workers exempted from the provisions of the Bill? Was the period of seven years stipulated merely because it approximates the five years that a Government daily paid worker must serve before becoming entitled to an extra week's annual leave? Those workers also enjoy 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years' continuous service, so where is the consistency in the Government's attitude? Were the desires of the trade union movement considered when this legislation was framed? When he received a deputation from the trade union movement the Premier apparently recognized the desirability of harmony in industry and the importance of long service leave in achieving that end. I believe that, when that conference was arranged—

The SPEAKER—I pointed out earlier that the honourable member could not refer to those matters but must confine his remarks to the Bill. I ask him to bow to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am sorry my enthusiasm led me astray. In referring to clause 6, Mr. O'Halloran said that the Labor Party stood for long service leave in its true sense and that since the issue was really that of long service leave he had moved that the Bill be withdrawn—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member is again departing from my ruling by referring to something that is not in the Bill. I ask him to confine his remarks to the contents of the Bill and not to delve into the history leading up to its introduction.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I conclude on this note: the real essence of the Bill is contained in clause 6, which provides for one week's leave after seven years' continuous service. In Committee it was decided that the legislation shall come into operation as from July 1, 1957. I would not have opposed this legislation if it had provided for 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years' service.

Mr. FRED WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 4, at 2 p.m.