

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, September 26, 1962.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****LOW DEPOSIT HOUSING.**

**Mr. COUMBE:** Yesterday, in reply to a question concerning the provision of houses under the £50 minimum deposit scheme, the Premier promised to obtain a report. Has he that report?

**The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:** As a result of tenders recently received by the Housing Trust for the erection of houses under the rental-purchase scheme for sale of houses on a minimum deposit of £50, the trust has placed contracts for a total of 1,350 houses. In the metropolitan area Orlit Limited has been given a contract for 300 houses, Adelaide Building Company Ltd. for 400, and D. J. Feeney & Company for 250. At Elizabeth a contract for 250 houses has been given to Orlit Limited and for 75 houses to M. & D. Richardson Ltd. Minuzzo Bros. have a contract for 75 houses at Salisbury North. These contracts represent a capital expenditure of from £3,750,000 to £4,000,000. Building will commence next month and the first houses should be completed in March or April, 1963.

The first building sites will be at Kilburn, Mansfield Park and LeFevre Peninsula in the metropolitan area, and at Elizabeth West and Salisbury North. When these contracts are in full swing the completion rate will be about 65 houses a month. As time goes on, this completion rate should increase. The rental-purchase scheme provides for a range of 17 house designs of from 10 to 11 squares in area. Houses will be sold on agreement for sale and purchase at £3,400 to £3,800 with weekly payments of interest and principal ranging from about £3 14s. to £4 a week for a term of 40 years. This scheme will, in large measure, be in substitution for the present rental programme of the trust. So far, about 2,200 applications to purchase houses under the scheme have been received, of which about half are from trust tenants or from applicants for rental accommodation. The scheme will, in due course, be extended to the larger country towns.

**GASOMETER.**

**Mr. FRANK WALSH:** The South Australian Gas Company recently announced that it intended building a new gasometer in the district represented by the Minister of Education adjacent to the border of the Edwardstown District. The gasometer will be of about the same height as the *Advertiser* building. The Marion council made certain representations and desires to make further representations both to the Minister and to myself concerning the question of an amendment to the Gas Act. Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to consider referring to Cabinet the advisability of amending the Act so that, in future, occurrences of this nature will not create the problem that has arisen in the Marion area?

**The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:** I will discuss this matter with the Government. I am not quite clear as to the occurrence mentioned by the Leader but I will obtain details from him later.

**WEED CONTROL.**

**The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER:** At a recent horticultural conference in Greenmount Agricultural College, Ulster, Dr. D. Robinson, Deputy Head of the Ministry of Agriculture's research station at Loughgall was reported to have stated:

Before the end of the 1960's the weed problem will be eliminated completely. The economics will no longer permit hand labour for weed control.

Has the Minister of Agriculture similar good news for agriculturists and horticulturists in this State?

**The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:** As requested, I took this matter up with the Director of Agriculture who has reported as follows:

The statement was made at a horticultural conference and clearly refers to horticultural crops and not to cereal farming or pasture production. The present situation is that most annual weeds of horticultural areas can be controlled by the use of chemicals. Some annual weeds and some important perennial weeds cannot be killed by sprays but with the present rate of progress in this field it is quite possible that by the end of this decade there will be chemicals available to control all weeds. Whether or not it will be economic to rely entirely on chemical methods will depend partly on the cost of chemical treatment, the cost of alternative treatments, for example, cultivation, and the value of production per acre.

Herbicides are chiefly being used at present in situations where cultivation is difficult, impossible or ineffective. The following are the most important:

1. Vegetable crops and nurseries—selective weedicides eliminate or greatly reduce hand weeding or hoeing.

2. Vineyards—strip treatment with herbicides avoids the use of the French plough or similar implements, which are used to get close to the vine.

3. For the control of particular weeds, for example, skeleton weed, against which cultivation is not effective.

#### PORT RIVER CAUSEWAY.

Mr. RYAN: Yesterday I asked the Premier when it was intended that a start should be made on the work connected with the new causeway across the Port River. This was recommended by the Public Works Committee some 18 months ago. I believe the Premier has a reply to my question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The position is somewhat as I stated it to be. The Commissioner of Highways reports:

The survey has been completed and the approach roadways are being designed. Investigations into the soil conditions of the river bed are now being assessed, as there are indications that poor foundation conditions exist. The embankment has been designed, but because of poor foundations final designs for the pipes and control valves have not yet been completed. This work is in hand, and it is expected that work on the construction of the embankment and approach roadways will commence in January, 1963.

#### WATER RATES.

Mr. HARDING: A letter from the Naracoorte Chamber of Commerce to Senator Butfield states:

At a recent meeting of the Naracoorte Chamber of Commerce it was unanimously decided to write you this note of encouragement in your efforts to have water and sewerage rates paid in at least two instalments. We hope this effort will ultimately be crowned with success.

Can the Minister of Works say whether the suggestion contained in that letter is a practicable one, and will he comment on it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This is not a new suggestion, and it has been examined sympathetically by the Engineer-in-Chief and also by myself. I think that two years ago we printed on the assessment notices a note to the effect that where both water and sewer rates are involved the consumer may pay the water rates at the time they are due and may defer the payment of sewer rates for two months, if the consumer desires to pay in two instalments. That arrangement was instituted

at a time when some country sewerage schemes, including Naracoorte, were coming up for rating for the first time. The department and the Government agreed that it was a concession which might be helpful to consumers in some cases. We have also been requested to make meter readings and issue rate notices twice a year instead of once a year as at present. That matter has been carefully examined, but I consider that it is impracticable. Speaking from memory, I think that about 400,000 accounts go out every year, and to duplicate the meter readings and the notices for payment would involve the department in a duplication of clerical work and inevitably would result in increased charges to the department and therefore increased charges to consumers. The department would incur much extra work and extra cost. It always listens sympathetically to requests by consumers to defer payment or to pay in instalments, and for the comparatively small number who find it necessary to ask for leniency in this regard, it is far preferable to meet their cases than to adopt a general process of rendering accounts twice a year. For the reasons of cost and the amount of clerical work involved, I consider that the department and the Government cannot accede to the request to read meters and render accounts twice a year. In cases where there is difficulty, the consumers should just write in and explain the circumstances, and every consideration will be extended to them.

#### REFRIGERATOR REPAIRS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yesterday it was brought to my notice by a constituent of mine that he had sought to have repairs carried out on a refrigerator. A company representative attended and made certain alterations to the refrigerator, which rendered it not only useless but dangerous, according to another party. The owner was sent an account for about £25, speaking from memory. On complaint, it was reduced by more than half, and now he is being pressed for the money. As altered, the refrigerator remains in practically the same condition. Can the Premier say whether this is a case the Prices Department can inquire into and, if it is, will he have an investigation made if I supply him with the particulars?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer to both questions is "Yes".

#### UNION BAN ON AMPOL.

Mr. HALL: Recently a stop-work meeting of seamen was held at Port Adelaide and a resolution was passed calling on the Australian

Council of Trade Unions to declare a black ban on construction work for Ampol Petroleum Limited, and all products of the company. I understand this was the result of Ampol's decision to register the tanker, *P. J. Adams*, being built at Whyalla, under the flag of another nation and to employ Asiatic seamen. I understand also that this is to be done because of the great trouble experienced on Australian shipping routes because of Communist control of the Seamen's Union of Australasia. Can the Premier say whether this ban will threaten the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla, and will the threat affect the employment position at Whyalla?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The ship referred to is the first to be built in Australia to ply the high seas. All other ships subsidized in Australia have been subsidized by the Australian Government purely for local use, and not for use on the high seas. From our point of view, and the Whyalla point of view, the Commonwealth decision to provide a subsidy for a ship that was to be an ocean-going ship was, I believe, an important decision for us. Since that time I have had some conversations, not successful, although I cannot say they were unsuccessful, with another company that is considering building a ship of a similar character for ocean-going work, but not interstate work. Therefore, I cannot answer the honourable member's question as to whether work at Whyalla would be prejudiced because I do not know at present of a definite proposition for Whyalla.

Speaking without any reservation at all, I hope the time will come when the shipyards at Whyalla will be able to engage in shipbuilding in addition to what is regarded as purely and simply coastal shipbuilding. This work would quickly absorb the shipbuilding industry in Australia. There are shipbuilding works in four States, and I believe there has been already some difficulty in getting orders for the coastal trade. We have been able to get orders for that trade because during the war, and for a period before the war, there was no replacement of ships. I believe that position has been rectified to a substantial degree. I hope that the present difficulties will be cleared up so that there will be an opportunity for us to engage in shipbuilding on a world-wide basis, rather than purely on a coastal basis.

#### HOUSING TRUST ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Chairman of the City of Whyalla Commission wrote to the Minister of Lands on April 4 and, as the Minister of

Lands will apparently be away for some time, I will read the whole letter for the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture, to whom my question is directed. The letter is as follows:

The attention of this commission has been drawn to the number of families leaving Whyalla after a short sojourn. It is frequently claimed that one of the main reasons for the families' leaving the new areas is the absence of proper shopping facilities. This matter has been taken up with the Director of Lands and his co-operation has been given in offering building sites for auction as soon as possible. Unfortunately the purchasers of business sites frequently take the full three years allowed for building. In addition, land is sometimes purchased by large organizations, thus excluding the small businessman. My commission is strongly of the opinion that the matter would be best met from the point of view of early erection of shops and protection of small businessmen if the South Australian Housing Trust were to erect the shopping areas at least on part of the land available for business purposes. The matter has been discussed with the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust. The trust considers it cannot enter into competition at an auction. Consequently, I have been asked by my commission to suggest that consideration be given to amending the above Act to provide for the following:

- (1) The South Australian Housing Trust to have the right to purchase business sites, either before or after subdivision, without the land's being offered by auction.
- (2) The South Australian Housing Trust to be permitted to purchase land for residential and business purposes prior to its subdivision; the subdivision then to be the responsibility of the trust.

If the Minister of Agriculture (as Acting Minister of Lands) has not yet received a reply to my previous question on this matter, will he try to expedite a reply with a view to seeing whether the Act can be amended this session so that the request can be met?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I mentioned earlier, I referred this matter to the Chairman of the Housing Trust to ascertain in the first place the trust's position. There is no doubt that, if it were given the necessary power and responsibility and told to do so, the trust could undertake what has been requested. On the other hand, I told the honourable member that, as this was a matter of policy, I would have to discuss with Cabinet any possible amendment to the Act. I have not yet completed that discussion. After the Government has considered the matter, I shall certainly be able to say whether the Act will be amended. If I receive an affirmative reply, it will be in time for an amendment to be placed before the House this year. I do not want it to be

inferred from that that I am on the point of recommending alterations; there would have to be strong reasons for doing that, and I am not convinced that there is anything wrong with the present system. If the Housing Trust is made responsible for building these shops, that will be an added function. This must be discussed by Cabinet before a final decision is given. However, a decision will be given on the honourable member's request and, if the Government decides to act in accordance with the request, the decision will not be delayed so long that no action can be taken during this session.

#### COUNCIL MONEY-RAISING POWERS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: There are two provisions under the Local Government Act that give a council loan-raising powers. One is section 423, which empowers councils to raise money on the security of a special rate, and another section provides that this special rate shall be a continuous rate. An approach has been made to the Minister of Local Government by the Woodville corporation asking that consideration be given to deleting all provisions for the raising of money under the provisions for a special rate and including the provision for a special rate in section 424, which at present deals with the security of the general rate. The Minister of Local Government informed the council last month that the Local Government Advisory Committee was of opinion that such a request should be agreed to, and he has undertaken to bring the question before Cabinet, when matters for inclusion in the Act are being reviewed during this session. Can the Minister say whether this question has been before Cabinet and, if it has, whether an amendment to the Act will be introduced this session in accordance with the assurance of the Minister of Local Government?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will inquire of my colleague and get a reply.

#### DRIVING TUITION.

Mr. CASEY: Recently in the United States of America the chief State school officers unanimously decided that the teaching of young students to drive safely was a vital part of their learning to live effectively as citizens in modern society. From the point of view of the students themselves, driver-teaching taught them the attitudes, skills, habits and knowledge so vital to their living safely in today's world. I understand from available statistics that of all the deaths in the 15 to 24 years age group nearly 40 per cent are due to motor traffic

accidents. In view of that, I ask the Minister of Education whether at any time his department has considered the advisability of driving being taught in perhaps our larger high schools. I understand that the only school-children's driving school in Australia is in Tasmania. If the department has discussed it at any time, will the Minister say what agreement was reached?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The matter has been discussed from time to time. A large expenditure on capital equipment and the training of teachers would be required. We have also to consider the present crowded curriculum. However, it was tried out on a small scale last year by the Police Training Squad, which took a selected number of secondary students, and I believe it was successful. It may well be repeated on a larger scale this year. I will take up the matter with the Director of Education, who, I think, has had some negotiations with the Commissioner of Police on this, and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

#### SERVICE STATIONS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I want to know the present position in relation to the undertaking originally given by oil companies about the number of service stations that would be erected in the metropolitan area. Some of my constituents have raised this matter with me because at the moment, although my district is bedewed with service stations at almost every intersection, it is proposed to demolish some houses near the Norwood caravan park for the purpose of putting a service station there although there are now several such stations within little more than 100 yards of the caravan park. A house has just been demolished on East Parade within 100 yards of four other service stations. There is the projected demolition of a house worth £17,000 on the corner of Magill Road and Wellington Road immediately opposite an existing service station and within 200 yards of four others. There is the projected demolition, which has already begun, of five houses and a block of shops at the Maid and Magpie intersection for Freeman Motors' service station immediately opposite the new service station that has just been erected on the intersection, too. Other service stations are planned within the district which will entail—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am trying to explain to the Premier the full nature of the facts of this

case. There are other projected demolitions of dwellinghouses in this area and, as housing accommodation is extremely short and we already have many service stations, can the Premier say whether there is extant any agreement between the Government and the oil companies about the number of new petrol reselling outlets that are to be established?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will put that question on notice, I shall be happy to reply.

#### ARCHWAY PORT.

Mr. RYAN: Yesterday, during the debate on the Estimates, I drew the attention of the Treasurer to the amount appropriated for Archway Port and, much to my surprise, he said he intended to increase the amount shown as appropriated for this year. He promised to let me know today, if possible, the amount by which it was intended to increase the sum shown in the Budget. Can the Treasurer do so now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I told the honourable member why the amount had not been altered before—that certain information was not to hand; but it has since come to hand and the amount has been approved by Cabinet. During 1960-61, £4,000 was paid to Archway Port; during 1961-62, £4,500 was paid; and the amount approved this year is £6,000, of which £2,000 has already been paid.

#### BOOK SALES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education received a reply from the Attorney-General to my question about prosecuting book sellers who have infringed the legislation passed last year?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, but I did read a report of a reply he gave in another place when he said that he was having the allegations investigated. I will refer this particular request to my colleague to see whether I can get a reply soon.

#### TABLE GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a private request I made for a report on the outcome of an experimental export shipment of table grapes to Germany? This shipment occurred in April, 1961, and the suppliers of the grapes are greatly interested in the outcome of that experiment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not received a report yet but I will let the honourable member know as soon as I have it.

#### POLICE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: My question arises from a report that appears in this afternoon's *News* attributed to the Commissioner of Police and arising from statements made in Parliament yesterday by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) and me about the recent publication of statements and allegations made by us. I am amazed that the Commissioner of Police should take it upon himself to reflect, I consider offensively, on members of Parliament who are responsible for passing the laws that he, as a civil servant, is responsible for administering. He is reported to have said:

Mr. Fred Walsh, M.P., has uttered threats about me in two places.

I challenge him, or anybody else, to prove that I have uttered threats of any kind either inside or outside Parliament, particularly outside. He is also reported to have said:

I was quite sure about my facts when I made a recent statement about allegations made by him. I will not make up my mind on whether to ask for an independent inquiry until I have fully studied a *Hansard* copy.

It is a pity that he did not study fully a *Hansard* copy before he made any statement at all. Since, according to the *News*, an independent tribunal is being called for to investigate allegations regarding the Police Force administration, will the Premier set up a Royal Commission to inquire into the allegations that have been made about the entire Police Force?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is obviously a question of policy and I ask the honourable member to put it on notice.

#### COUNTRY SHOWS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to the financial position of country shows. In view of the importance of country shows in the promotion of rural industries, and in view of the difficulty experienced by country show societies in making ends meet, will the Minister of Agriculture consider in future increasing the support to the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society to enable greater disbursements to country shows?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government has subsidized the prize money of country shows for many years, and about five years ago it introduced a system whereby country shows were subsidized regarding the costs of erecting buildings. This was done when my colleague, the Minister of Works, was Minister of Agriculture. Since then the sums for subsidies for prize money and buildings have been increased steadily, although not every year, to

about £10,000 or £12,000 annually. If it is at all possible in the next Budget, that sum may be increased again.

#### SMITHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: During the recent Parliamentary recess I wrote to the Minister of Education about complaints that had been made to me by the Smithfield Primary School Committee that the newly-surfaced schoolyard had deteriorated rapidly. The Minister said he would look into the matter and communicate with me as soon as possible, but I have heard nothing further. Will the Minister obtain a report for me on this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

#### MILK BOARD.

Mr. BYWATERS: According to the Auditor-General's report the Metropolitan Milk Board had a surplus of £1,710 in its working operations last financial year, and it had accumulated funds of £32,200 from which £31,000 had been spent on the erection of a building. Some time ago it was suggested that the board be given power to advertise the value of milk. I realize that if this suggestion were approved it would probably require an amendment of the Act. Now that its building has been completed and it has a reasonable annual profit, will the Government consider amending the Act to enable the board to be able to advertise the value of milk?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As the honourable member knows, the Metropolitan Milk Board is a statutory board and it could, if it wished, ask for power to advertise milk. Up to the present it has not done so, but if it does the request will be considered.

#### JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING: Can the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee report when the inquiry into the replacement of Jervois bridge will conclude?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee): The committee is well aware of the urgency of this project and it is at present communicating with the final witnesses who will be required to tender evidence before the committee reaches a decision. I do not think it would be wise, for instance, to ignore the Port Adelaide council which is entitled, as one of the bodies most concerned, to know what the proposal is before we reach a decision. The Secretary of the committee has been asked to communicate with

the council about its tendering evidence. After we have heard the council's evidence we may wish to hear from a few other bodies before we reach a decision and make a recommendation to Parliament. I hope that the decision will not be long delayed, but it will depend somewhat on our being able to fit witnesses in. We do not want to interrupt other inquiries that are proceeding concurrently with this inquiry.

#### PETERBOROUGH COURT.

Mr. CASEY: Last month I received a reply from the Attorney-General through the Minister of Education to a question I asked relating to the Peterborough Local Court. In the reply the Attorney-General said the volume of work was not sufficient to warrant the appointment of a full-time clerk of courts in that district. However, he went on to say that alternative methods of staffing Peterborough and other country courts were being considered. Has the Minister of Education anything to report on the inquiries being made by the Attorney-General's Department?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have not the information at the moment, but I will ask my colleague to supply me with it. I will advise the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### RATE PAYMENTS.

Mr. CURREN: At a meeting of the Wine Grape Growers Council of South Australia held at Barmera on June 18 last the following resolution was carried:

That water rates and drainage rates due and payable to the Department of Lands by May 31 each year be altered and that the rates be made payable by July 31.

The reason for that was that many growers in the river areas did not receive any substantial payments for their fruit before the end of June and payment of rates before May 31 is burdensome because of previous harvest commitments. Can the Acting Minister of Irrigation say whether an approach has been made to the Government in this matter by the Wine Grape Growers Council and, if it has, what action is proposed by the Government?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: An approach has been made to me about this and I have declined the suggestion on the ground that there is no reason why Government finance should be upset because of receipts from some other source. This is a matter that growers should take up with the people to whom they sell grapes, and it is not necessarily a matter in regard to which the Government should have to carry the burden. These services have to

be provided somehow and it is fair that the Government should receive its true recompense for providing them.

**MODBURY-SMITHFIELD ROAD.**

Mr. LAUCKE: On August 9, in a reply to a question I asked concerning the Modbury-Smithfield main road, the Minister of Works stated that safety fencing would be provided on certain sections of that road. As this safety fencing is urgently needed to reduce a traffic hazard, will the Minister obtain information from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, as to when this fencing will be installed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

**SPECIAL CONSTABLES.**

Mr. LOVEDAY: Recently I received a letter from the Chief Secretary dated September 4 dealing with the appointment to Coober Pedy and Andamooka respectively of two officers of the Mines Department. Both men had been appointed as special constables. In a previous conversation with the Chief Secretary I suggested that these men in their activities as special constables should not use their official capacity when dealing with the Aborigines on those two fields, and that part of the work should remain with the welfare officers appointed by the Aborigines Department, one of whom had been appointed to Coober Pedy and was a special constable. I believed that a division of the work of the special constables in that manner would best serve the interests of all concerned on those fields. Can the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether in view of my suggestion this has been done or whether the two officers appointed by the Mines Department are acting in their official capacity as special constables over Aborigines?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no knowledge of this matter and this is the first time I have heard of it. I will inquire and inform the honourable member tomorrow or next Tuesday.

**SOOT NUISANCE.**

Mr. TAPPING: An article in today's *Advertiser* states that seamen aboard a ship at Osborne yesterday said they had contracted "Osborne measles" as a result of the soot nuisance from the Osborne power station. The article continues:

Seamen of the *Lake Sorrell* said greasy black spots had come out of the atmosphere and spoiled their washing. They had complained to their union, and they would apply for "dirt money" to compensate them.

As the Premier knows, I presented a request to him a week ago from people living near the Osborne power station asking that efforts be made to minimize this menace. However, now we have a different point of view concerning seamen on a ship. Will the Premier take up this question with the General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia to see whether this report is founded on fact?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

**LAND SETTLEMENT ACT.**

Mr. JENKINS: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce a Bill this session to amend the Land Settlement Act so that some burden may be taken from the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter is now being examined and I will inform the honourable member later when a decision is made.

**APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Apprentices Act, 1950.

**LAND VALUES ASSESSMENTS.**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

(For wording of motion, see page 764.)

(Continued from September 19. Page 988.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): When this matter was last before the House I suggested to the Leader of the Opposition that he examine a proposition that I submitted to the effect that the Government would appoint a competent committee to examine the questions that he had enumerated. I suggested also that it would be unwise to appoint a Select Committee that would probably consider this matter from a political angle. I was courteously given leave by the House to continue my remarks while those suggestions were considered by the Leader.

I have now been informed that the Leader does not accept my proposal so we come back to the position that the motion is now before the House, and the Leader desires it to be carried and acted on. In those circumstances I ask the House to defeat the motion. The motion deals with the setting up of a Select Committee to deal with what is, after all, a highly technical problem and one that cannot be properly solved if it is examined from a political viewpoint. If the matter were to

be examined on that basis, the members selected from this side of the House probably would start off by having views widely divergent from those of the members appointed from the opposite side of the House. I am not complaining about that; if we all had the same political views we would all be sitting over here. I believe that such an investigation would not do any good at all. It would take up considerably more time than any member of Parliament would be able to devote to the question. As it is a highly technical question, probably it would require a considerable amount of examination of schemes and methods applied in other countries. I venture to suggest that with the work that is before the House honourable members could not possibly undertake an examination of that description.

On one occasion the Government referred a certain matter to the Public Works Committee, but after about six years the committee still had not been able to give any answer, and finally it resolved the matter from its point of view by obtaining the Crown Solicitor's opinion to the effect that the project concerned was not within the terms of its Act. I oppose the motion for a Select Committee, and I hope members will do likewise. However, let me say that if the House rejects the motion I will not take it that the House does not desire an investigation to be made. If the House rejects the motion, which I am asking it to do now, the Government nevertheless will appoint a committee consisting of four members, under a highly competent chairman. The members of that committee will be persons that the Government believes are qualified to give some valuable guidance and assistance on the matter, and the Government will ask that committee to proceed as rapidly as it can with its investigation.

In order to show that the Government does not desire to be contrary, I assure the House that the terms of reference that will be given to that committee will be, as far as practicable, the same as those provided in the Leader's motion. The only alteration I would propose is that the chairman of the committee would be asked whether he desired any slight alteration to those terms of reference, or whether they were perfectly clear and comprehensive. The House has the assurance that if the motion is rejected the Government will be prepared to set up a thoroughly competent committee which will be able to give full-time consideration to the matters and facilitate an investigation in every way.

Mr. Lawn: You want to hand-pick your committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In fact, when the Government believes that it has a responsibility to undertake a job it does so. I have never yet asked anybody else to undertake my responsibility. In the same way that I would have the responsibility of selecting the committee, I also would have a responsibility to see that the committee was one that could contribute something valuable for the State; it cuts both ways, I suggest. I wish to emphasize one other thing. All the representations that the Government has had by way of deputations in this matter have emphasized that a political committee is not desired; those people want a competent committee appointed composed of people outside of politics.

Mr. Lawn: If you appoint the committee you will write its report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not wish to take up time debating the motion. I ask the House to reject the motion. At the same time, I assure members that an investigation will be made if the House agrees to my request.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I support the motion. I think that all members in the House (particularly my friends, of whom I claim to have a number on both sides of the House) will agree that over the last two or three years, both in private conversation and in the House, I have been vitally concerned with the effect of land tax. I am particularly concerned about its effect in my own district. With the possible exception of one, I do not suppose there is a district where this matter is such a vital issue and where so many people are concerned and affected by the very steep increases in land tax and the consequent very steep increases in council rates.

Every member knows that thousands of Housing Trust houses have been built in my district, and consequently there has been a wholesale subdivision of land—in my humble opinion, too much subdivision altogether. Consequent on this, of course, we have had, as we normally do, a tremendously inflated land value in that area, and consequent again on that we have had an inflated land tax. Again consequent on the same thing, we have had inflated assessments for council rating purposes. As a result there has been a very real hardship on landholders who have no desire whatever to subdivide their land but have a very real desire to continue in agricultural pursuits. I

do not know how those people in the main vote, and quite frankly I do not care. No doubt some would vote for me, but I know that many of them would not, and that does not mean a thing to me. I believe this is a wrong that has to be righted; I have said so on two or three occasions in this House, and I have not changed my opinion. In fact, the events of the last 12 or 18 months have only strengthened that opinion.

Honourable members know that this is not the first time that this matter has been raised by the Opposition. We raised the matter last year when the Land Tax Act was amended. I said at that time that I did not think the amendment would provide much assistance to the people in my district. On checking up I have found that a number of people received some very real assistance from the amendment, but many did not get much out of it. Earlier this session we took the rather unusual course of moving an amendment to the Address in Reply because we thought the matter was so important. I know that we were charged with making this a political issue, but I assure the House that the main idea of that amendment was to try to force some action on something that we thought was wrong and should be rectified. The House will recall that on that occasion we sought the appointment of a Royal Commission, consisting of five members of the House of Assembly, to conduct a review and to inquire fully into the incidence of the land tax legislation, but Government members did not seem greatly interested in the matter at all. I have had to scan through the Address in Reply debate hastily to obtain a summary of what members said on the subject. I did not expect to have to speak at this stage, and therefore I have done this rather hurriedly. As I see it, from a quick perusal of *Hansard*, the attitude of Government members was as follows: The members for Barossa, Albert and Stirling did not mention the amendment when they spoke. The member for Gouger thought it was a political stunt, and he is entitled to his opinion, but I do not agree with him. The members for Torrens and Burnside did not mention the amendment. The member for Mitcham rather regrettably had much to say about it, but he treated it not on its merits, but as an issue, which he said was political.

Mr. Millhouse: What was regrettable?

Mr. CLARK: I thought the whole speech was regrettable. The honourable member probably thought it was a pretty good speech, and he is entitled to that opinion, but he did not convince me of it. The Premier's remarks

were rather tedious at the time, and I will not repeat them. Virtually he refused to give the matter serious consideration. He regarded it as a vote of no confidence and a political matter, and so made no attempt to assess the matter on its merits. I think he adopted that line as a convenient let-out to avoid having to debate the real problem. Last week we saw a change on his part. I do not intend to quote at length what he said—only one sentence; and many of us were pleased to hear him say it. We had the feeling that at least something might be done about the problem. I could not agree with him more when he said:

I do not deny that the best method of providing for land values to be assessed is a matter to be considered, and that that is a problem that everyone would desire to have dealt with. We on this side would, but I rather formed the opinion during the Address in Reply debate that the matter was not of much interest to Government members. We wonder why there has been a sudden change on the part of the Premier, and we might rightly ask several questions. Has the force of our argument in this debate had such an effect on the Premier that he is prepared to change his mind? I do not think so. Has the force of the argument put forward by deputations that waited on him had an effect? Again, I do not think so. I believe that the Premier has not changed his mind at all. He gave us some impression last week that he had, but when he continued his remarks this afternoon he did not fail to convince anyone that he is still of the same opinion. We were told this afternoon that he would not support the appointment of a Select Committee, because an inquiry by such a committee would be conducted from a political point of view. Possibly there may be some grounds for saying that such an inquiry would be made from a political point of view, but there would be two political points of view. My hope was that it would be possible to have three points of view.

Mr. Quirke: Would you like to be a member of the committee?

Mr. CLARK: Like the honourable member, if I were one of the members of the committee I think I would be pleased to act. I admit, however, that there would be some difficulties in my doing that because I am close to the problem. I had hoped that we would have three political points of view, one from this side and one from the other side, and I had hoped that you, Mr. Speaker, as an Independent member, and a member who has shown a real interest in this question, and sought to do something

about it, would also be on the committee. With a tri-lateral point of view we would have something better than the political point of view that would come from a committee appointed by the Premier. He said he did not want the committee to make a decision from a political point of view, but I feel that if he appointed a committee we would have a political point of view. No matter how worthy the gentlemen appointed by the Premier I feel that their ideas, opinions and thoughts on the matter would be tinged by the thoughts of the gentlemen who appointed them. All members have heard the Premier say, not facetiously, that if he had the right to appoint a Royal Commission he would virtually write the report.

Mr. Dunstan: His definition of "politics" is anything that disagrees with his view.

Mr. CLARK: There is much in that remark. The Premier said he did not want it to be a committee that would present a report from a political point of view, but I point out that it would be better to get a report on this important matter from the points of view of the best thoughts of the two political Parties and an Independent gentleman. It would be better for the committee not to be handicapped by the Premier. I think his remarks were more of a show than anything else. I believe the committee he wants would give the report he desires. Of course, then everybody would be happy, but we would get nowhere, except that the Premier would be able to say that he did this and he did that, but no real attempt would have been made to solve the problem. Members with any interest in this matter realize that enormous problems are associated with our present land tax system. There is no need for me to repeat the argument I have put forward again and again in favour of an inquiry into this matter. I have been fortunate in having had passed on to me a copy of the submissions by a deputation to the Premier recently. I think it was introduced by you, Mr. Speaker. I want to read some extracts from it, and to summarize some of the matters briefly in my own words. If I make errors in my summarizing no doubt you, Mr. Speaker, will be quick to draw attention to the inaccuracies. I cannot agree 100 per cent with some points in the submissions by the deputation, but I think members of the House would be well advised to take much note of the matters put forward. After all, it was a deputation from a number of farming, grazing and stud-breeding organizations. Also, there were representatives of wine grape-growers and the Red Comb Egg Association.

Practically all representative bodies engaged in agricultural pursuits in South Australia were represented. The deputation was concerned with land tax, council rates, succession, probate and gift duties, and water rates. Practically all these matters are included in the motion. I do not agree completely with everything submitted by this deputation, but I agree substantially with practically every point made. It began by saying:

The South Australian branch of the National Farmers' Union of Australia and affiliated bodies—

I have not given them all, but I have given some idea of the scope of the deputation—have given serious consideration to anomalies that have occurred and are likely to occur in greater incidence in the future in respect to the above matters. This deputation requests the Government to amend forthwith the Land Tax Act to alter retrospective tax from a five-year period to a one-year period.

I have not had time to examine this thoroughly and I am not certain that I agree with this. Continuing:

The deputation desires to request the Government to give favourable consideration to appointing a committee of inquiry with power to investigate the whole method of assessing and rating land for land tax, council rates, succession, probate and gift duty purposes and to be given the necessary authority to inquire into:

(a) whether any anomalies do exist in the assessment of land used for agricultural purposes and land adjacent thereto used for subdivisational purposes—

That, of course, is a very real problem in my area—

(b) whether those anomalies should be rectified and, if so, to make recommendations to remove such anomalies; and

(c) whether the present method of assessing land for council rates, succession and gift duty purposes should be altered (where land is used for agricultural purposes); and whereas for land tax purposes land be assessed as agricultural land (*vide* Land Tax Amendment Act 1961), and whether the same principle now approved by Parliament should be applied for the above purposes.

Many members of the organizations have found themselves faced with a serious position in carrying on their agricultural pursuits in view of the alarming increase in land tax, council rates and water rates.

These, of course, are added matters all connected with the same thing. Continuing:

At present the problem has been caused by land being purchased for subdivisational purposes alongside and adjacent to land used for agricultural pursuits. The problem became so

acute in the districts of Morphett Vale, Reynella and Noarlunga in respect to land tax assessments that the Government saw fit to introduce a Bill into Parliament to amend the Land Tax Assessment Act by enabling the agriculturists to apply for their land to be assessed as agricultural land. Parliament has therefore established the principle that a person carrying on an agricultural livelihood should really have his land assessed on an agricultural basis in respect to land tax.

I believe the next part is most important; I shall quote from the remarks made by this deputation particularly in connection with council rates. The deputation goes on to say that exactly the same problem still remains in respect of council rates. It points out something of which I have had a good deal of experience and which has caused me to have many telephone calls and to spend much time—the severe incidence of rates in the Salisbury District Council area. Later I shall give names of a few cases to show the very real increase and the hardship that could result from such steep increases. The submissions of the deputation continue:

The point we wish to stress is that whereas a speculating company purchases land at a colossal figure for the purposes of cutting it up for subdivisational activity the farmer across the fence is left with the problem of paying high council rates which are assessed on the block sold for subdivisational purposes. It is quite impossible for a farmer to continue as an agriculturist and pay these colossal rates based on subdivisions.

That is the point I made earlier in my remarks. Continuing:

We therefore ask that the Government consider amending the Local Government Act with a view to applying to district councils the same principle that has been adopted by Parliament to allow the agriculturist to apply for a reduction in his land tax assessment provided he carried on as a farmer.

The deputation went on to speak in a similar strain regarding succession and gift duty tax. It continues:

This deputation believes the time has now arrived where a new perspective should be adopted in respect to assessing land for all the above purposes. It must be quite obvious that a farmer growing wool, sheep, lambs, wheat, barley or vines cannot possibly continue as an agriculturist and pay these colossal land taxes, council rates and water rates.

It then went on to speak about succession and gift duties. The next two or three paragraphs are most important for members to consider because, to a great extent, they hold the kernel of the matter. I believe they are some of the things that would be first discussed and investigated by a committee such as that which

we seek to have appointed. The submission continues:

The point here is that assessors say that they are carrying out the definition of the Act—they assess the land on the definition of “unimproved value” in the Land Tax Act (section 4) and so the association believes that Parliament should lay down a new procedure for assessing land for all purposes; that is, as agricultural land. If the Local Government Act is amended accordingly, district councils can then apply a differential assessment where a farmer is carrying on his agricultural pursuits.

I will mention on this some of the steep increases in the Salisbury District Council area, but in doing so I am not attempting to reflect on the council. Naturally, I do not always agree with it, but all I am saying is that it is doing what it has every right to do. As all members know, most councils are glad to have any additional revenue they can get. In the Salisbury area, where there has been a big increase in the number of houses with the problems that consequently follow a growth of population, the council has needed plenty of finance. However, some of the assessments in that area made consequent on the increased land tax assessments were, to put it mildly, hard to put up with. Mr. A. Mumford, whose previous assessment was £79 15s., has a current assessment of £727 10s. That is a multiple increase of nine times what he paid before. Messrs. O. and R. Rossitano, who paid £82 10s. previously, now pay £247 10s.—three times as much. Bishop and Sons had a previous assessment of £50 and now have an assessment of £169; C. Santon's assessment increased from £6 to £27; G. W. Schultz's assessment increased from £9 to £52; D. Pioveson's assessment increased from 10s. to £14; G. Lupoi's assessment increased from £7 10s. to £41; J. H. Johnson's assessment increased from £39 to £121 6s.; and M. Tropeano's assessment increased from £16 7s. to £52. I can quote many more similar cases, but I will not do so. I think I have probably quoted enough to give the House a real idea of how steep were the council assessments consequent on development and the increase in land tax. I will quote two more paragraphs from the submissions made to the Premier by this deputation. The first is:

Until such time as any land is improved to the extent of becoming a housing area, it remains agricultural land, and under these circumstances should be rated on its productive capacity accordingly. This being so, the principle adopted by Parliament in respect to the Land Tax Act whereby an application could be made to assess the land as agricultural

land, should be applied to the district council assessments by amending the Local Government Act enabling councils concerned to apply the same principle.

I could not agree more. Another submission is:

Until this is put into effect, agriculturists in this State who own land in any area where subdivision is rife will suffer one of the greatest anomalies that has ever faced the primary producer in South Australia.

In the main I agree with the points raised by members of the deputation. I think that honourable members will agree that the deputation was representative of men who were making their living on the land, as in some cases their ancestors had done for generations. I consider it worth while bringing these points to the knowledge of the House. Some members may have seen a copy of this statement, but I know that many have not. In such a debate, anything that makes our point clearer that there is the need for a committee to inquire into the whole question of the land tax is worth bringing before the House. Members will know that practically all the matters I have mentioned or read from this document are contained in the motion. My Party believes sincerely that it is vital and essential to have an inquiry, but cannot agree that the inquiry should be undertaken by a committee appointed by the Premier; it should be a more representative committee than that. I am not reflecting on the gentlemen who would make up this committee because obviously I do not know who they would be. However worthy they may be, they would tend to give the kind of report that the Premier wanted them to give. The Premier on occasions has made that very point when opposing the proposed appointment of a Royal Commission or Select Committee. I am afraid that such a report would relate only to a few little things, magnified to make them look important. As to the Premier opposing the appointment of a political committee, I am very much afraid that the effect of what he desires would be only to make the inquiry more political—unfortunately, political from only one point of view. I do not think it would be of any help to anyone. I ask all members sincerely to consider the proposal, as it is worthy of their support and their keenest interest.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I oppose the motion, but nevertheless agree with some of the comments of the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark), because he says there is an essential need for an inquiry. We are in agreement that a problem exists, warranting an inquiry. However, we differ greatly as to how the inquiry

should be constituted. He has asked us to consider this motion carefully, but I cannot do that without also considering the method originally adopted by the Opposition. At that time it was a political stunt raised during the Address in Reply debate. Unfortunately, that reflects on this motion. It cannot be considered alone, but must be considered in conjunction with the first official mention of the matter in this House earlier this year. The fact that members opposite desire that the proposed committee should be composed of practising politicians would necessarily bring politics into the inquiry. Need I mention more than one fact of how far politics would intrude, as the proposal is a plank of the Labor Party's platform. All its members are pledged to support progressive taxation on properties exceeding £6,000 in value. This is the belief of members opposite which they are pledged to support and it precludes them from approaching the question independently. They are not able to do so because they are pledged in the opposite direction. Therefore, it becomes impossible to have this matter inquired into by a mixture of politicians from this House.

The problems mentioned by Mr. Clark have had my close attention during the last year or so. The particular aspect that has concerned my constituents and myself has been land tax and its incidence on those people having properties close to subdivisional development projects. This matter concerned this House last session, a Bill having been passed to give relief to landholders in such instances. Unfortunately, this did not have the wide-spread effect that we who voted for it expected it to have. People at Virginia have said they were not assisted in any way by the 1961 Land Tax Act Amendment Act which provided that certain land of high economic value for subdivisional purposes should remain as agricultural land. Under this amending Act it would be valued at agricultural land values. This of course greatly benefited people having properties close to the city which had a high value, perhaps £1,000 an acre. Under such circumstances they could claim to come under the Act in a defined area, and have their land assessed on agricultural values. This land would be assessed at the high agricultural values for market garden purposes. That would bring such an assessment down to £150 or £200 an acre. Land in the Virginia area does not come within a defined area. Landholders would be taxed heavily if the land were valued at £200 and they applied to have it valued for agricultural purposes. It would still

be valued on market garden values if the defined area were extended to Virginia. This would not provide them with any relief. Many of them are paying a tax of about £1 an acre on land that produces no more than other lands do tens or hundreds of miles from a capital city. That is just one aspect of this problem. There is a wide basis for setting up this inquiry, taking into account the representations made to the Government by its own members.

In one instance, the country convention of the Liberal and Country League passed a resolution calling upon the State Government to set up a competent committee of inquiry to investigate the whole field of land taxation. That motion was moved by the Virginia L.C.L. Branch and at that meeting I seconded it. It was carried unopposed. That is one basis on which the representations were made to this Government. Another basis is this sheaf of correspondence I have here containing a series of letters I have had with the Premier about the administration of the Land Tax Amendment Act. I started this correspondence on September 15, 1961, and continued it over a period of four, five or six months. Since then, of course, nothing more happened until this matter was raised in this House; but you, Mr. Speaker, have been active, as a leading member of the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association in this State, in bringing to the notice of the Government the anomalies that exist in land taxation. This problem extends from land taxation to water rating (which depends on land taxation values), council rating, and probate and succession duties.

I know of a property close to the Port Wakefield Road, just south of the Gawler River, where the water rating is far higher than it is for areas 50 miles north of Adelaide; yet that property, which has no prospect within the foreseeable future of any subdivisional or developmental activities, pays a greater water rate than a property producing far more an acre. These matters certainly call for inquiry by a competent committee. I stress that the area where this matter is considered to be contentious is, in the minds of most members, immediately surrounding the city. I hope that this matter is dealt with on a wider basis than that and that the whole State is included for consideration by this committee which we hope will be set up if the motion is defeated.

I urge members to defeat it and hope that the Government will choose wisely the members

of its proposed committee. It has been suggested by the Premier that Sir George Ligertwood should head this committee. That, of course, should recommend it to all members of the House. I hope I have demonstrated the need for a wide basis for this inquiry, and I trust that the Premier, in acceding to the representations of his own members and to the resolutions of his own Party, will set up an effective inquiry to investigate this important matter.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the motion as moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The House seems to be agreed that it is more than necessary for an inquiry to be held in accordance with the terms of the motion. We have an extraordinary difference of opinion voiced by the Premier: that the Select Committee would be a political one. But, if he selected the committee, it would be non-political. I do not know how green one must be to accept such a view, for in the final analysis, whoever may be the representatives on any committee that is to make recommendations in respect of land tax, one has to return here for the matter to be finally determined by legislation in this House before it can be effective. So, ultimately, members of this Parliament will have to decide what is going to happen in future in the assessing of land tax. To say that it is going to be a political committee if members from each side of this House are appointed to hear evidence and bring down a recommendation is just a little beyond comprehension, because both sides of the House will consider the evidence submitted.

Sufficient evidence has been submitted to the Government and to this Parliament to show that the time is long overdue for a new method of assessing land tax. No member of this House can ignore the fact that our overseas trade balances are determined by the success of agricultural pursuits in this State. It has been proved conclusively by every member who has spoken this afternoon that many of our primary industries are finding themselves in extreme difficulty because of the present method of assessing land values. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) by producing some figures demonstrated the great extent to which land tax has been increased. One set of figures will be sufficient to illustrate that. He quoted one figure of £79 15s. which, later, rose to £727 10s. This is not the full story, because council rates, the water rates and other assessments are based on the land tax assessment. So, to say that the primary producer has to pay only

ten times as much in this case is putting it more than moderately because, if the present system continues, this sort of thing must get worse.

The Premier tries to convince the House that a Parliamentary Select Committee would not be able to do this work, but many a Parliamentary Select Committee has been called upon to do mighty works in the interests of the State. Who would say that any one of the Select Committees of this House in the past showed a political bias in its recommendations? Every committee that has been selected in this House has come back with an unbiased opinion. It has considered the evidence submitted to it and on the evidence—and the evidence alone—it has made its decision.

Mr. Hall: What about your pledge to implement your land tax policy?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member interjects and says we have a policy.

Mr. Hall: It is in your platform.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The member for Gouger reminded the House that the Opposition has a policy and platform. Of course we have, but we are a flexible Party and if we find it necessary to alter our policy to meet the State's economic and developmental requirements we do so. That is more than can be said of the Government, which has no policy but merely moves of expediency. I challenge the member for Gouger to persuade one of his fellow members to rise and show the House his Party's policy in black and white.

Mr. Hall: It is not pre-judged.

Mr. Lawn: The Premier would appoint the committee and write its report.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUTCHENS: Any report of any committee must be considered by this Parliament which has the sovereign power to amend the legislation regarding land tax assessments. To suggest that a committee would be political is merely an attempt to mislead the House. Those most interested in this motion are the wheat-growers, woolgrowers, egg producers, wine-growers and district councils.

Mr. Jenkins: They were all represented on the deputation, and they did not want a Select Committee.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member is becoming intelligent; he is repeating what I am saying. We are here at the good graces of those people and we are obliged to listen to

them whether we have policies or not. To suggest that it is not competent for a Select Committee of this House to listen to evidence and make an unbiased report is a direct condemnation of the House and every member in it.

Mr. Hall: No!

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member did not argue to the contrary when he spoke. Can any member suggest that the Public Works Committee, which comprises members of both Parties, has brought down politically biased recommendations?

Mr. Hall: It has not dealt with taxation.

Mr. HUTCHENS: No, but it has dealt with almost every other subject under the sun. I was a member of the Land Settlement Committee for some time and served with representatives from the Government on that committee. I never once heard any member develop a political argument. We made recommendations in what we considered were the best interests of the State.

Mr. Hall: Could you ignore your pledge on the—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a conversation between the member for Gouger and the member for Hindmarsh.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I urge members to recognize the importance of this motion. Any action to delay the commencement of this inquiry will adversely affect primary producers on whom we rely to provide us with favourable trade balances.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Previous speakers have emphasized the importance of this subject to primary producers. The only objection made by the Premier and the member for Gouger was that the appointment of the Select Committee we suggest would be political. However, it is clear from what other Opposition speakers have said that if the Premier appointed a committee there would certainly be an accusation that it was political. It has been pointed out that such a committee would be politically inclined one way, and that is a certainty. We cannot imagine the Government's appointing a committee that would not comprise people favourably inclined to its political views.

Mr. Hall: It would not be political: it would not be pledged.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The honourable member does not realize that man is a political animal and that it is impossible to find anyone who is truly neutral. As one writer said years ago, only the stars are neutral.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member referring to the member for Gouger as a political "animal"?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am not sure whether he is an animal of the higher order or of the lower order: he can decide that issue for himself. Man being a political animal, I think the honourable member will surely realize that it would be impossible to select a committee—whether it is selected by the Premier, the Government or this Parliament—that has not political views.

Mr. Quirke: Would that apply to a Royal Commission?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, definitely. I do not know of any person who has not political views, nor does the honourable member.

Mr. Quirke: But a Royal Commission is pledged to do a job.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, and so would the members of this House be pledged to do a job. To insinuate that the members of this House, when pledged to do a job, are not just as capable of doing it properly because they have political views is a reflection on the character of the members of this House.

Mr. Hall: No! You are specifically pledged.

Mr. LOVEDAY: It is absurd to suggest that because members have strong political views they could not investigate this matter properly and fairly.

Mr. Quirke: I think you might find a lot of them running for cover.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Burra can make his speech later.

Mr. LOVEDAY: For a long time I have been interested in this question of man's being a political animal. I have noticed in local government activities that if one is in an area that is predominantly Labor the Liberal persons in that community always say that there are no Party politics in local government. However, when they are discussing the city of Adelaide it is an entirely different matter: the Liberal Party is quite happy to endorse candidates for local government and no-one suggests then that there is no Party politics in local government. The boot is on the other foot. We have the same position now. Members opposite claim that the Select Committee we propose will be Party political because they won't have the actual selection of the committee. In other words, if it is truly representative politically, they don't want it. They want it to be representative of their own political views, and nothing else.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member had better relate his remarks to the motion. The committee has not yet been appointed so I do not think his comments are relevant to the debate.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I was dealing with objections raised by the Premier to the motion. I want to deal now with a particular objection raised by the member for Gouger. I believe I am right in saying that the member thought it would be dangerous to appoint the committee we suggested, because members of the Australian Labor Party were committed to progressive increases in land taxation on properties valued at over £6,000. That has absolutely nothing to do with the motion, because it deals with the method of assessment and not with the total of taxation or whether it should be progressive. The method of assessment is the vital issue. Under present conditions we find speculative values entering into the buying of land and this affects people living in the areas involved. That has nothing to do with the Labor Party's platform of progressive land tax.

If the member thinks that under a Labor Government land tax will necessarily be higher, I invite him to read the *News* of Thursday, September 20, where he will find a report headed "Land Tax 'hunt' is on". The report is from Sydney and it states that the Land Tax Office has compiled a Domesday Book of landowners to aid a hunt for unpaid land taxes running into millions of pounds. Further, a description is given of the methods used in the Land Tax Office, but I shall not read that because it is irrelevant. The report continues:

The average home owners do not have to pay land tax. It is based on unimproved capital values of more than £15,000 for primary production land and more than £7,500 for other land.

The average house owner in New South Wales does not have to pay land tax because New South Wales has a Labor Government. If the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) examines our Land Tax Act he will find that the value of land for taxation purposes commences at £5,000, not £7,500. Therefore, the member need have no worries or fears about the dangers associated with the appointment to the committee of members from this side of the House. His fears are not borne out by what has happened in New South Wales, which is a good example.

Mr. Quirke: Has the honourable member seen today's *News* about taxation in New South Wales?

Mr. LOVEDAY: No. The report continues:

Minimum valuations were doubled last year because rising land values had brought home owners into the land tax brackets.

That is a further indication that land tax rates in New South Wales have been considerably lower than they have been in South Australia under a Liberal Government. Obviously, it is far more dangerous to have a committee appointed by a Liberal Government than it is to have one composed of members of both sides of the House. That effectively deals with the objections raised by the member for Gouger. Dealing with the question of whether people of Liberal or Labor persuasion are best fitted to deal with this question, it has been suggested that Labor members have a bias towards progressive land taxation, and it is true that members of the Labor Party favour taxation based on unimproved land values, but it is also interesting to anyone acquainted with local government to observe that members of the Liberal persuasion for the most part favour taxation based on rental values in local government affairs.

There again, a bias is exhibited in a particular direction, but I would not say that disqualifies members of the Liberal Party from sitting on the committee we suggest. A mixture of various points of view should bring about a better result than that which would be achieved if the suggestion of the Premier were adopted. In the latter case we know that a certain class of people will be selected and that they will hold the same views as those held by the Government.

A further important point is that the final decision, on the recommendation of any committee appointed, will be made in this House. In other words, it will be a political decision. Now, surely, it is quite absurd to carry this argument further on the points advanced by the Premier. Although the final decision will be made in Parliament, the people making that decision will not have shed their political views.

Mr. Millhouse: If you had your way, whom would you put on the committee?

The SPEAKER: Order! This motion has nothing to say about the membership of the committee.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am not discussing the personnel of the committee; I do not think that question comes into the discussion at all. The member for Mitcham is obviously obtruding something that is irrelevant.

Mr. Millhouse: I think it is very relevant.

The SPEAKER: It is quite irrelevant. The House must make up its mind firstly what it will do before a committee is appointed.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The main points have already been well made on the motion. There is no question about the desirability of this inquiry; there is no question of the desirability of having a committee representing different political points of view to ensure that every angle is properly examined. To suggest that a joint committee, as suggested by the Labor Party, cannot deal with this matter properly and investigate it conscientiously is to reflect upon the ability of members of this House. I hope that the motion receives the support of the House.

Mr. Clark: Isn't that exactly what Parliament is for?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Exactly! We maintain that that is the virtue of this Parliament: that it is able to get all points of view on the question, and it is because all points of view are reflected and the matter is examined in the light of those points of view that we get the best results. We are doing the right thing to ensure proper, conscientious and adequate investigation into this question. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I join with members on this side in supporting the motion submitted by the Leader. The whole point revolves around the fact mentioned by the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), that recommendations made by any committee must be placed before the House and decided upon by members of Parliament. We have only to recall committees that have been appointed by Parliament, such as the Public Works Committee, the Industries Development Committee, and others that are all comprised of members of Parliament from both Houses. The information gathered by those committees is correlated and a decision is arrived at, apparently, without Party politics entering into the discussion. Members of those committees realize that they must have at heart the interests of the State, and for that reason Party politics are put aside and the interests of the State are borne in mind. Therefore, apart from the time factor, there is no reason at all why members of Parliament should not comprise the suggested committee. That would place a strain on members, but this question is important from the State's point of view and we have seen how important it is regarded by the public through deputations to the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. It is the duty

of members of Parliament to find time to carry out these duties. The Premier said that the Opposition wanted to make it a Party political show, but I think the boot is rather on the other foot. It has been proved in the past—and no doubt it will be proved again in the future—that he will do anything to hold the reins of office in this State. In his capacity as Leader of the Government, I think that if he had the opportunity of forming a special committee to delve into land tax he would see that that committee was one that would favour whatever he had to say. The Premier would have full access to whatever information was collated by that committee, and there is no doubt in my mind that the influence he would exert on the committee would be one-sided and would not be in the best interests of the State on such an important question as this.

We maintain that an impartial committee consisting of members of this House should be set up to inquire into land tax. I can see no reason why that committee would not be an impartial one. However, if a committee is to be set up by one side of the House, it will definitely be influenced by the leader of the Party setting it up. Land tax is a particularly vital issue in this State today. People on the land realize that unless something is done many of them who are feeling the strain today with increased costs of production will be forced to sell some of their property to meet their commitments or sell out altogether. Already, the tendency is for land to be reaggregated into large holdings in some parts of the State. I urge members to think seriously about this important matter, in which impartiality is of paramount importance. I support the Leader's motion, and I hope members opposite will do likewise.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I agree with members on both sides of the House that land tax is a matter of great importance to everybody in this State. I also agree with the Premier and members on this side of the House that a committee should be formed outside of Parliament. Some members have likened the duties of the proposed committee to those of the Land Settlement and the Public Works Committees, but I consider that this is something of far greater importance and of far greater scope than anything that has ever been undertaken by either one of those very good committees. This committee would have effect over the whole of the State and would affect almost everybody in some way. Members of this House are very competent in some ways,

but in my opinion they would hardly be competent to take evidence of the nature that would be needed by such a committee as this. I think such a committee would need somebody with a knowledge of the workings of the Commonwealth Taxation Department or the State Land Tax Department, because the machinery dealing with land tax is so complicated. The committee would need at least one member with vast experience in the various methods of land valuation, not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the whole State. I think that probably these things are outside the capabilities of members of this House.

Mr. LAWN: Do you say that a committee would not be competent to take evidence?

Mr. JENKINS: A committee of members of this House could accept and compile evidence, but much more would be involved than merely taking the evidence. I think most members of such a committee should have a firsthand knowledge of the methods of assessing land values. Members of the committee should be men of great experience. Preferably, the chairman should be a member of the judiciary, for as such he would not be influenced by any Party or anybody else. I think that is the only way in which anything worth while will ever come out of any committee or commission set up to do this job. I oppose the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I would not have spoken at this stage but for the remarks of the last speaker, who disagreed with Parliament's setting up a committee.

Mr. Jenkins: I did not say that.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member disagreed with the motion, which provides for the setting up of a committee consisting of members of Parliament to consider land tax. One reason he advanced for opposing the motion was that the committee would not be competent to dissect evidence.

Mr. Jenkins: I said that members of Parliament would not have experience in assessing land values.

Mr. LAWN: I understood the honourable member to use the expression "dissecting evidence". I also understood him to imply that a committee of members of Parliament would not be competent to hear evidence. However, I do not wish to misrepresent him on the matter. The honourable member said that members would not have enough experience of assessing evidence. It seems that the honourable member was not very clear on the subject, and that he does not know what he said. If

a committee of this House is not competent to hear points of view and ultimately to make a recommendation to this House regarding matters—

Mr. Clark: We do that every day, don't we?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, that is what I was coming to. What is the work of the Public Works Committee, the Subordinate Legislation Committee and other committees of this House? We have the Subordinate Legislation Committee—

Mr. Jenkins: That committee deals with a specific reference: this is one with much greater scope.

Mr. LAWN: The idea is that the proposed committee would do a specific job, for the wording of the motion would ensure that all aspects of land tax would be investigated. We have another committee dealing with the development of industries. We have industries coming before that committee and stating their claims for Government backing and for Government money. That committee is not going to throw away Government money, and no-one can say that it is not competent to deal with the important matters that come before it. One committee that stands out above all others is our Public Works Committee, to which every State undertaking that is to cost more than £100,000 must be referred for investigation before coming to this House. The Public Works Committee investigates all sorts of projects, and works practically each morning of the week before the House meets. When the House is not meeting the committee spends more time on its work. It investigates matters that involve millions of pounds. It hears evidence, dissects it, and presents reports to Parliament. I was surprised to hear a member opposite suggest that members of this place would be incompetent to take evidence, dissect it, come to a decision and present a report to Parliament. In this debate all sorts of statements have been made by Government members. One was that the proposed committee would be political. Do members think that the Public Works Committee is political? I challenge any member to say that that is so. It has been said often that it is non-political. It is accepted that the committee does its job irrespective of politics, and has done it for years.

Mr. Jennings: That applies to every Parliamentary committee.

Mr. LAWN: I think we can say it also about the Subordinate Legislation Committee and the Industries Development Committee. Why should the proposed committee be political when

dealing with land values? The Premier does not want an investigation. He has made that clear. He has been pressed for a long time to have an investigation. Last year Parliament considered a Bill to increase land tax. Opposition members sought to reduce the tax on the minimum taxable amount of £5,000 from 3d. in the pound to 4d. in the pound. The Premier opposed the move. He had the numbers then, but he is not in the same position today. Now he depends on the casting vote of the Speaker, who has led many deputations to him. Prior to that, as a floor member of this place you, Mr. Speaker, spoke about the high land taxation in South Australia. The Premier now feels that the tide may be running against him, and he is prepared to come some of the way, but will not agree to the motion in its present form because, if carried, it will bring the Opposition some credit for steering the matter through Parliament. The Premier says he will agree to similar terms of reference, plus anything the chairman of his committee might require, but will not agree to the motion because, if carried, it will bring some credit to the Opposition. He said that if a Select Committee were appointed it would be political. I have heard him say, "Give me the right to have a Royal Commission and I will write its report". I do not know whether he has done that, but in the 1940's he introduced a Bill for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the activities of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. No-one ever thought that the Liberal Party would do such a thing. It was done because the company would not burn Leigh Creek coal. The Royal Commission brought in the report the Premier wanted. When we have made suggestions since about the appointment of a Royal Commission, the Premier has made the remark I mentioned, "Give me the right to have a Royal Commission and I will write its report." He has killed us when we have asked for a Royal Commission. That is what he thinks of Royal Commissions.

In order to make sure of tying up the report on land values he wants a committee of four to be appointed by him. That is why he opposes our motion and says it would be political. He has indicated that if the motion is defeated he will move another motion. That would be the more political of the two. It has been suggested by the other side that if any of our members were on the Select Committee they would be biased, but the member for Whyalla pointed out that Labor policy is progressive taxation on unimproved land values. That is the form of tax that applies at present.

We have progressive or graduated taxation now. It starts at ¼d. in the pound and then progressively increases. The Commonwealth Government is a Liberal Government, and our income taxation is on a graduated basis.

The member for Whyalla gave some information that I think took members generally by surprise. In South Australia all land is taxed. Up to a value of £5,000 the tax is ¼d. in the pound. If the total tax does not exceed £1, the land is exempt from taxation, but that is the total exemption. The member for Whyalla said that in New South Wales, where there is a Labor Government, private blocks of land used for house or shop purposes up to a value of £7,500 are exempt. No tax is paid until the land is worth more than £7,500. A block of land used for primary production, and this should interest members on the other side, worth not more than £15,000 is exempt from land tax. If anyone would be prejudiced in this matter, surely it would be members on the other side. I remember when the Premier introduced a Bill to ease succession duties. He said it was done because of inflation, but don't members think that is one of the reasons for the outcry against our land taxation? If we do not have an investigation by a Select Committee, we should do something along the lines indicated by Mr. Loveday, who pointed out what is done in New South Wales. Perhaps we could increase the minimum amount to be taxed. I support the motion, and if it is carried we shall have less politics in the work of the committee than we shall have if the motion is defeated and the Premier's suggestion is adopted.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1033.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the second reading of this Bill, which contains features objectionable to me and the Party I represent, but, if the second reading is carried, I reserve the right to move two amendments in Committee. This Government strongly opposed the establishment of a meatworks at Noarlunga about five years ago and, as far as I can ascertain, its opposition was based on a legal point of whether the company required a permit from the Government to slaughter for export. The case eventually

went to the Privy Council, which ruled that the company did not require a State licence to slaughter meat for export. The case did not hinge on processing meat for local consumption because the company did not during the flush season get the output it was believed that it would get. I do not intend to deal with this company at length, although I shall probably have more to say about it later.

The Government has now introduced panic legislation that reverses its policy and even allows meatworks to be established within the metropolitan area, and for what reason? I point out, as members on this side of the House know, that employees engaged at the abattoirs are working five days a week, which is their normal working period. At no time have they worked on an overtime basis on Mondays to Fridays inclusive. They have in the past worked on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays as and when the occasion has required. Not long ago these same people were highly commended for slaughtering sheep and cattle injured in the drastic bush fires, yet I have been told that, when representatives of the Meat Industry Employees' Union approached representatives of the management of the abattoirs recently to discuss an application for an additional one week's leave a year because of certain diseases believed to exist at the abattoirs (about which the Minister spoke yesterday), they were led to believe that this would not be granted. I believe this reply can be attributed to the Chairman of the Board although if that is not so no doubt I shall be corrected. Probably the same reply would be received if the men applied to their wages board. Is it any wonder that, when no agreement can be reached between representatives of the management and the union, a conflict of views exists immediately? As a result, the Government has introduced this panic legislation.

Mr. Jenkins: Call it relief legislation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I call it panic legislation.

Mr. Millhouse: Panic on your side!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Who is panicking?

Mr. Millhouse: You, I think.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Mitcham!

Mr. Millhouse: Who introduced the word "panic"?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I did.

Mr. Quirke: Pannikin boss!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It would not be hard to prove my contention that it was panic legislation. Section 70 of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act provides:

While abattoirs are available under this Act for slaughtering stock no person shall within the metropolitan abattoirs area—

- (a) elsewhere than at the said abattoirs slaughter or allow or cause to be slaughtered any stock for sale for human consumption or dress or allow or cause to be dressed any carcass for sale; or
- (b) sell or attempt to sell or expose for sale or allow or cause to be sold or exposed for sale any carcass or meat not slaughtered at such abattoirs;

The next subsection contains a proviso that if meat slaughtered outside the Metropolitan Abattoirs' area is brought to certain places for inspection, and if there is not enough room or time to make an inspection there, it goes to the abattoirs for inspection. Meat is brought from beyond the boundaries of the Mitcham district to Adelaide, returned to Blackwood, and resold over the counter. In addition to all the things I have mentioned, the meat must be taken to Adelaide to the point of inspection and then to Blackwood to be sold over the counter. The same applies to Noarlunga. The Noarlunga meatworks is now being operated by the Metropolitan Wholesale Meat Company Limited, which claims it is rendering a service to the people.

The Minister of Agriculture received a communication from the South Australian Wholesale Meat Company Limited, sited in the Government Produce Department at Light Square, to the effect that it is operating at Kangarilla, which is a little over 20 miles from Adelaide. It has business interests in three retail shops and supplies processed meat, cooked meat, smallgoods and the like to another client. It desires to continue its meat supply. There may be other companies in a similar position.

Clause 3 of the Bill inserts the following:

Section 70a. (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Minister, if he is of the opinion that in the interests of the public it is expedient so to do, may grant a licence for such period as he shall think fit to any person to slaughter, elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board, any stock for sale for human consumption.

I return to the panic. Is any other organization to receive immediate consideration if, when this Bill becomes law, it is ready to build a meatworks? A company known as W. Angliss & Company (Australia) Proprietary Limited has already made strong representations to set up a big concern within the metropolitan abat-

toirs area. At the moment no overtime is being worked at the Metropolitan Abattoirs beyond the 40-hour week, but I have yet to learn that anybody has been short of a meat supply as a result of this recent action. I can only use the figures submitted by the Minister of Agriculture who indicated that about £2,000,000 was invested in the abattoirs. I can only assume that that investment is mostly public money. Why should the public want another meatworks established near the Metropolitan Abattoirs? That is certainly beyond understanding.

Let us take it a step farther. If meatworks are to be established in any area, will they be subject to inspection to ensure normal standards of killing, as provided in the Abattoirs Act? I can find nothing in the Act that lays down standards and conditions for the slaughtering of stock. If stock were slaughtered outside the metropolitan abattoirs area, the inspectors would have a right to say what type of conveyance should be used. Then, it would have to pass the scrutiny of the examiner, and that would be all. In spite of everything, there must still be some dissatisfaction with the working conditions at the abattoirs. It is not altogether the fault of the board or of the employees, who have good reason for saying that a working week of 40 hours should not be exceeded. Why, then, do we insist that it must? If, in accordance with the terms of the Bill when passed, these meatworks are established within the metropolitan abattoirs area, will they have to provide for an excessive plant that could not possibly be used other than at certain peak periods? I believe that now is a peak period. What happens in the off-peak periods, which probably last from nine to 10 months? Can we afford to say of any meatworks that may be established within the metropolitan abattoirs area, in competition with the present abattoirs, where its supply shall go? The Abattoirs Board has admitted that it can supply all the meat requirements of the metropolitan area. It transports meat as far south as Marino, into the Adelaide Hills, and over wide distances. No-one has gone short of meat through the employees not working overtime.

I disagree with the Government's claim that this Bill is reasonable and necessary. If another meatworks is established in the metropolitan area, will it be able to compete with the Metropolitan Abattoirs in supplying the metropolitan area, will that area be divided, or will a quota system be introduced? Proposed section 70a (3) states:

If the Minister is of opinion that an inspection of any carcasses or meat additional to the inspection provided for in the licence relating to such carcasses or meat is necessary for the purpose of safeguarding the health of the public, he may give such directions to the owner of the meat as he considers necessary to ensure that an additional inspection is made before the meat is sold, and the owner of the meat shall comply with such directions.

I believe that this provision may need amending. It also provides that any person who fails to comply with a direction shall be guilty of an offence. Proposed section 70a (2) states:

Any such licence may contain conditions as to all or any of the following matters, namely:

The branding, and inspection of carcasses slaughtered and any other matters which in the Minister's opinion are required for the purpose of ensuring compliance with law or in the interests of the public.

I believe that the licence should provide for the inspection of carcasses at the place of slaughter. I have already referred to the hardship imposed on those persons who seek a quota of the metropolitan supply. They must kill the animal and bring the meat to a place of inspection approved by the board; the meat must be hot, and it must be returned to their place of business after inspection. If it is necessary to approve the establishment of other killing centres, it should be the Minister's obligation to appoint the necessary inspectors.

I understand that at the meatworks outside the metropolitan abattoirs area there is no dispute between union and managements. I believe that between 40 and 50 persons are employed at Noarlunga and about 15 at Kangarilla. I do not know how many are employed at Strathalbyn and elsewhere, but there is no friction between management and personnel. Those meatworks would be capable of slaughtering, even for export purposes. At Noarlunga a Commonwealth meat inspector is engaged to supervise the carcasses for export. If some of that meat does not meet export requirements it can be admitted to the metropolitan area, but that right of entry was not granted until 1958. Although a Commonwealth inspector examines the meat that meat must be brought, while hot, to a place appointed for inspection before it can be accepted for human consumption in the metropolitan area. At present the Government will not accept the examination of the Commonwealth inspector. I do not know why there is a need to duplicate the inspection. I do not know what the export standard is, but I believe that certain weights are involved. However, if I am wrong, no doubt my colleagues will correct me.

I believe that reasonably good relations have existed between the union and the board of management and that negotiations have taken place for improved conditions. During my experience in union matters I have never hesitated to negotiate for improved conditions wherever possible, because workers engaged in industry have their labour to sell, whether it be sold for wages or salaries, and that labour should be sold under the best available conditions in the various industries. In the case under discussion the employees consider that, because of the work they perform, an additional week's sick leave is necessary, whereas on the other hand the management says "We are not prepared to grant this." I have heard nothing of this grave emergency that is alleged to be occurring at the abattoirs, but, if a grave emergency exists, what efforts have been made by the Government or any of its representatives to solve the problem by conciliation? I have not been informed of any such attempts. If a straight-out approach were made to the management by the union having members engaged at the abattoirs surely, instead of this stalemate, some attempt should and could have been made to solve the problem. I believe that ample time existed for an approach, but as I have heard nothing about it I assume nothing has been done. Negotiations would have achieved better results than the Bill, which was explained in the Minister's second reading speech. I will oppose the second reading and if it is carried I will submit certain amendments. If they are not accepted I will call for a division on the third reading. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the union has always adopted a reasonable approach in these matters, and I believe it would be prepared to discuss this question if the case were examined more closely. I hasten to reiterate, following the information I gave the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) yesterday, that the abattoirs is fully equipped and can be manned to cope with the meat requirements in the metropolitan area. Therefore, it is not necessary—

Mr. Quirke: Will you read the full title of the Abattoirs Board? It is the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I was referring to a question in which I was asked to provide certain information. I approached the union Secretary and as a result I provided the fullest information. I do not think that I can do more than give an honest explanation. I do not question the information I received from the Secretary. Dealing with the letter, if an

extreme emergency exists at the abattoirs on products for export, resulting from the application made by the union to the management, why hasn't the Government done something in the interests of the people it represents? I oppose the second reading.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I support the Bill, and despite the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that it is a panic Bill I will try to show that it is a Bill the object of which is to attempt to overcome an emergency. Unfortunately, from what I have heard from the Leader of the Opposition, he does not seem to realize the extent of the emergency existing at the abattoirs. However, before dealing with that I shall come back to the last remark of the Leader on the question I asked yesterday. In his answer the honourable member said:

I think that, instead of making a second reading speech, the member for Rocky River could have extended to me this afternoon the courtesy of asking whether I had a reply to that question, which I would readily have agreed to give.

I do not know why the Leader made that statement because, five minutes before I asked the question, I received a slip of paper from him on which was written "I have the answer to your question".

Mr. Frank Walsh: I did that out of courtesy.

Mr. HEASLIP: Why the Leader should think that I was discourteous I do not know, and I consider that his comment was quite uncalled for and quite unnecessary. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) yesterday made the remark "rubbish", and even though he had to withdraw the remark he was entirely correct, in my opinion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not comment on that matter.

Mr. HEASLIP: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that the Leader was merely passing on the information supplied by the Secretary of the union when he said:

The Secretary of the union also informs me that there is no shortage of labour whatever at the abattoirs to supply all the meat that is required for human consumption in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Jenkins: That is not the point, is it?

Mr. HEASLIP: No. What a narrow view! The union cannot see further than the metropolitan area. Apparently the Opposition does not realize that there is an emergency. The union states that there is enough meat for consumption in the metropolitan area, and apparently that is all its members think about; they do not think of the people that produce it

or the losses those people are incurring, and they do not think of the suffering of the animals out there. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in a letter to a newspaper, said that there was nothing to worry about, as only a few sheep were affected. Actually, there were nearly 30,000 sheep in the small paddocks at the abattoirs, but the R.S.P.C.A. said there was no need to worry; three sheep had died, but there was no need to worry about that. If these people go into the country later and see the effects that this ban will have in the losses of hundreds of sheep through starvation, they will realize that there is some reason to act; at the present time it does not hit them.

In introducing this Bill the Government has done something that I think is long overdue. I believe that this Bill or a similar one should have been introduced years ago, because for years now—not every year but almost every year—the slaughtermen at the abattoirs, as soon as the producer has the sheep ready to be slaughtered, point a gun at his head and say, "Give us this or we won't kill your sheep." That has been going on for years, and it should have been brought to a halt much sooner than this. I do not know whether members opposite know the industrial record of the abattoirs, but it is anything but nice. From 1950 to 1955 there were 42 industrial disputes out there.

Mr. Fred Walsh: How many have there been since 1955?

Mr. HEASLIP: I will deal with that in a moment. In those five years there were 42 industrial disputes.

Mr. Fred Walsh: There has not been one since 1955, and I challenge you to deal with that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I will come to that. In 1950 there was one strike and four industrial disputes. In November, 1951, the men were dismissed for a period because of irritation tactics and an endeavour to force claims for increased pay and three weeks' annual leave. It will be seen that they took that action when the glut period was on. They are employed there for 12 months of the year, and for nine or 10 months of the year they do not cause any trouble at all, but as soon as the sheep and lambs are ready to be killed the men adopt the irritation tactics and go on strike and ban overtime. In 1952 there were five disputes, and in 1953 there were six. It was in 1953 that the Industrial Board granted the men three weeks' annual leave.

Mr. Ryan: There must have been some justification for the stoppage a couple of years before.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think there is ever any justification for pointing a gun at anybody's head.

Mr. Ryan: Why did the court grant it?

Mr. HEASLIP: The union causes a stoppage when we have to get rid of the stock.

Mr. Ryan: Was the court biased in its judgment?

Mr. HEASLIP: I will come to that point in a moment. In this case the court granted the men three weeks' annual leave, and one of the conditions in the granting of that concession was that they would work overtime; and they promised to work overtime.

Mr. Ryan: You believe in overtime, do you?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a private conversation.

Mr. HEASLIP: It does not matter whether or not I believe in overtime. When the men were granted three weeks' annual leave in 1953 they promised they would work overtime when required, and they did so for a number of years, and things went along quite well for a little while. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) asked what had happened since 1955. Unfortunately, I have not the details of the disputes since then, but there have been a number.

Mr. Ryan: Why have you got details of disputes before 1955 but not after?

Mr. HEASLIP: Because this information has to be supplied by the Minister of Agriculture. In 1955 a question was asked in this House, and the figures quoted in the reply are incorporated in *Hansard* for anybody to read. Had I given notice of a question yesterday probably I could have obtained the more recent figures from the Minister today, and perhaps I should have done so. Although in 1953 the men promised that they would work overtime they have now banned it. I am sure that the Leader does not understand the position, for he made some statements that were very wide of the mark. A recent report in the *Stock and Station Journal* on this matter states:

No recent application had been made to the Abattoirs Industrial Board for extension of annual paid sick leave for members of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees' Union, according to the Chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, Mr. David Waterhouse. Mr. Waterhouse said there appeared to be some misconceptions about the chain of events which had led to the present ban on overtime by employees at the abattoirs. The

union had approached the Abattoirs Board with an application to have annual paid sick leave doubled from 40 to 80 hours a year, he said. The board at a special meeting refused this request, and, in advising the union, said that the application should be submitted to the Abattoirs Industrial Board for decision.

In other words, the board just cannot give it: it has to go to the proper authority. The report continues:

This was in accordance with an assurance given at a mass meeting of employees when the three weeks' annual leave decision was made in 1953 that all industrial disputes of this nature would be submitted to the Industrial Board, and that the union would abide by its decision. At that time the union also gave an assurance it would work overtime when required. However, when the board refused the union's sick leave application the employees held a stop-work meeting and decided to ban all overtime. "The Industrial Board is comprised of four employers' representatives, four union representatives, and an independent chairman." Mr. Waterhouse said, "This board is the proper authority to make decisions of this nature." Mr. Waterhouse pointed out the present practice of the Abattoirs Board was to make sick leave cumulative without limitation, although the award only provided that it should be cumulative for five years. "The board also pays accumulated sick leave not taken."

I hope that gives the background to the position that now exists. I am surprised that the Opposition does not support the Bill, because I always thought it opposed monopolies.

Mr. Quirke: It is not a Socialist monopoly.

Mr. HEASLIP: This is a monopoly, because no-one has the right to compete against it. The Bill will allow competition, which competition has not been allowed in the past. I thought the Opposition would support the Bill because it gets rid of a monopoly. It is a monopoly that has been bad. All monopolies are bad, and I think the Opposition believes that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: We believe in State monopolies.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member believes in that but not other monopolies. They are all bad.

Mr. Ryan: Don't you support the Electricity Trust?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am talking about the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I do not think we shall get proper results until we have free enterprise and healthy competition.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Why not advocate free enterprise for the Electricity Trust?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am trying to stick to the Bill, which deals with the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is in order in doing that.

Mr. HEASLIP: In getting this competition we as producers may have to pay more for our killing. Don't run away with the idea that the Metropolitan Abattoirs has cheap charges, because that is not so. The slaughtering charges are not low, in comparison with others. I do not blame the board or the slaughtermen for that. Work at the Metropolitan Abattoirs is a seasonal occupation. If it continued the whole year, as it does in Queensland where there is a continuity of supply, our charges would be on a par with, if not lower than, others, but at present they are above them. We have gluts and then nothing to do, because there is no continuity of supply. As producers we shall probably have to pay more, because of the competition. We may get it done more cheaply, but I do not know. We have some assets at the abattoirs. In his second reading explanation the Minister of Agriculture said:

Members will recognize that this legislation, in providing competition for the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs, could embarrass it in some respects. The public investment in the abattoirs is considerable. It is made up in the following way:

	£
Debenture funds (almost entirely Treasury advances) . . . . .	842,823
Grants (some Commonwealth largely concerning sale yards) . . . . .	44,433
Internal provisions and reserves reinvested . . . . .	951,963

In connection with the £842,823 and the £44,433, that is the extent to which the taxpayer's money is involved. The £951,963 represents profits made by the abattoirs, and does not represent taxpayers' money. There is no chance of our losing these assets. I do not think we shall lose any of them, but we shall not be able to run the abattoirs at a profit because of the competition. Prices will be forced down. Private enterprise competition will reduce prices. Primary producers want to keep costs down. We do not work 40 hours a week, but 60 hours, and do it continuously. We do not ban overtime. I would like to see the member for Port Adelaide, if we do not supply any stock to the metropolitan area—

Mr. Fred Walsh: Whom do you refer to as "we"?

Mr. HEASLIP: The primary producers, who keep the metropolitan people supplied with meat.

Mr. Ryan: At a price.

Mr. HEASLIP: Irrespective of the price.

We do not put the price on our produce. We accept what is offered. We do not go on strike and put a pistol at the head of the consumers in the metropolitan area. Unfortunately, not enough people realize the job that is being done by the primary producers.

Mr. Ryan: Where does the discrepancy in the price occur?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know what price the honourable member is speaking about. The slaughtermen at the abattoirs are putting a pistol at our head and refusing to work overtime.

Mr. Quirke: I do not think the slaughtermen are doing that.

Mr. HEASLIP: If it is not the slaughtermen, it is the union. I think the member for Burra might have a point there, but I do not want to go into it. The men are advised by the union and the result is that slaughtering is not done as it should be. A strange statement came from the member for Frome in an interjection when Mr. Quirke was speaking. He asked that member how much the primary producers were losing, and, rightly, Mr. Quirke replied that he could not say.

Mr. Casey: That is not quite what the question was. It is not close enough.

The SPEAKER: This is not an inquiry into what was said. The member for Rocky River.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Frome said it was 2d. a pound.

Mr. Hall: On the export market.

Mr. HEASLIP: No. The member for Frome is a primary producer and I would have thought that he knew more about the matter.

Mr. Casey: That was on the ruling price that day, and I got it from a stock firm that morning.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member did not take into account all the losses, only one. He did not consider the fact that because of the ban thousands of sheep will remain in the paddocks eating feed that should be left for the breeding flocks that we must preserve. He forgot that when a lamb is ready to be slaughtered it must be slaughtered if the primary producer is to get full value for it. Once it is a week over there are other losses, but he did not take that into account at all. The most serious feature is that we are already short of feed and we cannot possibly carry 16,500,000 sheep. Fortunately, some sheep are going to Victoria, but there is a limit to what that State can take, so we must slaughter and export. The metropolitan demand does not count very much; to get rid of the sheep we must export as well as consume locally. The

biggest loss is not apparent yet, but it will be apparent later in the year when it will not be possible to hold our breeding stock. If we lose breeding stock we will lose next year's increase, yet the member for Frome said we were losing only 2d. a pound. That is one of the strangest statements I have heard from a primary producer. Another thing mentioned in relation to the overtime ban was infection; the men are demanding on extra 40 hours' leave because of the risk of infection.

Mr. Fred Walsh: But you do not believe in 40 hours.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am talking about leave. The men claim they are more liable than anyone else to get infections and disease.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that true?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have been in shearing sheds and have shorn sheep, and I, like anyone who has been a shearer or knows anything about shearing, know that the sheep breathe over the men, whose hands are over the sheep's faces and close to the skin. As a result, they often get dermatitis and yoke boils, whereas men at the abattoirs are protected; they have ideal conditions and first-aid. There are much more hazardous jobs than their job.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member connect up his remarks with the clauses in the Bill? There is nothing about sick pay in this Bill. I have allowed a fair amount of latitude.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am speaking about the ban that has brought about the necessity for this Bill. If there had been no overtime ban at the abattoirs there would have been no need for this Bill. It is not a panic Bill: it is to meet an emergency.

Mr. Ryan: You admit that one links up with the other, do you?

Mr. HEASLIP: I say that the overtime ban has made it necessary and urgent that the Government introduce this Bill. We must get rid of our surplus sheep, and we cannot do so unless employees at the abattoirs work overtime, but they refuse to do so. The Bill is necessary because of the ban. The whole crux of the Bill is in new section 70a (4), which provides:

Any carcass or meat slaughtered in accordance with the terms of a licence issued under and inspected pursuant to the directions (if any) given under this section may be sold within the metropolitan abattoirs area.

That is something that nobody has been able to do in the past, and now the Government in its wisdom is throwing open for sale in the metropolitan area meat killed by other people.

I commend the Bill. Some amendments have already been foreshadowed, but I will not support them. The Bill is what we want, and I support it in its original form.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I oppose the Bill from start to finish. There is no doubt that the member for Rocky River stated the Government's position when he said, "I want the Bill. I will stick to it. I do not want the amendments." He does not want anything but what is contained in the Bill. The Government is not hiding very much regarding its reasons for bringing in the Bill, but the real reason has not been stated, and I will refer to it. In introducing the Bill, the Minister of Agriculture said:

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the Minister to be able to grant licences for slaughtering stock and the sale of meat within the metropolitan area. The policy of the Government is to create conditions whereby the interests of all sections of the community are properly observed and it is felt that these interests would be furthered by permission being granted for the establishment of more slaughtering facilities.

Mr. Ryan: There is no overtime there!

Mr. LAWN: No. I will come to that. I emphasize that the Minister wants to create conditions whereby important sections of the industry (I will put it that way) are served by the establishment of more slaughtering facilities. It is well known that William Angliss & Co. (Aust.) Proprietary Limited has over 30 acres at Dry Creek and that two years ago plans for an abattoirs were prepared.

Mr. Hall: It is a pity that the company did not have an abattoirs now, isn't it?

Mr. LAWN: This Government was not game to introduce a Bill of this description two years ago, or even 12 months ago.

Mr. Heaslip: It had a promise from the slaughtermen then.

Mr. LAWN: It did not. The honourable member agrees with the statement I made. My statement was not challenged by any member opposite, who would have challenged it if it had not been correct. We all know that William Angliss & Co. had plans prepared two years ago to build an abattoirs, and we all know where the land is situated and that this firm is waiting for the Government to give it the green light, by way of a licence, to build.

Mr. Ryan: This is it!

Mr. LAWN: It is. The Government has jumped in and has used the overtime ban as an excuse for creating conditions whereby the

interests of all sections (meaning William Angliss and Co.) are observed.

Mr. Ryan: What about the employees? Don't they come into it?

Mr. LAWN: No. The Minister said:

It is felt that these interests—

that is, William Angliss's—

would be furthered by permission being granted for the establishment of more slaughtering facilities.

We all know that Sir William Angliss left £20 a week to the Prime Minister; we do not know how much the Premier or other members of the Government or of the Liberal Party will get out of this! We were told a couple of months ago that the Liberal Party was broke. It is most fortunate that this Bill has been introduced, as it may be that this is the opportunity to fill the Liberal Party's coffers with Sir William Angliss's funds.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Ryan: How much did Menzies get?

Mr. LAWN: He got £20 a week for life, and that statement has not been challenged. The Minister also said:

Many of the installations at Gepps Cross are sufficiently large to cater for a population increase in the Adelaide area. It is felt, however, that difficulties of management and operation make it advisable for licences to be granted to other persons for the killing of stock.

He says that plant and equipment, etc. already installed at the abattoirs are capable of slaughtering for an increased population in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Heaslip: You are thinking only of the metropolitan area, are you?

Mr. LAWN: The Minister says that; he says "the Adelaide area".

Mr. Heaslip: That is not sufficient; he does not say it is enough.

Mr. LAWN: He went further than that. It takes a long time to penetrate the honourable member's mind. This is the Minister's statement:

Many of the installations at Gepps Cross are sufficiently large to cater for a population increase in the Adelaide area.

Why should the honourable member object to my saying "the metropolitan area"? The Minister admits that the plant and equipment at the abattoirs are capable of meeting all our requirements now and for years to come. He admits that there is no need for the Bill purely because of a shortage of meat, but that is not the reason that justifies the Bill.

I have given the reason for that. The Minister went further, and this statement is worth noting by the Government:

All members are aware that at the present time there is a ban on overtime imposed by the union at Gepps Cross. This ban has been placed at a time when it is of the greatest urgency to kill as many stock as are offered. Lambs reach a peak of condition and quickly deteriorate if not slaughtered at the right time. The same applies, though to a lesser extent, to sheep. As a result of the present ban, there has been a serious loss to producers. I do not propose to discuss the merits of the question on which the overtime ban has been imposed. I can briefly outline the position.

Then he described the dispute about sick leave. I emphasize that the Minister says, in effect, that at present there is an urgency to slaughter lambs and, to a lesser extent, sheep; he also said that, as a result of the present ban, there is a serious loss to producers.

Mr. Jenkins: Does not the honourable member believe that?

Mr. LAWN: I am not denying it. The honourable member does not seem to follow me, but I remember the Premier saying something like that on another occasion in relation to price control and rent control. Does the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) remember that? The Government introduced Bills to extend this legislation for 12 months. When there was an emergency relating to Government supporters inflicting exorbitant rents and prices on the public it was forced to give some protection to the people, because other States were doing likewise. This was during wartime. As a matter of fact, we had Commonwealth control for a while. The Government on that occasion saw fit in those cases of emergency to limit the operation of the Bill to 12 months. Even now every year these Acts have to be brought before us for renewal, but we do not see any period specified in this Bill. If the Government provided for a period of six months, that would be ample for the purpose of meeting an emergency. Three months would have been ample, but I won't argue for three months.

Mr. Jenkins: Set up a meatworks and then close it down in six months!

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member has admitted that they are going to build the meatworks. We have it on record now that they have openly supported my statement: the proposition is for W. Angliss and Company to build an abattoirs at Dry Creek. He said they would build it and knock it down in six months. I think the honourable member had better go quietly and stop interjecting.

Mr. Jenkins: You are getting a bit more mental every day!

Mr. LAWN: The Government, if sincere in its desire to meet this situation, should limit the life of the Bill. As the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) has pointed out, if a building is put up for W. Angliss and Company, why should we knock it down in six months?

Mr. Jenkins: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. LAWN: We do not want hanging over the slaughtermen's heads all the time the building of another abattoirs. The Minister went on to say:

The operating clauses permit the Minister, if he considers it is expedient in the interests of the public, to grant a licence elsewhere than at the Metropolitan Abattoirs to slaughter any stock for sale.

So he has made it quite clear that the licence is not confined to the Metropolitan Abattoirs: it can apply elsewhere. The Minister also referred to the dispute by saying:

The union approached the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board seeking an extra week's sick leave in addition to the week already allowed. The board informed the union that this was a matter that should be heard by the Abattoirs Industrial Board. It is understood that the overtime ban has been imposed by the union until the extra week's sick leave is granted.

I will come back to the Minister's reference in a moment. He goes on to say:

It is not proposed to provide for other sale yards, but authority is provided in the Bill for auction sales to be allowed with the Minister's consent as an alternative to the consent of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board.

The Minister, not the Abattoirs Board, can give consent in all these cases! All this control will be taken from its hands and placed in the hands of the Minister. Before the next elections, it may well be that the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) will be one of the members who will regret the introduction of this Bill. If I am a back-bencher sitting on the Government side after the next elections, the licences will be withdrawn, and they can do what they like with their building: they can demolish it or leave it idle with the capital investment in it. The Government is doing it with its eyes open. It is surviving only on the casting vote of the Speaker and, if the company is prepared to hand any money to the Liberal Party for this act and is prepared to build out there, it is doing it with its eyes open.

Another factor that the Minister has made available for the information of members which does not concern a conservative Government—and interjections were made from the other

side of the House while the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) was speaking that they were not Socialists over there—

Mr. Ryan: When it suits them they are!

Mr. LAWN: When it suits them, of course. They have another bug in their minds. When the Adelaide Electric Supply Company would not use Leigh Creek coal, the Government took it over. I want to draw attention to the public money invested in these abattoirs. I am accepting the figures quoted by the Minister when he said:

Members will recognize that this legislation, in providing competition for the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs, could embarrass it in some respects. The public investment in the abattoirs is considerable. It is made up in the following way.

The Minister then gave some figures that totalled £1,839,219. He makes it quite clear that this legislation could embarrass the Abattoirs Board. He sets out that the public investment is considerable, and obviously the Government has decided that W. Angliss & Company's interest is greater than the public investment. Government members boast about private enterprise.

Mr. Ryan: They are selling Government instrumentalities.

Mr. LAWN: It is not a question of selling them. If W. Angliss & Company were to compete successfully and knock out the Metropolitan Abattoirs, the money invested would be sunk in the interests of private enterprise. I was surprised at the Minister's making such a statement. He concluded that reference by saying:

Whilst this is a considerable sum, it has to be considered in relation to the total value of the State's livestock industry.

In other words, he summed it up as I did by saying that whilst that was a considerable sum, the interests of William Angliss and the Liberal Party are greater and have to be looked after from that point of view.

The SPEAKER: Order! I can see nothing in the Bill about William Angliss.

Mr. LAWN: No, but I am giving the reasons for this Bill. We have introduced legislation to this House and we have frequently had it rammed down our throats that the explanation given in moving the second reading has not been the true purpose for the legislation. Members opposite accuse us of not giving the actual reason for the introduction of legislation.

Mr. Ryan: They do it every time we introduce a Bill.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and I am giving the reason for the introduction of this Bill.

Throughout his speech the Minister hinted at the reason, but he did not actually mention William Angliss. The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) has admitted that another abattoirs will be built, and that so far as he is concerned it will not be knocked down within 12 months.

Mr. Jenkins: The honourable member can't tell the truth.

Mr. LAWN: I suggest that the honourable member read *Hansard* tomorrow; then he will know what he did say. As the Minister said, this dispute arose over sick leave. He said he understood that representatives of the men had met the Chairman of the board to discuss this matter and that the Chairman had said that extra sick leave would not be granted even if the men went before the wages board. Yesterday the Minister referred to a circular that he had received last week. As a matter of interest, he was shown preference because I received my copy only two days ago.

Mr. Coumbe: You were lucky!

Mr. Jennings: If members opposite are going to interject, they should speak up.

Mr. LAWN: They will not speak up because they are making so many blues that they do not want them to appear in *Hansard*. They prefer to mutter under their breath. The member for Stirling will be called before the Party meeting next week and will be put on the mat by the Master.

Mr. Jenkins: I am not worried.

Mr. LAWN: The Minister referred to the circular yesterday when he spoke about sick leave. When I received my copy of the circular I immediately checked to determine that the information it contained was correct. I invite the Minister to challenge its correctness. No doubt he has already had it checked. The circular stated that in the last 12 months, in addition to sick leave for which compensation was paid, the equivalent of 1,240 men lost a full week's work through sickness after having used their normal five days' paid sick leave.

Mr. Ryan: And the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that they don't have a complaint!

Mr. LAWN: If they had been losing some dividends the position would have been different so far as the member for Rocky River is concerned. The Arbitration Court, when it granted sick leave, expressed the opinion that a workman should not lose or gain from being sick. I agree with that principle. If a workman is sick and is unable to go to his place of employment he, his wife and children

should not be forced to suffer a lower living standard. In many awards sick leave is permitted to accumulate, although the period of accumulation differs. Railway employees, for instance, are permitted to accumulate 26 weeks' sick leave. My point is that for an additional week's sick leave to be granted the union would have to prove to the court that one week is insufficient. If a union took a case to court and the employer was able to submit evidence that 1,240 employees took an average of only three days' sick leave during the preceding 12 months the court would rule that one week was sufficient and the claim would be rejected. On the other hand, the court, by its own judgment, has admitted that if 1,240 men can prove that they have taken the week's paid sick leave and that they have been forced to take an extra week, then the awarded leave is not sufficient, so the court would have to be consistent and give justice by increasing the period of sick leave to a fortnight. That is the situation at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. These men have a just complaint.

Mr. Ryan: Some of the men have used other leave so that they would not lose a week's pay.

Mr. LAWN: By arrangement with the management some have used part of their annual leave or long service leave so that they would not lose pay. The men complain that their sickness is caused primarily by the nature of their occupation. Some employers in other industries—and I will not name them because I do not want to delay the House or be accused of introducing irrelevant matter—have agreed to increase sick leave because of the nature of the employment. The abattoirs men undoubtedly have a just claim and to suggest that they are holding a gun at someone's head is unjust. That line of argument will not go over with the public today. The Minister, in reply to questions from the Leader of the Opposition, has made it abundantly clear that the work performed by the abattoirs employees during their five-day 40-hour week is sufficient to cater for the requirements of the Adelaide area. I use the term "Adelaide area" because that was the expression used by the Minister, and the member for Rocky River took exception to my use of the term "metropolitan area" earlier.

Mr. Hutchens: But the Minister used both expressions!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Personally I do not think there is much difference in the terms, but the member for Rocky River objected to my reference to the metropolitan area.

Enough animals can be slaughtered in five days for all the meat requirements of the people in and around Adelaide. The men at the abattoirs have been requested by the management to work on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays during a certain period to provide meat for export purposes. They are not asked to work an extra hour or two each day, but to give up their weekends and public holidays. Questions and answers in this House have made it clear that a fourth chain could be worked, and that would provide sufficient meat to supply the board's export requirements.

Mr. Nankivell: The Secretary was asked to supply the staff for that, but did not reply.

Mr. LAWN: I did not hear the member's interjection. Would he repeat what he said?

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Adelaide get on with his speech.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Albert was a little hurried in his interjection, but I will reply to it in due course and he will probably regret that he interjected. The management told the union that it required the existing staff to work on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. In effect, it said that it was not calling for labour for the fourth chain. Questions and answers in this Chamber have disclosed that when the union was asked recently to supply 150 men it supplied 156. Usually when the abattoirs management has required more labour the union has been asked to supply it and it is always understood that it allots the labour. It is the responsibility and the desire of the board to see that the labour is trained, and that may take as long as five weeks. Some men may pick up the work in one week, whereas others may take two, three or even five weeks. Some members of Parliament could be here for 25 years and yet not make the grade. I suppose that in the training of labour for slaughtering the odd man does not make the grade, but the accepted thing is for three to five weeks to be required for training.

The position is that the management did not attempt to obtain labour to work on the fourth chain on a five-day week basis. Members opposite claim that they cannot get their lambs slaughtered for the overseas trade, but they could have got them slaughtered by the men working overtime during weekends; an extra chain could have been working five days a week slaughtering more than 10,000 lambs each week. Members opposite do not believe in full employment. They speak of their policy and of the policy of the Australian Labor Party, whereas their policy is to have a high level of employment, but they also desire a pool of

unemployed workers. They did not wish to see another 150 men, or the required number, working on that chain, or for the board to call for extra labour to work that chain. They would sooner have men registered at Currie Street and drawing unemployment relief than putting them to work at the abattoirs. They could have had more carcasses for the overseas market with a fourth chain in operation than by sticking to the present policy of having the men work overtime.

That leads me to comment on the motor vehicle industry, with which I was associated for many years. If any industry in Australia is over-capitalized it is the motor vehicle industry.

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

Mr. LAWN: Before the adjournment I referred to an industry with which I was associated for many years before becoming a member of this Chamber, and I said that that industry was very much over-capitalized. Until after the Second World War employees in that industry were working half-time and even less. The industry was taking on seasonal labour at busy times, for instance, just prior to placing a new car on the market, but after a few months' work hundreds and thousands of men throughout the industry would be dismissed altogether, and later still those remaining at work would be placed on short time. I visualize that the same thing could happen here. The Metropolitan Abattoirs, on a five-day week, is able to cater for the wants of the people in this State. The overtime that they have been asked to work on two days a week and three days when there is a holiday weekend is for the export market and is only seasonal work; at present it is required for only a few weeks, after which the men will not be required to work overtime again. If W. Angliss & Co. or any other firm commences operations this industry will become over-capitalized, and the result will be that after the finish of the export season the abattoirs and any other private company that starts up will not be able to retain their employees full-time. Of course, that is the state of affairs that members opposite want. Their Party contains the greatest Tories that I know of; they always plead that they do not believe in Socialism, and they want a state of affairs under which they can pick and choose labour, hire and fire, and work employees under the conditions they want to set inside the factory while those employees are on the payroll.

Mr. Quirke: More rubbish!

Mr. LAWN: As I have said before, the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), who is sitting beside the honourable member who is interjecting, has made it clear in this House for years that he opposes the 40-hour week. The Government which the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) now supports opposed the decision of the Arbitration Court for a 44-hour week; it appealed against that decision. It also showed its hostility to the 40-hour week.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: The Minister of Agriculture has had much to say about this overtime ban. The Government does not want a 40-hour week; it wants the employees to work 40 hours in five days, plus two days (Saturday and Sunday) on ordinary weekends and three additional shifts on holiday weekends. The Government has never wanted a 40-hour week, and it is prepared to introduce this Bill with the object of breaking down the conditions of people working in this industry.

Mr. Nankivell: Don't they want overtime at the abattoirs?

Mr. LAWN: Let me tell the honourable member that before he became a member of this Chamber the matter of a 40-hour week and overtime was fully discussed here, and at that time the honourable member's colleagues charged me with wanting overtime; they said that we did not want a shorter working week, but merely more money. We slung the lie back in their faces. In the present case the employees do not want just money.

Mr. Heaslip: Are you sure of that?

Mr. LAWN: The men are prepared to sacrifice two days' pay at overtime rates on normal weekends and three days' pay on holiday weekends in their fight for a full week's pay all the year.

Mr. Quirke: I doubt whether they are prepared to do that.

Mr. LAWN: They are also fighting for one extra week's sick leave. Honourable members opposite claim that all these men are concerned about is more money, but if that is all the men are concerned about, don't members opposite think that in a few weekends of work the men would earn more than one week's pay? Of course they would. If it was only a question of money they would take the overtime that was thrown to them. However, they have made it clear that they lose their full week's sick leave that is allowed by the court and they are losing an additional week's sick leave without pay during the year. They are fighting for a principle.

Mr. Heaslip: And by working overtime they do not lose anything.

Mr. LAWN: The workers do not merely want more money; I know they need more money, as we all do, but they also want better conditions, and when all is said and done conditions are equally as important as pay.

Mr. Heaslip: And they have got them out there, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has made his speech.

Mr. LAWN: I don't know about making a speech; I heard the honourable member say a few words. These men are fighting for a principle, just as the honourable member always fights for dividends. Let me say in conclusion that here we have all sections of the community, which is the term used by the Minister—

Mr. Heaslip: You mean, just the metropolitan area.

Mr. LAWN: No. I take it that on this occasion the Minister was referring to the whole State, and at least I am referring to all sections of the community throughout the State. All sections of the community that are mentally and physically fit and able have something to sell. It might be goods, and it might be sheep and cattle. Honourable members opposite are concerned only for the people they represent who have sheep and cattle to sell. The labourers—the people who work at the abattoirs—have only their labour to sell, and I am equally as concerned for those people who have only their labour to sell as I am for the people who have sheep and cattle to sell.

Mr. Hall: You are not interested in the people who have sheep and cattle to sell.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member has a warped mind and a mouth to match.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: There is a chain out there at the abattoirs which is not being worked.

Mr. Quirke: The men don't want it to work.

Mr. LAWN: I say that it is the management that does not want it to be worked. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) said that I am not interested in the people who have sheep and cattle to sell. I am interested in those people. There is a chain at the abattoirs which is not being worked, and I say that it should be worked. The men want the chain to work, but I believe the management does not want that. The union concerned is quite willing to supply the labour if the management will only ask it to do so.

Mr. Jennings: The union has faithfully carried out its part of the bargain.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, it has supplied all the labour until recently. We should be concerned with all sections of the community—the people who have their labour to sell and the people who have stock to sell—because otherwise we cannot say we really represent all sections of the community. We know the electoral boundaries in South Australia have been gerrymandered—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: —to give the Government Party a majority in this House to enable it to look after the interests only of the people I have mentioned. I am just as interested in the people who have sheep and cattle to sell as I am in the people who work in the industry. I oppose the Bill.

The SPEAKER: There have been far too many interjections and too much conversation. Let us have the decorum in this Chamber that we should have.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): When the member for Adelaide began his discourse he said he opposed the Bill from start to finish. Diametrically opposed to him, I support the Bill from start to finish. I am in complete accord with it because it is high time that its provisions were dealt with by Parliament. The member for Adelaide said that the Minister wanted to create conditions favourable to one party. We are aiming at conditions favourable to the whole community and the economy. If passed, the legislation will work in that direction. It is high time that the spirit of enterprise, keen and buoyant, was promoted far and wide in South Australia, and in the Commonwealth. This is necessary if we are to continue to progress as we have done in this great nation. I was interested to hear the member for Adelaide speak as he did today and hear him support wholeheartedly a socialistic policy.

Mr. Ryan: There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am not in favour of Socialism.

The SPEAKER: There is no Socialism in this Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE: I was referring to Mr. Lawn's statement that he keenly advocated Socialism as the best means of getting progress in this State. The duty of the State is to provide the framework of utilities within which the individual can freely operate. Beyond that I am opposed to restricting the ability of private enterprise to operate. I have a very

keen appreciation of what has been achieved by private enterprise, and through the years I have noted the deadening effect of undue State intrusion into industry. I am old enough in the tooth to know the ill-effects that can come from a monopoly. In our Metropolitan Abattoirs we have a monopoly that is not operating in the best interests of the primary producers and the State's economy. The competition that will come under the Bill is a good thing.

Mr. Dunstan: How do you explain the Commonwealth Government's policy of selling public utilities to private enterprise in order to prevent competition?

Mr. LAUCKE: From time to time the Commonwealth Government has disposed of national undertakings to private enterprise, and to good purpose. The situation at the abattoirs has finally led to the Government's decision to facilitate the entry into the slaughtering business of interests other than the Metropolitan Abattoirs, and it is indeed good. We have our primary producers in adverse seasonal times carrying an all-time record of stock. They are carrying 16,500,000 sheep at present. They are faced with the severity of an adverse season so far this year, and desire to dispose of their stock as quickly as possible to obtain the higher values the market provides for stock in good condition. There is also the serious feed situation, and the need of the farmer individually and the State as a whole to dispose of stock in prime condition, but we have a situation diabolically promoted to hold to ransom both the producer and the consumer. Because of a lack of efficient processing at a time when the stock should be processed there is an increased cost to the producer, which is passed on to the consumer. The union's action was taken at a time when those who engineered it fully realized that it was a most difficult time because of the quantity of stock coming forward, the condition, and so on. The irresponsibility of those men who now refuse to work overtime at a critical period reflects badly on those who should be working for the common good.

It must be realized far and wide that the rural economy is the basis of our prosperity. We earn overseas credits from the products of the land. If we have a good season and good prices we attain an overseas credit balance of about £80,000,000 in any given year. If we have an adverse season and good prices we attain about £50,000,000 to £60,000,000. If we have an adverse season and adverse prices we

get an overseas credit balance of about £30,000,000. From our rural economy come the credits that are necessary to allow secondary industries to exist first, and then expand for the good of the community.

Fundamentally, secondary industries have a local market. They do not export much at all. Increased local costs to the secondary manufacturer can be passed on to the consumers. He is working in a very protected market, as it were. On the other hand, the primary producer must dispose of much of his produce on the overseas markets, where keen competition exists. Because the increased costs to secondary industries are reflected in the costs of the primary industries the latter are in great difficulties, and cannot continue profitable operations. We have the situation where the goose that lays the golden egg is in danger of dying, or being severely hurt, by increased costs being placed on it, and we may reach the stage where, through the increased costs, we cannot sell on the overseas markets. If that were to eventuate, our Australian economy would be in a bad position.

Mr. Hall: The present trouble is the export market.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. If we can have timely and efficient processing of our products, and can ensure to the producers the greatest possible margins through that efficiency, and catch the overseas market at the right time, and so on, it is our duty to see that we have it. We in this House in recent years have been most ready to assist efficiency in rural production. I refer to bulk handling of wheat and barley, which assists the grower to handle his crop more economically and enables him to maintain his farm in a reasonably profitable condition. The fat lamb export industry is being adversely affected at present through its inability to get lambs processed as quickly as possible because of the overtime ban at the abattoirs.

Mr. Hughes: Do you support country abattoirs?

Mr. LAUCKE: I certainly do; anywhere they can be economically founded. It is a good thing to have decentralization of slaughtering facilities. This legislation will allow enterprises conducted privately in the metropolitan area to slaughter and country interests to have slaughtering facilities in given areas. This is a good thing from which will come a competition that will, I am sure, be beneficial to the slaughtering industry, the producer, the consumer, and the economy as a whole. It is a

good thing to have meatworks situated throughout the State provided that they are in economically situated locations. The bird must have a reasonable chance of flying before it is released—of that I am certain.

I am pleased to note that, in deciding where a licence may be granted, the Minister proposes to have the advice of a committee. He will not be the sole person to make a decision about where a licence should be granted; he will have the advice of an advisory committee (a competent body) which will make recommendations to him. I commend the Minister for this approach, as this provision takes away from one person a grave and great responsibility. This is in keeping with his approaches to all matters. He views things fairly, and in this instance it will be from a fairness that will come from a wider knowledge gained by being advised by several people.

I was most intrigued to hear the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) say that, were he to be a member of the Party in office, on being elected he would immediately withdraw all licences issued under this legislation and revert to the system we have so far known. That, to me, further emphasizes the insistence on the part of this gentleman to promote a socialistic State so far as he possibly can.

Mr. Nankivell: It shows a lack of responsibility.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, it indicates a lack of responsibility in this matter. I, like every member who views the situation, believe that, having given an organization the freedom and protection the abattoirs has had, to have noted recurring strikes and been prepared to perpetuate those conditions is a smallness of view. I do not think any person who noted these things would not say, "We admit a big investment by the State in this abattoirs, but in the public interests it is desirable to have competition operating to make the whole system more efficient than it has been in the past and to ensure that we do our utmost to maintain to rural producers the best possible facilities for clearance of their stocks at the right times and at the right prices."

As I view this legislation, I consider it is a good thing in every respect. I can see in it a move in a responsible direction to allow private enterprise, which has been such a huge, strong and wonderful force in progress in this State and in this nation, to return most definitely. I trust that this will be the criterion and the way, as it were, for other institutions which assume too much importance as

governmental institutions but which could be beneficially and profitably affected by the good, sound, healthy winds of competition. I have much pleasure in supporting this legislation.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I oppose this Bill for several reasons, the principal being that I am definitely opposed on principle to legislation of this kind. Consequently, I see no merit in the Bill. I believe the measure has been introduced because of the panic caused by the position that has resulted from action taken by employees of the abattoirs, and that the Government has been stampeded by a certain section that has, perhaps, been affected to some extent because the employees have been clamouring for many years for certain advantages. My thoughts have been borne out by the statement of the member for Rocky River, who admitted that this was emergency legislation. I believe the Bill reflects discredit on the Minister and the Government. I am sorry it was introduced, particularly on an occasion like this.

One always expects from the member for Rocky River the type of speech he made this afternoon. Anything that has as its object increased wages or improved working conditions, no matter of what kind, he always opposes. Improved wages or reduced working hours are anathema to him; one has only to suggest reducing working hours and he immediately objects. He has hardly made a speech in this House without referring to this. In the Address in Reply debate he quoted extensively from the official journal of the Australian Insurance Staffs' Federation.

Mr. Heaslip: This all means extra cost to the primary producer.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Of course it does, but don't they benefit in the long run?

Mr. Quirke: No, they never do.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I don't think the member for Rocky River is any the worse off as a result of all these improved conditions. I do not think he is on a starvation level, and I think that applies to most members opposite. None of them is in straitened circumstances, as a result of the improved living standards gained by the working people of this country. They seem to me to be in a fairly flourishing condition and, the better the standards of the working people are, the greater is the demand for the things they produce.

Mr. Heaslip: Do they ever go on strike?

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, they go on strike because of people like yourself. If we dealt with reasonable people, there would not be half

the number of strikes. The honourable member mentioned strikes and was going to make a lengthy speech about all the industrial disputes that had taken place at the abattoirs.

Mr. Heaslip: And I gave them.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes; the honourable member went from 1950 to 1955. He was challenged to mention any dispute that had taken place at the abattoirs after 1955, but he could not mention one; and there has not been one industrial dispute at the abattoirs since 1955—seven years ago. I suggest that that is a good record. Compare that with any other industry, or with most other industries, and we shall find it compares most favourably. Much is said about the poor old primary producer. Mr. Walter Kidman said the other day that it was the "poor old primary producer" who suffered and he was "broke"—but he never worked at any industry in his life. It was his father who carried his swag and battled to set up his big industry and Mr. Walter Kidman and the rest of the family gained the benefit of it.

Mr. Ryan: And they are still living on it.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, and his grandchildren will probably benefit from it. The same applies to Angliss & Co.—it will be the one to benefit. I give full credit to those who carried their swags and did the pioneering work; we appreciate what they did, but do not let Mr. Walter Kidman talk about "the poor old primary producer". You can't tell me about that! No-one raises any objection against the ordinary farmer, the man working his farm and doing a good job. He is doing the right thing, for which we all give credit, but those big monopolistic interests—

Mr. Nankivell: Some producers are paying an extra freight of 10s. a head to send their stock to Victoria to get rid of their surplus sheep!

Mr. Ryan: Have they not been doing that for years?

Mr. Nankivell: No.

Mr. FRED WALSH: When some members talk like this, as they do, one tends to question their sincerity, because I really believe that they are concerned about the big people and not the small people, whom they claim to represent.

Mr. Quirke: Those with little blocks of 500 acres!

Mr. FRED WALSH: It is the little man about whom we are all concerned. Certainly we on this side of the House are concerned.

Mr. Quirke: He is in real trouble.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Burra can make his speech directly.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I have the greatest respect for the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who said much about private enterprise, including that he believed that private enterprise should be allowed to operate more or less unfettered and have an open go. If he were sincere in his attitude he should advocate the complete abolition of the abattoirs and give private enterprise a go.

Mr. Ryan: I wonder who would regret it in 10 years?

Mr. FRED WALSH: I know who would, and I suggest to Mr. Laucke that he also advocate the disbanding of the Electricity Trust and the sale of all its assets.

Mr. Laucke: No.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes. If the honourable member wants private enterprise to run this State entirely, as he suggests, then he should do as I say, if he is sincere in that regard: abolish these State instrumentalities and let private enterprise run them. But the honourable member and the Premier both know that private enterprise could not do that. Despite what the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said, it was not a question of Leigh Creek coal; it was the inability of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited to do the job. If it had continued we could not have had electric power to the same extent as we have it today, or the same development in the State. We know why the State took the company over and I give the Premier full marks for what he did, which was with the support of the Australian Labor Party. Members on his side who bitterly opposed the Bill at the time were loud in their plaudits here a few weeks ago when we were considering the lowering of country tariffs.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. FRED WALSH: It is all wrapped up with the question of private enterprise. The union, about which we have heard so much, has a long and honourable record in the Labor movement. Its officers are honourable men, as I think the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. D. N. Brookman) and the Premier will admit. True, disputes have occurred at certain times, but let us look at the union's record in its shop section. There have been very few disputes in respect of the ordinary butchers. I think that members of the Abattoirs Board will agree that the union and the board generally get on very well together. Although there is a dispute today on the question of extra sick leave—

Mr. Ryan: Can you blame the men for that?

Mr. FRED WALSH: It is only a passing phase, as so many of these things are. Soon we shall revert to the position existing a few weeks ago. I suggest that that is no reason for introducing legislation of this type. I do not know whether it is true that this legislation was recommended by the Abattoirs Board. The Minister has not mentioned it, and I should like an assurance from him on this aspect. I could not imagine the board's recommending the legislation, but possibly it did in view of the prevailing circumstances. I do not want to discuss the merits or otherwise of the overtime ban, but this is not the first time a ban has been imposed on overtime. I remind members that if this legislation becomes law and another abattoirs is established, it does not necessarily follow that similar industrial action will not be taken at the new establishment in an effort to secure an improved industrial condition. The legislation will not afford protection against industrial disputes.

The history of abattoirs legislation goes back to about 1902. Several Bills have been referred to the House over the years and in 1907 legislation was referred to a Select Committee. In introducing the legislation, Mr. Vaughan, the Minister, spoke of compensation. The report of that debate was as follows:

When a public authority took away from a person the right to earn a livelihood, and virtually destroyed his property by rendering it valueless, it was only fair that he should be compensated. While power was given to the board to take over the city markets and slaughterhouses, no provision was made with respect to private premises. If a rich city like Adelaide was to receive compensation, surely butchers like Hill and Conrad ought to receive compensation. He did not think goodwill should be taken into consideration, but he thought the actual money private persons were out of pocket should be paid back to them, and he thought the municipalities and ratepayers would be quite agreeable to that being done.

He then referred to Hill, who had a big slaughterhouse near Glen Osmond, Conrad's, who operated another slaughterhouse, and Turner's. I can well remember Turner's because as a boy it was intended that I should be apprenticed to that firm as a butcher. I worked for them for about two months, but the first day I was put into the slaughterhouse was enough for me. I went home and refused to go back again.

Mr. Lawn: You went on strike!

Mr. FRED WALSH: Mr. Vaughan referred to compensation for Hill and Conrad. My point

is that it was intended to compensate them for any losses they incurred through the establishment of the Metropolitan Abattoirs. What is the Government's intention now? Will it compensate the Metropolitan Abattoirs for any losses it incurs through the Government's introducing licensed competition that may affect its trade and business? In 1907 the intention was to get away from private slaughterhouses. The Government of the day favoured a public slaughterhouse and referred to adequate hygiene, proper inspections and so forth. In introducing this Bill, the Minister of Agriculture said:

The policy of the Government is to create conditions whereby the interests of all sections of the community are properly observed and it is felt that these interests would be furthered by permission being granted for the establishment of more slaughtering facilities. The Government has for some years had a stated intention of providing killing licences for country abattoirs where these can be established.

We might not have the same objection to country abattoirs: our objection is related to the establishment of another abattoirs in the metropolitan area. The Minister continued:

However, this has not been availed of. The reason is partly due to the ready market to be found in the metropolitan area. The Metropolitan Abattoirs has been for many years in a favoured position in regard to the Adelaide market as the introduction of meat slaughtered by other interests is strictly controlled. Many of the installations at Gepps Cross are sufficiently large to cater for a population increase in the Adelaide area. It is felt, however, that difficulties of management and operation make it advisable for licences to be granted to other persons for the killing of stock. Any reduction in output has a highly deleterious effect on the interests of primary producers in the first place, and also the consumer is affected and the State's economy suffers as a result of loss of export killing. All members are aware that at the present time there is a ban on overtime imposed by the union at Gepps Cross. This ban has been placed at a time when it is of the greatest urgency to kill as many stock as are offered.

We know that the abattoirs has not been killing to its capacity, so if there is any fault, part of it can be attributed to the management. If the abattoirs were killing to capacity this build-up would not have occurred and overtime would not be necessary to the extent suggested. I am not familiar with the facts mentioned by Mr. Lawn concerning the slaughtermen, but I am prepared to accept the facts and figures he quoted. The Minister's contention about the ban on overtime does not

stand up. When it suits stockowners they do not bring their stock to market. When they want to keep prices high or to force prices up they keep their cattle and sheep on their properties.

Mr. Ryan: That is not a strike!

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, that is not a strike. Everyone knows that is done, but when people stop work to improve conditions or take action to ban overtime that is said to be a strike or something in the nature of a strike. We should fairly examine these things and appreciate that this is only a passing phase, and we should not be stampeded into taking action that we may later regret. I regret that you, Mr. Speaker, will be the determining factor in this matter. I appreciate that you represent certain interests that will be affected, but I hope that you can see the position a little in the same way as we see it having regard to all the circumstances. The Minister adopted a strange attitude in this matter and said, on page 1033 of *Hansard*:

Members will recognize that this legislation, in providing competition for the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs, could embarrass it in some respects. The public investment in the abattoirs is considerable. It is made up in the following way:

	£
Debenture funds (almost entirely Treasury advances) . . . . .	842,823
Grants (some Commonwealth largely concerning sale yards) . . . . .	44,433
Internal provisions and reserves reinvested . . . . .	951,963

Total funds employed in the undertaking . . . . . £1,839,219

That is a considerable sum and it will be gradually whittled away if the Minister enforces the provisions of this legislation, which are to some extent contradictory. In some cases the word "shall" is used and in other cases "may" is used. Clause 3 (2) provides that "any such licence may contain conditions as to all or any of the following matters" and then it refers to the branding and inspection of carcasses. Why "may" and not "shall"? Why not be determinate about the matter? In clause 3 (3) we read that the Minister "may" give such directions. Why does the clause not provide that he "shall" give directions to the owner of the meat? Clause 3 (6) provides that the Minister "may" revoke the licence granted to such a person if he is convicted of an offence under subclause (5). There should be no question about it, and once a person commits a breach of the Act the governing word should be "shall" and not "may".

Mr. Shannon: The nature of the breach should play some part in the decision.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Firstly, that person should not get a licence and secondly, if he breaches the Act, his licence should be revoked. I am not sure whether the member for Adelaide mentioned some points in support of the men's arguments. I stated that I did not wish to enter into the merits of the present ban, but the actual amount of wages lost in 12 months due to absence on unpaid sick leave cost the abattoirs' employees £22,330, and added to this figure we must consider that many of them were forced to take annual leave and long service leave in lieu of sick pay. Therefore, the stated loss of wages could be greatly magnified to show that this claim is modest. It is true, as stated by the member for Adelaide, that workers in other industries receive more than one week's sick leave, and workers in an industry with which I am associated receive unlimited accumulated sick leave during the whole term of the workers' employment. The question of unlimited accumulated sick leave is not new.

Members on this side know the position is hopeless as far as the voting on the floor of the House is concerned. We know how members from each Party will vote, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider how we feel about this matter. This involves a vital principle from our point of view. This is strike-breaking legislation despite what members opposite may say to the contrary, and I would sooner lose my seat in Parliament than record a vote for this type of legislation, and I believe that applies to all my colleagues. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give special consideration to this question before voting on the matter.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I sincerely congratulate the Minister on introducing this legislation. I offer the thanks of my constituents for his endeavour to put the matter of stock slaughtering in this State on a sound basis. Far too much has been said of the industrial point of view at the abattoirs as a background to this Bill. Legislation of this type has been demanded, asked for, and petitioned for over many years by country people and this is the result of the ground swell of opinion in country areas. It should not be entirely related to this dispute although the dispute may have brought it to a head. This is not panic legislation and no-one has been stampeded into this measure; rather it is the result of representations from many people

over a long period of time. I know that the Minister has been interested in this problem for many years.

Many opinions have been expressed by members of the Opposition on the introduction of this Bill. From the views expressed and the lack of understanding shown it is clear that members opposite have little understanding of country conditions, so much so that it makes one shudder to think what their administration in country areas would be like. Let me give one illustration. This is purely a misunderstanding on the part of the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh). He referred to the action of the graziers in withholding their sheep, and likened this to strike action. He said it was easy for graziers to hold sheep, and sheep are just held from sale until they bring a better price. If that argument were put to a meeting of country graziers or country fat lamb producers it would be laughable and would be the biggest comic turn they had heard for a long time. They only wish they could hold their sheep for some time. At present the farmer is carrying his stock in the spring flush, but when the flush of feed disappears, as it soon will, he will have to quit his stock and there will be no prospect of his holding stock to gain higher prices.

Mr. Hughes: But you do do that?

Mr. HALL: There are many moves to have this done by supplementary feeding and better farm husbandry methods, and it would be far better for the consumer if this could be done. He now has to pay a higher price in the autumn at a time when sheep and fat lambs are not fully available, simply because they have to be quit in the spring. Do members think farmers would not hold their stock until times of better prices if they could do so? The argument simply does not line up with practical farming.

I congratulate the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) on his assessment of the position. I do not think this is panic legislation, or that it is the result merely of this one stoppage at the abattoirs. It has been evolved over the many years' history of disputes, as outlined earlier by the member for Rocky River. I am surprised that several members opposite who represent country areas should become involved in this question of the disputes. As I said earlier, I think we are looking too closely into this dispute. It is not for us to pronounce judgment on it. Several statements made by members opposite should be answered. It ill behoves the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) to belittle the losses that the primary producer

has suffered because of this overtime ban. It was pointed out that the honourable member recently referred to "a mere 2d. a pound loss on export mutton." We know very well, however, that it is the unwritten losses—the losses that cannot be put in a book and tallied up with a pencil—that are the bigger losses. The fact that aged sheep have to be retained and therefore eat up the available fodder reserves is preventing the acquisition later in the year of younger stock and next year's breeding flock for many of the fat lamb producers in the Middle and Lower North.

Mr. Shannon: The 2d. a pound might be the full value of some of the sheep you have to quit.

Mr. HALL: Yes. Another aspect is the number of sheep that go to Victoria. Do members think it is the consumer in Victoria who pays the cost of the freight involved? Of course, that has to be paid by the South Australian supplier of the sheep, who has nowhere to slaughter his stock. Perhaps it might be of interest to members to know the cost of transporting sheep to Victoria by rail. From Pooraka to Newmarket the cost is £50 7s. a rail truck. Lambs loaded 120 to a truck cost 8s. 5d. a head, and sheep loaded 110 to a truck cost 9s. 1½d. a head. From the market on September 4 nearly 20,000 sheep went to Victoria, and from the September 11 market 30,000 sheep went. From the restricted market that came into force because of the ban on overtime, 3,870 sheep went to Victoria.

Mr. McKee: Was there a shortage of mutton and lamb in South Australia?

Mr. HALL: If the honourable member went to a country district and said such a thing he would be laughed out of the district. According to him, there is no inconvenience to South Australia.

Mr. McKee: I asked whether there was a shortage of mutton and lamb.

Mr. HALL: Of course there was not. The honourable member cares not for the producers but merely the consumers. The supply of local meat is not affected, because the men at the abattoirs would run up against public opinion if that happened, and they dare not run up against public opinion in the metropolitan area. The union is holding the producer to ransom, not the consumer. The honourable member is fully aware of that.

Mr. McKee: Stock are being taken across the border in their thousands. I have seen that happening.

Mr. HALL: The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) had much to say. He said that a six

months' licence would be enough time to grant a private firm to overcome this blockage of slaughter of export lambs. Apparently some private firm is to put up all the capital that is necessary to build a killing works, I suppose with its associated by-products treatment plants and other things. If we take just the bare killing works without the by-products treatment plant, we know that it would cost many tens of thousands of pounds to establish. According to the honourable member, this is to be put up for six months' use and then disbanded, or perhaps we can wait for the next dispute and then get it ready again.

This perhaps ties in with the honourable member's later thoughts. He said that if the Bill is passed, if the Minister grants licences and if the works are established, then when the Labor Party gains office in this State he will destroy those works, and he said he spoke for the Labor Party. Let the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) go back to his district and tell the farmers who have created this ground swell for this move for killing works that, if his Party gains office, he will destroy their facility. We want the truth of this. I would say that the member for Adelaide has demonstrated by his threat on behalf of his Party to destroy an industry that was properly set up under an Act of Parliament—and I hope it will be passed by a majority vote of this House—that he is nothing more than an industrial and social disruptionist. I hope the country members will take this truth back to their districts and explain to their own farming communities how they stand.

We heard from members opposite about the slaughtermen and the fact that they were forced to work overtime. This terrible thing was foisted on them! It was also said that the premises were unhygienic. An interesting thing happened last Saturday. A carload of slaughtermen came through my district in the course of calling on various farmers and putting their case. This case is outlined in the pamphlet that has been handed around this House. The party comprised four young, presentable Australians—slaughtermen and trainee slaughtermen from the abattoirs—who quite impressed me. I admit that they had learned that I was a member of Parliament, and that is probably the reason they spent more time with me.

Mr. Ryan: I wonder what they appreciated most.

Mr. HALL: They appreciate the stock I send down to the abattoirs, for I suppose it gives them a job, and I appreciate the fact

that they slaughter those stock at times. I put several things to those men. They told me that there was a spare chain at the abattoirs not being used. I said to them, "Forget the dispute for a moment. In normal times, would you want that chain to work, because if it worked you would not get so much overtime, would you?" They agreed that in normal times they would not want the chain to work. Where does that leave the question of this spare chain? The slaughtermen themselves do not want it.

I said to them, "Do you want the overtime?" and they replied, "Oh yes, we want the overtime; it is our harvest, but we are willing to forgo it for these conditions." They admitted they wanted the overtime. Is it a poor condition, something in violent opposition to normal industrial behaviour, that this overtime is forced on them? It is their harvest, and they admit it. I asked them what they earned in a week, and the reply was that they earned £22 and more than £40 with overtime. I am not saying that that is too much, for they work hard when they are working seven days a week, but let us be sensible about it; they want that overtime, and they do not want to see that extra chain take their overtime away. I do not begrudge them their overtime, but let us get the facts straight.

Much was said also about the alleged filthy state of the premises. This was mentioned in the pamphlet. It was said that there are a lot of rats around, and so on.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot find in this Bill anything about rats.

Mr. HALL: If the premises are unhygienic it is because they are old buildings in many instances. We all know that old buildings are more difficult to keep in good condition than new ones. I said to them, "If the premises were put up privately you might have better conditions" and they agreed that might be so. I also said, "Why do you spoil your case by not taking it as far as you can with arbitration?" That is something they have not been able to answer. I do not think there is any need for us to say more about the dispute. It is not for us to make a pronouncement on it. Each year primary producers live through the spring in dread of a dispute at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. If they were told that there had been no disputes there since 1953 they would not believe it, because they always have the fear, and as the years pass they feel that there have been disputes. There will

always be claims from workers for better conditions. It is the nature of things and members opposite are aware of it.

Mr. McKee: Don't you agree with claims for better conditions?

Mr. HALL: Yes, but as the claims are made from time to time and are not taken through the proper arbitration channels, we shall be faced with threats of the cessation of overtime killing during the spring. There is only one way to deal with the situation, and that is to provide additional killing facilities. This would bring about more killing in normal hours, and do away with much of the overtime worked now. That would not be a bad thing, because it would provide more steady jobs throughout the year. Of course, there will always be overtime worked to cater for the spring rush. I am confident that the Bill provides the solution to the problem, and I hope the Minister will act as quickly as possible, on the advice of the proposed committee, to ease the position. Adelaide is growing at the rate of 20,000 people a year, and the present population will be doubled in about 20 years. There is room in Adelaide for the present abattoirs and at least two additional abattoirs. Competition has never hurt anyone. The farming community has to face the greatest competition there is in prices and methods. Our farming industry is efficient. On behalf of my constituents I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on introducing the Bill. I hope that it will be passed and that we shall see practical results so that the producers will not have fears that in the spring they will not be able to get rid of their normal surpluses.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I oppose the Bill. I listened with much interest to what the member for Gouger said. I feel that the Bill has not received the support expected by the Minister, who would be well advised to withdraw it. The member for Gouger said that Opposition members lack an understanding of country conditions, but that is a statement from an uncontrollable imagination. The member for West Torrens made it clear that in 1933, when private enterprise could not cater satisfactorily for the primary producers, Parliament established the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board after paying compensation to private enterprise. Over the years supporters of primary industry have given increased support to the operations of the Metropolitan Abattoirs. In June, 1936, when explaining the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act Amendment

Bill, the then Premier (Hon. R. L. Butler) said:

If Parliament can congratulate itself on one thing, it is the change which took place in the administration as the result of the appointment of a new board at the abattoirs. I think it will be essential for the abattoirs to take over the Port Lincoln freezing works in the future. Last year the works at Port Lincoln experienced difficulty in the slaughtering of lambs, with the result that the lambs were available too late to be exported. There should have been co-ordination between the Port Lincoln freezing works and the abattoirs, so that lambs which were not fit for export could have been sold in the metropolitan area.

Today the member for Rocky River said that the Opposition is opposed to the establishment of abattoirs. History proves the contrary. During the time that I have been in this place the Opposition has moved several times for the establishment of country abattoirs, but it is strange that some members who support this Bill have opposed the establishment of country abattoirs whenever we have made the suggestion. We have now a Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board comprised of representatives of breeders of pigs for export, breeders of lambs for export, exporters of stock, master butchers, stock salesmen, consumers and employees. This covers the wide section of the community associated with the slaughtering and consumption of meat. Not one member here who has supported the Bill has indicated that any section represented on the board has asked for the measure. Of course, members opposite cannot, because these are the people who appreciate the establishment of the abattoirs, knowing full well that private enterprise could not meet the situation. On many occasions we have asked for an abattoirs in the country.

Mr. Ryan: Have we got it?

Mr. HUTCHENS: No, our requests have been rejected, but what are we as a Parliament asked by this Bill to do? In explaining the Bill, the Minister said:

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the Minister to be able to grant licences for slaughtering stock and the sale of meat within the metropolitan area.

Later, he said:

The purpose of this Bill is to make it possible for other persons to slaughter stock in the interests of the community. The operating clauses permit the Minister, if he considers it is expedient in the interests of the public, to grant a licence elsewhere than at the Metropolitan Abattoirs to slaughter any stock for sale. The very intention of the Bill must be to destroy an institution that is representative of the widest possible sections of the community.

The Minister asks every member of this House to sacrifice his rights as a representative of the people and give him a blank cheque to destroy the Metropolitan Abattoirs when he thinks it expedient to do so. That is simply what it means, and it proves conclusively that private enterprise cannot do, will not do, and has not been able to do, the job. Of course, members opposite, like their Commonwealth counterparts, want to destroy semi-government enterprise and take away the competition that may be provided by it. I believe the reason for the introduction of this measure is hidden, and hidden deliberately. If that be so, and if we are in doubt, the wise thing is to reject it. If the Government had said that it wanted to give a licence to establish an abattoirs in a certain area to clean up the surplus for export, we would have been able to consider the matter on its merits, but this Parliament would be failing most miserably in its responsibility to the people if it passed a measure that left it to one individual to give a licence wherever he thought it expedient to do so.

Mr. Nankivell: Don't you believe the Minister is being honest to Parliament?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Nankivell: The honourable member has not answered that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member would be out of order if he did so.

Mr. Nankivell: Is the honourable member going to answer?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Will the honourable member keep quiet and save the Speaker from calling him to order again? The Minister also said that the State's economy had suffered as a result of the loss of export killing. He gave about three different reasons but no conclusions whatever. He then said that lambs reached a peak condition and quickly deteriorated if they were not slaughtered at the right time. The Opposition has been saying these things for ever so long and has been pointing out that, because this is the position, there should be abattoirs in specified country areas.

Mr. Ryan: Like that at Kadina!

Mr. HUTCHENS: Exactly. An intellectual and self-opinionated gentleman spoke tonight about the colossal cost of transporting live-stock to killing places. The Opposition has been saying for a long time that it is wrong and undesirable to transport spring lamb by rail or by any other method when it can be killed without the necessity for its being sent long distances, during which it must deteriorate. We have been saying that lambs should be

killed as near as practicable to the area in which they are reared and that this would result in a greater export value to the primary producer. As set out by members on this side, of course, this is simply panic legislation, and it has one objective—to do a little bit of strike breaking. How limited is the thinking of members opposite when they believe that it will be effective? The member for West Torrens has had a phenomenal amount of experience in the trade union movement, and, as he says, if other works as proposed in the Bill are established, their employees will be members of the same union, and, if I know the calibre of unions in this State, there will be solidarity if it comes to a matter of principle regarding conditions. The union will not be broken by this method. I believe this legislation is a panic measure with an ulterior motive, and I therefore urge that the House reject it in the way it should be rejected.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): It was interesting to hear comments from members of the Opposition who would not know a Hereford steer from a blue-beeler dog—and this applies particularly to the member for Wallaroo. He was assuming that one of those persons who would apply to set up under this Bill would be at Wallaroo. If a permit were to go to Wallaroo, I suppose he would oppose it. It appeared from his remarks that he would, but I think that, in view of his remarks on divers occasions about decentralization, he would support this if the offer were made.

Mr. Hughes: It will come again.

Mr. QUIRKE: It is peculiar to me that the exponents of decentralization are today hell-bent on opposing it—and that is what it amounts to. They want centralized control, as every word they have uttered in this House tonight indicates. They want centralized control so that they can manage the industry. This Bill has one purpose only.

Mr. Ryan: What is that?

Mr. QUIRKE: I will give it. It is to see that, as far as legislation can make it possible, the set of conditions operating today shall not occur again. There is the straight answer that gives the purpose of this legislation—that is it shall not occur again. Honourable members have spoken to this, the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutcheus) being the greatest sinner in this regard. He says that, if this legislation is passed, it will back the union because the members in the other place will be

members of the union and they can still tie the business up if they want to. This is not a matter whether the workers at the abattoirs are justified in asking for an extra week's sick leave. If they are justified in doing that, then they should have it.

I know enough about the killing of stock to appreciate that certain contagion can occur in places like the abattoirs, as I have said before in this place. There is a way of getting better conditions, but this is not the way. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said there were three factors concerned. One was the abattoirs worker, whom he supported. I have a high regard for those men. They are average Australian citizens who want only to do the job, earn their money, and live the life they wish to live. That applies to Australians generally. I daresay if one were to take a secret ballot among the workers at the abattoirs today one would not get a vote in favour of the action taken by the union. I know something about this. I pick up those workers on the road time and time again. It would amaze the members opposite. These men do not know who I am and I do not disclose who I am. I just take them to Gawler. If any member opposite would like to do likewise, he, too, would get some candid communications.

There is this about the Australian that, when it comes to storming chinks in the armour, he is fearless. He makes a magnificent soldier but, when somebody who is inspired by a Communist line of thought (and I say that advisedly; I challenge members opposite to deny that) gets together with others like himself, the average Australian becomes a moral coward—and I defy anybody to deny that.

Mr. Jennings: And you have said it!

Mr. QUIRKE: I said it, and I am asking you to deny it. There is a principle in this. The honourable member should link it with what the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said: there was the worker, there were the consumers of meat, and there was the primary producer. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) referred to him as "the poor old primary producer". Some of them are old, some are young, but they are rapidly getting poorer and poorer. A malign influence in this matter today is a drought period—there is no doubt about that. If we do not get rain very soon we shall have a major calamity in South Australia. Anybody who has been through the country knows that. These people who have promoted this trouble know it as well as we do. For that reason, they know there

will be an urgent necessity for the owners to quit their stock, and to quit so that they shall not incur the loss of having to quit also their breeding stock, which is invaluable to them.

There are two factors involved there. The first is that these people know it is imperative for them to get rid of their surplus because they have not the necessary feed. There is no chance of baling hay for the reserve feed this year. The growth is not there and, because it is not there, they want to get rid of their sheep in order to conserve what little they have to maintain the nucleus of their breeding stock. Today, this is destroying their opportunity of doing that, and it is devised deliberately.

Mr. Jennings: You don't think they would have a business like this in the middle of winter, do you?

Mr. QUIRKE: I should not think so. I am not blaming the slaughtermen, the workers, for it, but I would expect the people who are designing this thing today to have those thoughts. They would leave it until it would do most damage to the community, for those doing it are not concerned with the workers.

Mr. Jennings: The time to do it would be when it would have the most effect.

Mr. QUIRKE: The most damage, and damage is effect enough. The people who have designed it are not concerned with the workers: they are concerned with creating conditions of chaos in this country. That is what they are concerned with—and they have succeeded beyond their greatest expectations. If this Parliament sets out, by this Bill, to prevent conditions like these arising again, then it is amply justified. I have a high regard for the average Australian worker.

Mr. Jennings: You have not shown it.

Mr. QUIRKE: Haven't I? I think I have shown it on more occasions than the honourable member, and in wider fields, too.

Mr. Jennings: You have lived longer!

Mr. QUIRKE: I hope that, by the time the honourable member has lived as long as I have, he will have the same record.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's age has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. Riches: You have just called the Australian workers moral cowards.

Mr. QUIRKE: They are.

Mr. Riches: They are not.

Mr. QUIRKE: They are. Say it again and I will repeat it.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a private conversation: this is a debate.

Mr. Ryan: One-sided, so far.

Mr. QUIRKE: No. They are, otherwise they would never allow this. If they had the interests and continuity of their job at heart, they would be displeased with what is taking place today, because they know that under this Bill, which is forced into this Parliament to prevent these conditions recurring, their overtime, which they value, will have gone for ever. That is one way in which they have been absolutely misled.

Mr. Jennings: By whom?

Mr. QUIRKE: By the union and its components. It is a matter of principle. Their leaders have used this emergency, a State emergency, which will under natural conditions, cause tremendous losses to primary producers, losses that are accepted in primary production because they have to work at the mercy of the elements and all the vicissitudes of the weather. Producers know and accept that as part of their lives. They do not expect any section of the community they supply with food to take action that will further damage their interests, as is being done today, and, because of that, to take advantage of it. That is a matter of principle that should not operate today. The good Australian should sympathize with the people suffering from what is happening in the country today, not try to rub their faces in the dirt because of the unfortunate predicament that the weather conditions are placing them in. That is what is happening today. If there is a necessity for that leave, then I would be the first to grant it, but they have a constitutional method of going about it, which they have by-passed.

The member for West Torrens, in reply to an interjection from the member for Rocky River, said that there had been no trouble at the Metropolitan Abattoirs since 1955. Of course not! Conditions were not propitious until now. It is despicable for one Australian to act in such a manner towards a fellow Australian. The primary producer is subject to all the vicissitudes of the elements—flood, fire, hail and wind. He gets rain at the right time, rain at the wrong time and no rain at all. He does not complain about those conditions.

Mr. Jennings: His representatives here do!

Mr. QUIRKE: He realizes that these conditions are inseparable from his chosen way of life, but he does not expect that in his time of misery another section of Australians will deliberately set out to harm him, as is being done today. There is a revulsion in Australia to putting the boots in. I hope people are disgusted today at the way the boots are being put into innocent people.

Mr. Riches: What are you trying to do now?

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not putting the boots into anybody, unless it is into Opposition members. To the extent that they have consented to the present action they are culpable, and I do not excuse them for it. However, I am prepared to excuse them to the extent that they have been misled. This Bill proposes to break a monopoly. The Opposition is in a cleft stick and torn between two loyalties. They favour a centralized socialized industry. They need not think that I am going to engage in a barrage of talk against socialized industry.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would be out of order if he did.

Mr. QUIRKE: An analogy has been drawn frequently between the Electricity Trust and the Metropolitan Abattoirs. The Electricity Trust was well founded and it has functioned remarkably well. I hope it never changes and that nobody intrudes on what it is doing. However, if the situation at the trust became as intolerable as the conditions at the abattoirs today, I would consider that the trust had fallen from grace and that it should be opposed. However, there is no likelihood of that. There is much loose talk about Socialism: one cannot walk on a footpath without walking on a socialized footpath or turn on a light without turning on a socialized light.

Mr. Ryan: Is that a disadvantage?

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not opposing the honourable member; I am supporting him. Absolute Socialism, however, is Communism, and when members use a socialized service like the abattoirs in order to promote that ideology I am opposed to them, and so should the member for Port Adelaide be. That is what is happening at the abattoirs today. For seven years there has been no trouble, but when one disturbing element got into the show the trouble started. The time has been well picked. I think members opposite in their hearts realize that the proposed legislation is justified. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition quoted a letter which was an excuse for the union's action. The letter said that the people in the metropolitan area would be supplied with meat and would still get their chop for breakfast. That chop is getting skinnier every day as a result of the union's action. Of course the metropolitan area will be provided with meat! The people controlling the union do not want to be alienated by depriving people of their breakfast chops. They will see that the majority of the population receives its meat ration, but they do not recognize the man who

produces the chops and who today is losing an incalculable sum. In the eyes of the Opposition the poor old cockie is a capitalist because he owns a few acres of land. The Opposition is against capitalism so it does not matter how much the cockie is bashed into the ground or knocked around. He is only a fellow Australian anyway, doing his job on the land!

Mr. Fred Walsh: Who said that the cockie was a capitalist?

Mr. QUIRKE: In the eyes of the Opposition anyone who owns 1,000 acres of land is a capitalist.

Mr. Hughes: I have not said so.

Mr. QUIRKE: Well get up and deny it!

Mr. Hughes: I am denying it now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. QUIRKE: I may have made a mistake because one member opposite who spoke owns more than 500 acres of land so he must be a capitalist.

Mr. Hughes: No he doesn't.

The SPEAKER: The decision on whether any member shall rise and make a speech is in the hands of the Speaker, and I call on the member for Burra.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am glad of your protection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loveday: Continue with your objective survey.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is the position as I see it.

Mr. Ryan: You had better put your dark glasses on, then.

Mr. QUIRKE: This is a matter of principle completely, and members cannot escape that.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree with principles?

Mr. Jennings: He agrees with "principals". He spells the word differently.

Mr. QUIRKE: I agree with the principle that nobody should subject to economic torture any other section of the community in order to gain his own particular ends. To the extent that the action at the abattoirs is a deviation from that principle, it is wrong. The workers at the abattoirs, who have been badly misled by their union, have broken that fair-minded principle which is characteristic of the Australian. Because they have done that to the extent that they have, they are moral cowards.

Mr. Hughes: Don't tell those chaps that when you give them their next ride.

Mr. QUIRKE: They will probably tell me! They are pretty factual, those boys!

Mr. Hughes: You tell them and they will be factual.

Mr. QUIRKE: I will take the honourable member out to them and tell them who he is and he will get some candid communications from the workers whose right to overtime will disappear if this Bill is passed. Never again will there be sufficient work at the Metropolitan Abattoirs to give them overtime.

Mr. Hughes: Have they told you that?

Mr. QUIRKE: They have told me, as they have told the member for Gouger, that overtime is their bread and butter.

Mr. Hall: Their harvest!

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. They look forward to it each year, but today it is being denied them. The employees are paid more for shift work and they are eager to do it, too.

Mr. McKee: If that is their bread and butter, don't you think their conditions need improving?

Mr. QUIRKE: There is no complaint about conditions other than that the men are subject to certain contagions, and I am prepared to believe that.

Mr. Ryan: It would be hard for you to believe it.

Mr. QUIRKE: I gave the House an example of that and am prepared to believe it. Anyone who understands the processes of contagion in places like the abattoirs realizes that the men run greater risks than those engaged in cleaner industries, and I am not opposed to giving them an extra week's sick leave—that is the second time I have said that—provided they go through the correct channels. If their request were granted I do not believe any member on this side of the House would oppose the finding of the tribunal.

Mr. Jennings: What is the use of their going to a tribunal?

Mr. QUIRKE: What are tribunals for? Is the member for Enfield saying that all tribunals are biased against the worker?

Mr. Jennings: In this case the men were told that they would not get extra sick leave, so what was the use of going to the tribunal?

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member is incorrect and has been misinformed. The men have refused to go to the tribunal. They can go before the tribunal and be refused their claim, but before they take that step, no action should be necessary. I do not deny people the right to strike.

Mr. Ryan: You are doing your best to prevent it.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member is doing his best to prevent it. Everyone should try to prevent strikes.

Mr. Ryan: You are bringing down legislation to prevent strikes.

Mr. QUIRKE: No. That shows that these people do not understand the position. They are ahead of their time and run on a monorail. If I say that every possible effort should be used to avert strikes, other honourable members, like the member for Port Adelaide, say I am a strike breaker.

Mr. Ryan: You admit that!

Mr. QUIRKE: Nothing of the sort. I have been engaged on work that is more laborious than work ever done by 90 per cent of members opposite, and that includes the member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. Ryan: Don't take us back 100 years.

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Port Adelaide never did anything but talk his way out of work. No harder work exists than carrying wheat, and when I was a member of the Australian Workers' Union I quarried stone and built roads, so members opposite can't tell me that I do not know the conditions of the workers.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member going to connect his remarks with this Bill?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, I will directly connect them with the Bill. I am opposed to unnecessary strikes and to deliberately engendered strikes, because they do not benefit the worker. He is always the poor dummy who loses, and also his family. If the worker is out for six weeks he can never make up that loss. Every possible effort should be made to avert strikes. To deprive these people at the abattoirs of their right to overtime in the flush season, which is the only time they get it, is wrong and this Bill is necessary to see that the innocent section of this community (the people who supply the materials to keep the abattoirs going) shall not be the primary sufferers. I support the Bill in its entirety and will oppose any amendment that attempts to destroy its intentions.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS BILL.

(Second reading debate adjourned on August 30. Page 824.)

The SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that I have examined the clauses of the Aboriginal Affairs Bill and consider that it is of a type which should have been founded in Committee in pursuance of Standing Order No. 283 and not introduced, as it was, on a simple

motion for leave. Although the basic principle demanding its introduction by a Minister of the Crown has been observed, I feel that the procedural formality requiring the Bill to be founded on a Committee resolution cannot be ignored. I rule that the Bill may not be further proceeded with until the irregularity has been corrected.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Are you raising a point of order?

Mr. RICHES: In connection with the ruling you have just given, I was on my feet, but was not seen.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order in raising a question of a point of order regarding the Speaker's ruling. If the member wishes he may disagree with the Speaker's ruling, but he must bring it up in writing at once. The only way the House can test the ruling is to put it to the vote.

Mr. RICHES: May I move that the ruling be disagreed with and then ask that the debate be adjourned, because you have given a ruling and members have not had a chance to consider it, and that vitally affects the rights of members on this side of the House ever to introduce a Bill of this nature? I am only asking you to consider you have given a ruling without allowing it to be challenged.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must move that the Speaker's ruling be disagreed with. Before he does that I probably should inform him, for his own consideration, that the Speaker is in a rather difficult position with regard to Bills as they come up. He does not know whether they are money Bills or whether they are properly introduced until they are laid on the table of the House. That is why this ruling is probably late. If the honourable member disagrees with my ruling and wishes to move that it be disagreed with, he should bring up his reasons in writing.

Mr. RICHES: Can I ask a question?

The SPEAKER: No, you must move that the Speaker's ruling be disagreed with and bring up your reasons in writing.

Mr. RICHES: I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed with.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Stuart has moved that the Speaker's ruling that the Aboriginal Affairs Bill is out of order because it should have been founded in Committee be disagreed with. Does the honourable member wish to speak?

Mr. RICHES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I regret the necessity for taking this action,

Mr. Speaker, but I consider that the ruling that has been given could vitally affect the rights of every member on this side. I have taken this action because I believe that we should have an opportunity of examining the ruling that you have given before we agree to it. In fact, the Opposition had prepared a Bill on almost all fours with the Bill that you have ruled out of order, and if you rule that any such Bill must first of all be founded in Committee and introduced by a Minister you are ruling out for all time the rights of the Opposition ever to introduce a Bill of this type. I know your difficulty, Mr. Speaker; I know that you do not have the opportunity to examine Bills immediately they are introduced. I hope that the House will appreciate our difficulty, too, because if this ruling is allowed to stand and no objection is taken it will be held as a precedent and we will be bound by that ruling in the future. We have not had time to have recourse to Standing Orders or to search the authorities on previous procedure. This is the first time that I can remember that such a ruling has been given. I venture the opinion that the Government must have thought the procedure that it adopted was in accordance with the accepted practice or it would not have introduced the Bill in the way it did.

I am at a disadvantage in not having had any notice that this ruling was to be given and in not having had any opportunity of being able to carry out any research or to consult authorities such as Erskine May. If it were possible I should like this debate to be adjourned so that we could examine the matter, but if that is not possible then I am afraid we shall have no alternative but to test the feeling of the House and proceed with the motion that I have submitted. My first thought is that in my opinion your ruling seriously infringes the right of every member of the House to introduce a measure of this nature, a right that most of us in the past understood that we had, and a right that members have exercised in the past, and we are not willing to see that taken from us without a protest. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I move that your ruling be disagreed with.

The SPEAKER: I think I should make it clear that clauses 14 and 41 of this Bill deal with the expenditure of money, and the honourable member will appreciate that Standing Orders provide that a Bill which authorizes the expenditure of money must be founded upon resolution of the Committee of the whole House before it is introduced. This Bill was

not founded in the correct manner, as provided by Standing Order No. 283, and that is what I base my ruling on. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I entirely agree with the point of view put to the House by the member for Stuart. The ruling that you are now giving means that any Bill which provides the manner in which public moneys may be expended, even though it imposes no impost upon the people and does not in itself authorize the expenditure of public moneys without appropriation, is out of order unless it is founded in Committee as a money Bill in this House and the resolution in Committee is obtained by a Minister. The effect of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is to call in question the validity of a number of Acts that are upon the Statute Book at the moment, and that will have serious repercussions to the public of this State. This is a complete departure from previous rulings. Let me turn to the provision concerning money Bills. Under the provisions of the Constitution, money Bills may be introduced only in this House: they may not be introduced in the Legislative Council. Under the Standing Orders of this House money Bills are to be founded on resolution in Committee. Standing Order 283 reads:

Every Bill which imposes a charge upon the people or authorizes the borrowing or expenditure of money shall be founded upon resolution of the Committee of the whole House, submitted by a Minister and agreed to by the House.

Well, Sir, previously it has been the practice of this House to accept that a Bill which provided the manner in which moneys might be expended was not a Bill authorizing the expenditure of public moneys, unless it specifically provided for appropriation or mandatorily provided that certain moneys must be expended without further appropriation. Let me instance the introduction in this House of the present Maintenance Act. That Act provided for the manner of expenditure of public moneys, and it was not founded in Committee but introduced simply by ordinary leave. It was not introduced in the manner provided by Standing Order 283, because in itself and without further appropriation it did not authorize the expenditure.

Let me point to the further fact that we have on the Statute Book at present the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961, which provides for the expenditure of public moneys for setting up a department in the same way as the Aboriginal Affairs Bill

does. It did not in itself provide for an appropriation. It did not in itself impose a charge on the people or authorize the expenditure of moneys without further appropriation by Parliament. It was introduced in the Legislative Council and it was not treated as a money Bill.

Mr. Lawn: It was out of order.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. Mr. Speaker, if your ruling is correct, any person committed by the court under that Act will have the right of an action for false imprisonment and can call into question the whole of the validity of the law, because under the Colonial Laws Validity Act, which binds this Parliament, section 6 provides that the publication of the Act with the notification of assent by the Governor, and notification by the Clerk or authoritative officer of the Parliament, is only *prima facie* evidence that the matter has been dealt with on the forms prescribed by Parliament. The Constitution provides that a money Bill shall be started in this House. If your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is correct, no-one will be committed under the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act without being able to bring a case in the court.

Mr. Clark: There are many others.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. If your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is correct, no private member in this House may introduce a Bill which deals with a form of administration, or indeed commands the administration to do a single thing, because by doing anything the administration must spend some money. That has never been the intention of this Standing Order and not been the practice of the House previously.

Mr. Lawn: That has not been the previous ruling.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. Your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, in this House did not rule the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Bill out of order. Your predecessor when the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill was introduced did not rule it out. Neither of these was introduced in accordance with your present ruling. Your ruling does trench upon the rights of private members, and although Parliament is not making any appropriation of public moneys, and is not putting a charge on the people, and is saying that Parliament must provide a separate appropriation, and although this is not an expenditure of public moneys, you say that no-one may introduce anything which lays down the way in which public moneys later appropriated may be spent

You say that that is an authorization of expenditure, even though some other thing must be done in this Parliament before an appropriation is made and a charge is made on the people.

This is not the practice in the House of Commons. Erskine May makes it clear that your ruling of what is a money Bill is certainly not the practice in the House of Commons. There are two definitions used in the House of Commons: one is a money Bill under the provisions of the Parliament Act, and the other is in the practice of the House of Commons, which gives a wider definition. Under neither definition is a Bill which simply says the public moneys may be expended without providing an impost on the people or authorizing the expenditure. Page 779 of the 14th edition of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* states:

The expression "money Bill" which has been given a statutory meaning by the Parliament Act has long been used, and is still used, in the House of Commons in a different sense, which is too well established to be discontinued. That is in a wider sense than is provided in the Parliament Act, and indeed our Constitution. It continues:

For this reason, wherever in this section the expression is used in the sense given it by the Parliament Act it is printed in inverted commas. The ordinary Parliamentary signification of the expression is not very strictly defined. Without inquiring into its earlier meanings, a money Bill has meant, since the establishment of modern financial procedure (that is to say for the last hundred years or more), primarily a Bill originating in a Committee of the whole House appointed with the Royal recommendation. But it is also sometimes used as meaning a Bill originating in the Committee of Ways and Means. Thus, in its widest sense, it means a Bill the main purpose of which is either to impose a charge upon public funds or to impose a charge upon the people, *i.e.* a tax. It will be seen that the statutory use and the ordinary Parliamentary use of the expression overlap rather than coincide. A Parliamentary money Bill may be certified by the Speaker as a "money Bill" if its provisions deal only with the imposition of charges. But it will not be certified if it contains provisions dealing with any other matter except "subordinate matters incidental" to such charges. On the other hand, the terms of the statutory definition allow ample opportunity for the certification as "money Bills" of Bills which do not impose charges and are, therefore, not required to originate in a Committee of the whole House . . .

Let me now turn to the clause under which you, Mr. Speaker, have ruled this Bill out of order. Clause 14 states:

The Treasurer of the State shall in every year place at the disposal of the Board such sums as are provided by Parliament to be applied to the purposes of the Board.

Mr. Lawn: That is not an appropriation.

Mr. DUNSTAN: No. It does not authorize expenditure. The expenditure has to be authorized under a further measure. There must be a separate appropriation Act under which Parliament authorizes the expenditure; otherwise the Treasurer has no funds to place at the disposal of the board. It does not authorize the expenditure until Parliament is given the authority under a further measure. That is the only way in which Parliament can function. Otherwise, no private member can introduce any Bill dealing with administration at all. That has never been the intention. What was the purpose of the Standing Order? It was to provide that when matters came before the House which involved an expenditure of public moneys they would fit into the programme provided by the Government in the disbursement of public moneys. It had to have an overall programme; otherwise executive Government could not be carried on. That is not trenched upon by this Bill or any other Bill of a like kind previously agreed to by Parliament. The Government only needs to introduce here the appropriation and authorization of the expenditure in accordance with its plans, and if it does not do so Parliament does not authorize the expenditure, and cannot authorize the expenditure even though it has provided the manner in which the Government may expend the moneys which are appropriated. Until those moneys are authorized by Parliament there is no authority for the expenditure. That has always been the attitude ever since the inception of the House.

I have given two instances but many can be given where this is the case, and if this ruling is persisted in not only will it mean that private members are extraordinarily limited in the measures they may bring before the House in future but it will mean that there will be questions as to the validity of a number of Statutes already on our Statute Book, which have not been introduced in this House in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, if your ruling is correct, Mr. Speaker, and therefore will be challengeable in accordance with the Colonial Laws Validity Act, and the administration will then be in hopeless holts because of cases brought against the Government by private citizens.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member for Norwood has overlooked the fact that this action of the Speaker does not invalidate any Bill at all.

Mr. Dunstan: If your ruling is correct, it will.

The SPEAKER: There is a provision that, because of a mistake, informality, or something of that kind that is effected in this Bill, it does not invalidate this Bill or any other Bill at all. The honourable member was quoting from Erskine May, who was dealing with the position between the House of Lords and the House of Commons, but that is not relevant to this matter. I shall quote from page 692 of the 16th edition of Erskine May in the chapter entitled "General Rules of Financial Procedure" which cover this ruling; this is not the position between the House of Lords and the House of Commons. He states:

At first the requirement of the Queen's recommendation was confined to proposals which directly and effectively authorized expenditure by ordering payments to be made out of Consolidated Fund. It was a considerable step when the requirement was extended to proposals which were not in themselves effective, and did no more than direct that payment should be made "out of moneys to be provided by Parliament," *i.e.*, by Estimates to be subsequently presented which the House might vote or reject as it pleased.

On page 755, which is headed "Tests whether expenditure involves a 'charge'", he says:

The most frequent case of expenditure of this type is that of charges upon moneys to be provided by Parliament for salaries and other expenses caused by the imposition of novel duties upon the executive government by the legislation of the session. . . . The sanctioning of such expenditure thus undergoes two stages: (1) it is initiated by a money resolution imposing a charge payable "out of moneys to be provided by Parliament" which receives confirmation by specific enactment; (2) it is subsequently presented to the House of Commons in the form of an estimate which receives final sanction in the Appropriation Act. Although a resolution of this type initiates no immediate charge, but it is intended only to authorize the eventual presentation of an estimate, it is in view of the terms of Standing Order No. 78—

this is read in relation to our own Standing Order—

regarded as containing a "charge" in the technical sense and could not be brought before the House without the recommendation of the Crown.

Mr. Lawn: It does not sound too convincing to me!

The SPEAKER: Therefore, this position is not creating any dangerous precedent whatever. It is only a formality under the Standing Orders as I have interpreted them and as they have been interpreted for as long as I have been a member. The previous Parliamentary Draftsman (Sir Edgar Bean) to my knowledge on two or three occasions had to draw the attention of the Government to this so that it would found this on a proper resolution. This is a formality and it does not prevent any private member from introducing any Bill so long as it is not a money Bill. Clause 14 is the power from which flows the authorization of the money. The other Appropriation Act is only a matter of formality and, even if the Minister did get an appropriation by the Appropriation Bill, he must come back to this Bill from which it flows.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches (teller), Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Ralston. No—Sir Cecil Hincks.

While the division was being taken:

Mr. Lawn: Look at Onkaparinga! He can't say anything.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide is completely out of order. There can be no interjections while a division is taking place. There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes, and I cast my vote in favour of the Noes; therefore, the question passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 27, at 2 p.m.