

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, September 27, 1962.

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

QUESTIONS.

MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main and, in association with that project, is there a proposal to make a connection at Iron Knob that will supply water to Kimba. If this is planned, when is it expected that that service will be in operation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not able at short notice to say precisely what stage has been reached with the laying of pipes on the Morgan-Whyalla duplication scheme, but if the honourable member so desires I will obtain a more precise answer and let him have it next Tuesday. Suffice to say now, I think, that the programme is running to schedule and satisfactory progress generally is being made. The first section has been completed and the second section is in the course of active work. The contract is for the stage to Hughes Gap. An establishment at Port Pirie will soon be in production on the concrete pipes called for in the contract. Survey work has been done from Hughes Gap to Winninowie and preparations are being made to call tenders (indeed I think they have been called) for the pipes for that section of the work. On that part of the scheme between Port Augusta and Whyalla, the main is completed from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob. A booster station north of Whyalla has been in operation for some time and that will ensure supplies to Whyalla this summer.

The link from Kimba to Iron Knob is not part of the duplication scheme; it is an extension of it. Surveys have been made between Iron Knob and Kimba along two possible routes for the main. The department is proceeding with the planning on the data that has been collated as a result of the surveys, and is preparing to present a case to the Public Works Committee when that reference is authorized by Cabinet. However, there is no immediate prospect of being able to commence the project, because it has to go to the Public Works Committee and finance has to be provided by Parliament. I am not able to say just when that can be done. I think that answers the honourable member's question as to the general progress of the scheme.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Does the Minister of Education agree with the statement in a recent issue of the *South Australian Teachers Journal* by the General Secretary of the South Australian Institute of Teachers that the rapidity of growth in the primary schools in the immediate future will be about half what it has been? If so, does the Minister consider that the time will soon be opportune for increasing the school leaving age as envisaged by section 4 of the Education Act Amendment Act of 1946?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have not examined the General Secretary's statements, but he is very good on statistics and I would think that his forecast is substantially correct. Regarding the second part of the question, we are having very great success on a voluntary basis in encouraging children to stay on longer at school than children have been doing in previous years. However, I express the personal opinion—and although it is not shared by responsible people elsewhere, I have expressed it over a period of many years—that we are lagging behind most of the other States in having our school leaving age too low, and I hope that the time will soon arrive when the Government will be able to promulgate the proclamation which it was empowered to do by Parliament many years ago. That is purely a personal opinion; I have not discussed it with my colleagues in Cabinet, and it may well be that they do not share the same opinion.

WONGA SHOAL LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. TAPPING: I understand the Minister of Marine has a reply to my recent question concerning the demolition of the Wonga Shoal lighthouse off Semaphore.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This morning I was discussing various matters with the acting General Manager of the Harbors Board (Mr. Hilder), and subsequently he advised me that he discussed this matter by telephone with the Commonwealth Navigation and Lighthouse Services. He stated that that authority proposed to do this job with its own engineers, and it has requested the Army to supply demolition charges. It is proposed to set up demolition charges at sea-bed level under each pile. This will mean using explosives instead of the method of underwater burning. The Lighthouse Department states that the series of small explosions will not affect anything or anybody. At the same time, the opportunity will be taken to remove the framework of the old original Wonga Shoal light.

COPPER FREIGHTS.

Mr. FREEBARN: My question concerns a matter vitally affecting South Australia's trade. I was most disturbed recently to hear that the freight charge on copper concentrates shipped from Port Augusta to Port Kembla was about two-and-a-half times the freight charge from Port Augusta to Japan. Can the Premier say whether that is so and, if it is, can he give the reasons therefor?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not believe that that information is in accordance with fact. As the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) will agree, Port Augusta has had some difficulty in the limited size of ships it can berth. Any freight from Port Augusta to Japan would be subject to the same problem as freight from Port Augusta to Port Kembla. Port Augusta has suffered because of not having sufficient depth of water, and that is one of the problems the salt industry has been up against. The member for Port Augusta again will concur in that. Salt has been sent to New South Wales by rail because of the problem of shipping from Port Augusta. If the salt industry, on which some investigation work has been done, is established, one of the big advantages will be that Port Augusta will have large-scale accommodation for overseas ships. I have had some experience of the problem of sending copper ore from Port Augusta to Port Kembla, and it is not as set out in the honourable member's question, but there is undoubtedly a problem with freight from that area, and it can be cleared up only by having better shipping accommodation.

Mr. RICHES: Is the Premier aware that copper from the Peko mines is being exported via Port Augusta direct to Japan? Overseas ships call at Port Augusta and the copper is exported in them to Japan. The question arises in my mind as to why it is not possible for shipping to take copper from Port Augusta to Port Kembla when it can be taken from Port Augusta to Japan.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was not aware of the information that the honourable member has supplied about exports to Japan.

Mr. Ryan: They have been going on for 12 months.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A lot goes on in 12 months that the honourable member would not even dream about. I will inquire about the position because if, as the member for Stuart states, there is direct export to Japan I should think similar export could take place to Port Kembla.

EGG INDUSTRY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday last regarding the future of the South Australian egg industry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have a report from the Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board, but it is too lengthy to read in full, so I ask that I have leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EGG EXPORTS.

Further to the position of the egg industry in South Australia I have to advise that there has been very little improvement, if any, in the position during the last 12 months. The prices returned to the producers from the commencement of this pool year, i.e., July 1, 1962, have varied from 4d. to 8d. a dozen less than for the comparable period last year. However, from September 17 of this year the prices were the same as those for the same date last year. Extreme difficulty is being experienced in all States in the disposal of the surplus production. There is no outlet for eggs in shell to the United Kingdom, and the only outlet is in the form of egg pulp, and this position is very difficult. The overseas exports are controlled by the Australian Egg Board. New South Wales, although they have representation on the Australian Egg Board, sell their surplus on their own account. The other four States, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, are what is known as the "pooling States", and pool all their surpluses.

At the moment the pooling States have approximately 1,600 tons of egg pulp in the United Kingdom unsold from the 1961-62 season. What quantity New South Wales has is not known to the pooling States. However, at a meeting of the Australian Egg Board held in Sydney on Monday of this week, i.e., September 24, the board agreed that the Chairman, Mr. R. C. Blake, proceed to England almost immediately to try and effect the sale of pulp for the pooling States. In addition to the quantity mentioned for the year 1961-62 there are heavy quantities being manufactured in some States for the season 1962-63, and for which no sale has been made. The prices returned to producers for eggs in shell for the 1961-62 season have had an effect on the receipts of eggs by the South Australian Egg Board. From July 1 to September 15 of this year the board's receipts show a decrease of 420,869 dozen eggs as compared with the comparable period of last year. This is equivalent to a decrease of 17.72 per cent.

SWINE FEVER.

Mr. HARDING: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that a serious outbreak of swine fever has occurred in New South Wales and that during the campaign to combat it about 15,000 pigs have been slaughtered. New outbreaks in August this year totalled 16, and for the year the total was 116. Can the Minister

inform members whether swine fever is prevalent and a menace to piggeries in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Swine fever does not occur in South Australia. The authorities here take a most serious view of the risk of its getting into our herds of pigs and, in fact, to that end the regulations have recently been tightened. Every type of inspection that can reasonably be imposed is being imposed to prevent entry of the infection to this State.

PORT PIRIE AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on September 20 regarding a Mines Department survey of the arsenic content and lead fall-out in the atmosphere at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Deputy Director of Mines reports that the testing of the atmosphere at Port Pirie for the presence of arsenic and lead fumes requires specialized equipment, and a preliminary survey has been made to determine the type of sampling and equipment best suited to the problem. As soon as the equipment has been procured testing will be undertaken, but it will be a considerable time before results are available.

COOMANDOOK SIDING.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Railways to a question I asked on August 29 about improving facilities for the unloading and trucking of cattle at the Coomandook siding?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the cattle trucking yards at Coomandook are used very little. For the last four years there was an average of 13 head of cattle inwards and nine head outwards. Therefore, the Commissioner feels that improvements or extensions to the yards could not be justified at present. However, any essential repairs to the existing yards will be undertaken.

POST-MORTEM EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. RICHES: Last Friday one of Port Augusta's most highly-respected and best-known citizens died in a street in that town. He had not been to a doctor for some 10 years because he had been in good health previously, and because of that the doctor was not able to give the ordinary death certificate. I understand that, under a general instruction from the City Coroner, the local coroner ordered a post-mortem examination, but that, although Port Augusta has a Government hospital and five doctors (all of whom were approached), they all refused to perform the post-mortem.

This type of refusal has not been confined to this occasion; at other times a body has been sent to Whyalla for a post-mortem examination to be conducted. However, for some reason or other, that was not possible in the case that occurred over the weekend, and ultimately the body had to be sent to Port Pirie. During all these negotiations the widow was greatly distressed and her family was most upset through not knowing where the body was or what was happening to it.

I have been reliably informed that a fortnight before this happening a returned soldier died and his body had to be sent to Adelaide for a post-mortem examination. I have also been told that in June last a baby died and the body was brought to Adelaide by train in a brown paper parcel for examination in the city. This situation is causing grave disquiet in my district and I have been requested to ask whether the Attorney-General will initiate a full inquiry into the circumstances and use every endeavour to see that these post-mortem examinations, if they are deemed to be necessary, are carried out at Port Augusta. Will the Minister of Education take up this matter with the Attorney-General?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so. Naturally, of course, I am not aware, and I do not think the Attorney-General is aware, of the facts and circumstances outlined by the honourable member, but I know the Attorney-General has given this matter his personal and sympathetic consideration in recent months and weeks. I am sure he will look into these matters and see what he can do in the circumstances.

PORT GAWLER BORE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 29 concerning a test bore sunk at Port Gawler by the Mines Department?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Director of Mines:

The Mines Department sank a bore near Port Gawler as one of a series of observation bores designed to obtain data on the effect of underground supplies of the intensive irrigation of market gardens from underground sources. These bores will be used to observe changes in salinity and level through several seasons, as it is already apparent that seasonal variations in level are quite normal. If over pumping should occur then it is expected that the salt water, which is marginal to the area, will move in and will be detected in the observation bores before serious damage can be done. Accordingly, it is emphasized that the work is of a long-term nature and it is not possible, at this stage, to specify the safe pumping limits in the area.

CEREAL CROPS.

Mr. HUGHES: In view of the dry season throughout the State, can the Minister of Agriculture say how seriously the wheat, barley and oat crops will be affected?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a considered statement.

RATES ON HOME UNITS.

Mrs. STEELE: My question concerns water and sewerage rates on properties known as home units. I have had numerous representations made to me by owners of individual units expressing concern that they are charged separately. They claim that, if there were only one home building on the property assessed on the total value, there would be only one assessment. My constituents feel that their individual assessments should be an equal share on the total value of the property. Can the Minister of Works say what is the position regarding such assessments on home units?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree that this matter frequently arises not only in the case of occupants of what are known as home units, but also in the case of occupants of group blocks of flats, whether the flats are owned by the occupant or whether they are leased to tenants and again in the case of other premises that are capable of serving two distinct purposes. Where the building happens to be under one roof the question arises whether or not the department is correct in assessing the properties individually. I think that is the point at issue. In respect of properties that are capable of being used separately and indeed are used separately by separate families as dwellings, or by separate lessees of shop premises, which may be under one roof in a group of buildings, and in cases similar to that, the rule is that they shall be assessed at their annual value for occupancy for which they are used. Therefore, it is correct that the department should evaluate each unit of the building separately and render separate assessments for them.

MILLICENT COURTHOUSE.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Minister of Works say when construction of the new courthouse at Millicent is likely to commence, and when the building is likely to be completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director, Public Buildings Department, reports that tenders for the new police station and courthouse buildings at Millicent will be advertised in the *Government Gazette* on October 4, 1962. I would add that the call for tenders will probably be for a duration of three or four

weeks from that date, after which time the tenders will be examined (which may take a week) and then a contract should be let. The contractor will, of course, commence work as soon after that date as possible. As I have not before me information regarding the expected construction time, I cannot inform the honourable member on that, but it would not be a long period for a building of this size.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Some months ago, accompanied by the members for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) and Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) and members for Central No. 1 District in the Legislative Council, I attended a conference at the Woodville council chambers, at which the council was represented and Mr. Jackman (Commissioner of Highways) was present, on lights at the Woodville Road and Port Road intersection, and at Clark Terrace. At that time the council and the members present were assured that this was a No. 1 priority and were led to believe that almost immediate action would be taken to commence this work. Questions have been asked in another place and we have been told that the assurance will be honoured, but there is no evidence yet of any progress being made. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, why this work is being held up and, if there is no reason for the delay, will every endeavour be made to expedite the work at these dangerous crossings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

EUDUNDA-ROBERTSTOWN RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to my recent question about the Eudunda-Robertstown rail service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, states that the direct rail passenger service to Robertstown has been discontinued on account of lack of patronage. Commencing from Monday, September 24, a co-ordinated rail-road passenger service has been introduced on the following schedules: Monday to Saturday.

Adelaide to Robertstown:

Adelaide . . . dep. 7.45 a.m. (Railcar)
 Eudunda . . . arr. 9.34 a.m.
 Eudunda . . . dep. 9.45 a.m. (Road bus)
 Robertstown . . . arr. 10.20 a.m.

Robertstown to Adelaide:

Robertstown . . . dep. 11.00 a.m. (Road bus)
 Eudunda . . . arr. 11.35 a.m.
 Eudunda . . . dep. 11.50 a.m. (Railcar)
 Adelaide . . . arr. 1.33 p.m.

PALMER-SEDAN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday about the Palmer-Sedan water scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No. I regret that I do not have the information yet, but I will get it for the honourable member for next Tuesday.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. TAPPING: Yesterday the Premier announced a huge £4,000,000 scheme for building houses for sale on a £50 minimum deposit. According to the *Quarterly Report* of the Housing Trust, many tenants of single-unit houses have been permitted to buy those single-unit houses. Can the Premier say whether it would be practicable to provide the same facility to tenants of double-unit houses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Housing Trust provides two types of rental house—single units and double units. I do not think there would be much difficulty in arranging the sale of a single-unit house, but for many years the trust has declined to sell double-unit houses because of their structural design. I will address the question to the Chairman of the trust. As far as the Government is concerned, if it were possible it would facilitate purchases by tenants of those houses.

WALLAROO COPPER MINES.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 18 about whether the Mines Department would extend the tests with its new electronic device to include Wallaroo copper mines?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Perhaps the best reply I can give is to quote a letter from the Director of Mines to the Kadina corporation, as follows:

In reply to your letter of September 10, I wish to advise you that a large area including Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina is held under special mining lease by the Western Mining Corporation. As a matter of convenience and by arrangement with Western Mining Corporation we are conducting a short training school with our new I.P. equipment in this district at the moment. However, detailed exploration of the area is the responsibility of the licence holder, and I am aware that the company has been using a similar type of equipment intermittently in your district over the past year or so, and has plans for an active mineral research programme there.

SHEEP DRENCHES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish to deal with the question of the effectiveness of proprietary drenches used for the control of gastro-intestinal worms in sheep. Complaints, which are

substantiated by qualified veterinary surgeons, have reached me that the product under the trade name "Kempak" is almost worthless for the commercial control of gastro-intestinal worms. Can the Minister of Agriculture verify this and say whether thiabendazole is the only chemical sold in a proprietary drench in South Australia that will effectively control all forms of gastro-intestinal worms in sheep?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a report from the Director of Agriculture on this matter, but in the meantime I prefer not to mention trade names of these various drenches in case some injustice may be done. I shall supply the honourable member with a considered reply.

NORWOOD GIRLS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question that I asked on the Norwood Girls Technical High School and the new girls technical high school on the old Norwood High School site?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: It is intended to establish a new girls technical high school to be known as the Kensington Girls Technical High School, initially in some of the permanent buildings of the old Norwood High School in Lossie Street. This will have the effect of considerably reducing the number of students at the Norwood Girls Technical High School and so greatly ease the accommodation problem there. Although it is intended at some future time to demolish some of the old buildings at the Norwood Girls Technical High School, it is not possible to proceed with this work at present because of more urgent commitments elsewhere. The new Kensington Girls Technical High School will be established in buildings forming part of the old Norwood High School at the beginning of 1963. It is not intended to house the School of Art temporarily at the old Norwood High School until the new School of Art building in Stanley Street, North Adelaide, is completed. The School of Art will remain in the front or southern portion of the old Exhibition Building until the new School of Art building is ready for occupation early next year.

I wish to make it clear that I am not promising the early construction of any substantial new buildings at Norwood in the near future because some few years ago I promised the honourable member a new infant school at Marryatville and was not able to fulfil my promise until recently. I am pleased to inform him, as I think he is probably already aware,

that tenders have been called for this new infant school at Marryatville and also, of course, only at the beginning of this week the new Norwood High School was opened, and that is one of the best schools in South Australia. I am very anxious for work to proceed on the Norwood Girls Technical High School as soon as possible, but there are so many pressing claims that it is impossible to do them all at the one time.

TABLE GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked yesterday on table grapes?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked about the result of a trial consignment of table grapes that was sent to Germany from South Australia. The results of the test are included in a long report that I have here, which will be published in the *Journal of Agriculture* shortly. I shall read the conclusion, which is as follows:

The result of this trial consignment has shown that fresh table grapes can be transported over long distances in fibre board cell packs without the addition of cork fillings. The much cheaper pack of treatment No. 4 could also be considered for future consignments; this, however, only if delays between picking and sailing dates can be avoided. Fresh grapes in Hamburg meet a high demand during four and a half months. However, even the highest prices on record would at present not provide reasonable returns.

REMARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning the priority allocated to the installation of sewerage in the town of Renmark?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has been the subject of much correspondence between the Upper Murray Local Government Association, myself and the Engineer-in-Chief, and to assist in putting the matter in its true perspective I may mention that back in 1959 a letter was addressed to me from the association pointing out that in the view of the association the priority that had been allocated to the Upper Murray group of towns, namely, No. 5, had not taken into account the disabilities of the towns. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Country Sewerage, subsequent to that, reported to me that the factors mentioned in the letter dated September 10, 1959, from the Secretary of the Upper Murray Local Government Association were taken into consideration by the advisory committee in fixing the priorities. The committee was fully appreciative of the difficulties that the river

towns had in disposing of effluents because of the high water tables in the towns, and also the possible hazard to health through discharging effluents and waste water in the towns, but had grouped the Upper Murray towns for priority No. 5, having regard to the disabilities of other larger towns, and believed that was a very fair and satisfactory allotment. Since that time, because of the requests not only from towns on the river but also from other towns in the State, the Government at my request reconstituted the advisory committee on a permanent basis so that it could rehear evidence from towns whose civic authorities felt there had been some new and important circumstances that justified a revision of the advisory committee's earlier allocations of priority. More recently I have had a report from the Engineer for Sewerage, who is Chairman of the committee, and he reiterates that although the committee is fully appreciative of the problems in the river towns it is of the opinion that this priority is a fair one in relation to disabilities of towns in other parts of the State. He states:

As a group the Upper Murray towns have a priority of five, and in view of the disabilities of the larger towns it is considered that this priority could not be raised until some of the larger towns were sewered. The limitation of Loan money prevents this from being done more expeditiously than is being carried out at present.

That summarizes the reports that I have, and I think the information is up to date regarding the advisory committee's recommendations. I point out to the honourable member that the advisory committee is a completely non-Government and non-political committee. It comprises mainly medical authorities who are experts in their field, and the recommendations it has made are the recommendations the Government is following in allocating the priorities for various country sewerage schemes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: When I was speaking to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill I referred to the Noarlunga meatworks. I regret that the *Advertiser* became confused. It reported me as having referred to a meatworks at Naracoorte.

STRATHMONT PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Strathmont Primary School.

Ordered that report be printed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 26. Page 1137.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): This is a most important Bill from my point of view. I would say that from a practical point of view there is only one primary producer on this side of the House, and, I think, three on the other side. For that reason, members on both sides of the House are vitally concerned with this Bill, for it directly concerns those people that I have mentioned. We have heard speeches by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) and several other members from the Government side. The member for Rocky River apparently was on the land some years ago, and it might have been wise for him to ascertain the conditions that apply on the land today before he made some of his statements. He is living in the past, and I suggest that it is time the people who live in the past gave up the ghost.

In discussing the Metropolitan Abattoirs we are dealing with two sections of the community. As in private enterprise, we must have complete harmony in order that employees and employers may work efficiently. We have heard in this House that this harmony has been particularly good at the Metropolitan Abattoirs over the last seven years. Previous to that, there were some stoppages. We all know that industry goes through trying times, when there are stoppages one after the other, and perhaps they are caused by just grievances. I am not an industrial man and I do not know whether that is so, but apparently these things come to a head, and, after all, we all have our ups and downs in life. For this reason I think the last seven years at the Metropolitan Abattoirs has been a particularly good period for both employers and employees.

Two points of view are involved. Some members opposite say this is a relief Bill and other Government members refer to it as an emergency Bill, but we on this side of the House claim—and I do so without any hesitation—that it was introduced as a panic measure.

Mr. Heaslip: You don't think there is any need for it?

Mr. CASEY: I think there is a big need for more abattoirs in South Australia, but I do not think another abattoirs should be established within the metropolitan area to compete with our own State organization.

Mr. Heaslip: You mean, we should carry on as we are at present?

Mr. CASEY: No, I do not say that at all. I say there is a need for more abattoirs in this State, but I do not think it is advisable to establish a new abattoirs in the metropolitan area. Men in this line of business have spoken to me on this matter, and have said, "Leave the Metropolitan Abattoirs as it is and it can cope with all the meat that is necessary for the metropolitan area and much of the export as well." I remind honourable members opposite of what happened in 1959. My farming is limited to sheep, and in that line I was hit particularly hard in 1959. In 1959 we had about the same number of sheep in South Australia as we have today—about 16,000,000. We all know that South Australia is a very dry State, and for the numbers to increase to such proportions must give anybody who is interested in the land cause for alarm. We do not know how this season will develop, but if it continues to deteriorate heavy losses will be incurred, and we cannot do anything about it; perhaps it can be said to be an act of God. Together with hundreds of others in the northern areas of the State, I was hit particularly hard in 1959. We could not do anything about it, because we could not get rid of our sheep; we almost had to give them away—breeding ewes as well as all our young flocks. Some flocks were reduced to 40 per cent of what they should have been, and that is a big drop for a man on the land who is producing sheep. In 1959 the Metropolitan Abattoirs did a magnificent job in coping with the stock that were sent there for killing. Overtime was worked. Full marks should be given to the employers and the employees for the way in which they handled the stock. I think the situation in 1959 was infinitely worse than it is now. Today the drought is in pockets around the State, whereas in 1959 it was State-wide: it extended from the southern portions of the State right through to the northern portions. A considerable area of the northern portions of the State is experiencing its best season for years, whereas the Mid North is being hit particularly hard, and that is the area that is being affected at present because of the influx of lambs.

Mr. Heaslip: You are out of date; the drought is all over the State.

Mr. CASEY: Oh no, it is not; that is the point I make. The honourable member is living in the past. Years ago he was a primary producer but he has lost contact with the land. The only way to keep contact with it is to live on it. I defy any member who does not live on the land to give a true graphic description of the position.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no reference in the Bill to the honourable member for Rocky River living on the land.

Mr. CASEY: Earlier in the debate the members for Rocky River and Burra accused me of saying something when I knew nothing about the matter. When I interjected, Mr. Quirke was speaking about the losses incurred by primary producers, and said that they were out of all proportion. When such a statement is made it should be supported by facts. At the time I was trying to be helpful to the honourable member.

Mr. Quirke: I accept the explanation.

Mr. CASEY: At that time we had a large influx of sheep and lambs to the abattoirs, and I investigated the extent of the loss incurred by producers that day. Ruling prices for sheep and lambs are always available at the end of the day, and it is possible to tell how much a pound lambs, trade wethers, canning ewes, etc., are making. I discovered that the price of sheep fell by about 2d. a pound. Yesterday about 100,000 sheep and lambs came to the abattoirs. Lambs opened up five shillings cheaper than in the previous week, but the rates were dearer at the close of the day. Between 30,000 and 40,000 sheep went to Victoria. Although we hear much about the colossal sums of money being lost by primary producers, trade wethers were up 1d. a pound at the abattoirs. It is difficult to get rid of some types of sheep, and I am now having some difficulty in this regard. Perhaps it is because more lambs could be slaughtered for export. Over a period of 12 months the average weekly killing of stock for human consumption has been 20,295 lambs, 11,822 sheep, 2,107 pigs, 952 calves and 1,566 cattle. I could not ascertain the total capacity of the abattoirs, mainly because it was not desired to give the information. I think that about 50,000 sheep and lambs could be slaughtered at the abattoirs each week. I suggest 32,000 could be for home consumption and 18,000 for export. That is only an estimate, and if I am corrected I shall take back those figures. If overtime were

worked at the abattoirs probably the figures could be increased by 25 per cent. As a primary producer I am interested in primary producers, but I want to see a fair go all round. The charges for slaughtering at the abattoirs are the highest in Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: A monopoly.

Mr. CASEY: No. In other States the Government controls abattoirs, which kill much more cheaply than we do in South Australia. The charges at our abattoirs for meat for local consumption are 2.41d. a pound for sheep and lambs, 2.21d. for beef, 2.86d. for veal, and 2.7d. for pork. On export meat the charges are 3.09d. for mutton, 3.22d. for lamb, 3.12d. for beef, 3.16d. for veal, 3.72d. for pig meats (Wiltshire sides) and 3.28d. for pig carcasses. Many Victorian buyers come to South Australia for sheep, mainly because our abattoirs' charges are so high. They come here every year, and not merely to take the cream of the stock to Victoria. Some of our Adelaide Hills people send their cattle to the Newmarket yards in Victoria rather than send them to Adelaide. It is possible to get a price better for each 100 lb. in Victoria than in South Australia, and it is so much better that it covers the freight charge from Adelaide to Melbourne. The same applies to sheep and lambs. These Victorian buyers even go to the northern parts of South Australia when it is possible to produce lambs suitable for export. Unfortunately, in our northern areas we produce only merinos, which do not lend themselves to export, but this year suitable lambs are coming down and being sold for export. I point out to the member for Rocky River that not all parts of the State have had a bad season. I know he will agree that if a merino lamb is fit for export it must have been on good feed.

Mr. Heaslip: Sheep must be slaughtered, too; they cannot be held.

Mr. CASEY: As the charges made by the Metropolitan Abattoirs are higher than those of any abattoirs in Australia, I think the Government should examine this and realize that the only way in which they can be reduced is by investigating the way the abattoirs is managed. The Minister of Agriculture and his department are doing and have done a wonderful job. I congratulate them on their efforts to improve properties, including mine. They are there to help farmers, graziers, and other people on the land who want to improve pastures and soils or get a different strain of stock. Many men on the land could improve not only their properties

but the management of their farms. I have seen many farmers hang on too long hoping for something to happen. I know this is a human characteristic which is difficult to overcome—and I have been caught in this way myself—but experts have often pointed out that we must instruct people on the land to improve their management. In a season like this season, it is a common saying within the sheep industry that the first loss is the best loss. This refers to getting rid of stock when one knows one is over-stocked. I notice that the member for Albert is shaking his head, but I think he will agree that that is correct. That is not only my contention; it is the contention of most stock agents, and it is a common term. If the member for Albert has not heard it, I am surprised, as it is common gossip in sheep circles. If the Minister is to be permitted to grant licences to kill in the Adelaide metropolitan area for human consumption, eventually we shall find that a big firm will come in and compete against the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

Mr. Heaslip: What is wrong with that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: I do not agree with that. The Metropolitan Abattoirs is a Government-controlled undertaking in which nearly £2,000,000 of public money is tied up. The Premier has often been criticized for the Government's having taken over the State's electricity supply, and we have such State instrumentalities as the State Bank. The Premier has often been referred to as "the greatest Labor Premier the State has ever known", and I give him full marks for establishing these things, which are part of this State. If big companies open up in competition with the abattoirs, anything is likely to happen. Let us protect our State industries.

Mr. Heaslip: You don't think that!

Mr. CASEY: I do think that. The primary producer should be given an opportunity to get his stock slaughtered at a cheaper rate, and I suggest that the management of the Metropolitan Abattoirs should be investigated thoroughly. There should be some new blood in the management to give it some additional initiative and drive. We can do this sort of thing. As I have said before in this House, I believe in quality on the hook. I think this should be looked into. I know that the Minister of Agriculture has been approached by some members of the Abattoirs Board and asked to institute this method at the abattoirs,

and I think it will come eventually. The live-weight basis is used now, but I do not see why the weight should not be taken of animals on the hook. This could apply particularly to trade wethers, lambs and beef cattle.

Mr. Shannon: Provided that you can get them killed.

Mr. Heaslip: You must get them killed first.

Mr. CASEY: There is no reason why they cannot be killed. I think the 1950 drought proved beyond all doubt that this could be done.

Mr. Heaslip: It is not being done now.

Mr. McKee: If the men are given the conditions they deserve, it will be done.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: Let us have complete harmony between employers and employees. The member for Rocky River must appreciate my point of view. I have gone into this matter from this side of the House, which he has not done, and I am speaking without bias. As the Leader mentioned, when representations were made by the employees to the Abattoirs Board they were told that they were not going through the correct channels.

Mr. Heaslip: Were they?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order. This is not a debate between two honourable members.

Mr. CASEY: It would not make any difference if they went through the right channels. There is no harmony between employers and employees and there is no reason why the Government could not come into this matter and say, "You are both at loggerheads. Why not get together and settle it peaceably?" That is what I would have done, and this is the opportunity to do it. I have given the position as I see it, as both a primary producer and a member on this side of the House. I suggest that the Minister have another look at this Bill in order to protect State interests. The abattoirs as it is at present can cope comfortably with the situation; it needs only a little co-operation between all parties for this to be done. I cannot support the Bill as it stands, and I hope members opposite will not support it.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I shall make a few observations that have not been made from this side of the House already. First, I shall deal with those few people who have an axe to grind. I admit that any man on the

land these days has a blunt axe to grind—he has much stock but little feed, and he wants to get rid of his surplus stock. He is an interested party, and I do not think anyone blames him for looking around to see what he can do about the position. I think his case has been well stated, and I do not intend to add anything to what has been said. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) has had a few comments to make which I think, on reflection, he will wish he had not made. He drew attention to the high costs of killing at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, compared with those of similar institutions in the other States, and then he went on to say that we should have harmony between the staff and the board of management, and apparently he wanted peace even if it meant pointing the gun at the board to influence it to grant the new claims of the employees; and he also implied that the board would not lift a finger to hold even the present high costs, as the honourable member describes them. That is a peculiar approach to the question. If he thinks that that will go down with the man on the land he will discover that primary producers are wise enough to realize that killing costs are part of their running costs. In the final analysis it all comes back to paying the producer for the sheep, lambs or beef he wants to sell. All costs come out of the carcass; hence, I think that the honourable member will have some trouble when he goes back to his northern friends who grow stock to satisfy them that it does not matter what the employees are asking for the work they do.

I will refer to the history of this matter so that members may know just what happened in the last few months in relation to overtime. I recollect that we have had a peaceful period since 1953 onwards, which matter has been mentioned several times by members opposite. We should remember this and look at the reason for the lack of peace at the moment. Members may find something of interest if I refer to the record, and then they may draw their own conclusions. Shortly after the conclusion of the Second World War we had a total hold-up at the abattoirs, and some members of the Opposition used to ask me to bring down a side of lamb or mutton from the hills district where stock could still be slaughtered. Some were my friends and I did not want to see them going without their chops, so I brought down a number of parcels of meat that had been killed by the local butcher, because of the great shortage of supplies in the city.

However, members opposite are getting a little more clever and I give them full marks, because they are making sure that the metropolitan area will be supplied with meat, otherwise it would hit them where it hurts. However, they hit other people they do not mind hurting, namely, the producers, who are purposely being deprived of the opportunity to provide supplies of lamb for our overseas markets because of the men refusing to work overtime to kill lambs for shipment. They are mainly concerned that the people who will suffer most financially are the producers. The question will arise, "Who are the growers' friends and where do they come from?" I am sure that growers will be able to assess that. In fact, I am certain that when my friends opposite who represent rural districts return home their meat-growing constituents will want to know what is going on at the abattoirs. They are not blind or deaf to the pleas being made at the moment to have something done in their interests to relieve the position.

Mr. Hall: They will be able to read the remarks made last night by the member for Adelaide.

Mr. SHANNON: I am afraid that it will not be very much to their advantage. I know the problem from the point of view of growers and also those who receive wages for slaughtering stock. This money comes from the export of mutton and lamb. I draw the attention of the House to certain matters that have been revealed to me because I have done a little homework with some assistance, I must admit, from my good friend, the Minister of Agriculture. I asked him a question and he was able to give the answers and I think that they should go on record. First, let us get the picture straight. There was no trouble at the abattoirs with regard to the payment for sick leave, annual leave and long service leave. Under the Industrial Code wages boards are set up. The wages board for the meat industry is comprised of eight members (plus the Chairman, Mr. Ralph Newman), who are appointed under the Code. There are four representatives of the Abattoirs Board and four of the men who work at the abattoirs. A determination was published in the *Government Gazette* on April 12, 1962, in which the full field of the conditions under which employment is carried on at the abattoirs was covered. Anyone interested in this matter should, I suggest, take the trouble to get a copy of the *Government Gazette* dealing with this matter and read it.

The point at issue in the dispute is sick leave. The determination takes up about one column in the *Government Gazette* to explain the basis for sick leave. However, I do not think it is fair to have it published in *Hansard* because of the cost of printing, and the cost of time of honourable members. These matters should be read by the people concerned. There were, in August, three changes in the personnel. The Chairman (Mr. Newman) remains; the four nominees from the Abattoirs Board remain; one nominee from the employees' union remains, the other three being new men. I draw the attention of the House to two pertinent points, the first being that the wages board made a determination in April, there was a change of personnel on this same board in August—and in September we got into strife. It may be that I am of a suspicious turn of mind but I am of opinion that this is not without some relevance to the problem with which we are now faced; in fact, I am confident it is.

If, for instance, the determination made by the wages board in April was not reasonable and was, in fact, unfair to the employees, the employees' representatives had every opportunity before August (they had May, June and July, three complete months, not taking into account a part of April, which made it nearly four months) to do something about it, to appeal further to the wages board if they were not content. But I have a hunch that they were satisfied and, because they were satisfied, they were told, "Look here, old chap, you are too easy to get on with; we will have someone else on that board in your stead."

These may be only assumptions and totally without foundation but, as a rule, we keep an eye on the wind and, when we see the straws blowing, we generally know the direction the wind is taking. I think these are even more than straws in the wind: they are a definite guide as to why it is that we have now what is obviously an unreasonable request by these people at the most awkward and inappropriate time possible. If that is not a pistol at the head, I don't know what you would call it when, unfortunately, the producer is in a cleft stick. He cannot hold his stock because he has not the feed for them; he cannot get them killed because there are not the men available to kill them. What is he to do—let his stock die on his farm? Are we going to allow the abattoirs costs to rise interminably, each time a situation like this arises the pistol being pointed again?

Giving in to the highwayman is not the right way out of the problem, for he will come back for more and demand a second helping.

I want to make another point clear because I think the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) was under a misapprehension as to the accumulation of sick leave for employees at the abattoirs. They have a few days' sick leave. In fact, it might not be inappropriate, while I am dealing with this point, to give the House some facts and figures from a report of the Abattoirs Board for the years 1960-61 and 1961-62. For the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board for those two years, we find these figures for payment of wages, first for the year 1960-61. These are in some ways a measuring stick. They do not necessarily reflect a change in the number of men proportionately with the amount of work done; I am not suggesting that, because overtime comes into this and it may be that there are either more or fewer men employed. But in 1960-61, £1,501,408 was paid in wages and, in 1961-62, £1,005,910—a drop of about 33 per cent in the wages bill over those two years. In actual payments made for annual leave in those two years—

Mr. Fred Walsh: What about that drop of 33 per cent?

Mr. SHANNON: I cannot give the actual reason for that but I suggest it could in part be taken care of by men working overtime and earning more money. That may account for some of it.

Mr. Fred Walsh: There was no overtime ban on then.

Mr. SHANNON: No; there was no overtime ban in 1961-62, and I point out that these figures are prior to this stoppage, prior to the ban taking place, so they are comparable figures. For actual payments made during 1960-61 in respect of annual leave the figure was £2,475, and for accumulated sick leave it was £5,167, a total of £7,642 for that year. For 1961-62, the figure for accumulated sick leave was £11,228, and for long service leave it was £25,433. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the title of that last item was, apparently, changed from one year to the next: in the first instance it was called "annual leave" and in the second instance it was called "long service leave".

Mr. Fred Walsh: That may have meant that more men became entitled to long service leave.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. I believe that the first title, "annual leave", is perhaps a misnomer, but I am not sure. I am reading the actual wording of the accounts as printed in

Parliamentary Papers so that there can be no shadow of doubt about their authenticity. I will not try to explain it, but these are actual payments by the board during this year. During 1961-62, £36,661 was paid under the headings of "accumulated sick leave" and "long service leave", compared with £7,642 for the previous year. That is not the whole picture, because the board—

Mr. Fred Walsh: Are sick leave and long service leave separated?

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. I can give the honourable member the two items separately. I gave the House the total of those two added together in the last figures I gave, when I compared £7,642 with £36,661. That is the pay-out for long service leave and accumulated sick leave for those two years.

In a year when there was a wages bill of about £1,500,000, £7,642 was paid out under those headings; in a year when there was a wages bill of just over £1,000,000, £36,661 was paid out under those two headings. If that does not mean anything to anybody who can understand arithmetic, I am wasting my time. Next, there is the provision for contingent liabilities—and I guess the board has some basis for its estimates for which it now makes provision in its accounts. In the year 1960-61 accrued annual leave was set down as £35,994; accumulated sick leave was £45,498; and retiring allowances (as they were then called) amounted to £83,795, making a total of £165,287. For the year 1961-62 (and this is the year when we had a lower wages bill by 33 per cent), accrued annual leave was slightly less than before—£29,786. This indicates that there may have been a drop in personnel employed. Accumulated sick leave was £82,198, and long service leave amounted to £210,738, making a total of £322,722.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You do not give the number of personnel.

Mr. SHANNON: Unfortunately that is not given in this report.

Mr. Fred Walsh: So you cannot make a proper comparison?

Mr. SHANNON: With all due respect, these figures are a direct comparison for the two years 1960-61 and 1961-62.

Mr. Fred Walsh: But you can't make a fair comparison without knowing the number of personnel.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member is trying to dodge—

Mr. Fred Walsh: I am not trying to dodge anything.

Mr. SHANNON: Perhaps it was unfair to use that word, because the honourable member is not that way inclined. However, he fails to appreciate that I am quoting these figures to disclose the impact accumulated sick leave and long service leave have on the Abattoirs Board, irrespective of the number of employees.

Mr. Fred Walsh: But several employees may become due for long service leave in the one year. That could be reflected in the figures.

Mr. SHANNON: Fair enough! I won't argue that. I have had some experience in industry and I realize that in some years more men retire than in others. Although the figures I have quoted reveal a big discrepancy in the lower wage year, it is obvious that the impact on the abattoirs' costs is already particularly heavy. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) suggested that the producer should carry a greater burden without any complaint, all for peace and a quiet life. We can always have peace if we are prepared to pay for it. However, in my opinion, peace at any price is the most expensive peace one can get. We did not accept it from those countries that sought to dominate us in the last two wars, thank God.

The member for Frome also quoted figures relating to the prices of various beasts sold at the abattoirs on given days to reveal that the grower was suffering a loss of 2d. a pound. Anyone who understands the auction system realizes that there is always a fluctuation in market prices; sometimes fluctuations in the one market. The trend cannot be assessed prior to the start of a market. It may be a falling market; it may be a rising market. Indeed, prices sometimes firm as the market proceeds and buyers realize that they have not secured their full requirements. You, Mr. Speaker, have had some experience of this, and will realize that this is the actual situation. To quote prices as any reasonable guide to the overall cost to any group—whether it be the producers, consumers or anyone else—is wasting breath. It does not prove a thing.

Any grower realizes that if he has stock in excess of his feed supply he must quit the surplus stock and convert it to cash. The member for Frome said that the grower must cut his losses, but how can he if there is no market? How can he get a market if he cannot get his stock killed? Where can he find an outlet for his stock? I should like to know who the grower's friend really is. I am sure that some of the honourable member's constituents would not agree with his contentions. I want to know why the Opposition, which claims to

be the grower's friend, objects to the licensing of killing works within the metropolitan area in competition with the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Why do they oppose giving private enterprise an opportunity of competing fairly with the Metropolitan Abattoirs? Surely a body that has been in business and with a monopoly for so long should be able to cope with reasonable competition. Anyone who entered this industry now would have to fight for a share of the metropolitan sales. Is the Opposition, as the friend of the producers, afraid that it might be possible to reduce killing costs? Is there some nigger in the woodpile that I have not noticed who will cut costs so that the grower can say, "We will send our stock to Bill Jones. He has a meatworks and can slaughter for half what it would cost me at the Metropolitan Abattoirs"? Why should not private enterprise be enabled to enter this field to see whether costs can be reduced?

The Opposition suggested that any new meatworks should be so far distant from the Metropolitan Abattoirs that the Metropolitan Abattoirs would not be affected by competition. The costs of transporting stock to distant abattoirs and of supplying markets would be barriers to competition with the Metropolitan Abattoirs. The Opposition members who represent rural districts are embarrassed with the position in which they find themselves. If this legislation is fought to the bitter death, as has been suggested by some of the wealthy sheep farmers opposite from Hindley Street, the Opposition members representing country districts will be seriously embarrassed. They will lose a lot of grace in the country.

Mr. Ryan: You hope.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not hoping: I am telling.

Mr. Ryan: You are hoping.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member, who sits on the wharf and counts his votes, should be more concerned for his colleagues. A fellow-feeling for colleagues is a wondrous thing. His attitude is not consistent with friendliness for the member for Whyalla, for instance. I would not adopt that attitude if my friend were confronted with a sticky problem.

Mr. Ryan: You'll look after your friends!

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member does not know who my friends are. He is one of my friends, but apparently I have not told him so often enough.

Mr. Ryan: The member for Adelaide told you who your friend was yesterday—William Angliss.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Adelaide can make his speech presently.

Mr. SHANNON: I have drawn attention to what I consider to be relevant facts. They are in print and can be examined. One can assess why it was, so soon after the appointment of the new wages board in August, that the dispute at the Metropolitan Abattoirs has arisen. If any member cannot understand the reason, he has my sympathy.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I oppose the Bill. I listened intently to the conglomeration of figures submitted by the last speaker, but I was just as confused by them as was my colleague, the member for West Torrens. A statement of the wages paid in an attempt to assess the profit and loss on figures is absolutely unheard of, from a reasonable viewpoint.

Mr. Shannon: The honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Onkaparinga has made his speech. The member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: If it is necessary to introduce this Bill in September, 1962, why was it not necessary to introduce it in 1959 when the producers were in a far worse position than now? No hint was given in 1959 that the Government intended introducing this legislation. It is apparent to me and to every other member who has listened to the debate that confusion exists in the minds of Government members. Firstly, we heard the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) making statements that the present overtime ban had nothing whatever to do with the Bill. Then we found that the member for Snowy River—

The SPEAKER: Order! Rocky River.

Mr. RYAN: I get tangled up because he looks like the man from Snowy River. The member for Rocky River said that this Bill was introduced only because an overtime ban had been applied by the men employed at the abattoirs. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) who at one time had socialistic views and who now, and probably in the next 12 months I believe, will be one of the greatest Tories we have seen in this House for a long time, also said that the Government introduced the Bill because of the overtime ban imposed by the men at Gepps Cross. What is the real reason for this Bill? Is it for the purpose pointed out by the member for Adelaide: that the Government members intended once again to fill the coffers of someone in private industry and allow him to create competition against a Government instrumentality, using the overtime

ban as the excuse? I incline to the view that that is the reason, and that is why camouflage is being used by Government members.

Let us examine the overtime position. Apparently, many Government members know nothing of workers' conditions and know even less of awards. Yesterday we heard much about the terrific number of strikes involving these men that occurred before 1953 but, when challenged, the Snowy River man said that he would explain that later. That was because he had no proof. He had no record of stoppages after 1955. Why? What Government members do not realize is that to a certain degree some unions have good relationships with employers, and agreements are reached between the employers and the employees. That is what has happened between the Meat Industry Employees' Union and the abattoirs. Over a long period of years prior to 1953 there were numerous strikes, and the men would not meet and decide by agreement what the working conditions should be, but from 1955 onwards practically every improved condition operating at the abattoirs resulted from agreements between the union and the abattoirs board. That is how better conditions have been achieved and why a period of stability existed on working conditions at the abattoirs. The same circumstances applied when an attempt was made to gain an extra week's sick leave on this occasion. The union adopted the same procedure it had adopted in past years of making an application, meeting by arrangement, reaching an agreement and then having that agreement recorded. That is what has happened over the years.

Mr. Hall: And they broke the last agreement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) said the men broke the agreement, but if he can show me anything in the award covering the meat industry employees that compels them to work overtime I shall be very surprised, because there is nothing like it in the award. The honourable member should stick to awards as against agreements. To which union did the honourable member say he belonged? Was it a bankrupt union or something?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill concerning the member for Gouger.

Mr. RYAN: There might not be anything in the Bill, but he made many comments to which I will refer. There is nothing in the

Meat Industry Employees' Determination that makes it compulsory for the workers to work overtime.

Mr. Hall: Do you say they do not want to work overtime?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gouger is out of order.

Mr. RYAN: Overtime is never a good proposition for the workers, and I have always taken the attitude, and always will, that if it is necessary for a worker to supplement his income by working overtime, the time is ripe for him to have a decent wage without having to resort to overtime.

Mr. Hall: Do you say they are underpaid?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gouger is out of order, and he will not be here at all if he continues to interject.

Mr. RYAN: Apparently, some members wish to put words into my mouth.

Mr. Jennings: Perhaps they cannot hear you.

Mr. Lawn: They have not the mental capacity to understand you.

Mr. RYAN: I will speak up. I do not think any member was more confused than the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) when he mentioned a kindergarten, because I thought he was in a kindergarten when he spoke of those figures. If he believes that the loss of £22,330 in unpaid sick leave by workers in any organization is not worth fighting for then further industrial troubles can be expected. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) referred to moral cowards. Those are his words.

Mr. McKee: Did he say that?

Mr. Quirke: I used that expression three times.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Burra has made his speech and he is out of order. The member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: I do not know of a worse slur to cast on any man who has to work for a living than, under Parliamentary privilege, to call him a moral coward, for that is what was done. The member for Burra is fully aware that these men decided to place a ban on overtime and since then they have decided to carry on with it. They have decided their own destiny in this trouble, and any man who is prepared to stand up and fight for certain conditions is no moral coward. The sooner people refrain from making those statements the sooner we shall have more harmony in the industry.

Mr. Quirke: I still repeat them.

Mr. RYAN: I admit freely that I am not a primary producer, but in my time I have handled a considerable amount of the production of primary producers. A letter from a person signing himself "Primary Producer" appeared in the *Advertiser* in 1958. I accept the fact that the person who wrote the letter was a primary producer and that he knew something about the subject. He said:

Like the Electricity Trust, the abattoirs is a public utility and a non-profit-making concern, open to everyone, and the Government is to be commended for its action in protecting the enterprise in the interests of the producer and the consumer.

What follows is pertinent to the present Bill:

To allow other works to operate would increase the cost of meat to the consumer and lessen the return to the producer, as treatment charges would have to be increased to offset the fall in revenue occasioned by lower turnover. The Government should give earnest consideration to this. The drift to Victoria of South-Eastern stock has a detrimental effect on the economy of this State.

Mr. Hall: Was that a letter or an article?

Mr. RYAN: A letter, written by a primary producer whose name I do not know. That person amplifies the fact that if private enterprise becomes a competitor of the Metropolitan Abattoirs it is only natural to assume that the private undertaking will receive a fair proportion of the stock for killing, and despite some Government members' expectation of lower production costs, it will result in increased production costs and reduced returns to the primary producer. Another letter from a meat producer, who would know what he was talking about, states:

The lower volume of business which would be undertaken by the Government at the abattoirs as a result of private competition would result in increased killing charges and dues and a lower rate of return to the producer.

We have to accept those statements as facts.

Mr. Hall: How would you verify the facts?

Mr. RYAN: Earlier, one honourable member spoke about the kindergarten, and apparently the member for Gouger has not got beyond the kindergarten stage. The Metropolitan Abattoirs is a Government instrumentality, and it is only natural to assume that if the volume of work there is reduced the killing costs will increase, and that increase must be passed back to the producer. Let us return to the question of how and why the Metropolitan Abattoirs was created. At this stage, nearly 60 years later, I think the

original intention of this legislation still obtains. Legislation was introduced in 1907, and a Select Committee was appointed to examine the question of an abattoirs in the metropolitan area under Government control. As a result of the Select Committee's investigations it was ultimately decided that "all slaughtering required to be done for many years to come in the metropolitan area can be best done at one centrally situated abattoirs."

The Select Committee's report, a lengthy one, goes on to say that at that stage there were numerous small abattoirs operating throughout South Australia. Even as far back as 1907 it was feared that private enterprise would step in, effect a takeover—apparently there were such things as takeovers even then—absorb all the small abattoirs, and create a private enterprise which would not be in the best interests of the State. The Select Committee in its recommendation decided that the only solution was to set up a Government abattoirs in the metropolitan area. In my view, nothing has happened to alter that viewpoint. Some members opposite have said that the union has dominated this industry to such an extent that it has a stranglehold on it and will not accede to the requests of the board itself. We have been told that when the union was asked to supply 150 extra men it was able to supply 156 extra men.

One thing has been lost sight of throughout this debate: it is not the duty of the union to train the employees in this industry, and in fact that condition applies in practically every industry. It is the duty of the employer or the employer's organization to train employees in an industry. On several occasions the union has requested the board to train extra men in order that full production at the abattoirs can be achieved, but that request has never been agreed to. That is one reason why some Government members have dodged this issue of full production. We know that one chain has not been in production, and we have been told that that state of affairs has been created because of the union's stranglehold on the industry. In answer to that, I can say that the union has been, is, and will be prepared to supply the men in order that they can be trained and the abattoirs operated to its full capacity. If that is achieved, there will be no necessity whatever for the overtime that was being worked prior to the recent ban.

It is apparent to Opposition members that there can be somersaults, and we have seen one in the introduction of this Bill. Yesterday the member for Barossa said:

I am old enough in the tooth to know the ill-effects that can come from a monopoly . . . Competition that will come under the Bill is a good thing.

When we were discussing the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Bill we were told that the Electricity Trust was doing a wonderful job. It was pointed out that the trust was the only body that could adequately supply electricity to the city and country areas. It was also said that the trust was not a monopoly, as we have in education, water supplies and the railways. We are now told that we have a monopoly at the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

Mr. Lawn: Is the Electricity Trust any different from the Metropolitan Abattoirs?

Mr. RYAN: I do not know, but we have monopolies in education, water, railways and electricity.

Mr. Quirke: There is a difference in all of them.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member dodged the issue when he spoke on this Bill.

Mr. Quirke: I did not.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member said something about moral cowards. Let the honourable member repeat that outside!

Mr. Quirke: I will go outside and say it. You can come too. Don't challenge me on that one.

Mr. RYAN: It is all right for the member for Burra to say that there is a difference. What is the difference?

Mr. Quirke: All the difference in the world.

Mr. RYAN: The only difference about the honourable member is that he has a different viewpoint now from what he had three weeks ago. The honourable member has changed his political outlook.

Mr. Lawn: How many times?

Mr. RYAN: About four. He did it again in the last three weeks. The dispute at the abattoirs is being used by some people for an ulterior motive. The member for Gouger said yesterday that he considered the member for Adelaide wanted to destroy the abattoirs. If there is to be any destroying of the abattoirs it is associated with this Bill. Each member who has got hot under the collar and has been riled like the man from Snowy River—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): Order! The member for Port Adelaide must refer to the honourable member properly.

Mr. RYAN: He said that this Bill was due to the ban on overtime. Mr. Quirke admitted that present happenings at the abattoirs will not happen in the future.

Mr. Quirke: Exactly. That is the reason for the Bill.

Mr. RYAN: In other words, it is strike-breaking legislation to intimidate the workers.

Mr. Quirke: It is to prevent strikes. Don't you think they should be prevented?

Mr. RYAN: I hope we shall never see the day when the right to strike will be taken away.

Mr. Quirke: I agree with you.

Mr. RYAN: I shall fight tooth and nail to see that it does not happen.

Mr. Quirke: You cannot fight on that question. Take me to the abattoirs and I shall tell them what I am telling you now. I'll go there myself and tell them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections from both sides of the House. Interjections are out of order.

Mr. RYAN: I sincerely hope that the member for Burra will go to the abattoirs next week and then in the week after that I shall be in the Burra District in a by-election campaign. Won't the people of Burra be pleased with the position? They will be able to record a vote for the first time after the defection took place.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The principle of the right to strike has been adopted by the International Labour Organization.

Mr. Quirke: It was said that the men at the abattoirs were being denied the right to strike.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are too many interjections. If there are any more I shall name the honourable members concerned.

Mr. RYAN: I am pleased that the member for West Torrens interjected, because it is true that the principle of the right to strike has been accepted by the International Labour Organization, and that acceptance should mean its acceptance by the Commonwealth Government. The I.L.O. has accepted the principle of the right of the individual to strike.

Mr. Quirke: Who is denying that?

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member is doing his best to see the right is taken away. He said the legislation is to be used for strike-breaking purposes.

Mr. Quirke: I said it was to prevent strikes.

Mr. RYAN: I said that the honourable member said the legislation was brought down as a strike-breaking measure. The member for Burra will see that the workers are not moral cowards when it comes to fighting for their rights. They will never be stopped.

Mr. Quirke: You want to stop the gang leading them. Answer that one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard the member for Burra refer to "the gang leading them". I have the greatest admiration—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I raise a point of order because I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Pirie, Secretary of the union, who is a responsible officer.

Mr. Quirke: That is not a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is not a point of order.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Is it not a point of order when the honourable member refers to "the gang leading them"?

Mr. Quirke: What do you want? Do you want me to withdraw?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition ask the honourable member to withdraw his remark?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I ask the honourable member to withdraw any reflection on a responsible officer of the union.

Mr. QUIRKE: I referred to "the gang that leads them". If that is offensive to the Leader of the Opposition, I will withdraw it. That is simple enough.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: I think a north wind is blowing somewhere; it is marvellous what it blows in! Members of any organization have the right to decide for themselves what they intend to do. As far as I am aware, they have done that in this instance—nobody can dispute that. If the member for Burra can honestly say that a strike exists at the abattoirs, then he has less knowledge of industrial affairs than I think he has.

Mr. Quirke: I did not say a strike existed.

Mr. RYAN: If a man or an organization carries out its contract regarding daily work, there is no strike. If they want to implement restrictions, it is between them and the employer. All the accusations by Government members have been made against the employee, but no criticisms have been levelled against the board. I think we have reached the stage when serious consideration should be given to the activities of the board. Members opposite say that on every occasion when there has been industrial strife at the abattoirs, and especially before 1955, the men have been at fault; the member for Rocky River did not

say anything about the administration's being at fault. Despite this, however, it is amazing that the demands of the men have always been met in the past and have been adjusted by agreement between the two bodies. Why is not the same set of circumstances operating now? One can conclude only that there must be some ulterior motive. Although I was not aware of this, I was reminded by the member for Adelaide that William Angliss and Co. wanted to come into this field. That could be what is behind this Bill. I hope it will not be carried, but, if it is, I think the Government will regret it and some Government members will be sorry soon.

We must be fair about this. If the Government considers it necessary to bring down this legislation because of the circumstances that exist now (because there is some industrial dispute between employer and employee), why has it not brought down similar legislation regarding the railways, where there has been a dispute recently? Will there be disputes on the railways in future? Of course there will, but no suggestions have been made about introducing strike-breaking legislation. The Government might find it hard to set up a competitor to the railways, of course. If this legislation was introduced because of the glut, it was more necessary that it should have been introduced in 1959, when the abattoirs was in worse circumstances than at present. However, legislation was not implemented then. Why the change of face now? Why has the Government considered this legislation necessary?

Members on this side of the House have been accused of not being prepared to fight for what they consider right, but members opposite will find that we are prepared to resist this legislation to the bitter end because, if it is to be as outlined by the member for Burra, we will not have any part in it. I have received many letters from primary producers and interested persons who are all of the one opinion—that, if a competitor is set up to the Metropolitan Abattoirs, it will not be bound by awards and the conditions regarding over-award payments, whereas the Abattoirs Board is controlled to a certain extent on these. Men conversant with the industry fear that the best of the labour will be attracted to private enterprise and the rest will be left to the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Those who will be using the Metropolitan Abattoirs will find that the rate of production there will drop and, naturally, there will be an increase in costs.

Mr. Lawn: Plus an increase in dividends for private enterprise.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, we all know what will happen once private enterprise gets a stranglehold. This is what Government members are hoping for. Certain amendments are foreshadowed. Some remarks made by the member for Rocky River would be laughable if the matter were not serious. He said, "Certain amendments have been indicated but whatever they are I will oppose them." He is supposed to be a legislator—a man who sits, listens, reasons and gives a fair judgment on legislation—yet he says, "Whatever the amendments are, I will not support them." He does not even know what they are, but, as they come from the Opposition, he opposes them!

Mr. Nankivell: They are here; we have them on our files.

Mr. RYAN: At that stage we did not have them. If any members will be sorry that they did not vote for the amendments, it will be members opposite.

Mr. Lawn: That proves they do not want decentralization. They do not want country abattoirs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Adelaide should take no notice of the member for Adelaide. He should address the Chair.

Mr. RYAN: I am just having a breather.

The SPEAKER: Address the Chair!

Mr. RYAN: I agree with what the member for Adelaide said. I remember when the Government was greatly concerned about winning the seat of Wallaroo. It even told some people that land had been procured and that a big abattoirs block would be built at Kadina.

Mr. McKee: It had the blueprints.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, but when the seat swung back to Labor someone lost the blueprints for some convenient reason, and they have not been resurrected since. This information was given out as a political stunt before a by-election, and the result proves how much faith the electors place in the promises of the Government. Yesterday and today remarks have been made about cattle, sheep, etc., being taken to markets in the Eastern States. According to one member, this has happened only in the last six months or so. Present conditions at Gepps Cross have necessitated some producers sending their stock to Victoria for slaughter.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Frome exploded that.

Mr. RYAN: Let us consider a debate that took place in 1958. The following remark was made by the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) when speaking on a subject similar to this:

According to my information, very few lambs come to Adelaide from the South-East. I understand that most go to Victoria.

That was said some four years ago. Following that, the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) interjected:

I think we might encourage them here.

Yet, somebody said that this has happened only since there has been industrial strife at Gepps Cross. In 1958 the same thing was occurring as occurs today.

Mr. Lawn: They wanted to encourage it.

Mr. Jenkins: Yes; that has always applied to the South-East and not to other districts.

Mr. RYAN: That is true. I am only quoting remarks made in this House. In the last few months we have witnessed the situation where lambs and sheep have been transported to Victoria to be killed at abattoirs there, owing to the industrial strife existing here.

Mr. Freebairn: From the market here.

Mr. RYAN: Stock has been going over there for years. As the member for Onkaparinga pointed out, it is to be encouraged. It was not I who encouraged it, so it must have been he.

Mr. Freebairn: That happens in the South-East.

Mr. RYAN: That raises another important point. What happened to the big meatworks that was to be built by a private person in the district of the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding)? That was all fixed up and orders were being taken for meat to be produced there. I was down there the other day and it has not yet been established, but it was mentioned again just prior to an election.

Mr. Jenkins: He has gone to Frome.

The SPEAKER: Order! You cannot go on like this. You must debate the matter properly and address the Chair.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that suddenly Government members want to set up in competition against a Government enterprise. They want a meatworks in the metropolitan area, but they do not want the same thing to be set up in the country.

Mr. Millhouse: Arrant nonsense!

Mr. RYAN: I challenge the Government now to create an abattoirs in country districts.

Mr. Jenkins: This Bill is only to grant licences, not to build an abattoirs.

Mr. RYAN: Who's dumb now?

Mr. Hall: You are.

Mr. RYAN: I am not as dumb as you were last night.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whether the honourable member is dumb or not, please get on with debating the Bill.

Mr. RYAN: Somebody told me that the purpose of this Bill was not to set up an abattoirs but to give licences. Where are they going when they get it? What will they do with it when they get a licence? Will they go into somebody's backyard? There are certain laws and regulations that have to be abided by and certain standards have to be observed. Are they not also under Commonwealth licence? Would it have any bearing when meat was killed for export purposes? The honourable member has the cheek and audacity to say that this Bill creates legislation for the purpose of giving licences.

Mr. Jenkins: Yes, for somebody else.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling is out of order.

Mr. RYAN: I said, in the first place, if there is ever any confusion over a piece of legislation, as occurs in this legislation, it exists in the minds of Government members. Each has a different viewpoint; each has given a different reason for the introduction of the Bill. Irrespective of the confusion existing in their minds, I do not think anybody can say there is confusion in the minds of the Opposition, whether they be metropolitan or country members. They have a certain principle to abide by and I have no doubt they will support it in any circumstances.

From what we have been told about this Bill and the reason for its introduction, I am satisfied that it has at least united the Opposition when it comes to voting upon it. Surely, on all occasions when men decide to take action to protect what they have and get some advancement on what they have, they are not always wrong? On no occasion in the course of this debate has any member opposite offered any criticism, either now or previously, to the effect that the board itself is wrong, and could stand up to some investigation. Any adverse comments have been about the men. They have broken no award. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said that they had broken an agreement. Agreements are made between two organizations, and there is power to terminate an agreement. Agreements are not awards; they are vastly different. The conditions enjoyed by the union have been won by that means, and somebody has broken down in trying to reach further agreement. When we realize the

necessity for the attitude the men have taken on this, we can understand that they intend to fight for what they consider is right. The introduction of this legislation will not create harmony in the industry.

I agree with the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) that, if the Bill is passed, present indications are (*Hansard* records the views of the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) on abattoirs and I can count heads as well as anybody else can) that, in the conditions arising from the operation of this legislation, we shall not get perfect harmony if licences are issued and William Angliss & Company get No. 1 consideration, because the men working for William Angliss & Company and those working in the Metropolitan Abattoirs (who are, according to the member for Burra, "moral cowards") will fight in the future as they have done in the past when their rights are involved. It does not necessarily follow that conditions would be harmonious at a meatworks established by William Angliss or anyone else who was granted a licence. When the Government introduces legislation of this type it should be truthful in explaining the reason for it and its objects. It is obvious that we have had to extract this information slowly and labouriously from the Government members who have spoken. I believe there are ulterior motives behind it and I will not support it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to comment briefly on this Bill, which I support. My comment is prompted by my personal experiences as a fat lamb producer and as one who has sustained some financial loss through labour disputes at the Gepps Cross abattoirs. I represent a rural district that has a fat lamb industry depending almost entirely on the capacity of the abattoirs to slaughter the fat lamb crop when it is marketable. From 1948 to 1958, when I was personally interested in export fat lamb production, no fewer than three disputes occurred at the abattoirs between the times the fat lambs left my farm and the times they were slaughtered. The lambs left my farm in prime condition, but, after languishing in holding paddocks at Gepps Cross for a few days awaiting the slaughtermen's pleasure, they ceased to be of export quality. Since 1958 I have relinquished that fat lamb industry for wool production, principally because of the recurring industrial disputes and labour troubles at the abattoirs. I am but one of many growers in my district whose pattern of sheep husbandry has changed for reasons that should not be.

On the question of exports, it is worth considering the effects of the current overtime ban. Because of this ban the weekly slaughtering of stock for the local trade have been restricted to 30,000 sheep and lambs, 1,500 cattle, 2,000 pigs and 900 calves. Normal local killings approximate 28,000 to 32,000 sheep and lambs, 1,400 to 1,700 cattle, 2,000 to 2,300 pigs, and 900 to 1,200 calves. In addition to the slaughtering for local trade, the board has been treating 35,000 lambs and 3,000 cattle a week for export. If this overtime ban had not been imposed an additional 30,000 lambs could have been slaughtered each week. I believe that privately-owned abattoirs in or near the metropolitan area are the only long-term solution to this problem facing the fat lamb industry. I support the Bill.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I oppose the Bill, mainly on the grounds of principle. I could never be a party to a measure that seeks to take away privileges and rights that have been fought for over the period extending back to the Eureka Stockade. Government members have said that the Bill is designed simply to offset the overtime ban at the abattoirs. We have also heard much mention of the cloak of privilege that protects members in this House. I never want to be protected by any privilege either inside or outside of this House, particularly in this instance, because I know that this Bill is designed as strike-breaking legislation. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) referred to the abattoirs' workers as moral cowards because they were defending the rights and privileges that have been obtained over the years. He said that he was prepared to go to the abattoirs and talk with the men. I am prepared to go with him whenever he desires.

Mr. Quirke: My offer stands. I will go whenever you care to arrange the visit.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKEE: I will arrange to go whenever it suits the honourable member, but I make one condition: that, if he survives the ordeal, when he returns he obtains a cake of Lifebuoy and has a good clean-up, because I assure him he will get plenty of stockyard confetti thrown at him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to advertise soap in this Chamber.

Mr. Quirke: That is a reflection on the men.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. If the honourable member does not obey the Chair he will be out of the Chamber.

Mr. McKEE: I assure the honourable member that there will be some reflection on him if he goes out to the abattoirs and repeats what he has said in this House. If he does not repeat what he has said here, I will have the opportunity to tell the men. I do not know whether the honourable member wants to go under those circumstances.

Mr. Quirke: I do.

The SPEAKER: Order! It does not concern this Chamber whether you do or not. We want the Bill discussed.

Mr. McKEE: I agree with the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) who said that we do not agree with overtime. If workers were paid a reasonable wage for their work there would be no need for them to want overtime. The Secretary of the union has informed the board that he is prepared to supply men to work the extra chain. If the board put more men on, there would be no need for overtime. No member in this House would be more pleased than I to see the abattoirs working at full production. We must have regard to the nature of this industry. It is a wet and cold job. The stock apparently carry various diseases and if a worker is not in good physical condition he cannot resist the diseases to which he is subjected. However, I have noticed that other employees at the abattoirs received additional leave. Meat inspectors enjoy three weeks' sick leave annually, and they are trained to recognize disease and so are able to avoid it. The management and staff receive two weeks' sick leave and they have little contact with disease, but the meat workers receive only one week's paid sick leave. They are justly entitled to their claim for two weeks. If it is good enough for one section of the industry to receive extra sick leave, we should fairly examine the question and take into account all the workers connected with that industry.

I understand that William Angliss & Co. was the company mentioned by various speakers as being interested in establishing a second abattoirs in the metropolitan area. If that is correct, only one meaning and purpose can be attributed to this Bill; the Government intends to kill two birds with one stone. It intends to support a company that has been generous to the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) by leaving him a handsome bonus for the rest of his life for services rendered. I can be excused for thinking, when this sort of thing occurs, that we may even have some sugar bag men here. No-one can deny that the Prime Minister is receiving a bonus from William Angliss. One purpose

of the Government in providing for the establishment of another abattoirs is to prevent strikes. That was mentioned by Government members and I cannot attribute any other reason for the Bill, which will improve the Government's dictatorial position by taking away the right of workers to strike.

These employees have caused no inconvenience to consumers in the metropolitan area. No shortage of meat has been experienced on Adelaide tables but, of course, some homes do not have any meat because the breadwinner is unemployed, and there are many homes in those circumstances. Various speakers have spoken of the bad season. That state of affairs could, unfortunately, occur at any time for the primary producers. No-one could be more concerned over the position of the primary producers than I am, and I am sincere when I say that, because I am concerned with everybody who is responsible for producing and contributing to the welfare of this country. If members examined this question fairly they would conclude that the Government, instead of introducing this type of legislation, should say it is prepared to meet the Abattoirs Board, discuss this problem, examine the position of the workers, assess the incidence of sickness, and obtain medical reports that would undoubtedly prove that in this type of industry, particu-

larly during this season of the year, workers are prone to colds and various infections that can be picked up by persons whose resistance is lowered. I believe an extra week's sick leave is justified in those circumstances.

I cannot support the Bill because it defeats the purpose for which the Industries Development Special Committee was constituted. That committee has taken evidence in various country centres that are suitable for an abattoirs, but by means of this Bill the Government is trying to shove an abattoirs in through the back door of the metropolitan area. We could have abattoirs established where sheep and cattle are located, but the Government desires killing works here. Yet Government members tell us that they favour decentralization. Something more than meets the eye is involved in this. If the Government forces this Bill through, the establishment of the Industries Development Special Committee will prove to have been a mockery and the committee's report should never come to the House because it will never be acted on. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 2, at 2 p.m.