

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 25, 1957.

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

QUESTIONS.**FEED BARLEY SHORTAGE.**

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of last week concerning feed barley?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received the following letter from the General Manager of the Australian Barley Board:—

I acknowledge receipt of your secretary's letter passing on a copy of *Hansard* for 18th September, from which I have noted the question submitted by Mr. Bywaters and your reply. The board cannot be expected to know from whence a demand for feed barley may come, and it has adopted the principle of keeping supplies of barley for feeding purposes at strategic points throughout the State. Although the Murray Bridge barley has been sold, the board have retained stocks at Coomandook, which is a station not far removed from the Murray Bridge area. You will be interested to know that the whole of the balance of the barley from the 1956-57 season's crop has been disposed of.

The reply from the Barley Board follows closely that which I gave the honourable member in the first instance concerning the board's general policy. Although it has not retained stocks at Murray Bridge, it has retained them at strategic points which it is expected will meet the needs of the people. I am informed further that the board, as a matter of policy, is for the moment holding back feed barley from export because of the abnormalities of the present season.

NEW UNLEY BOYS HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Can the Minister of Education say whether tenders have been called for the erection of the new Unley Boys High School, and if not, when will they be?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Architect-in-Chief expects that tenders will be called for either late in November or early in December.

ROAD TRANSPORT PERMIT.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Permission was recently given for a six months trial of the transport of stock by road between Eyre Peninsula and the mainland. Will the Premier seek to have this period extended as the present period will end in January, which because of possible adverse seasonal conditions threatens to be a critical time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The trial period of six months was designed not as a limitation period, but to see whether the plan envisaged would work out satisfactorily. As far as I have heard, it has worked satisfactorily, the proposals have been supported in the district, and there has been no unfavourable reaction to the plan. Under those circumstances I think the Government will favour a continuance of the plan, but I will submit the question to the Transport Control Board.

RECLAIMED AREAS WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. BYWATERS—During last year's River Murray flood the properties of vegetable growers around Purnong and Walker's Flat were inundated, but now conditions have been reversed, for the water has receded and the landholders are finding it difficult to pump enough water from the lagoons to irrigate their land. As they contribute large quantities of vegetables to the East End Market, this difficulty could result in a reduction of those supplies. Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether the pool level can be raised to assist these people who water from lagoons? I understand there are a number of them, not only in the lower reaches, but also in other places.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will get a report and see whether anything can be done to assist the settlers in those two localities.

NEW NORWOOD HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Minister of Education a further reply to my question of August 6 concerning the availability and price of additional land for the new Norwood High School?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Some information has been obtained and negotiations are still in progress. As soon as I hear anything further I shall be pleased to let the honourable member know.

MURRAY BRIDGE RAILWAY STOP.

Mr. BYWATERS—Last year I asked that houses be built at Murray Bridge for flood victims. Some houses are nearing completion there and I believe some will be occupied over the week-end. As these are some distance from the Murray Bridge railway station, but adjacent to the Cypress Terrace railway crossing, will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, whether passenger trains could stop at the crossing to pick up and set down passengers?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will direct that question to my colleague, who will have to take it up with the Railways Commissioner. I point out, however, that under the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act the Commissioner alone can decide such issues as the working of trains and it will be for him, not the Minister, to decide this issue.

FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT AT MOUNT CRAWFORD.

Mr. LAUCKE—A recent article by the Conservator of Forests (Mr. B. H. Bednall) stressed the importance of protecting forest plantations against the ravages of fire. Although Mount Crawford forest reserve has one very good fire fighting unit it is felt that a single unit, which also has to serve the Kersbrook reserve, is inadequate for the control of fires. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider providing additional firefighting equipment there?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will call for a report.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 702.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—The general approach by members to this matter has centred around the question of whether a five-day working week for bank officers would be detrimental to the public interest and cause any great inconvenience to the public. This is not just a theoretical question because we have had experience in the past of bank officers working precisely the same hours as other people. First I shall deal with the attitude of the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins), who put forward the argument that the tourist trade at Victor Harbour is such that it is necessary for banks to open on Saturdays. On that argument the banks should be open all the week-end because probably the greatest number of tourists are there on Saturday afternoon and Sundays; but I do not think anyone would agree that that was a reasonable suggestion.

If shops and banks were open seven days a week and 12 hours a day some people would still want to do their business during any of those hours. A small shopkeeper I know of opens on Christmas morning for an hour to suit the convenience of people who may wish to purchase certain commodities, and he has said that during that hour some people come in with

an order for a week's groceries. Mr. Jenkins' argument that banks should remain open at Victor Harbour on Saturday mornings to suit the convenience of tourists is not tenable. I listened with interest to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), particularly on what he considered was the most powerful argument in favour of the Bill. He said:—

In the propaganda for a five-day week one of the strongest arguments on the surface has been, how did industry get on when it worked a 5½ day week? It is said that workers were able to transact their business at that time when the banks were open for the same period, and we have been asked why they cannot do so if the banks enjoyed a five-day week.

The honourable member recognized the strongest argument in favour of the Bill. In other words, when there was a 5½ day week for both bank officers and other employees, the arrangement was quite satisfactory and nobody suggested then that the bank officers should work a 6-day week to suit the convenience of the general public. He continued:—

That argument is fallacious when we realize that one of the reasons advanced by the workers for the introduction of a five-day week as opposed to a 5½ day week was so that they could transact their business and do their shopping on Saturday mornings. It may interest members opposite to know that in the Five-day Week Case the workers of Whyalla and Iron Knob advanced five reasons why they should have a five-day week. Their second reason was the inability of members working 44 hours in 5½ days, plus necessary overtime, to transact their business and shopping.

The honourable member, in making that comparison, was dealing with something quite different from existing conditions because the workers in Whyalla and Iron Knob were working a 44-hour, not a 40-hour week. Moreover, most of them were working at least six hours' overtime regularly, so they were finding some difficulty in doing their shopping. We are not talking about shopping in this Bill, but about banking. The honourable member did not elaborate on this argument, but I shall give some particulars that are quite relevant. In the voluminous evidence tendered in that case the word "banking" was not mentioned more than three or four times, and the union, in presenting their case to the court, did not emphasize the importance of banks being kept open on Saturday mornings. I am familiar with that case because I was a witness, and if the honourable member will read the transcript he will find that the question of banking on Saturday morning was a minor one. He put forward a very weak argument on that point, and it was put forward in rebuttal of

what he said was the strongest reason for the introduction of a five-day week for bank officers.

When workers generally were working a six-day week no one suggested that bank officers should work on a Sunday on that account so as to suit the convenience of the public. The crux of the matter is that it was satisfactory to everybody when banking officers worked the same hours as other people in the community. I have heard members speak on this proposal as though its acceptance would cause a radical upheaval of trade, but that cannot be accepted. The five-day working week for bank officers has worked satisfactorily in Tasmania, and some parts of United States of America, Canada and New Zealand. There is much evidence that the matter can be satisfactorily arranged and banking business carried on to everybody's convenience. Reverting to the inquiry at Whyalla, witnesses pointed out that the banking of the workers in the area was done by their wives during the week, or arrangements were made for their money to be paid into the bank by the company. Facilities for banking were provided at the single men's quarters. It has been admitted that in the city and suburbs banking facilities are becoming more widespread, and if necessary, they could be increased. I support the Bill.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I oppose the Bill. I have always believed that Saturday morning trading was a blessing for country people who could not get into the town on Friday. Much banking business is done in Mount Gambier on Saturday morning and the opening of banks on that day has been a great help to the workers, whom I have always represented. They have never had better representation at Mount Gambier than they are getting now. Some people are never satisfied and if the banks were closed on Saturday morning they would want more. We are all entitled to a banking service on a Saturday morning. When people commence work at a bank they know they must work that morning. We must cater for people who cannot do their banking on Friday.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I have not been approached by the bank officers. The information I have has been gained from discussions I have initiated, and the people to whom I spoke showed a reasonable attitude. Some of them hope the Bill will be defeated; others hope it will be passed. What I put to

them they accepted as my opinion. It is difficult to please everybody. It is unfortunate that some bank officers approached Parliament for the closing of banks on Saturday morning, whilst others approached the court. If they miss out here their weight will be thrown behind the court application. If they succeed here the court application will be purposeless. Everybody should work as long as he can in a day, for this is a growing country. Neither the court nor Parliament should fix working hours, and we should pay wages commensurate with the work done. In industry we have shift work, and when a person enters industry he knows he must do shift work. I have worked odd hours—probably more so than most members—but I entered upon my employment knowing the hours I would work. We have too many restrictions in South Australia. We state that traders shall not do this or that. They are not committing any crime by conducting business outside legal hours, yet we make it an offence. This is a free country and people should be permitted to do as they desire so long as they do not injure their fellow man. This Bill, if passed, will mean that banks must not work on Saturdays.

Mr. Dunstan—It provides that the bank doors shall not open on Saturdays. Officers can be called back to work behind closed doors.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, to make up their 40 hours.

Mr. Dunstan—I am attempting to provide that they shall work their 40 hours in five days and, if called back, receive overtime.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I believe it is the right of every Australian to do what he wants, providing he does not harm his fellow man. We have too many restrictions and this is another. I admit that if the banks only opened four days a week it would not have any impact on our national economy. If they close on Saturdays it would not make any difference to anyone, although it might cause some inconvenience, but then shop assistants would not want to work on Saturdays, and I would not blame them. If shops closed on Saturday mornings members opposite would contend that industrial workers could not perform their personal business and would seek a 4½-day week.

Mr. Davis—Don't be silly.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member would be right in the forefront in seeking a four-day week if he thought he had a chance of getting it. I have a high regard for the banking fraternity. Bankers are clear thinkers and lead Australian thought. By the same token I have a high regard for shop assistants,

with whom I have spent most of my life. Why shouldn't they get a five-day week? I believe that in trade and in banking, service is paramount. Would unions favour shops opening on Friday nights? In the main I believe the answer would be "no." I suggest that bankers would co-operate if shopkeepers were prepared to close on Saturdays and open on Friday nights. I think that is an excellent idea. I have questioned several people with whom I worked and they would welcome such a situation because it would give them two clear days each week.

Mr. John Clark—What would that be like for business?

Mr. HAMBOUR—A service would be provided and that is the main thing. Members opposite would not understand the meaning of "service," but that is the essence of the contract. Banks and shopkeepers must serve. The industrialist produces and it does not matter whether his employees work during the day or at night. Their hours could perhaps be regulated into four days. Some workmen in a Government instrumentality in my district are working 10 days straight in order to have four clear days. That is an arrangement they have made among themselves. They are 90 miles from their homes and I think it is an excellent idea. I do not know how the trade union movement would view that. It is not a five-day week, but a 10-day fortnight. It enables the men to go home for a longer period. This measure could lead to five-day weeks in other spheres. I would not oppose that if I thought a service could be maintained to those desiring it. Banks render a service to the community and are essential to our existence. I deplore the silence of the bankers on this Bill. Who would be better qualified to indicate whether it is necessary to open banks on Saturday mornings?

Mr. O'Halloran—It is usually understood that silence means consent.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Not necessarily. I believe their silence represents opposition to the Bill. I suggest that if this Bill were delayed it might receive more support. The application before the Commonwealth Arbitration Court is seeking £3 15s. for adult male officers and £2 10s. for officers under 21 years for Saturday morning work. If that is accepted by the court bankers might be happy to close on Saturday mornings. Bankers would oppose opening on Saturday mornings if they had to pay all their adult officers £3 15s. I believe that a member of this House has received a letter indicating that bank officers would resist the application.

They have been asked to withdraw their application, but be that as it may, the whole matter is in the hands of the court and we will not know the answer for some time. I suggest the answer could have an impact on all people concerned. If the application is granted bank officials may want to work on Saturday mornings for the additional £3 15s.

Mr. John Clark—They don't want to work on Saturday mornings.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member does not know what they want, but I suggest that if bank officers were offered £3 15s. to work on Saturday morning many of them would want to, whereas the bankers would want to close. Members supporting the Bill have said that a bank career is less attractive because bank officers must work on Saturday morning, but it is for the bankers to see that the banking career is made more attractive by offering adequate remuneration. After all, many members come into Parliament because of the salary and if it were lower they would not want to be here. Many other people accept employment because of the remuneration offered, and an adequate remuneration would ensure sufficient young people taking up a banking career. I am sure that Saturday morning opening of banks is not a deterrent to a prospective bank officer. I would not begrudge bank officers retaining their present remuneration and working a 5-day week instead of a 5½-day week. Good luck to them if they can secure those conditions, but I suggest that if this Bill is withdrawn until the court gives its decision in the Bank Officers Case, that decision may put a different complexion on the Bill, which at present I oppose.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent)—I support the Bill. The main argument against it is that it would cause dislocation and have an unfavourable impact on business people and workers, but I have considered that aspect and I am convinced that no hardship would be suffered by any one. No reform has ever been received with open arms. When it was proposed to abolish slavery, people opposed the move; when it was suggested that children be taken out of coal mines it was said that the mining companies would go bankrupt; when it was proposed to close Mount Gambier shops on Saturday evenings we were told that the farmer would go bankrupt because he would have to knock off to shop on Saturday afternoon. In the latter case, however, 12 months after the shops closed on Saturday evening the people could hardly remember the time when

they were open until 9 p.m. I believe that people will adjust themselves to the Saturday morning closing of banks.

Mr. Davis—Not according to the member for Light.

Mr. CORCORAN—Then I disagree with him. Surely bank officers are entitled to a holiday on Saturday morning and to be able to work their 40 hours in five days.

Mr. Hambour—What about barmen?

Mr. CORCORAN—They are essential. Certain services are essential, but no dislocation will be caused by the closing of banks on Saturday morning. People will become a little more methodical and bank either on Friday or Monday, or use the night deposit system. No Government members will support the Bill.

Mr. Stephens—They are not allowed to.

Mr. CORCORAN—I do not know about that, but it is rather a coincidence that they all follow the Premier's example. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) advanced an argument that would not hold water when put to the test. I hope members opposite will some day realize that all sections of the community should get justice. Labor members have equal respect for all sections, and I am sure that my constituents will agree with my conception about the rights of bank officers. There has always been an outcry when any reform has been mooted.

Mr. Jennings—The time was never opportune.

Mr. CORCORAN—That is so. A wise person said, "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." I have no doubt that some members opposite will be influenced by my appeal.

Mr. Davis—You are optimistic.

Mr. CORCORAN—We have to be in this world, but let us hope that they will support the Bill. If my desires are gratified it will pass without much further delay.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I support the Bill because it is just. When reforms are proposed we always hear that they cannot be carried out because industry would be ruined. Many years ago I conducted the first case heard in the State Arbitration Court. The employers' representatives said that if drivers' hours were reduced some businesses would have to close, but they are still going today, and making big money too. The judge told the employers' representatives that if this reform would ruin some businesses it would be better for them to close. He said it would be better for one man to suffer than for 50 to suffer, and that if some businesses

had to close there might be some temporary inconvenience but it would last only until others took the work offering. When an Early Closing Bill was before Parliament many years ago some said that it would be a bad thing to pass it because it would mean the ruin of many poor widows who had shops. They were not worrying about the poor widows, but about the emporiums that wanted to keep open until 9 p.m. on Fridays.

Mr. Hambour—What is wrong with that? Shops remain open at night in America.

Mr. STEPHENS—The honourable member says that is all right in America, but to be consistent he should agree to reforms in this State that have been carried out there. I was in New Zealand about three years ago, and banks do not open there on Saturdays, yet that country is going ahead faster than ours.

Mr. Hambour—Were they closed by Act of Parliament?

Mr. STEPHENS—Yes, and Saturday there is more like a Sunday here. Why do members opposite always want South Australia to be last in every reform? I will not be like many of them who say that they think this Bill should be passed and then make excuses, not reasons, for voting against it. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that the bank officers first asked the Government to introduce this Bill, but their request was refused. Then they went to some Government supporters (including Mr. Millhouse) but they, too, refused their request. Then they had to go to a Labor member, which shows that the people of South Australia, and bank officials, recognize that they cannot get justice from the Government or Government supporters, but they will get justice from the Labor Party. Government supporters have said that this reform will do much harm, but I am confident that it will not.

I do not think the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) quite understood the position because he said that bank officers were using a double-headed penny in asking for the introduction of this Bill. The Bill provides that the banks' doors shall be closed on Saturday, but it does not say anything about the wages or conditions of bank employees who have to work on Saturdays. Banks close at 3 p.m. on week days, but much important banking business is carried out after that time, and some banking business would still be done on Saturday mornings if this Bill were passed.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you really think that bank officers would be working on Saturday mornings?

Mr. STEPHENS—I am sure of it. Many shops close at 6 p.m., but some employees have to remain to do balancing. Again, hotels close at 6 p.m., but not all the barmen knock off at that hour, for there is still clearing up to be done. I point out to the member for Burra that the bank officials must have an award, otherwise there would be no rate of pay prescribed for those who have to work on Saturday mornings. The award provides for a payment when work is done on a Saturday. The Bill closes banks to the public on Saturday, but does not prevent bank officers from going in that morning to do essential work. I support the Bill because the practice has been adopted in other States and other parts of the world. Surely we can close our banks on Saturday and give justice to the employees. I may be regarded as a super-optimist for thinking that we might get something after the Premier, the big man of the House, has spoken against it. I believe that some members opposite, if they had the freedom, would vote for the Bill, but once the Premier has spoken they must do as they are told.

Mr. Millhouse—Absolute nonsense!

Mr. STEPHENS—No. I have often heard the Premier say, when the vote was likely to be close, "Let it pass here. It can be knocked out in another place." I hope the Bill will be passed, but I do not think there will be much chance of that, for when the Premier says "No" that is the end of it, but when he says "Yes," everything is all right. That has been proved often. I have known a Bill to be passed here, rejected in another place, and the Premier to get very sore over the matter. I have known him to call a special session of Parliament to force the other place to change its view and vote differently from what it did previously. This is a one-man House and a one-man State, but in spite of that I hope some members opposite will support the Bill. I have seen some of them change their minds previously and get into trouble, but I hope they will have the courage on this occasion to give justice to bank officers.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNCIL BY-LAWS: POULTRY KEEPING.

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse—

That by-law No. 67 of the corporation of the city of Adelaide made on August 20, 1956, and laid on the table of this House on February 5, 1957, and by-law No. 57 of the corporation of the city of Woodville made on July 23, 1956, and laid on the table of this House on June 25, 1957, both in respect of the keeping of poultry, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 18. Page 702.)

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the motion. On August 7 Mr. Millhouse explained that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation had no powers in this matter except to recommend that a by-law be disallowed because it could not be altered in part or amended. It must be dealt with as presented. If it contains a flaw all of it must be disallowed. If the keeping of poultry is regarded as objectionable councils should not try to get prohibition by setting impossible standards. If it is thought that conditions should be better regulated it is a subject for a by-law that can be observed reasonably. Mr. Millhouse covered this ground and pointed out the stringent provisions of the by-laws. This is a most important matter. He also pointed out that the conditions in the by-laws could be waived by the written permission of the council concerned. That is the crux of the objection to the by-laws. Both give an undesirable administrative discretion to the councils concerned.

Mr. Hutchens said he believed the desires of councils should be seriously considered and that unused food scraps in poultry houses were undesirable. Everybody will agree with that, but not necessarily that it is a sufficient reason for a discretionary power, which could be misused if granted. It is of little use a council being answerable to the ratepayers, because it might be too late to remedy injustice following on the misuse of a discretion by a council or one of its officers. As neither council apparently consulted the poultry experts of the Department of Agriculture and there are major difficulties it seems that a good case has been made out for the promulgation of a model by-law on this subject, or at least for more reasonable research by councils desiring to regulate poultry keeping. We need not debate so much the desirability of keeping poultry as the desirability of allowing councils discretionary power, although it can be shown that the conditions stipulated for the keeping of poultry under the circumstances outlined were perhaps unreasonable.

I am a strong believer in and a great admirer of local government, but I also believe that the powers of an authority should

be clearly defined. Local government is close to the people and it attracts to its ranks a wide range of people with varying interests. Discretionary powers may have slipped into by-laws in the past and before the committee was set up in 1937, and perhaps since, but I do not agree with Mr. Riches that discretionary power is implicit in the powers given by Parliament to local government, nor that by-laws are given as much thought, and prior consideration, as the honourable member believes. As a matter of fact, not too many councils are familiar with the by-laws that operate in their district. Council should be more specific in framing by-laws. The granting of discretionary power could be used to cloak a mistake, provide a loophole for a pressure group, and be seized upon by a few to hoodwink a majority. I have seen attempts by minority movements in councils to endeavour to use powers under the Local Government Act. Local government is an extension of Parliamentary government, from which local government derives its authority, and it is a good principle for every statute law to be clear and unequivocal in its administration, interpretation and reasonableness. If it is desired under special circumstances that some of the provisions of a by-law should be waived, then the circumstances and conditions of the waiver should be clearly defined. It is not just a question of having confidence in a council. The personnel of councils change from time to time and so do its administrative officers. Once a permit or waiver has been given under a mistaken impression of validity the council is in a difficult position. There is nothing wrong in a council having power to deal with the keeping of poultry and to make by-laws on the matter, but I maintain that the power should be clearly set out and defined, and the people interested should know under what conditions the by-laws can be waived, or some of its conditions relaxed. How else can we have good government and irreplicable administration?

As very little publicity is given to new by-laws it is more than ever important that proper safeguards should be incorporated in subordinate legislation to protect minority interests and others affected. It is one thing to give a liberal interpretation of the law, but another to arrogate a wide discretion which could be applied harshly and nullify the law itself. No one could formulate any firm policy with that threat present. No one would care to build a house or buy a piece of land under a zoning by-law if he felt permission could be

waived by the next council, or with a bare quorum present a by-law could be slipped through by an interested section. It is the duty of the subordinate legislation committee to protect the people. The question before the House is not only one of the merits of keeping poultry, but also one of principle. Should a council have a discretionary power to alter or absolutely nullify one of its own by-laws?

Was it in the mind of Parliament when the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation was set up that councils should take that power? I have made some research into this matter and find that in 1935 the whole question of subordinate legislation was of such concern to the Government of the day that it set up an honorary committee, of which the chairman was the present Minister of Education, Mr. Pattinson. Evidence was taken from a wide cross-section of the community, including members of Parliament, the Parliamentary Draftsman, the Police Commissioner, the Law Society, interested organizations and well-informed citizens. In 1937 the committee's findings were incorporated in an amendment to the Constitution Act under which the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation was set up. It is obvious that the directions given to that committee had received the fullest consideration not only by the honorary committee but also by Parliament. Therefore, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation must seriously consider the matters on which it reports to Parliament. The subject was also considered by the Standing Orders Committee of the House of Assembly, and I believe by the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Council. This committee also agreed on the terms of reference which are set out in Joint Standing Orders. Joint Standing Order 26, among other things provides that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation shall with respect to any regulation consider "whether the regulations unduly make rights dependent upon administrative and not upon judicial decisions." The committee has had recent evidence that ratepayers are jealous of their rights and object to such discretionary powers as are asked for in these by-laws. Incidentally, I referred the same question to a local government conference I attended recently and those present were quite satisfied that discretionary powers should not be granted as suggested, and that any powers under by-laws should be clearly set out. The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has taken the proper action under its mandate.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I congratulate the member for Mitcham on the clear and comprehensive way he explained the implications of the proposed by-laws. I commend the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation for coming down with a recommendation which preserves the principle that it is wrong to give unlimited discretionary power to any individual or body of men. The whole course of justice could be altered if power were given to anyone to make fish of one and flesh of another through his whims or personal bias. From this point of view alone I would support this motion. Further, I do not like sweeping intrusions into the liberties of anyone. The stringency of measures within the proposed by-laws are such as to impose stipulations and requirements on the careless and on the careful in like manner. I have no doubt that by keeping poultry in a careful way with a reasonable commonsense appreciation of one's neighbour's rights no objections would arise. It is all a matter of hygiene. If poultry keepers were to house birds under the intensive system of poultry keeping, having no runs for the birds and retaining them at all times in a shed of a size to permit each bird 4 sq. ft. of floor space, no objectionable smells would arise. Objection can rightly be taken to the insanitary conditions associated with some fowl houses. The prohibition of pens in the city would be a good idea because from the thick incrustation of rubbish in these yards arises smells which are the major objection of poultry keeping. It is desirable for householders to keep a few birds because household scraps can profitably be used and garden weeds disposed of to advantage. Under such circumstances poultry keeping can be a hobby.

I believe that some of the provisions in the by-laws are too stringent, for instance those providing that a poultry pen must be at least 50ft. back from a front street, not less than 3ft. from any boundary, fence, hedge or wall, unless such structure is comprised of sheet metal or rust-resisting material extending 18in. below ground, and not less than 12in. above ground and not less than 20ft. from any building, and of an area of not less than 6 sq. ft. for each bird contained in such place or enclosure. I do not object to that part which provides for the shelter to be constructed of material suitable to keep out all weather and permitting three sq. ft. for each bird, although I think 4 sq. ft. would be more suitable. Councils have the right to take action under the Health Act in case of insanitary conditions.

For the reasons I have stated I believe these by-laws are undesirable and I support the motion for their disallowance.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I thank members for the interest they have shown in this motion which does contain some element of humour. However, I desire to correct one impression of members who have opposed the motion. I think they have missed the main point of the committee's objection. The committee sympathizes with the object of the by-laws and does not deny that under some circumstances a limited discretion may be necessary and, in fact, desirable in either by-laws or Acts of Parliament. However, in these by-laws it objects to the absolutely unlimited discretion which the two councils are arrogating to themselves. We note the stringency of the conditions laid down in both by-laws, conditions which were admitted by the Adelaide Council to be greater than were necessary to bring about the required result. Quite apart altogether from these conditions, we believe that because of the unduly wide discretion contained therein the by-laws should be disallowed. There is no suggestion that these by-laws would be abused by the present councils, but we must look to the future. No council can bind its successor and that is the reason why it is always dangerous to insert such a power in a by-law and give it to a future body whose composition is unknown. The Minister of Education, in giving the Government's views, put before us a letter he had received from the Town Clerk of Adelaide, Mr. Veale. Mr. Veale admits that none of the present fowlyards complies with the by-law. He wrote:—

I desire to state that in one of the city wards there are approximately 140 fowlyards, 40 of which infringe the requirements of the proposed by-law, leaving an estimated 100 which could be brought to the desired standard without any great expense to the owners.

That was also the evidence of Dr. Fry and supports the contentions we have put forward. Mr. Veale also mentions the clauses the Housing Trust inserts in its leases with tenants. Mr. Veale points out that the trust will not allow fowls to be kept at all. In other words, there is an absolute prohibition. There is no discretion given at all in that case, and it is the discretion, not the prohibition, about which we complain in the by-laws. I thank the Minister of Education for the way in which he stated his views and those of the Government. He said:—

I am not very much concerned with the details of either by-law, whether they prescribe 4ft. or 40ft. areas or any of the other minor provisions. I make my stand on the one basis which was promulgated by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, namely, that it is an unwise practice to allow these by-laws which are based on administrative discretion.

That sums up the whole case against the by-laws. I suggest that the two councils redraft the by-laws so that the provisions are modified and that they be willing to enforce them in every case. If those provisions were modified it would not be necessary to insert a wide discretion as the objectives the councils say they wish to achieve could then be achieved without it.

Motion carried.

DECENTRALIZATION.

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

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

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

(Continued from September 4. Page 586.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent)—I support the motion. It was opposed by Government members, but that is not unusual for I do not remember any measure or motion introduced by the Opposition in my time being supported by the Premier and his supporters.

Mr. Hambour—You follow your Leader.

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes, but he is a wise man whom we are proud to follow. Although some Government members have implied that the Opposition wishes to dictate to industries as to where they shall establish their plants, I

point out that we do not. The only aspect of Labor's policy contained in the motion is our strong belief in decentralization. Surely any unbiased commission, after hearing the relevant evidence, would inevitably conclude that certain industries should and could be established in the country and that the Government should encourage such decentralization by the planning and co-ordination of both primary and secondary industries. Further, industries could be assisted financially by the Government as has been done in the case of the cellulose industry, which would not have survived had it not been for such aid.

Everyone I have spoken to on this subject has deplored the concentration of industries and population in the metropolitan area. If the Government thinks that this centralization is the best thing for the State, then I say it is the only body that does. The Government wants people to think that nothing can be done to decentralize industry. Indeed, the Premier has told us that it is inevitable; but something must be done about it. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) has often said that the Government is reluctant to establish industries in the country because such action would weaken its hold on country electorates. Perhaps that is the reason why Mount Gambier and Millicent have not been sewered.

Mr. Shannon—You are getting a good electricity supply.

Mr. CORCORAN—It was time the Government woke up and gave us that, and I remind Mr. Shannon that had it not been for the support of the Labor Party the Electricity Trust would not be operating today. Further, the honourable member was one of the greatest opponents in this Chamber of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Bill. Labor disagrees with the Government on the subject matter of the motion, not because of any Party consideration, but because members on this side believe that the distribution of population over as wide an area as possible is the best thing for the people. The main objection to the motion raised by Government supporters is that decentralization would not be economic, but the Government itself has been prepared to take socialistic action to create favourable conditions in the metropolitan area to encourage industries that would not otherwise have been established in South Australia.

If the motion is carried, a Royal Commission will be appointed to inquire into and report on certain aspects of decentralization. Such a

practice was adopted prior to the passing of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Bill. Further, a Royal Commission also inquired into the route to be followed by the railway from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta. Surely the subject matter of the motion is important enough to be investigated by a Royal Commission, which would not cost millions of pounds and which would produce wonderful results. After all, what chance has an individual member of collecting the information that might be collected by a Royal Commission? No chance at all.

How many components of primary and secondary industry are really economic in themselves? Some of them depend on others and some on climatic conditions. When those climatic conditions are adverse, Government assistance is required so that industries may survive. Further, some components of industry depend on artificial conditions. The whole purpose of Government should be to assist in providing services which, if left to purely economic considerations, would not be provided. The Government claims that it has done everything possible to place more people on the land, but its policy has been misguided because it has sought to bring into production inferior land and has acquiesced in spending huge sums on that land before ensuring that the better land is supporting all the people it can. A number of returned soldiers have been settled on the land in the South-East, and much undeveloped land has been used for that purpose. There is nothing to condemn that of itself, but there are vast areas of highly developed land that are still in the hands of private landholders, and it has not been properly utilized. At a returned soldiers' meeting recently a block of 200 or 300 acres was discussed. It has been sold to a landholder who already holds over 7,000 acres. Sales such as these result in the re-aggregation of small estates.

Generally speaking, most returned soldier settlers are doing fairly well and have little to complain about, but the seasons have favoured them. They have been placed on the land under conditions quite different from those of returned soldiers from World War I. The holdings then were too small and marketing conditions were quite different. Let us hope that the present settlers will continue to enjoy good seasons and conditions. If they do not they will have a hard row to hoe. Perhaps I should not take a pessimistic view of the future, but their prosperity depends largely on good prices for wool and lambs.

Even the settlers at Eight Mile Creek seem to be doing fairly well. I have heard nothing to the contrary and this may be the result of the work that was carried out on the drains in the winter before last.

Practically all industries depend on Government assistance in some form or another. How many of our primary producers—even those on the better land—would be prepared to carry on and acquire more land if they did not receive some concessions from the Government? Before the Government came into office there were many country centres which could have been built up by the establishment of industries. If appropriate action had been taken then the task of stemming the flow of population from the country to the metropolitan area would have been much less difficult, but it is not too late to repair the damage. We are only on the fringe of industrial development and countless new industries of the future will have to find a place in the scheme of things in this State. The Government has a great responsibility in regard to the exploitation of our land resources in the South-East. Hundreds of returned soldiers, and others, are waiting to get on the land and take an active part in the most important industry of the State, but they cannot get land, though plenty is available. If holders of large estates who are not using their land fully are not prepared to sell some of their land the Government should use its powers contained in the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act. I have said this before, and I know I am not popular with some people because I have talked in that strain, but I have the interests of the majority and the welfare of the State at heart.

Instead of allowing the better land to fall into the hands of fewer and fewer people, Labor would encourage the subdivision of that land, thereby greatly increasing the number of people deriving their living from the land. Such a policy would result in the growth of country centres and would attract secondary industries to them. The motion refers to the establishment of meatworks, and plants for treating hides and skins and to scour wool. Wool scouring was carried out many years ago in the South-East, and remains of the depots are still there, yet today we spend much money in sending wool to England to be scoured. I appeal to members opposite to support the motion, for it means a lot to the future of this State. They should not condemn it because it originated from this side of the House. I would not be surprised if the Government ultimately

adopted the motion because many things proposed by the Leader of the Opposition have been later adopted by it, perhaps with a slight variation to try and disguise it.

We are only proposing the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the decentralization of population and industries. The expenditure would be infinitesimal compared with the benefits that might accrue to the State. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion and I hope that it will get sufficient support to be passed.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I have no objection to the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate some of the things mentioned in the motion, but it is completely spoiled by one clause to which I shall refer later. Apart from the economics of this country, there is an urgent need to decentralize population. Today's *News* reports that another atomic weapon has been exploded at Maralinga. The fear of atomic warfare hovers over Australia and other countries in a cloud as menacing as the cloud that results from the explosion of an atomic bomb. Within 100 miles of Sydney and Melbourne, according to the Right Honourable R. G. Casey, there is congregated over 50 per cent of the population of Australia. In this State we have over half our population in the metropolitan area. That constitutes a tremendous danger to this country, particularly as our major cities are on the coast. They could be destroyed instantly by an enemy having the necessary force at its command. Some submarines powered by atomic energy can go around the world without refuelling, and they can carry the elements of destruction. They could wipe out the cities of this country and bring about the dissolution of Australia as a nation, yet we continue to build up the population of our cities. The motion asks for industries to be transferred to the country.

Mr. Corcoran—For a commission to decide that.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, and the commission would say what industries could be transferred to the country, but who would transfer them? That clause in the motion is not practicable because industries could not be transferred. In the first place, we could not get people to man the industries because not many workers in the metropolitan area desire to take work in the country. There are good grounds for an investigation into the decentralization of population and industries, but to get decentralization there must be an effort by big firms to decentralize their own plant. During the war some industries were set up in country

districts, and they maintained a remarkable record of production. They were industries making component parts of essential munitions. We had one such industry in Clare with a high record not only of service but of quality of production. We should attempt to prevail upon industries in the metropolitan area to decentralize the manufacture of some of the component parts of their products as is done in the United States and Canada. Such industries would be of direct benefit to country towns, most of which could not support industries of any magnitude.

The member for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) said that practically every day motor bodies from Adelaide passed through his town going to Western Australia. He asked why those bodies could not be made at Port Pirie. They could, but at what cost? The tooling for the presses costs thousands of pounds and it is hardly likely that the few bodies that go from here to Western Australia could be economically manufactured at Port Pirie. That is not the type of industry needed there. Country towns require small industries to assist in stopping the drift of population to the city. Some industries object to establishing in country towns because of the transport cost which must be added to the final cost of the article manufactured. I do not believe there is any value in that objection. The firm of Shearers, at Mannum, is able to compete with any foundry in Adelaide and that concern is not served by a railway line. The amount of transport cost per unit manufactured is infinitesimal and the advantages to be derived from establishing in a country centre with a happy staff are such that it can undercut the tenders of big centralized city organizations.

Today members inspected two organizations associated with the Department of Mines and witnessed the valuable work being done. I do not agree with members of the Opposition who suggest that the Government has done nothing, for the evidence was there for everyone to see. It seems to me that throughout the State there are forms of industry which reflect our general prosperity. In Clare there are five wineries, two sawmills, two brick kilns, the regional headquarters of the Electricity Trust and a fibrous plaster works. They are the type of industries that should be established in country towns—industries that provide for the requirements of the area. I would not like country towns to be desecrated by smelly industries which rightly belong in the city. It is in the interests of industries to decentralize their works.

Mr. Corcoran—What can we do to encourage that?

Mr. QUIRKE—I have no power to compel industry to decentralize. A Royal Commission might recommend that industry decentralize, but it has no power to compel it to. I will not support any motion which contains a provision as foolish as paragraph (b). No matter what decision is made, we have no power to enforce any recommendation. We have heard much criticism of this Government for not encouraging the decentralization of industry, but what of the Labor Government in New South Wales? All the major industries are congregated in what may be described as a vast metropolitan area extending from Woollongong to Newcastle. What is the political set-up in New South Wales? There are 66 so-called city seats and 33 country seats. It is the reverse in South Australia, but there is no decentralization in New South Wales. Instead, there is the worst form of centralization. The position is different in Queensland because large areas of the coast are served by rivers and it is easy to decentralize industry there.

The question of decentralization of industry in Australia has been bandied around as long as I have been in Parliament and it appears that nobody is doing anything to induce industries to the country. It has been suggested that this Government is not prepared to do anything for the good and sufficient reason that it does not want to set up Labor groups in the country thus endangering its position. In New South Wales no attempts are being made to decentralize industry because they have double the number of metropolitan seats to country seats. In my opinion that type of argument is fallacious. If this motion is carried it might take years to secure a report from a Commission.

Mr. Corcoran—You can amend the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE—I will not attempt to amend it, but if the Opposition deletes paragraph (b) my attitude could change. I want no bar of paragraph (b). I agree something must be done, but not necessarily on the lines advanced by members of the Opposition. It should be done from the point of view of financial security. We have been told that some country towns are rapidly becoming ghost towns, but decentralization of industry would not save many of them because they belong to an entirely different era. It is interesting to recall that at Carrieton at one time agricultural implements were made. We made a mistake of trying to grow wheat where

the good Lord determined only salt bush should grow. We did the same between Eudunda and Morgan and split that country into square mile farms. It was a failure. Towns in the north were built on the false assumption that the rainfall and fertility of that country could support agriculture. We had to pass the Marginal Areas Act that was aimed deliberately at building uneconomic areas into larger holdings to make them economic. Decentralization of industry could certainly assist towns like Jamestown, Eudunda, Kapunda, Burra, and Clare, which lend themselves admirably to small industries. If a commission is appointed it should say that every effort should be made to urge big manufacturers to make small component parts in country towns and in a way that will not increase the cost of the article as a whole. That would give country towns a chance to maintain some of their population. When a man has three or four children he knows that they must go to towns where industries are established. Any nation that neglects to build its country population is on the way to extinction. In view of what I have said, I would support the appointment of a Royal Commission but the motion should be amended to delete paragraphs I do not like.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I support the motion. Mr. Quirke will also support it, but only if it is amended to suit him. He does not like paragraph (b). He mentioned that Clare has a number of small secondary industries because of the primary production in the locality, but the time must come when Clare must encourage the establishment of other secondary industries; a Royal Commission could investigate this matter. Our Industries Assistance Committee investigates the prospects of an industry wishing to establish itself, and the Government guarantees financial assistance to assist in its establishment.

Mr. Quirke—Would you transfer industries from Adelaide to the country?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—A Royal Commission might suggest that an industry should transfer to the country. The Government has given every assistance to a plaster-board company to work raw deposits. What would be wrong in encouraging it to establish works at Clare? When considering mass production in secondary industry we must carefully investigate all the economics. South Australia depends a great deal on the motor body building industry in the city for the employment of thousands of workers. I cannot visualize it wanting to

establish a branch in a country town, but no inquiry by a Royal Commission would be necessary to learn what General Motors-Holdens will be doing at Elizabeth within the next few years, as it will only be an extension of the metropolitan works. In Victoria the company is getting away from Fisherman's Bend and there is no reason why the firm should not take similar steps here. Mr. Quirke should agree to the motion without amendment, because all the motion must be accepted if it is to be at all workable. When speaking on the motion Mr. King said:—

This motion has been sponsored by people who subscribe to a political theory, which means by implication, that they like manpower regulations, such as we had during the war. He was not at all discreet in saying that. During the war we had a directorate of manpower which asked people to work where their services could be best employed in the prosecution of the war. It had to decide whether a person should be engaged in actual warfare following on voluntary enlistment or whether, because of his knowledge of an industry or trade, he should be directed to a particular sphere. In selecting the best man to direct defence industry operations Mr. John Curtin, the then Prime Minister, went to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company for Mr. Essington Lewis, one of its high officials. Mr. King, in considering this motion, should decide the best action to take in the establishment of industries in country districts. He also said:—

I do not see why members opposite should be particularly alarmed about the concentration of people in the larger areas because when they can socialize everything the metropolitan area will provide the pressure points through which socialistic experiments can be tried.

I do not know all there is to know about the Chaffey district, or much about the drainage schemes, but is there a part of South Australia where there has been a more socialistic approach to industry? The river areas have many co-operative organizations. Along the River Murray we find co-operative concerns, such as wineries and canneries, that have been formed for the purpose of processing and marketing certain products. As the co-operatives generally desire to cut out the middle man and supervise marketing arrangements, I cannot imagine a more socialistic approach than theirs. Labor members believe in Socialism and some of the best examples of socialistic enterprise in this State are to be found along the River Murray, so Mr. King did not choose his words very wisely.

The metropolitan area has become industrialized to a high degree. In my electorate Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. is establishing a plant

at Tonsley Park where it is expected that many motor cars will be produced. This firm is recognized as competent and has done a good job on aircraft production. It is now preparing to increase production and I believe that alongside its new plant another new industry has commenced building operations. These industrial sites are being used because the working population is available in nearby districts.

What has the Broken Hill Proprietary Company done at Whyalla? It may be argued that fresh fruit and vegetables cannot be grown on a large scale in that town, but I point out that ancillary plants could be established along the Murray River so that the fruit and vegetables grown there could be deep-frozen and transported to such northern towns as Whyalla. After all, the deep-frozen article is at least as satisfactory as the canned product. Further, a quantity of vegetables weighs less deep-frozen than the same quantity when canned. Deep-frozen products from the River Murray areas could be easily transported by road to such towns as Whyalla, and this would result in the establishment of more processing plants in River Murray towns.

Most of the people in Canberra are employed in the Public Service or in Parliament. What other industry is there in that place? If one suggested the establishment of a secondary industry there one would be ridiculed. The people in Canberra are isolated and unless they join the Public Service they must move away. We are reaching the same state of affairs in this State: there is plenty of scope for primary producers in our country areas, but Government members are apparently unwilling to allow a Royal Commission to inquire into certain aspects of decentralization and the possibility of establishing in the country secondary industries ancillary to our primary industries. It is not for me or for this House to say who should be selected to go to a particular area. Bad as things may appear on the surface, we have not really done too badly in some respects, but if we can improve the lot of mankind generally we should do so.

I had occasion to visit Wallaroo several times recently. While there I made a close examination of homes that had been erected probably 40 or 50 years ago and I found that, although many of them were of cut limestone without any trimmings, a considerable number were built of cut freestone and sandstone. It is obvious that there was prosperity in the area. Not all of these homes would have been owned by the miners: probably the owners of some would have been engaged in

some ancillary industry while the mines were operating. There must have been something very valuable in addition to the mines to engage these people 40 years ago.

It was stated that one Housing Trust home had been erected at Belair. Belair was always known more or less as a holiday resort, and assuming that it can be classed as a country area, how can we say that what has been done there amounts to decentralization of industry? We find that many country towns have gone back, and it has been stated that the reason for that in some instances is that they were mining towns and the material being mined petered out before the towns became fully established. Any town of any appreciable size needs industries. Where a town has no secondary industry one should be established, and an additional secondary industry should be established in towns which already have one. This type of motion would consider these matters. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) made a valuable contribution to this debate and very ably pointed out what was needed to make things a little better for the country people.

The Opposition believes that the amenities of the metropolitan area should be extended to the country and, as the member for Millicent said, something should be done with regard to country water schemes. Surely there is no question of a shortage of water in the honourable member's area, and there is a vast potential for the establishment of secondary industries there. Following the development of the pine forests a sawmilling industry became essential, with the result that a secondary industry is now allied to the primary industry. I wonder if yet another secondary industry could be allied to that primary production and whether a company like Bryant and May, for instance, could make use of some of that timber in the manufacture of matches. There would then be an even further ancillary to the already established afforestation and milling industries in the South-East, and I believe that the Royal Commission proposed in this motion would approach the matter in that way. Why should it be necessary for children in that area to be either employed in the planting or cutting of forests or in the sawmills? Surely other industries could be established in that area, such as clothing or footwear, which would give them other opportunities. I mention these matters in order to show the need for the adoption of the motion, which I have much pleasure in supporting.

Mr. HUGHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 495.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I propose to close this debate, which I do not think there is any need to prolong until another day. When the Premier spoke on the second reading on August 28, he indicated that if I was prepared to accept an amendment that he foreshadowed then, he would support the Bill. I have examined the amendment, which makes no impact on the principle that I sought to establish, which is that the employees of the Metropolitan Abattoirs will not be subject to two sets of laws in regard to their industrial conditions. I wanted the provision that had been incorporated in the Act in 1911, prior to the passing of the Industrial Code as we now know it, removed, and the industrial relationships of the management and men at the Metropolitan Abattoirs to be defined under the Code in the way that the relationships of other employees are defined under it.

I sought to establish that by the simple process of removing from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act the two sections that had relationship to this matter. The first, of course, is section 34, which provides that disputes shall be subject to an arbitrator or arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon. The second section I wish to have removed is a very harsh punitive provision in the event of employees not agreeing to the decision of the arbitrator. This provision was twice as harsh as those provided in the Industrial Code. The Premier pointed out that if we took that out in full there would be no authority to provide for the settlement of disputes that might occur between small sections not subject to awards of the court. The amendment he suggested is acceptable to us. It still means that all disputes will have to come to the Industrial Court, to a wages board or to somebody appointed under the Industrial Code, and that the machinery for settling disputes provided under the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, and the penalties provided for infringements of any terms of settlement, will disappear from the Act. Under those circumstances I do not anticipate any objection to the second reading, and I trust that consideration of the Bill will be completed this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Repeal of sections 34 and 35 of principal Act."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move the following amendments, which will be necessary consequential on my proposed new clause 1a:—

To delete "Sections 34 and" and to insert "Section," and to delete "are" and to insert "is."

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 1a—"Amendment of section 34 of principal Act—Industrial disputes."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move to insert the following new clause:—

Section 34 of the principal Act is amended as follows:—

(a) All words in subsection (1) after the words "referred to" in the seventh line are struck out and the following words are inserted in lieu thereof:—

"the Industrial Board constituted under the Industrial Code, 1920-1954, in respect of the industry or section of the industry concerned, or as regards any employees engaged in industries or callings not within the jurisdiction of an industrial board, to the Industrial Court constituted by the Industrial Code, 1920-1954, or to any other authority to which the functions of the said Industrial Board or Court are by any Act transferred";

(b) Subsection (2) is repealed.

Section 34 of the Act provides:—

If any dispute arises between any of the employees of the board, or any trades or other union, or any association or organization of or on behalf of such employees, and the board as to the wages or remuneration to be paid to such employees or other employees of the board, or as to their hours of work or any other condition of their employment, such dispute shall be forthwith referred to an arbitrator or arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon between the parties or, failing such agreement, to the Industrial Court constituted by the Industrial Code, 1920, or any court to which the functions of the said court are by any Act transferred.

The words proposed to be struck out are:—

their hours of work or any other condition of their employment, such dispute shall be forthwith referred to an arbitrator or arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon between the parties or, failing such agreement, to the Industrial Court constituted by the Industrial Code, 1920, or any court to which the functions of the said court are by any Act transferred. Subsection (2) states:—

The award of such arbitrator or arbitrators or of the court (as the case may be) shall be final and shall not be re-opened for a period of at least 12 months from the date thereof.

The procedure under that subsection is different from the procedure followed under

the Industrial Code. My amendment is a precise copy of the one the Premier handed to me, so I do not propose to debate the matter further.

New clause inserted.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 24. Page 802.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

House of Assembly, £13,490; Parliamentary Library, £6,807; Joint House Committee, £10,827—passed.

Electoral Department, £18,249.

Mr. TAPPING—When the Estimates were before Parliament last year I referred to badly lit polling booths, particularly in the Semaphore district, and I hope that the department has attended to this matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The honourable member will see that an additional amount has been made available for this department.

Mr. QUIRKE—Does the Treasurer intend amending the provision in the Electoral Act that members must hand in an expenses sheet after an election? That sheet shows how much a candidate has spent, but this is a farce and it should not be necessary to send in any return.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I agree that the returns present a great difficulty and not long ago Parliament made some alterations. Cabinet has made no decision to introduce legislation, but I am prepared to bring the honourable member's remarks before the Chief Electoral Officer, and when his report is obtained will submit it to Cabinet to see whether anything useful can come out of it. I will advise the honourable member in due course.

Line passed.

Government Reporting Department, £34,929; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, £5,123; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, £5,123; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, £3,713; Miscellaneous, £43,733—passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, £8,034; Chief Secretary's Department, £17,335; Statistical Department, £31,386; Audit Department, £61,230—passed.

Printing and Stationery Department, £261,238.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I think it was last session that the Treasurer said that he believed

that the Government Printing Department would be transferred to more suitable premises and I ask him whether anything further has been done in the matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The department is carrying on under considerable difficulties. A modern printing office has all its machinery and plant on one common floor instead of being spread over a number of floors as is the case in this department. However, its transfer involves a major work which would have to be referred to the Public Works Committee, and it would be several years before it could be given effect even after the committee's report had been received.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Obviously the Treasurer considers that this work is long overdue, but I ask him whether he could obtain a further report as to how soon this transfer could be effected.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A building of the kind required would obviously involve Loan moneys which, of course, are strictly limited; moreover, the work is not nearly so high in priority as, for example, the building of schools. However, investigations are taking place as to a suitable site and the project is being matured, but it is not one that can be expected to appear on the Loan Estimates in the next couple of years.

Line passed.

Police Department, £1,884,808.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—An increase of £83 is shown for the item "Deputy Commissioner of Police." I have not noticed an announcement of an appointment, although, of course, I could have missed it. It is an important position and if it has not been filled it would seem to me that someone has been lacking in his duty. I believe that serious consideration should have been given to the promotion to this post of a now retired Superintendent of Police in view of his outstanding ability. He was a very valued officer who acted on many occasions, not only as deputy, but as Commissioner of Police, and I understand that the relationship between the department and the public was improved as a result of his ability. In view of tragic happenings within the last few days we read in this evening's press the suggestion that Adelaide is becoming a little Chicago and this raises very important considerations. There can be only one head of an organization, in this case the Commissioner of Police. When the commissioner died the deputy commissioner was overseas. The Government might to advantage have recalled this ex-superintendent who was on holidays and who would voluntarily have fore-

gone his vacation to act in the State's interests. Can the Treasurer indicate whether the deputy commissioner will be appointed from the Police Department or from our civilian population? Will this appointment be deferred because of the absence overseas of the Chief Secretary? When will the appointment be made?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I expect an appointment will be made some time in November.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—There could be an appeal against any proposed appointment. What would happen during the hearing of that appeal? Who would act as commissioner? In the event of the commissioner being absent for any reason, who would act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The procedure is well-known and has applied for many years. In fact, it was only recently that the position of deputy commissioner was created. For about 50 years we had only a commissioner. If, for any reason, he is absent the most senior officer assumes the responsibility of and acts as commissioner.

Line passed.

Sheriff and Gaols and Prisons Department, £360,248—passed.

Hospitals Department, £4,254,596.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If what Mr. Shannon said about the Royal Adelaide Hospital is correct, we are in for a torrid time. I have examined the situation and discovered that Government hospitals have a capacity of 1,822 beds with a daily average of 1,394 patients. I am concerned with the dead weight of public debt charges which at the moment exceed £6,000,000. It has been suggested that we should bulldoze the Royal Adelaide Hospital and erect an edifice of which the State could be proud. I would rather have an edifice the State could afford. Last year, despite a charge of 36s. a day on patients, insufficient revenue was forthcoming to meet the increased costs. I do not know whether the present Hospitals Board is hopeful of meeting the situation, but I agree with Mr. Shannon's suggestion that a separate board be appointed to administer the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the hope that the competition might assist in lowering costs. It is interesting to examine the daily average cost per bed in Government hospitals. At Royal Adelaide the cost is £5 0s. 4d.; Barmera, £4 17s. 5d.; Mount Gambier, £4 18s. 7d.; Port Augusta, £4 11s. 6d.; Port Lincoln, £5; Port Pirie, £6 7s. 7d.; and Wallaroo, £4 19s. 6d. Those costs are out of all proportion to other country hospitals. I suggest the Government set up local boards

to try to reduce these costs. They are all a charge on revenue. Our hospital services are costing a great deal. It is said that we have insufficient hospital accommodation, but according to figures we are not using what we have. There is no need to bulldoze any of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. If it costs £7,000,000 to complete the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, how much would it cost to build a new Royal Adelaide Hospital? What would be the use of getting a glorious plan from overseas architects when we could not afford such a building? Medical men are all right when it comes to dealing with the body but many know little about finance. Mr. Shannon said that plans from the best architects overseas should be obtained for a new Royal Adelaide Hospital, which indicates to me that the Public Works Committee is not satisfied with the present plan. A new Royal Adelaide Hospital would cost anything from £15,000,000 to £20,000,000. More attention should be given to the running costs of our hospitals and they must be carefully considered before we commit ourselves to new hospitals. Local boards for country Government hospitals would be a great help. This line dealing with hospitals needs urgent attention. I do not ask for more expenditure, but that we should reduce the expenditure to a minimum.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Treasurer say whether the Bedford Park Sanatorium will be closed in the near future, and will the Morris Hospital be enlarged, because it does not seem necessary to have the two hospitals operating at the one time? The medical profession has made outstanding progress in the treatment of tuberculosis, through the use of drugs and improved methods of treatment. Is there a possibility of the valuable property at Bedford Park being used for other purposes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We are making rapid strides in the early diagnosis of tuberculosis and with the use of modern drugs there are many cures. The incidence of tuberculosis is falling rapidly, but we do not know to what extent the immunity of the people is falling. People who have not been in contact with the disease for some time lose their immunity. We are passing through a transition stage. I have discussed the matter with doctors of some standing and I am sure the medical profession does not know how much immunity will be lost as the incidence of the disease falls. I will get a considered report for the honourable member. As far as I know there is no proposal to close the Bedford Park Sanatorium.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is proposed to pay £698 in fees to members of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Board (also members of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Board), and £299 to the members of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Board (also members of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Board), making a total of £997 in fees for the two hospitals. The sum of £982,000 is provided for the maintenance of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, about £47,000 for the Magill wards, and about £192,000 for the Northfield wards, and I assume that those three institutions will be controlled by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Board. The sum of £176,918 is provided for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which means that the expenditure of well over £1,000,000 is to be controlled by a board consisting of part-time members who are paid only £997 for their services. Is this the most efficient way of supervising these institutions? Although we have an excellent director and staff, should we not have expert advice from outside on how this money should be spent? Should not the Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth be controlled by separate boards?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This year the Chief Secretary was sent abroad and given the high priority job of investigating the most modern and efficient methods of administering Hospital services overseas. It would be easy to say that the Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth hospitals should be under two controlling bodies as there are apparent advantages to be derived from that form of control. On the other hand, however, these two hospitals will be one teaching school, and part of the cost mentioned by the honourable the Leader arises from that fact. Two problems face the Government: the efficient management of the hospitals, and the efficient provision of teaching schools. For many years Western Australia relied on South Australia to train its doctors. The lack of a teaching school in Western Australia meant that Western Australian doctors were not being brought into constant contact with modern developments. The university provides for the teaching of students to a certain stage, but no student can be taught theoretically to become a doctor, for it is only by constant service to patients that a student can become conversant with the problems of diagnosis and treatment.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 26, at 2 p.m.