HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 29, 1963.

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

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.

FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question about providing solid buildings at the Forbes Primary School. I understood that the Railways Commissioner or someone else might be prevailed upon to supply land for a new school in the area. Has the Minister of Education anything to report, particularly for the benefit of the school committee and teaching staff, about providing additional accommodation at Forbes?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, nothing definite other than it seems to me to be hopeless that we will ever be able to obtain the land we want. Therefore, we think that we can go ahead planning a new school on a limited area. As soon as I have anything definite I will inform the honourable member, but I think that is what we will have to be resigned to.

MISS AUSTRALIA.

Mr. HARDING: About 12 months ago I asked whether you, Mr. Speaker, would write to Miss Tricia Reschke on her appointment as Miss Australia congratulating her on behalf of all members of this House, which I understand you did. Since then her successful tours overseas and within Australia have ended and a new Miss Australia has been appointed. Will you, Mr. Speaker, send to these two charming ladies suitable letters expressing the congratulations of all members and wishing them well in the future?

The SPEAKER: I shall be pleased to do so. Miss Tricia Reschke made a splendid ambassadress for Australia and performed her duties with much credit to herself and to South Australia. I shall be pleased to wish the new Miss Australia great success during her overseas trip and to express the hope that she will be able to emulate the fine example set by our renowned Miss Reschke. For the information of members, I was hoping to arrange some form of entertainment at which members and their wives could meet the new Miss Australia; if not her, then Miss South Australia.

WHYALLA BRIDGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made with the contract for the second bridge over the Whyalla to Iron Knob tramline and when the work is likely to start?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will seek that information and let the honourable member have it.

WINDY POINT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the last few weeks several questions have been asked by members about the proposed development of Windy Point, and especially the establishment of a high-class restaurant there. If such a restaurant is established it will have to compete successfully with other restaurants in the metropolitan area, but it will not do so, despite the natural attractions of the area, unless it is licensed to sell liquor with meals. Windy Point was dedicated as a national pleasure resort on January 28, 1960. I have recently examined section 13 of the National Pleasure Resorts Act and it seems to completely prohibit the licensing of any premises on a national pleasure resort. Can the Premier, as Minister of Immigration, say whether the Government has considered amending this section to allow the restaurant, which we hope will be built at Windy Point, to be licensed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director of the Tourist Bureau has raised the matter, but no decision has been made.

NORWOOD SCHOOL SITE.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In previous years, and when discussing the Loan Estimates this year, I have raised the question of the development of the Norwood Girls Technical High School. Recently senior departmental officers visited the Norwood Demonstration School, which is on the same site as the Norwood Girls Technical High School. In the course of discussions with the school committee the whole question of future development of schools on that site was raised. The site at present accommodates about 1,300 children and is hopelessly overcrowded, and on present plans it seems that no satisfactory arrangement can be made for the future development of the

Norwood Demonstration School, which is crammed far beyond the standard normally applied for a school of this size and nature. Subsequently, I have discussed, with the council of the Norwood Girls Technical High School and with the headmistress of the Kensington Girls Technical High School, possible future development. As a result, the Norwood Girls Technical High School authorities were of the opinion that probably the best development for their future was to remove that high school entirely from the site at Osmond Terrace and to build an entirely new class 1 school at the Kensington Girls Technical High School site, which is the old Norwood High School site. This would be preferable to having two class 2 technical girls high schools within a mile and a quarter of each other, which in itself would present administrative difficulties and would mean that neither of them would be of the standard sought by the parents in the area. Will the Minister of Education arrange to meet me at an early date at this site with the Superintendent of Primary Schools and the Superintendent of Technical Schools, so that we might discuss on the spot the possible future development of these sites? If plans are to be made of the nature suggested, they must be made immediately before there is a further expenditure along the lines of the present plans for development at Kensington.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so. I have had discussions from time to time with the Deputy Director of Education, the Superintendent of Technical Schools and some of the other high officers of the department, but the problem is not capable of easy solution and I am attracted to the idea of the honourable member that he and I meet with these other officers and anyone else who would be able to offer valuable advice because, although it is not capable of easy solution, I do not for one moment agree that it is insoluble, and I therefore welcome the suggestion.

YELDULKNIE RESERVOIR.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: A few weeks ago I asked the Minister of Works a question about the advisability of raising the retaining wall of the Yeldulknie reservoir. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have had this matter investigated. The District Engineer (Port Lincoln), the Engineer for Design and the Engineer-in-Chief have all examined the possibility of acceding to this request and the conclusions are that there are difficulties that appear to make it an uneconomic proposition. First, the records show that this reservoir has filled only three times in the last 23 years, so the infrequency of its capacity being required in itself would suggest that it was not desirable to increase the capacity. Secondly, the reservoir is built on land that has not very good holding qualities, and the losses through seepage are substantial. For example, this year between, I think, August 1 and September 1, although the actual draw from the reservoir plus evaporation was only just over 9,000,000 gallons, the reservoir fell by 28,000,000 gallons, so the seepage was three times consumption plus evaporation. Those factors suggest that the proposal would not be economic.

SCHOOL LIGHTING PLANTS.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked some time ago regarding the installation of 32-volt lighting sets in some outback schoolhouses?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Since 1959 the Education Department has been providing 32-volt lighting plants for 12 schoolhouses each year where reticulated power was unlikely to be available for some years. The group to be served during the current financial year will complete the department's present need for lighting plants. The honourable member will be interested to know that Beltana is included in this programme.

NORTH ADELAIDE SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about extra land to enlarge the area at the North Adelaide Primary School in Tynte Street, North Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The honourable member will be pleased to know that negotiations have been successfully completed for the purchase of several small pieces of land as additions to the North Adelaide Primary School grounds. Further negotiations are now proceeding to obtain another small block of land on which is erected an old cottage which would probably have to be demolished to provide play area if the property were acquired. The Land Board has been asked to place a valuation on this site and the matter will then receive further consideration. I shall be pleased to advise the honourable member when a decision has been made, because I know he is as anxious as I am to provide adequate space for this heavily congested school.

RECLASSIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. BYWATERS: Regarding the reclassification of high schools, I am concerned about the position of the Murray Bridge High School, which I am told will have an enrolment of over 700 next year and still will be only a class 2 school. I believe this school should be a class 1 school. Can the Minister of Education say what is the present policy of the department on this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The first stage of any reclassification was to reclassify some of the largest class 1 schools, and they are now being reclassified. Cabinet approved of some schools, I think four, being reclassified as class 1 special. Those schools were Elizabeth, Plympton, Seacombe and Henley. Applications will be called for other schools to take their places, and there will be a slow progression of reclassification. The upgrading of those four class 1 high schools is as far as we have gone at present. I cannot announce any other decision yet because no decision has been made.

Mr. BYWATERS: Will the Minister take up with the department the possibility of Murray Bridge being reclassified from a class 2 to a class 1 high school?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be only too pleased to do so, and it may well be that a number of the very large class 2 high schools will be reclassified to class 1.

CAPE TULIP.

Mr. HEASLIP: On October 8 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the spread of cape tulip in Crown lands in Wirrabara forest. During the weekend I inspected Bedford Park, and all I could see on that land (which again is Crown land) was saffron thistle and variegated thistle. The seed that falls there will be washed to the sea and will not do much harm, but the cape tulip that is now seeding and taking over in Wirrabara forest will do tremendous harm in the rural areas nearby. Has the Minister an answer to my question on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The cape tulip infestation in this forest has existed for over 10 years. Efforts have been made to control it with some of the less effectual methods known during that time. Now that 2,4-D has been shown to be useful in cape tulip control, I have given authority for it to be used. It will be used at the correct time next year, but it is of no use at present. The Woods and Forests Department will make strenuous efforts to eradicate cape tulip, which is fairly extensive in this locality. I am not sure of the position relating to landholders, but I imagine that cape tulip originally came from properties in the Clare district, or somewhere near there.

POINT GREY CUTTING.

Mr. TAPPING: The member for Port Adelaide and I have twice waited on the Minister of Marine regarding a request by the Port Adelaide Professional Fishermen's Association for a cutting at Point Grey, which is north of Torrens Island. This is needed because of the closing of the Angas inlet caused by the building of the new power plant on Torrens Island. Fishermen have to go through the harbour because there is no outlet through Point Grey and because Angas inlet has been closed; this applies also to ketch owners and amateur fishermen. Has the Minister of Marine a progress report on the request for a cutting at Point Grey?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No further investigation has been carried out since I last reported to the honourable member on a request to cut through the sand-bar at Point Grey. The matter was carefully investigated and I was forced to the conclusion that the cost of the cutting (I think it was estimated at £70,000) would be out of all proportion to the benefits that might be derived from it and, more particularly, that it appeared to the engineers that the cutting might not be permanent because of the littoral drift of sand in that area. I think the matter has arisen again because of requests made to me last week by the member for Gouger about boat havens farther up the coast. It has been suggested that these might be provided at the expense of, or as a prerequisite to, a cutting at Point Grey but, for the benefit of the inquirers, I point out that that is not the case. The Government and the department concerned do their best to meet any request from any section of the community, and meeting a request at one point does not necessarily preclude meeting a request at another. Therefore, I hope it will not be held that we are giving preferential treatment to someone in this matter.

Regarding the immediate question, I cannot see any way to improve on the estimates of costs produced earlier for the Point Grey cutting, and the Harbors Board does not possess suitable plant for constructing shallow cuttings. The only plant it has available is dredging plant for deep-water work. The draught of the dredger itself requires a fair depth of water to enable it to operate. Every possibility, including the use of earth-moving machinery,

has been considered, but the use of this machinery appeared to be impossible because of the tidal factor and the instability of the sand. I regret that I cannot report any progress in the matter. I do not know of any new approach that would offer a solution.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY EXTENSIONS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning progress on the Coonalpyn-Bordertown electricity extension?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust states that the transmission line to Bordertown is expected to be completed in the middle of December, 1963; and the electricity supply in Keith will be taken over by the trust from the Tatiara District Council on November 6, 1963. The remainder of the council's system will be taken over when the transmission line is completed.

COWANDILLA ROAD.

Mr. FRED WALSH: My question, which is directed to the Minister of Works (who represents the Minister of Roads in this Chamber), relates to a recent press report about the intention of the Highways Department to reconstruct Cowandilla Road from Brooker Terrace to Marion Road. I live in this district, and I have been approached by two residents, one of whom is a shopkeeper who desires, because of the nature of his business, to alter his shop. He wishes to know the intention of the department regarding reconstructing Cowandilla Road, which will involve the acquisition of certain land. I believe that land has been or is now being acquired. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague when this reconstruction work will commence and what is the position concerning acquisition?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will do that.

SPEAKER'S CASTING VOTES.

Mr. LAWN: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. Members are from time to time required to escort people through this building, explain Parliamentary procedure, and answer questions. We visit gatherings of people who invite us to talk on Parliament, and again we are asked questions. I desire to carry out my duties to the best of my ability, but lately I am a little concerned about my lack of knowledge. On October 16 this year, Mr. Speaker gave a casting vote against the second reading of an electoral Bill, and on October 23 gave a casting vote in favour of the second reading of the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill. On the first occasion, when the casting vote was given against the Bill, precedent was referred to. Is there a precedent for both these inconsistent casting votes and, if there is, can you, Mr. Speaker, say which would be the precedent for an impartial Speaker to follow?

The SPEAKER: The Speaker is not under any obligation to give reasons for the way he votes. There are plenty of precedents for the rulings I have given. The honourable member will be pleased to know, if he follows my vote in future, that I am one of the most impartial Speakers ever in this House.

NORTHERN LAND.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked during the debate on the Estimates regarding Block F, hundred of Mundoora?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: As the reply is lengthy, I shall delete the first portion, but the honourable member can have the answer in its entirety later. Block F, hundred of Mundoora, was dedicated on June 11, 1891, as a timber reserve under the control of the District Council of Redhill to meet firewood requirements of local residents. Licences for timber-cutting were issued by the council and fees remitted to this department less commission and travelling expenses. Details of the licences are available and I will let the honourable member have them. On January 23, 1961, the District Council of Redhill advised that it was perturbed at damage caused to flora since issue of the grazing licence, and recommended that the area be retained as a timber, flora and fauna reserve and not licensed for grazing. The honourable member will appreciate that a flora and fauna reserve area cannot have sheep on it. The district inspector reported that timber was seldom taken and the area was still in its virgin state. He considered the council's suggestion would conflict, and recommended that the northern portion of about 1,600 acres be made a flora and fauna reserve, and the balance of about 300 acres a timber reserve. Block F has now been renumbered as follows: section 439, hundred of Mundoora 730 acres; section 440, 275 acres; section 441, 347 acres, a total of 1,352 acres, which is being made a flora and fauna reserve or has been so dedicated. Section 442, hundred of Mundoora of 581 acres is a timber reserve. The total area is 1,933 acres.

In the *Government Gazette* of October 17, 1963, the existing timber reserve was resumed and the area dedicated as follows:

(1) Sections 439/441 as a wild life reserve under the control of the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves.
(2) Section 442 as a timber reserve under the control of the District Council of Redhill.

The council has been advised that the position regarding section 442 will be reviewed in three years and if the area is no longer required for timber, consideration will be given to adding it to the wild life reserve.

CROSSING GUARD RAILS.

Mr. CLARK: Recently, a constituent of mine suggested replacing the heavy guard rails with light tubular rails at railway crossings. I understand the Minister of Works has a report.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the Railways Commissioner is obliged, under the provisions of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, to provide at level crossings "an open ditch or ditches across the railway or other work sufficient to prevent the straying of cattle or horses on the railway". It has been the practice for many years to provide wing fences at level crossings. Such fences are necessarily constructed in a form which will comply with the Act. They have the added advantage that being painted they define the boundary between the roadway and railway land, both by day and night. Consideration has been given to proposals that the fences as now erected be replaced by lighter structures. The Railways Commissioner has been advised, however, that the wing fences represent at most crossings only the first line of obstacles met by road vehicles involved in collisions. There are usually drainage works, posts, signals, or other erections close to each level crossing, so that if no wing fences existed a high probability of serious damage would still remain.

TOMATO GRADING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the grading of tomatoes sold on the Adelaide market?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chief Horticulturist reports that the inspectors of the Agriculture Department are able to enforce the tomato-grading regulations but may not insist that the grower's name be on open tomato boxes because in South Australia open packages of fruit or vegetables are exempted from regulation 10a of the Fruit and Vegetable Grading Act which requires the identification of the packer or grower to be on any package submitted for sale. The exemption is designed to assist growers marketing their own produce. No amendment to the grading regulations for tomatoes has been proposed for a number of years. I have found the Fruit Growers' and Market Gardeners' Association to be progressive and co-operative in all matters. The question of open packages has been raised in the past but not recently, but the question of grading regulations has not been raised.

SOUTH ROAD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Recently, I introduced to the Minister of Education a deputation from the South Road Primary School Committee and the beautification of the area was discussed. Can the Minister say whether a site plan for solid construction buildings could be submitted so that the committee might prepare for the beautification scheme.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Deputy Director of Education forwarded to the Public Buildings Department a list of requirements for the proposed new solid construction school, and in the course of preparing a site plan of the proposed new works at the South Road Primary School the position of playing areas and gardens will be clearly shown by the Public Buildings Department. I shall be pleased to obtain the information concerning the site of the new buildings so that the committee will know where they can go on with the beautification scheme, and transmit it to the Leader as soon as it is available.

STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several times this session, Mr. Speaker, I have asked you about the reconsideration of Standing Orders, and have asked whether the Standing Orders Committee was meeting. I last asked this question four weeks ago when you, Sir, said the committee intended to meet soon. Has it now met and has it come to any conclusion?

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders Committee has met on three occasions; a meeting was held this morning and adjourned until next Tuesday. The committee has made much progress in streamlining some Standing Orders while, at the same time, not getting away from the traditional Standing Orders relating to the Mother of Parliaments, the House of Commons. Although the committee has not yet completed its report, it is progressing as rapidly as it can.

CRUELTY AT ABATTOIRS.

Mr. LAWN: In the *Sunday Mail* of September 28 appeared a report that a baby calf was found to be almost trampled to pulp when a truck reached the Metropolitan Abattoirs recently. The animal was still alive more than an hour after the truck had been unloaded. The person who inspected the truck before unloading said that about 30 calves up to a fortnight old were in the truck. They were all in poor condition, several were down and shaking violently, and he appealed to someone at the abattoirs to shoot the calf, but the person so requested said that he had no authority to do so. Has the Premier's attention been drawn to this report, has an investigation been made into the allegations, and what steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The police have investigated this matter and I have received the following report:

Inquiries have been conducted by Detective Fairweather and the undersigned into the complaint of Mr. Arthur Enoch alleging cruelty to animals at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. On Wednesday, August 28, 1963, Mr. Enoch went to the calf market being conducted at the abattoirs. While waiting to purchase stock he noticed a vehicle arrive and on inspecting the stock on the vehicle he saw a calf lying injured on the floor of the truck. Investigations reveal that the stock on the vehicle was owned by McCarthy Brothers of 26 Ross Road, Hectorville, and had been consigned by Bennett and Fisher Limited from Willunga by road transport known as Southern Transport and operated by a Mr. McDonald. The stock had been purchased by McCarthy Brothers on the previous day at the Willunga market sale.

When Mr. Enoch noticed the condition of the injured calf he immediately left the scene without inquiring from the driver of the vehicle or the owners, who are in fact well known to him, if they knew of the condition of the calf, or whether they had made arrangements for its destruction. Mr. Enoch states that he was absent from the scene for approximately 20 to 30 minutes while looking for an inspector to whom he could report the facts. On returning to the vehicle he found the stock had been unloaded and the injured animal placed on some bricks nearby. He then bought two calves from Mr. D. P. McCarthy and also spoke about the injured animal. Within five to 10 minutes of this conversation he left the scene without knowing if arrangements had been made for the destruction of the injured animal.

Inquiries were made from Mr. Dennis Patrick McCarthy, 43 years, stock dealer of 26 Ross Road, Hectorville, who stated that on the arrival of the truck he went to assist in the unloading of the stock, while unloading he saw an injured calf on the floor of the vehicle. He removed the calf and placed it on some bricks nearby. Mr. McCarthy immediately informed his brother to contact the abattoirs authorities so that they could come and destroy the animal, which was duly done within 10 minutes of unloading.

A statement from Mr. Enoch is attached to this report, it is the opinion of the investigating officers that the driver of the vehicle and the owner of the stock Mr. D. P. McCarthy took all reasonable steps to prevent cruelty, and to relieve the suffering of pain to the injured as soon as it came to their notice. This opinion is verified by the checking of abattoirs files showing that the calf had been killed by abattoirs employees. If there was a delay in the destruction of the injured animal, it was possibly brought about by Mr. Enoch not informing the driver of the vehicle or Mr. McCarthy of the condition of the animal when he first saw it.

SUPERPHOSPHATE BOUNTY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A recent press report that the Minister for Customs and Excise had announced an expansion of the superphosphate bounty stated:

Until now only one type of superphosphate had been produced in Australia—a standard superphosphate containing about 20 per cent of soluble phosphorus pentoxide. However, certain manufacturers were going to produce "double" (containing 40 per cent soluble phosphorus pentoxide) and "triple" (containing 50 per cent soluble phosphorus pentoxide) superphosphate, and also a new range of fertilizers based on ammonium phosphate.

I understand that these fertilizers are not readily available in this State at present. Will the Minister of Agriculture inquire of the superphosphate manufacturers whether it is intended to manufacture them here?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

EASTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.

Mr. DUNSTAN: For some time—I think since 1947—there has been an agreement between the Burnside, the St. Peters and the Kensington and Norwood councils concerning alterations to the eastern suburbs drainage scheme, particularly on the Second Creek which runs along St. Peters Street, St. Peters, into the Torrens River. Under that agreement work was originally to be carried out at Magill Road and between Magill Road and the river to straighten the creek and to widen it so that there would be no flooding in the area. However, work did not then proceed. The amount then assigned to the Kensington and Norwood Council was 8½ per cent of the cost, and the cost was estimated at £50,000. It has now been sought that this work proceed, but the estimate for the area on Magill Road alone is now £60,000, without anything else involved. The Kensington and Norwood Council is unhappy about the proportion allotted to it,

since there has been much building in Burnside in the meantime, and is also of the opinion that it is not bound by the agreement. While these negotiations have been proceeding there has been serious flooding in the area. There was bad flooding during the last weekend. In Stepney—in the area to be affected directly by the plan—houses fronting Henry Street were badly affected by flooding, gardens were washed away and fences and building improvements were affected. Farther up, in Norwood itself, were several floods, including floods where water came right into houses and over the floors. People had to remove their furniture and had their carpets ruined. Will the Minister of Works see whether some conference cannot be held immediately to determine whether agreement can be reached for work to proceed immediately because, whilst work is further delayed, flash rains such as we had at the weekend can cause serious damage to constituents in my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Of course I am entirely unaware of any of the circumstances in the matters raised by the honourable member, and there appear to be complications involved. However, I will refer the question to my colleague for investigation and reply.

MENINGIE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister of Works is probably aware that the Meningie water supply, which comes from Lake Albert, was formerly manually operated. Recently it has been automatically regulated. Lake Albert at times gets agitated through wind and the lake is almost black as the result of the dispersed sediment. Being worked on an automatic pumping arrangement, the pump often comes into operation when the lake is in that condition, with the result that not only is the water dirty, which is an embarrassment in itself, but the sediment that finally settles in the hot water services in the town seriously affects the efficiency of those services. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report for me on this matter, particularly about whether a settling tank or a filtration system could not solve the problem?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member and bring his suggestion to the notice of the Engineer-in-Chief. However, I am sure that the report will show that this pumping scheme has been converted to automatic operation in order to greatly reduce operating costs. The cost of operating manually-controlled pumping systems is very high, and as electrical power becomes available we convert every pumping station throughout the State to automatic electrical operation. I think the suggestion the honourable member made about settling or filtration may have some merit, and I will ask the Engineer-in-Chief to advise me regarding it.

FREIGHT CHARGES.

Mr. BYWATERS: Recently I drew to the attention of the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, an anomaly that existed between Victoria and South Australia in relation to freight charges on farm implements. I pointed out that the nearer one got to Melbourne the dearer was the freight, it being about £57 in respect of Tintinara compared with £38 for Adelaide, although the implements were off-loaded at Tintinara on the Melbourne-Adelaide run. I also referred to the rate applying to Murray Bridge. Has the Minister a reply to this question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Commissioner of Railways has furnished a report to the Minister of Railways, and this has come through to me. It is a fairly long and somewhat complicated report, but the Commissioner suggests in conclusion that, if the honourable member desires, he may get in touch with the General Traffic Manager and bring specific instances to his notice so that they may be examined and the honourable member informed on the policy regarding them.

FLINDERS RANGES.

Mr. HARDING: Recently, I asked the Premier to see whether the Government could provide additional accommodation to take the overflow of people from the Wilpena Pound chalet in the Flinders Ranges? Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Director of the Tourist Bureau which states:

It is true that accommodation in the Flinders Ranges is inadequate for tourists during certain periods of the year, particularly during the September school holidays and the best part of the wild flower season. These periods are somewhat limited and it would not be an economic proposition to attempt to satisfy the total demand for these periods because they are not long enough to make up for the rest of the year. Some additional bedroom accommodation has been provided this year at the Wilpena chalet in the form of 10 motel-type units. This modest progress is a step in the right direction. In accordance with your instruction, I recently inspected the Angorichina hostel. I do not covet the property for departmental purposes. It is difficult to administer efficiently such a property from Adelaide, and I think it would be better for the hostel to be taken over by a private enterprise tourist operator.

HOUSING OF ABORIGINES.

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago I suggested that further accommodation be provided for Aborigines in towns such as Beltana and Copley in the Far North. Several months ago the aboriginal population was increasing in Beltana, and a report I received only a few days ago emphasized the fact that more and more Aborigines were coming into the town, with the result that some houses were becoming overcrowded. It was reported to me that nine people were living in one room. Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs take this matter up with the department to see whether something can be done to alleviate the housing of Aborigines at Beltana?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The last time I visited Beltana and inspected the cottages occupied by aboriginal families there the position was satisfactory. However, in the light of the further information furnished by the honourable member, I will take the matter further. In fact, I think I have already referred the inquiry to the Director of Aboriginal Affairs for a report. Without having the benefit of that report, I say now that if any qualified families desire housing at Beltana their requests will be considered sympathetically. I do not know whether there are any families who are advanced to the stage where they could be satisfactorily housed, but I have no doubt that there may be, and the honourable member might care to let me have their names as a prelude to their request, which could be considered.

KILKENNY LAND.

Mr. RYAN (on notice):

1. Has a lease been agreed to between the Minister and Miller Engineering Co. Ltd., of Kilkenny, for the lease of land reserved for waterworks purposes adjacent to the M. J. McInerney Reserve, West Croydon?

2. If so, what is the tenure of the lease and the rental therefor?

3. Has an option to purchase been given?

4. Is the Minister aware that a proposed five-year lease in 1955 was reduced to four years as the result of an objection by the Corporation of the City of Woodville?

5. Has consideration been given to a request from the Woodville corporation to purchase the reserve for off-street parking?

6. Has the Minister considered the protest of the Woodville corporation against any proposed sale of the reserve to Miller Engineering Co. Ltd.?

7. In view of the fact that the reserve in question is located in a residential area as defined by the Woodville corporation's zoning by-law, is it the intention of the Minister to delay the decision on the sale of the reserve so that the matter may be further considered by him and the corporation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are.

1. Yes.

2. Four years from January 1, 1960, for an annual rental of £75.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5 to 7. These matters are now receiving consideration and no decision will be reached until all aspects have been carefully considered.

BOOKMAKERS' LICENCES.

Mr. RYAN (on notice):

1. How many bookmakers' licences have been issued by the Betting Control Board for the current year and each of the two previous years for the grandstand, derby stand and flat at race meetings and trotting meetings respectively?

2. How many of these licences have been relinquished or cancelled for the current year and each of the two previous years in the abovementioned categories?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Secretary, Betting Control Board, reports:

1. The board issued the following numbers of licences for the various enclosures:

	Racing Licences.			Trotting Licences.	
	Grandstand.	Derby.	Flat.	Stand.	Flat.
Current year (1963-64)	40	47	49	50	36
Last year (1962-63)	41	55	55	55	40
Year 1961-62	44	54	55	62	46

2. The following numbers of licences have been relinquished by way of surrender, cancellation or transfer during the years in question:

	Racing Licences.			Trotting Licences.	
	Grandstand.	Derby.	Flat.	Stand.	Flat.
Current year (1963-64)	—	—	1	2	1
Last year (1962-63)	1	8	8	5	7
Year 1961-62	3	7	8	13	19

MARINE STORES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement for the further variation of the agreement entered into between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia respecting the River Murray and Lake Victoria and other waters, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in similar form to the amending Act passed in 1958 on the occasion of the last amendment to the River Murray Waters Agreement. After reciting that the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have entered into a further agreement to vary the principal agreement subject to ratification by the Parliaments concerned, the Bill by clause 5 ratifies and approves of the agreement, the remaining clauses being of a formal or consequential nature.

The text of the sixth amending agreement is set forth in the schedule to the Bill. I will not go into details of the clauses of the agreement, but its general effect will be to enable effect to be given to the arrangements that have been made in connection with the construction of a storage dam at Chowilla, ensuring to this State adequate supplies of water well beyond the year 1970, when serious shortages could otherwise occur.

This State's dependence upon the River Murray for urban, rural and irrigation requirements is increasing each year. Total diversions in the year 1962-63 amounted to 300,000 acre feet compared with 190,000 acre feet 10 years ago. Irrigation requirements are growing steadily, but there has been a rapid increase in diversions to the water supply system. The average quantity used annually for this purpose during the last six years was 52,000 acre feet compared with an average of 15,000 acre feet in the previous six years.

Under the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement made on September 9, 1914, and subsequently ratified by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, the upper States (New South Wales and Victoria) are entitled to the full use of their respective tributaries joining the River Murray below Albury. Prior to that time, little had been done by the upper States to harness and use the waters of their tributaries with the result that most of the water from these sources flowed unrestricted to the River Murray and down that river to South Australia.

There has now been a radical change in the situation as major storages have been built on the three main tributaries—Burrinjuck on the River Murrumbidgee, Eildon on the River Goulburn and the Menindee storages on the River Darling. Storages and diversion weirs have also been built on the smaller tributaries. The result of these works has been to deprive South Australia of the benefit of uncontrolled tributary flows and therefore to increase this State's dependence upon controlled flows from storages administered by the River Murray Commission.

The 1914 agreement entitled South Australia to stipulated minimum monthly flows aggregating 1,254,000 acre feet a year, on the basis of 651,000 acre feet for losses and 603,000 acre feet for diversions. The agreement also empowered the River Murray Commission to declare periods of restriction in times of drought, thereby restricting the supply to all States. The method of restriction was placed on a firm basis when the agreement was amended in September, 1958, clause 51 stipulating that during a declared period of restriction the available water should be divided between the State Contracting Governments in the following proportions—New South Wales, 1,000,000; Victoria, 1,000,000; and South Australia, 603,000.

The main purpose of amending the agreement in 1958 was to provide for raising the Hume dam to increase the capacity to 2,500,000 acre feet. Resulting from the operations of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority approximately two-thirds of the water diverted from the Snowy River will pass into the River Murrumbidgee, a New South Wales tributary, and South Australia is not entitled to any of this water. However, the remaining third will flow into the River Murray above Albury, and South Australia contended that this portion automatically became part of the River Murray resources in which this State is entitled

to share. Following protracted negotiations the upper States conceded this point which meant that South Australia would be assured of an additional 100,000 acre feet or more during a year of serious drought. A thorough hydrological investigation has shown that in spite of the benefits received through increasing the capacity of Hume reservoir and obtaining the assistance of Snowy water, South Australia would suffer some restriction in its supply on an average of one year in every four and that the total flow to this State would be as little as 700,000 acre feet in years of serious drought. After allowing for unavoidable losses the amount available for diversion in such years would be about 300,000 acre feet only, that is, half the normal supply. This would mean that developments in this State dependent upon the River Murray would of necessity be tempered to this reduced quantity. South Australia is already diverting 300,000 acre feet a year, and therefore it would be necessary for all expansion to come to an end unless additional regulating works could be constructed to impound water in times of plenty for use in times of drought.

Much misunderstanding regarding the function of this proposed storage at Chowilla is evident from correspondence that we receive from time to time, and from expressed criticisms of the proposals. But the simple fact is that the purpose of this dam is to act as a storage in times of plenty to be available in times of lesser flow: it is as simple as that, in essence and in its effect on the supply of water to this State. The River Murray is one of the most erratic rivers of any magnitude in the world. The average annual flow of the Murray-Darling system is 12,000,000 acre feet, but during the last 60 years the actual discharge has ranged from 1,000,000 acre feet in 1914 to 43,000,000 acre feet in 1956. Reliability can be achieved only by the construction of regulating storages. An investigation by the River Murray Commission in the upper reaches of the Murray and its tributaries, and by South Australia in the lower portion of the river, has shown that construction of a storage at Chowilla, 392½ miles above the Murray mouth and 37½ river miles above Renmark, would be the most economical and satisfactory means of achieving the required result.

Chowilla dam will span the river valley at one of its narrowest parts, the overall length of the structure being 3¼ miles. The dam will consist of an earth and rock fill embankment with an average height of 42ft. with concrete weir sections fitted with radial gates to discharge floodwaters. The maximum water depth will be 55ft., and the capacity of the reservoir about 4,750,000 acre feet. Comparative capacities of Australia's largest water storages are: Lake Eucumbene (Snowy Mountains Scheme)—3,860,000 acre feet; Eildon reservoir (Goulburn River, Victoria)—2,750,000 acre feet; Hume reservoir (since enlarging)—2,500,000 acre feet. The height of Chowilla dam is limited by the need to prevent the flooding of Wentworth and the surrounding irrigation areas. The full supply level will be 105ft. above sea level and 3ft. below the upper pool level at lock and weir 10, Wentworth. The flood gates will be capable of discharging a flood more than twice the volume of any flood experienced in the past without any raising of the water level at Wentworth. The area inundated will be about 550 sq. miles, most of which is pastoral country in Victoria and New South Wales. The dam will incorporate a shipping lock and a roadway. A proportion of the impounded water will be lost by evaporation, but it must be remembered that this will be water which would otherwise have flowed to the sea.

Mr. Shannon: You cannot lose what you have not had.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That point is worth emphasizing because of the misconceptions about the operations of this dam and, in that respect, the honourable member's interjection is pertinent. As the report states, evaporation will occur of water that would otherwise be lost by direct entry into the sea. During the 12 months following filling, evaporation losses will amount to approximately 20 per cent of the reservoir capacity. An investigation carried out for the River Murray Commission by an interstate committee of engineers showed that the benefits to South Australia would be limited if Chowilla dam were built and operated as a River Murray Commission storage on the present basis of water distribution in a drought year, that is, five parts to New South Wales, five to Victoria and three to South Australia. In fact, on this basis South Australia's interests could only have been adequately served by building Chowilla dam as a South Australian storage at the full cost to this State. However, following negotiations with the Commonwealth and the other States, it was agreed that the basis of allocation in a drought year of all waters controlled by the River Murray Commission

would be changed to give each State one-third of the quantity. This completely changed the outlook, and the investigation showed that on the amended basis South Australia would receive the same benefits and would only be required to meet one-fourth of the cost.

With a repetition of the annual flows which have occurred during the last 60 years and after making due allowance for the further harnessing of tributaries by the upper States, South Australia would experience some reduction in flow on an average of one year in 20 when Chowilla dam came into operation, and on no occasion would the shortage be sufficient to cause any serious hardship. The calculations show that South Australia's total deficiency in the 60-year period under present conditions would be 3,425,000 acre feet compared with a total deficiency of only 425,000 acre feet if Chowilla dam were constructed. The deep sand foundation upon which the dam will be built presents design and construction problems. Site investigations of considerable magnitude have been carried out and tentative plans prepared. Expert advice now being obtained from England and the United States may result in some design modifications. Construction of the Chowilla storage will be of great national importance and vital to the future development of South Australia. Ratification of the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement will enable this important undertaking to proceed.

In moving the second reading I commend the Bill to honourable members. I believe that when the history of South Australia is finally written the writer will conclude that no more important and timely legislation than this has been introduced into this House. I believe that it offers South Australia the opportunity for continued development, particularly along the banks of the River Murray, and also in the whole hinterland of the State that relies to a large extent (but to a lesser degree) on the River Murray as a source of water supply. As the report has suggested, the State, with the exception of Eyre Peninsula, already leans heavily on this river for its domestic and stock water requirements. I believe that in time—possibly not in my time—the River Murray supply will be extended to that part of the State which at present is isolated from the system. In 1959 I think that for at least six months of the year 80 per cent of the State's water was derived from the River Murray.

Taking the two aspects of our development into consideration, this Bill is vital, and it has come—if I may use the expression—in the nick of time to avoid a limitation on our rate of growth along the river and throughout the State. I believe that the House would approve of my mentioning the vital role the Premier played in achieving this agreement. No-one has worked harder and no-one has tackled the problems that have arisen during the negotiations with greater tenacity, patience and skill than has the Premier in bringing the negotiations to a successful conclusion. As a member of the House I pay my tribute to the work he has done in making this Bill possible. I know that it is dangerous to mention particular persons when discussing such an achievement, but I should like to mention Mr. Dridan (Engineer-in-Chief), who is South Australia's representative on the River Murray Commission. He has a wider knowledge of the behaviour of the river than probably any other person in South Australia. Through his association with his colleagues on the commission he has been able to perform valuable work in preparing plans and specifications for the Government's consideration. I believe that the House will endorse this Bill enthusiastically, and I commend it to members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS AGREEMENT SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement entered into between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia respecting the waters of the Darling River stored at Menindee in the State of New South Wales in the connected series of lake storages collectively known as the Menindee Lakes Storage, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to ratify and approve an agreement made between the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia concerning the utilization for a period of seven years of water from the

Menindee storage on the River Darling. The Bill itself is very short providing only by clause 5 for ratification and approval of the agreement, the remaining clauses being of a formal or consequential nature. The text of the agreement is set out in the schedule to the Bill.

With the growing demand for water from the River Murray in the three riparian States serious shortages could occur before the Chowilla reservoir has been completed and becomes effective. The length of the intervening period will depend upon the rate of construction of the Chowilla dam and river flows in the years immediately following completion of the work. In the circumstances it is possible that the Chowilla dam will make no useful contribution until the year 1970, and steps should be taken to safeguard supplies up to that time. During the course of a conference held in Canberra in April, 1962, the Premier of New South Wales offered to make available the Menindee storage on the River Darling for operation as a River Murray Commission work for a limited period. The River Murray Commission recommended acceptance of this offer and agreement was subsequently reached in regard to the terms and conditions under which this storage would be utilized to augment supplies. The Commonwealth and the three States concerned agreed that this would best be brought about by the signing and ratification of an agreement supplemental to the River Murray Waters Agreement.

The total capacity of the four Menindee storages is 1,470,000 acre feet, and the agreement provides that any water stored in excess of 390,000 acre feet will be available for distribution by the River Murray Commission in accordance with the provisions of the principal agreement. This means that in times of shortage the three States would share equally any water released from the Menindee storage in terms of this supplemental agreement. The River Murray Commission will pay to the State of New South Wales £160,000 per annum in equal quarterly instalments, and in addition will meet three-quarters of the cost of maintenance work necessary to keep the storage in good order and condition. The total annual cost to each State will be about £60,000, which is considered to be a reasonable premium to pay in return for insurance against the serious consequences of a severe drought. The term of the supplemental agreement is seven years from January 1, 1963.

This Bill, as its title implies, is supplementary to the Bill that was explained earlier this afternoon. As I have stated, it provides sound insurance for South Australia particularly but also for the other States in like shares against a shortage in the flow of the River Murray and its tributaries during the period from now until the Chowilla dam can be completed and water stored in it for the purposes for which it is constructed. As honourable members are aware, the New South Wales Government decided only recently to construct the storages at Menindee, through which previously the River Darling flowed unimpeded, and at this stage those storages, fortunately, are available to tide us over the period from now until the Chowilla dam operates.

In addressing myself to the previous Bill I pointed out that already in South Australia our current diversions from the River Murray could be (and, in fact, are in some years) equivalent to the flow of the river less evaporation losses. At any time, therefore, we may face a shortage of water from the River Murray. This agreement is necessarily supplementary and complementary to the previous Bill. Its operation will extend for seven years, but should it be desirable the New South Wales Government and the River Murray Commission may consider an extension. At any rate, it gives us time in which to get on with the work of constructing the main reservoir at Chowilla, and also a year or so for water to accumulate in that storage. I commend the Bill to members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 29. Page 769.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Power to subsidize aged citizens clubs."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

After "council" second occurring in subclause (3) to add "and any additional amounts contributed to such cost by any other body or person".

I believe that the intention of the clause is that councils be responsible to help establish aged citizens clubs. Subclause (4) states:

The aggregate of all the payments made by the Treasurer under this Act in respect of any one club shall not exceed £3,000.

If any organizations within the area desired to contribute, they could forward a contribution to the council itself and indicate to the

council that the money had been raised for this purpose. I agree that the council could say that the body making the contribution was a responsible body. My amendment would achieve the desired objective.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The legislation has been drawn up on the widely accepted principle that the Government would help local government establish clubs. On the understanding that the insertion of these words does not automatically mean that the Government will accept payments by anybody, and that it is still a matter of discretion whether or not we accept a proposal, I accept the Leader's amendment.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I assume that anything would be done through the local council, and that in each case it would be a matter for the Treasurer's discretion.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It must be done through the council, otherwise there would be no authority.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I agree. The council might not have sufficient money, but some organization might make a collection and give the proceeds to the council, and that would still be under the council's jurisdiction. I do not want to exclude this. The amendment has no catches; these things will be done through the council, and the Treasurer will have a discretion whether he pays a subsidy.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 730.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill has been on members' files for so long that I have almost forgotten what I wished to say, but I will proceed as best I can. The Premier spoke in glowing terms of the need for the development of industry, the need to have a Minister, and the need to create what would be known as a Premier's Department—undoubtedly to give it greater prestige. We have many Government departments, administered by the eight Ministers of the Crown; the departments are added to from time to time in order more efficiently to deal with the functions of government, but it has not been found necessary on earlier occasions to amend the Constitution Act when it has been considered desirable to re-arrange one of those departments. In fact, section 65 (2) of the Constitution Act provides that the Ministers of the Crown shall respectively bear such titles and fill such ministerial offices as the Governor, from time to time, appoints. Therefore, it is a very simple matter for His Excellency, by proclamation, to determine which Minister shall be Premier of the State.

I need not mention the necessity to discover more minerals in South Australia and to develop these resources, but the Premier spoke glowingly of the importance of further industry being established in this State. The Premier seemed, on this occasion, to overlook the importance of an adequate water supply, because he did not refer to the mighty River Murray. No mention was made of the proposed dams at Chowilla and Teal Flat. However, the Premier's colleague, the Minister of Works, certainly made up for this when he explained the second reading of the River Murray Waters Act Amendment Bill a few minutes ago. In fact, the Premier did not even give a favourable mention to the steelworks and its associate at Whyalla, or to the water that was being pumped from the River Murray to this important town. Because the one type of Government has occupied the Treasury benches for over 30 years, I considered that the Premier would give information on why no real attempt has been made to investigate the possibilities of conserving water in the Flinders Ranges. I realize that the Aroona dam at Leigh Creek has been responsible for impounding a supply of water that can be reticulated throughout the settlement but, if industry is to be founded by the establishment of a Premier's Department in this State, would it take another 30 years under his proposals for the same type of Government to consider the advisability of impounding water in those ranges?

This Bill seems to be just so much window-dressing by the Government, for it is not necessary. It would have been far better for the Government to introduce a Premier's Act or something similar to lay down the duties and responsibilities of the department and to establish the department rather than for members to be confronted with this Bill, which seeks to establish the office of Premier.

An alternative recommendation I can make to the Government is that it seriously consider appointing a Minister of Housing. During the election campaign last year, the Labor Party promised the people that it would

appoint a Minister of Housing without any increase in the total number of Ministers. The Government would be well advised to consider this recommendation rather than to seek to appoint an extra Minister. My reason for making this recommendation is justified because of the serious decline in the rate of completions in Government domestic housing in recent years. Over the years, the Housing Trust has done a very good job in providing housing accommodation, and I have no doubt that its officers wish to continue with this service. However, in recent years, the Government has imposed a policy of labour-only contracting on the trust with disastrous results. In the last three years, 5 per cent, 9 per cent and 21 per cent fewer houses were completed per capita by the Housing Trust than in 1956-57. Because of this trend, it is about time the Government seriously considered the appointment of a Minister of Housing without worrying too much about amending the Constitution Act to provide for the title of Premier for one of the Ministers. We should have a Minister of Housing responsible to this House to explain why the Government is falling down in this field in its duty to the people as regards adequate housing accommodation.

In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

From time to time honourable members on both sides of the House have advocated the proposed increase and I do not think that it is necessary for me to labour the point that, with the considerable development of this State and increase in governmental activity, there is a real need for the appointment of an additional Minister.

I do not agree with this contention. Members on this side for many years urged the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate and report on the prospects of balanced development in South Australia, but the Government would not agree with our recommendations. This proposal now appears to be a compromise, as was the resolution in 1960 when the Government agreed to the Industries Development Committee being constituted a special committee to make certain inquiries regarding decentralization. However, this committee soon found that it lacked the power to compel witnesses to give evidence, where necessary, and it asked Parliament to give it this power. Members on this side were happy to grant this power but Government members would not agree. Although that committee has restricted powers, I believe we should receive its recommendations, because they could influence the responsibilities and duties of the proposed Premier's Department about which we have been given only a general outline.

Even the development in the last few years has borne out the necessity for steps to be taken to obtain balanced development throughout the State. We want to see balanced development instead of the present prospect of seriously congested areas from Gawler to Sellick Beach, with the remainder of the State facing decreasing population and, possibly, becoming decaying areas. It is the duty of any Parliament to see that men and women live in the best conditions possible, and the present Government could have made a substantial contribution towards this end if it had agreed to grant the powers of a Royal Commission to the Industries Development Committee to conduct its special inquiry. In any case, I believe that we should hear what this committee has to say on the problem of the encouragement of industry before we consider the appointment of another Minister. The Premier attempted to justify the new Ministerial portfolio because of increased governmental activities when he said:

With the considerable growth and development of the State, particularly in recent years, the need for a separate Premier's Department has become increasingly clear.

However, let us see how this contention stands up to a little scrutiny. Just subsequent to Federation, there were four Ministers and 42 members in the House of Assembly. If the Government now insists that nine Ministers are essential, it should also agree that there should be an increase in the number of members in the House of Assembly. We on this side have introduced a Bill providing for 56 members in the House of Assembly, with the object of providing for one House of Parliament and for the same number of members for each electorate. I realize, of course, that the Government has appointed a commission to consider the Constitution and may provide, on its recommendation, for an increase of one to three members, but the Government's approach to this matter, as is well known, will not receive the support of my Party.

If the Government had proposed to introduce legislation that would provide a House of 44 members elected on the basis of four members for each Commonwealth electoral division, I believe that the Labor Party would have seriously considered such a proposal, but I hold strong views regarding a member who is elected to Parliament becoming a Minister of the Crown, because it means that the voice of the people he represents is not heard as it

would be if the member had not been appointed a Minister. However, the most important point is that I do not believe in executive control, and until there is an increase in the number of members in this House, I oppose the second reading of this Bill.

I need to give no other illustration than the one I gave recently after listening to the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) making his maiden speech. I commended him for the information he placed before members, not that I desired or attempted to reflect upon his predecessor. The information that members received from Mr. Ferguson about the district that he represents enlightened members as they had not been enlightened about his district for years.

Let us be realistic. The Opposition agreed to the increase from six to eight Ministers, but we oppose this Bill until there is a substantial increase in the number of members of Parliament. At present, there are five Ministers in this Chamber out of 39 members: five voices seldom heard other than when they are dealing with the departments they control. Every additional member in Cabinet means one fewer in the number of private members. I endeavoured to assist the honourable member for Glenelg (the Minister of Education) the other day about a certain public announcement regarding a school. The member for the district could hardly write a letter to himself as Minister of the Crown complaining about what was going on and stating what he suggested. Another Minister means greater executive control. We are reaching that stage now.

Mr. Lawn: They have had 25 years of executive control.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: From the date of prorogation in early November last year we did not have the opportunity to obtain information in this House until halfway through this year. That is not good enough. If another Minister is appointed, this Chamber will have six Ministers with three in another place. That is what this Bill provides. Six of the 39 members will be sitting on the front bench, and those six from this House will assist in the executive control of this State. I believe in safety in numbers, but that safety has to be extended to this House. There should be more members of Parliament appointed before appointing more Ministers of the Crown. Under these circumstances, I oppose the second reading.

Mr. LAUCKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PHYLLOXERA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 1187.)

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I support the Bill, which has been introduced not without serious consideration. Phylloxera is a deadly opponent of healthy vines. I have received correspondence on this matter from local vignerons as well as from people in other States. All believe that an easing of regulations concerning the introduction of vine stocks is necessary. It is obvious that they are mindful of the dangers inherent in the introduction of phylloxera, but they believe that in view of modern research and control the dangers that were present some years ago are not as drastic now. A friend has written to me as follows:

One cannot guarantee complete freedom from virus because the subject is still in its infancy, and new work continually reveals more knowledge. There is no risk of introducing phylloxera on vine material these days. The quarantine regulations and measures take care of that. The danger of phylloxera is far greater by introductions of plants by tourists. Anyone bringing vine rootlings from a phylloxerated area could start an outbreak. This risk is always present where someone wants something badly enough. The best prevention is to have the person's needs released under proper quarantine.

I understand that in New South Wales and Victoria—and possibly also in Western Australia—the position is that certain rootlings are permitted to be introduced. This leaves South Australia, the pre-eminent wine-producing State of the Commonwealth, out on a limb so far as the introduction of necessary new varieties and types of vine are concerned. This legislation seeks to ensure that South Australia—the home of the best wines in the Commonwealth—will have access, under proper quarantine conditions, to new stocks. We can have access to white riesling, muellar-thurga, sylvaner, gewerz-traminer, traminer, chardonnay, cabernet sauvignon (which we have at present, although there is room for more of it, as it is basic to first-class dry red wines), malbec and semillon. There are other species that could greatly improve our ability to maintain our reputation as the State which produces the best wines in the Commonwealth. Bearing in mind the current situation, through modern research and through a condition that ensures that phylloxera could not well enter this State, I have much pleasure in supporting this legislation.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I, too, support the Bill. The Minister of Agriculture, in his

second reading explanation, gave a good outline of the known history of outbreaks of this disease. I have also undertaken some research on the subject and have referred to books in the Parliamentary Library. Various other diseases and fungi attack the vines, one being a fungus called oidium, which attacks foliage and bunches. Records shows that in the period 1854-1860, in an endeavour to propagate a disease-resistant vine type in France and England, oidium resistant types of vine were imported from the Eastern States of the United States of America which is the natural home of the phylloxera insect. In this way phylloxera was introduced to Europe and it spread rapidly through the vineyards of France and England causing great devastation. I liken the destruction caused by this disease in vines to that caused to the human race by the plague.

The first recorded discovery of phylloxera in Australia was at Fyansford, Victoria, in 1875, and in a vineyard near Geelong in 1877. Costly and unsuccessful attempts at eradication were made in these two areas. In 1899 the vineyards at Rutherglen in north-eastern Victoria, comprising 30,000 acres were infested. Uprooting of vines and fumigation of the soil was the method used in an attempt to control this outbreak. This area has now only 3,000 acres of vines, and the plantings are still subject to attack although much of the area has been replanted with resistant stock—an undertaking which has proved extremely costly as all vines must be grafted and the types of vine which must be used are poor producers. Stringent quarantine precautions are enforced to prevent the spread of the disease to other big producing areas of Victoria, namely to Mildura and Robinvale.

Several small areas in New South Wales are infected. Here again quarantine regulations are enforced. Isolation has been achieved by prohibiting the transfer of any plant life from infested to clean areas. Fortunately South Australia has never had an outbreak and this is mainly due to the strict enforcement of quarantine regulations which prohibit the importation into South Australia of any plant life except under the supervision of departmental officers. The fruit fly road blocks on all main interstate highways leading into the producing areas have played a significant part in keeping South Australia clear. The fact that all fruit and plant life must be surrendered at these road blocks gives added security to South Australian producers.

One suggestion I would make to the Minister is that the quarantine signs at the border be displayed in several foreign languages as well as in English. This could give added protection, as there are so many new settlers who do not fully understand the regulations or the need for their enforcement. This is a matter which cannot be too strongly stressed. As there is no known means of economically controlling any outbreak of phylloxera, I strongly support any move to prevent any possibility of the pest's being brought into South Australia either accidentally or deliberately. The economic consequences of having to uproot large areas of vines would be equally disastrous to the dried fruit industry as to the wine industry which has already been mentioned by the Minister.

One purpose of this Bill is to alter certain sections to enable the importation of vine root stocks into South Australia for experimental purposes and to enable scientific testing and cross indexing of disease-resistant varieties. As this work will be done under strict supervision at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute I see no danger in what is proposed in the Bill. The number and varieties of diseases and pests which attack our vines make it essential for our scientists to have as wide a variety of vines as possible on which to carry out tests. A grower myself, I am keenly interested in all aspects of this problem and I join the Minister in commending this Bill to members. I do this not only as a grower but also as the representative of the largest grape-growing area in the State. I am sure that all growers in my district and in other districts of South Australia will realize the necessity for the various amendments in this Bill. I will give active support and co-operation to those who are carrying out valuable work for the protection and benefit of the grapegrowing industry, which plays such an important part in the economic welfare of this State. I support the Bill and commend it to honourable members.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the Bill. It deals with phylloxera which, as most members know from the Minister's second reading explanation, is a most devastating disease. There are about 30 varieties, and the type of phylloxera which this Bill deals with is known in the viticultural industry as phylloxera vastatrix. The insect enters the vine and attacks the root system so that eventually there is an entire disintegration of the root system and the vine dies. The natural habitat of the insect is the United States of America. It was first discovered in hot houses in England in 1853. In

1863 it was discovered in France, and during the years 1863 to 1883 practically all the French vineyards were affected by the disease. It spread further afield to Tunisia, the Caucasus, Algiers and Switzerland. It was unknown in Australia until 1887, when it was first discovered at Geelong. Then it was discovered at Bendigo in 1883 and at Rutherglen in 1899. The ravages of the disease are extensive.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: To give honourable members an indication of just how much damage can be done, I now refer to what happened in France during the period 1863 to 1883. During that time about 2,500,000 acres of French vineyards was ruined by phylloxera. In the year 1875 the wine production for France was 83,633,000 hectolitres, but by 1899 this was reduced to about 23,000,000 hectolitres, or about one-third of what it was before the disease had reached its peak. The loss to the wine industry in France when the disease was at its highest peak was estimated to be £50,000,000 in one year.

The disease was discovered at Rutherglen in Victoria in 1899. In 1900, 12,145 acres of vines grew in the Rutherglen area, but by 1909 there was only 6,000 acres, the other 6,000 acres having been wiped out of existence by phylloxera. By the year 1915 most of the vineyards had disappeared. Naturally, when the disease made its appearance in Europe investigations were made and it was discovered that it was less prevalent in sandy country because, no doubt, the particles of sand in the soil prevented ready access to the root system by the phylloxera. As I mentioned earlier, it is the root system of the vine that is attacked and disintegrates. It was discovered, too, that it was less prevalent in the north of France than in the south of France, because it seemed to thrive more in the warmer areas than in the cold areas. It was also found that it could be checked to some extent if the vineyards were segregated by distance, although this did not prove entirely effective. Another method was resorted to in an area of France known as Gard, under which huge areas of vineyards were submerged in water in the hope that the disease would be exterminated. This proved successful for the time being, but in the long run it was found not to be efficacious. The use of insecticides was also tried, but this did not prove to be effective.

I point out that in South Australia when the first Phylloxera Act was passed in 1899 we had 19,000 acres of vines producing 1,342,000 gallons of wine, and in 1962—the last figures available to me—we had about 56,000 acres of vines producing nearly 31,000,000 gallons. Bearing in mind that South Australia is responsible for producing about 75 per cent of the wine produced in the Commonwealth, honourable members will realize of what importance the wine industry is to this State and, indeed, to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth collected revenue from excise totalling £2,367,000 in 1962. As South Australia's production of wine was three-quarters of the total Commonwealth production, that means that no less than £1,777,000 was collected by the Commonwealth in revenue by way of excise from the wine industry in this State.

In view of the importance of the wine industry to South Australia, it is vitally important that legislation which has the effect of doing something for the improvement of the industry should be considered. As I said earlier, the first legislation was passed in 1899. However, that legislation gave no power for the establishment of any phylloxera-resistant nurseries in this State or, indeed, anywhere; it proceeded on the principle that prevention was better than cure, and it did something regarding the prevention of the spread of phylloxera in South Australia. The legislation of 1922, which amended the Act of 1899, empowered the Phylloxera Board to establish phylloxera-resistant nurseries outside South Australia, but no power was given under that legislation for the establishment of such nurseries in this State. I understand that such a nursery was established at Wahgunyah near Rutherglen in Victoria.

It was not until 1948, when a further amendment was made, that power was given to the Phylloxera Board to establish phylloxera-resistant nurseries in South Australia. As the Minister said, a nursery was established on Kangaroo Island, but there has been difficulty in proceeding with the satisfactory establishment and continuance of such a nursery because of an outbreak of virus disease in the vines and, because it is necessary to introduce other stocks into South Australia that are not phylloxera-resistant to enable further experiments to be conducted on the virus disease to which the Minister referred, this legislation has become necessary. I wholeheartedly support this legislation, as anything that can be done in the interests of the wine industry that will secure an adequate supply of phylloxera-resistant stock in due time should

an outbreak of phylloxera occur in this State will be of tremendous assistance to the industry. I trust that, as a result of further experiments being undertaken, and to be undertaken if this legislation is passed, something concrete can be done to enable phylloxera-resistant nurseries to be established in South Australia so that adequate stocks will be available to vignerons if ever the phylloxera disease should get a hold in this State and should it become necessary to reconstitute vineyards as a result of the ravages of phylloxera at some time in the future. Naturally, all members hope that this disease will never find a footing in this State but, seeing how easily fruit fly has gained a foothold here, the disease may find its way here by road, air or water. I commend the Bill to members, and I support it wholeheartedly.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1244.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I have considered this Bill, but so many things have occurred all at once concerning other Bills that I have been able to give it only enough time to conclude that it is a machinery measure that does not contain any major changes concerning the use of motor vehicles. It contains a clause relating to "biddies". No doubt the honourable members for Port Pirie, Port Adelaide and Wallaroo know all about them, as they are used on wharves. The clause providing that a refund is to be paid when the person who has paid a full registration fee subsequently becomes eligible for a reduced fee is purely a machinery clause. If, for instance, a person pays a full registration fee and then becomes a primary producer, he is entitled to a refund.

Clause 9 relates to the duties of an owner on repossession. When people are not able to keep up hire-purchase payments and repossession takes place, the owner's duties under the Hire-purchase Agreements Act will be suspended until the rights of redemption of the hirer are extinguished. As this is a machinery Bill, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 5."

Mr. LAWN: Does the definition of "owner" mean that both the hire-purchase company and the person buying the car have to take out registration papers?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I do not think there is any suggestion that people should take out two registrations for the same vehicle. At present the person responsible for registering the vehicle is the one who is operating it and who is the practical owner. Under a hire-purchase agreement the hirer borrows the money to buy the vehicle and is responsible to register it. If the owner repossesses the vehicle and it comes into his possession, obviously he must register it before he can operate it. The operative owner is responsible for the registration, and not the legal owner, as he is termed in a hire-purchase agreement. A vehicle can remain in a yard indefinitely without registration: no obligation to register it exists unless it operates on a road. Even after repossession it can remain in the possession of the person who repossesses it as long as he likes without being registered, but it must be registered if it operates on a road. If he wants to operate it on the road for demonstration purposes he has to affix his trader's plates. The person responsible for the registration is the operative owner—the man using the vehicle on the road.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 12."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Under section 12 of the principal Act a tractor may be driven without registration on roads within 25 miles of the owner's farm when drawing farm implements. I understand that that section does not apply to a farm trailer. Some of my constituents have discovered this to their cost. Can the Minister say whether this amendment includes a mounted carry-all, which is an implement used for carting farm produce?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the answer is "No". The explanation of this clause is that some modern tractors are fitted with an attachment whereby farm implements may be carried, and this clause extends the operation of the section to a tractor carrying implements in this manner. It refers not to drawn implements, but to attachments that actually become part of the tractor.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Effect of hire-purchase and hire transactions."

Mr. LAWN: I ask that this Bill be withdrawn and redrafted. I cannot understand the use of the words "owner" and "hirer". In his second reading explanation, on page 1243 of *Hansard*, when dealing with section 61, the Premier said:

New subsection (4) of that section provides for the duties of the owner and hirer where a vehicle under a hire-purchase agreement is voluntarily surrendered.

I believe that these terms should be clarified. We cannot say that in section 5 (1) "owner" and "hirer" are one person and in section 61 (2) two persons.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I can see no difficulty with this clause. It uses terms that appear in the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act—the owner and the hirer. In this instance the owner is the legal owner who has advanced money to provide for the purchase of a vehicle. Under the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act he is the legal owner and is called the owner. The hirer is the person who is the visible owner—the operative owner—of a vehicle. He operates it as his vehicle but it is not his property when it is used as a security for a loan to enable him to buy it. Clause 9 provides that if the legal owner, because of a failure of the hirer to meet his commitments, repossesses the vehicle he cannot re-register it in his name until he has met the obligations of the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act in respect of the rights of the hirer for redemption of the vehicle. In other words, the hirer is protected as the vehicle cannot be taken away from him and operated until a certain period has elapsed and until certain conditions have been fulfilled. His rights are protected in that regard.

Mr. Lawn: It is obvious that clause 9 refers to the owner and the hirer as two separate persons. I think that clause 3 should be clarified.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot be more explicit. I have tried to explain that the person usually regarded as the owner is the person seen driving a vehicle around the roads, but in actual legal terms, under the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act he is not the owner but the hirer.

Mr. Lawn: Don't you think that we might be making the wrong person take out the registration?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I do not think so at all. If the honourable member examines new subsection (2) (*b*) he will see that the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act and the terminology of that Act are referred to. I think the position is clear.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HECTORVILLE CHILDREN'S HOME.

Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's resolution.

(For wording of resolution, see page 557.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the resolution be agreed to.

Its object, briefly stated, is to enable the Government to acquire compulsorily certain land at Hectorville for the purpose of the erection of a proposed children's home. The Government has already acquired by other means a piece of land of eight and three-fifths acres but, as I shall explain later, it requires a further one and two-fifths acres adjoining it in order that the total area will be sufficient for requirements.

As honourable members know, the work of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department in caring for neglected children and child offenders has increased considerably. Between 1954 and 1961 the number of children committed to the board more than doubled, and since 1961 it has increased still further. The total number of cases, excluding 51 children on remand, under supervision on June 30 of this year was 2,891.

In order to cope with the greater number of children it has been necessary to expand the staff and facilities of the department. The trends suggest that the increases will continue and that still more staff and facilities will be needed in future. It is likely that the number of children under care will again double within the next 10 years. In 1954 there were three reformatories, two larger institutions for neglected children, and five medium-size homes for special groups. On June 30 of this year the department also had an additional institution and six separate cottage homes for small family groups. Proposals for the immediate future include a major new building for Vaughan House (partly constructed), the rebuilding of the boys reformatory at Magill, a junior boys reformatory at Campbelltown, and a remand home at Glandore. All these proposals have been recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee. The projects will be completed as soon as possible.

Other plans include a new institution at Hectorville for about 90 neglected boys. This will replace the present Glandore Children's Home, the buildings of which will then be used for boys intermediate in type between those who are neglected and those who need reformatory training. It is proposed that the new institution at Hectorville will comprise cottage homes for accommodation of the boys in small family group units. There will be central buildings (offices, hall, etc.) for group activities.

Preparation of preliminary plans for this institution shows that the site now available is too small to accommodate, properly, the children on a cottage home basis. The area available is about eight and three-fifths acres. If an adjoining area of about one and two-fifths acres were acquired the department would have a sufficient area for its purpose. The shape of the enlarged site, which is a regular rectangle, would also be more convenient. The department obtained the portion of the land now available to it in 1952. At that time it was exchanged by the Electricity Trust for land previously available to the department, containing about 10 acres, which was needed by the trust. The lesser area was not then a disadvantage because the department had proposals to use the land for a smaller special institution. With the very considerable rise in the number of children needing care, it is now necessary to use the land for accommodation of a general group of neglected boys. With the expected future increases in numbers, the proposal is becoming more urgent.

In 1952 the Electricity Trust had recently acquired the land at Hectorville from the person who owns the land now proposed to be acquired. The owner was not then willing to sell all the land and decided to retain a portion. The value of the land secured in 1952 was £600 an acre, so that the value of the eight and three-fifths acres then acquired was over £5,000. In its efforts to obtain the remaining one and two-fifths acres for the department, the Government recently offered the owner's agent £6,000 for the smaller portion. The offer was refused, and the agent counter-offered to sell the area for £15,000, a figure which appears to be excessive. Even if the owner were able to subdivide the land, he would have only six housing blocks for sale. Any such subdivision would involve him in cost. In order that the Government may further negotiate about the price on a reasonable basis, it is necessary to have recourse to the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act, 1914-1935. Action under this Act can only be taken in the present case pursuant to paragraph III of section 4 of the Act. This paragraph requires resolutions by both Houses of Parliament that the purposes of establishing an institution at Hectorville for the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board under the Maintenance Act, 1926-1958, shall be a public purpose within the meaning of the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act.

Honourable members are aware of the provisions of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act relating to procedure to be adopted when the Government compulsorily acquires property and the assessment of compensation. That Act does not, however, itself confer any power of acquisition, which is always conferred by a special Act. The Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board has no power of compulsory acquisition. However, the Land for Public Purposes Acquisition Act, which is of a general character, empowers the compulsory acquisition of land for any purpose proclaimed by the Governor. The Governor may, however, under section 4 of the Act declare only certain specified purposes to be public purposes. Section 4 defines these purposes under three headings. The first relates to the provision of offices, buildings and premises for carrying on the Government of the State or any of its departments. The Crown Solicitor states that the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board is not a department of the Government of the State. While the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department is clearly a department of the State, land for a children's home to be carried on by the board cannot be said to be required for carrying on the department. The second paragraph of section 4 covers any work or undertaking which the Government is by law empowered to carry out but for which there is no power to acquire land. Although section 152 of the Maintenance Act empowers the Governor to establish homes, the Government of the State is not the Governor. Paragraph III of section 4 empowers the Governor to declare as a public purpose any purpose which both Houses of Parliament resolve shall be a public purpose, and it is under this paragraph that the present resolution is introduced.

If the motion is carried in this House, the Governor may then by proclamation declare the purpose set out in the resolution to be a public purpose. On the making of the proclamation, the purpose is deemed to be an undertaking within the Compulsory Acquisition of

Land Act, and proceedings may accordingly be taken in accordance with the procedure prescribed by that Act. In other words, the Government would be able, if it so desired, to acquire the land compulsorily.

I need hardly add that the Government is prepared to negotiate with the owner concerning price on a reasonable basis. Members will see that if the Government is not able to acquire the land compulsorily it will be unable to continue with the project at Hectorville except at very high cost.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TROTTING).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1246.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): A big cloud seems to present itself whenever we speak about the Lottery and Gaming Act. Probably no greater political football exists than trotting in South Australia. Until recently there were, I think, 17 trotting clubs in this State. One club, registered at Kimba, raced only once a year. Probably it would not be necessary for it to have a totalizator licence because there would not be enough people to warrant a totalizator, yet this club had a representative on the body controlling trotting. I will speak later about trotting at Victor Harbour. If members turn to today's *News*, they will see that a meeting is to be held at Gawler tonight.

Mr. Clark: And it will be a very good one, too.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: This meeting should have been held at Victor Harbour but was transferred to Gawler. Why? The answer is simple—not sufficient people are at Victor Harbour to attend meetings there unless there is an influx from the metropolitan area. The only successful meetings held there are those conducted during the Christmas holidays when there is also betting on Port Adelaide, Melbourne, and other meetings.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You are not conducting an election campaign at Victor Harbour at the moment.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: No, I am giving the Minister of Works some information; the greatest political football I know of is trotting. Recently I went to Port Augusta and was introduced around the town by the member for the district. I called to see a man employed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to ask him about the conditions under which the men were working, but he was absent on other business. However, I saw his wife, and when I mentioned trotting (which I did because I saw a couple of gigs there) I was told that people in Adelaide were killing the sport because they would not assist local trotting interests. That is entirely wrong. Had it not been for Wayville, the country clubs would not have benefited to the extent that they have. The South-Eastern, Port Pirie and Kadina clubs, and certainly that of Gawler because of the meetings that are transferred to that course, are all doing reasonably well. The Kapunda club is doing reasonably well because it has installed electric light, and the Gawler club is doing fairly well because it holds meetings for other clubs in addition to its own. Section 22a (4) of the Act provides:

> The members of the league shall elect one of their number to be chairman of the league. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the league at which a quorum is present the members of the league present at that meeting shall elect an acting chairman for the day. The chairman or acting chairman shall have a deliberative vote and if the vote on any question is equal the chairman or acting chairman shall also have a casting vote.

Only one committe can be better than that—a committee of three, with two away! At present, 13 clubs are in existence—one in the metropolitan area that is known as the South Australian Trotting Club (which races at Wayville on Saturday nights for most of the year), one at Gawler, and 11 others. These clubs have nine members on the executive to control trotting matters, and there is a league comprised of one delegate from each other club. In the past there has been too much control but no really effective control.

Earlier this afternoon I said I was not happy about executive control—nine Cabinet Ministers in a House of 39 members—and if I applied a reasonable approach to this matter I would say that the control of trotting in this State could be properly conducted if the Act were amended to provide for three representatives from the South Australian Trotting Club, three from country clubs, and one from the South Australian Owners, Breeders, Trainers and Reinsmen's Association Incorporated. These seven members could elect a chairman, but I think he should have one vote only—a deliberative vote. I am opposed to the chairman having a deliberative and a casting vote.

The transfer of meetings from place to place indicates clearly that country people are not receiving the support expected from country towns. If it were not for the interest of people in the metropolitan area many country clubs would be unable to conduct a proper programme. I believe that this sport is entertaining: it has glamour. If a meeting cannot be conducted at a place with a licence to do so, then something must be wrong with the sport. If a meeting has to be transferred (as is happening tonight, from Victor Harbour to Gawler), interest would seem to be lacking. I understand that a dispute has arisen concerning the Victor Harbour course. I do not know much about trotting at that place, but I do know that the Gawler Trotting Club will benefit by holding the meeting tonight. I do not know, however, of any community interest existing between Victor Harbour and Gawler. For city people with horses competing at Gawler the distance is much less than to Victor Harbour, and the attendance will be larger compared with what it would have been at Victor Harbour.

I attended a Victor Harbour trotting meeting during a Christmas holiday period. I am convinced that because it was held on the same day as a race meeting at Port Adelaide many people attending were more interested in the betting facilities for the city races than they were in the trotting meeting. Certain suggestions have been made by misinformed people that the trotting club at Wayville is trying to kill trotting in South Australia. I should like to see the Wayville trotting track enlarged, and if the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia, which conducts the Royal Adelaide Show, provided a larger arena for showing livestock, the track could be enlarged without difficulty and trotting programmes could provide more entertainment than they do at present. Trotting under electric lights at Wayville provides an entertaining evening.

Deputations have suggested that the number controlling the sport should be reduced to seven; this suggestion has been opposed, and perhaps the late member for Stirling would have been up in arms at it because of its effect upon Victor Harbour. This afternoon the Minister of Works was up in arms lest I say something about Kimba but I understand that it has one meeting a year. At Whyalla two sports combine to make up a programme, but if that is entertainment, then it is all right. At Barmera trotting depends (the same as at other country meetings) on the support given by city people, otherwise an effective trotting programme cannot be conducted. Complete agreement has been reached between the league and the trotting clubs, particularly that operating at Wayville. Clause 7 provides for certain assistance to be paid out of the betting tax. This is the only provision that is of real value to country people. It relieves the Wayville authorities of the necessity of having to pay a percentage of the stake money to enable country people to continue trotting meetings. I believe the chief steward of this organization is entitled to suspend people if they do not carry out decisions made on the conduct of meetings. I doubt whether the chief steward is as free to carry out his duties as he would wish to be. I believe he has to satisfy too many people. Furthermore, he is also the handicapper. At one time the handicapper was a separate entity. No doubt the chief steward has to know all about handicapping and other matters associated with the control of trotting.

Clause 6 provides for the deletion of section 24 of the principal Act. This will enable females to be employed in totalizators, a right they have been denied hitherto. In the past it has been the practice to employ males of reasonably good financial standing, because if mistakes were made in paying out dividends they had to make good the losses. If in future females are to be employed, then they should receive the same remuneration as the male employees receive for similar work.

I have not been approached by any organization to speak about these matters, but many of my comments have been based on statements made outside of this Parliament, some by deputations to the Premier. I must accept the Premier's statement that this Bill was agreed to by the organizations concerned before it was introduced. However, for the life of me I cannot understand why nine persons are needed to form the body to control trotting in South Australia, particularly as only 13 trotting clubs exist in South Australia. I think that adequate control could be exercised by a body consisting of three representatives of the South Australian Trotting Club, which is our main club, one from the Gawler club, one from the clubs north of Gawler, one from the clubs south of Adelaide, and one from the Owners, Breeders, Trainers and Reinsmen's Association Incorporated. The South Australian Jockey Club is the authority controlling horse racing in South Australia. In the other States the main clubs control horse racing. I believe that in the other States the major clubs also control

trotting. The position may be different in Victoria where a controlling body was appointed by Parliament. The South Australian Trotting Club is our main club and it is entitled to the major representation on the controlling body.

In Committee I will ask the Premier to consider making the control more effective in the interest of trotting generally by reducing the size of the controlling body. I believe that country people are entitled to all the entertainment they can get, but at the same time there is a limit to what can be provided by the metropolitan area to help make country trotting programmes more attractive. During certain periods in the early part of next year there could be as many as four meetings on a Saturday night—at Wayville, Mount Gambier, Barmera, and on the West Coast. On occasions last year two mid-week trotting meetings were held, making three meetings for the week. I do not think that number of meetings is warranted.

I consider it would not be a bad idea if the same qualifications were imposed for Gawler as exist at Wayville. A maiden must win two races in the country to qualify for acceptance as a starter at Wayville, and I believe the same rule could apply to Gawler, as it is so close to the metropolitan area. The Bill contains much of value, but I am not satisfied that the best has been done for the control of trotting in this State.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I support the Bill, which the Premier said was designed to assist the sport and to render its administration and control more efficient. I believe this amending Bill will do that. The Premier went on to say that the South Australian Trotting Club and the South Australian Trotting League had unanimously agreed to the proposals. For some time there has not been harmony between the club and the league. I have gone to the trouble of contacting people connected with both organizations, and I can confirm that they are unanimously agreed on the provisions of this Bill. Personally, I am satisfied with the existing control of trotting in this State, and I am pleased to support this amending Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 4."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not doubt that agreement has been arrived at between all the trotting interests, as stated by the Premier. Can he say whether any discussion took place regarding the number of members of the league? Section 22a (4) of the Act provides that the chairman of the league shall have a deliberative as well as a casting vote, and it seems to me that this provides for the appointment not of nine people but of 10.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Before the Bill was introduced it was submitted to the authorities concerned. A series of meetings was held by the league and the club, and representatives of those bodies came to me complaining about the existing state of affairs. At one stage the club refused to pay the special levy, and the league thereupon threatened to disaffiliate the club. Each put its case to me, and I promised to look at it. Those organizations together came to see me, and I submitted to them a proposition which I considered fair and reasonable, as follows:

1. That the league will continue to operate under its present composition, but the functions of the league should be amended to provide that the league is responsible for the overall rules under which trotting shall be maintained, and that meetings of the league might be limited to, say, two a year.

2. That the executive committee shall administer trotting in this State, the committee to remain as at present constituted.

3. All direct levies upon the South Australian Trotting Club for the support of country trotting shall cease.

4. That 20 per cent of the winnings tax paid back to the clubs for stakes shall remain as at present.

5. That 5 per cent of the winnings tax at present going to the Treasury shall be paid to the executive committee and its distribution shall be for the benefit and support of country clubs.

6. That these recommendations must be considered as a package deal, and the rejection of any one of the terms will be considered by the Government as a rejection of all of the terms.

The reply from the South Australian Trotting Club was as follows:

I have to advise that the proposals submitted by yourself to representatives of the South Australian Trotting League and this club on Tuesday last were submitted to my committee at a special meeting tonight. Members noted with interest each section of your proposals, following which it was resolved unanimously that they be accepted in their entirety. On behalf of my committee I extend to you our very sincere appreciation of the genuine interest you have shown in our problems and the generous and satisfactory manner in which you have solved them for the benefit of all concerned.

The South Australian Trotting League replied as follows:

A special meeting of the league was held on Wednesday last to consider the proposals submitted by you concerning the administration of trotting in this State. I am happy to advise that the league unanimously accepted the proposals. Before you proceed with the preparation of the Bill for the amendment of the Act, the league would like to have the opportunity of placing before you a few items which could have a bearing upon any proposed amendments. The chairman and the acting secretary will constitute representatives if you will fix a time and date.

The Leader will see that the proposals submitted were accepted unanimously by both authorities, and the Bill has been drawn up accordingly. The proposals were submitted in writing to those authorities, who took them away to consider them. I believe the league consulted every constituent club in the State. I am informed that the Bill has been approved by both authorities. The club had a full meeting. Both bodies considered that the proposals were fair and equitable, and I think they will lead to an entirely new approach in this State. A sport as important as trotting cannot be carried on with constant friction and a division between the league, which is the administrative body, and the largest club in the State.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The South Australian Trotting Club is represented on the league by three members, which is some improvement. However, because of the way the matter was submitted, there was no alternative. If any amendment were desired, there would have been no hope of resolving the differences.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is not the letter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It is the letter. If this is acceptable, I should be the last to say we should not agree with it. Before all this took place, I suggested to the Premier that there was a need for control. However, these people have not consulted me, so I accept what has been said.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Repeal of section 24 of principal Act."

Mr. HUGHES: In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

The selling of totalizator tickets and the payment of dividends are duties that could well be carried out by women, and the Government considers that both the clubs and the investors on the totalizator would be better served if section 24 were repealed. I have not checked on this, but I believe that in some of the other States there is no prohibition against women being employed on totalizator duties. Has he further investigated to see whether that is correct?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not checked in other States but I have been informed that several other States do not have this prohibition. I read the agreement between the South Australian Trotting Club and the league, and this was not one of the provisions. This provision was asked for by country trotting interests, which have experienced great difficulty on week days to get satisfactory clerks to operate the totalizator. I have been informed that some other States allow this. I know for certain that females work in Victorian Totalizator Agency Board offices, some of which are run by women. The Minister of Works has informed me that he believes this is done also in New Zealand.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 and 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.49 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1250.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The Industrial Code is one of the most important sections of our legislation, because it is the whole basis of employer-employee relationship in this State. Two years ago the Opposition introduced a Bill after long and careful consideration by the advisory committee on industrial legislation, which is the committee set up within the Labor movement to deal with industrial matters at legislative level. This committee comprises members of the Trades and Labour Council, the Australian Labor Party and the Parliamentary Labor Party. Its very existence is a striking example of the close co-operation between the industrial and political wings of the Labor movement in this State. The industrial wing is closely associated with industrial developments and changing conditions and is therefore in the best position to make recommendations regarding desirable improvements to our Industrial Code.

In explaining this Bill the Premier said that it embodied the unanimous agreement of the two employer organizations represented, the United Trades and Labour Council and the Government. However, he admitted there were

many other weaknesses in the Code not covered by the amending legislation. Although agreement was reached on many points with the Chamber of Manufactures, the Employers' Federation of South Australia, the Trades and Labour Council, and the Government, this Bill can only be accepted as an attempt to improve the existing Industrial Code. It was because of this wish to improve our antiquated legislation that agreement was reached on so many points. The weaknesses and shortcomings of our existing legislation were proved conclusively when the Government and the Trades and Labour Council could reach unanimous agreement on 165 clauses. Members on this side have often drawn the attention of the Government over the years to the weaknesses in our industrial legislation, but members opposite have strongly rejected our suggested improvements, in spite of the tremendous progress and expansion of industry.

In giving his second reading explanation the Premier admitted that since 1925 the amendments made to the Code had been minor or had been limited to particular matters. Even with the development that has taken place in this State in the last 35 to 40 years, the Government has not been prepared to introduce or accept amendments to the Code to keep it adequate for present-day business requirements. Therefore, members opposite will appreciate that I feel some bitterness in debating this worthy, but none the less very much belated, Bill at this time.

In an amending Bill in 1961 Labor members attempted to make several improvements to the Code, which have been omitted from this Bill. Clause 6 of the Government's Bill seeks to amend section 5 of the principal Act dealing with interpretation and definitions. Our amendments to this section of the Act provided that all persons engaged in primary production would be capable of being covered by an appropriate award. We also sought to amend the definition of "employer" to protect persons engaged as subcontractors. Both these desirable improvements are missing from the Government's Bill.

The present legislation denies the right to the court to direct that preference in employment be given to a unionist, even though the court may consider that this direction is desirable. All other States have the power to grant preference to unionists and the choice is left to the court whether it grants such direction or not. Earlier we attempted to amend section 21 of the principal Act to give this right to the court and to bring our legislation into line with what was provided in the other States. Another amendment we sought to section 21 of the principal Act on an earlier occasion was to include:

Provided further that a common rule may be operative from the date from which any new award or variation order takes effect.

I understood that both employers and employees agreed with this amendment because it would have had the effect of all employers paying new rates of pay from a common date. The Government's amendment to this section does not include these desirable alterations, and it is purely a machinery amendment dealing with the publishing of notices in daily newspapers and gazettes, and it is surprising that the Government has not seen fit to include our proposed earlier amendments.

The amendment to section 31 of the principal Act is another machinery amendment, in that it is to be the Secretary for Labour and Industry instead of the Chief Inspector who is to grant a licence in relation to slow or infirm workers, but the amendment does not include our earlier suggestion that the approval of the appropriate union should also be obtained prior to the licence being issued to pay less than the wage fixed by the court. These matters were contained in the Bill we introduced in September, 1961. We desired that the appropriate union be the responsible party to be notified and to draw up the agreement. We believed that if a person engaged in industry became slow and infirm because of his work the union should be the party to grant the necessary permission. The Government amendments on this matter do not touch the real issue. Who would be the best judge? We have shop stewards who work towards the smooth working of industry. We believe that the shop steward would be the best person to report to the union, and then its secretary could take up the matter with the department in an attempt to improve the position.

Another major omission from the present Bill relates to strikes and lock-outs. On numerous occasions we have sought to delete sections 99 to 119 of the principal Act, but our efforts have been strongly resisted by Government members. These sections stipulate the various penalties for strikes and lock-outs. Our 1961 Bill deleted them. Division VIII of the Code, concerning lock-outs and strikes, provides for all types of penalty. It states:

Any person who, being bound as to the terms of employment in any industry by an award or order of the court, a determination of a board, or an agreement under section 98 of this Act,

without reasonable cause or excuse, refuses or neglects to offer or accept employment, or to continue to employ or be employed, upon the terms of such award, order, determination, or agreement, shall be deemed to do an act in the nature of a lock-out or strike, according to the nature of the case.

Do we really believe that a man must accept employment, irrespective of this provision of the Industrial Code? Surely a man is entitled to accept employment or otherwise. After all, the freedom of choice should still belong to the party concerned who is offering his labour, because that is all he has to offer in many cases. He offers to sell it to the highest bidder on the market. Whether he works at a rate an hour, a day or a week why should he not be entitled to his right of selection? Even if a dispute exists in an industry surely he is entitled to have the right to please himself whether he accepts employment in a similar industry or in a different one. Why should he be compelled? These are antiquated provisions. We should ask ourselves these pertinent questions when dealing with industrial matters or the Industrial Code. If we believe that harmony should exist between the employer and employee in industry, should we retain this antiquated legislative authority? My answer is "No". I see no value in it and there is nothing to be said for it.

I believe that we should get down to the basis of conciliation on all industrial matters. This Code was written so long ago that probably at that time there were reasons for these provisions, but I doubt it. Even this attempt to amend the Industrial Code, which was antiquated and had not been altered for so many years, does not go far enough. My Party attempted to do so two years ago and I make no apology for its having given its amendments serious consideration before introducing them. This proposed legislation will not engender the best harmony in industrial relations. The policy of the Labor Party provides for conciliation and arbitration, but we feel just as strongly that an employee has only his labour to sell and he should not be denied the right to withhold his labour if he is obliged to work under inferior conditions of employment. The counterpart of the strike was the lock-out and I firmly believe that the penalty provisions in relation to these matters should be removed from our legislation to facilitate amicable methods of conciliation and arbitration.

As stipulated in section 139, Part III of the principal Act only applies to the metropolitan area unless the employees are employed by the Public Service or the councils, when it applies to the whole of the State. Earlier we attempted to have this part of the principal Act applied to the whole of the State as regards building employees but this desirable amendment was rejected by Government members, and it is not mentioned on this occasion. As members are well aware, this legislation has considerable repetition, and many arguments I have used in relation to the amendments affecting the Industrial Court would apply equally well to the comparable sections contained in Part II dealing with the industrial boards: and therefore, it is not necessary for me to repeat those arguments. Clause 123 provides an amendment to section 304 of the principal Act which deals with overcrowding, ventilation, heating and lighting of factories, but the amendment only goes part of the way because it inserts a requirement for adequate artificial lighting where natural lighting is insufficient; it could have gone further and laid down definite requirements as regards adequate heating and ventilation. It might be as well to see what Labor members tried to do in 1961. Our Bill amended this section to provide:

. . . shall be adequately lit in all working areas and passageways.

Our Bill also provided:

In every department of a factory or workroom in which a substantial proportion of the work is done in a sitting position and does not involve serious physical effort a temperature of not less than 60 degrees Fahrenheit shall be maintained. The occupier of a factory shall install suitable and efficient fans or air conditioning plant to keep the air moving and at the lowest possible temperature which shall be brought into operation when the shade temperature exceeds 85 degrees Fahrenheit.

In 1961 our amendments to the Industrial Code were more advanced than this Bill. These provisions were contained in our earlier Bill to conform with the recommendation of modern architects and factory designs, and it is disappointing that the Government did not see its way clear to include these remedies in this Bill. Section 308 of the principal Act relates to the keeping clear of doors and passages, and clause 126 makes several machinery amendments to this section. In regard to factory requirements, I have sought previously to have included in the Industrial Code a provision that there should be a passageway every 30ft.; that this passageway should be marked; and that it should be kept clear. These provisions are in accord with what is being provided in modern factories and I am still firmly convinced that this

provision should be included in our legislation so that any antiquated factories are obliged to equal the standard of safety in our modern and efficient factories. Therefore, it is a disappointment that the Government did not see its way clear to include these desirable improvements as well as the machinery amendments that it has placed before us. I doubt whether members opposite would deny that, if it is reasonable and fair to establish a standard of factory engagement for employees, industry should modernize antiquated methods and buildings, and provide places of employment in keeping with human dignity. It is no use our suggesting improvements to the Code. We have to protest. Two years ago when I introduced a Bill on behalf of the Labor Party the Premier said that it contained many matters worth ventilating, and he complimented the Labor Party on introducing the legislation, but then we heard no more about it. I know that conferences have taken place and that reports have been submitted to the Government by the Secretary of the Trades and Labour Council. Most times the recommendations have been rejected, although in some instances the recommendations have been accepted in part. It is not too late for this Government to insist on a proper standard in industry to enable the preservation of human dignity. All factories should be compelled to meet that standard; none should be permitted to operate below it.

Clause 136 amends section 321 of the principal Act dealing with the safeguarding of dangerous machinery in a factory, but I believe it should have gone further and made it necessary for more than one employee to be engaged in a factory where power-driven machinery is in operation. Probably the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) can amplify this, because he should know something about machinery. It is beyond reason to expect one person to control a factory where power-driven machinery is used. I do not want to go into accident rates, but members know from experience what has happened in quarries and other industries.

Section 348 of the principal Act provides that any male under 18 years of age, or any female, shall not clean machinery whilst it is in motion. Clause 155 provides a minor amendment to this section, but the cleaning of moving machinery is a very dangerous practice that should be prohibited. I believe such an amendment should have been contained in the Government Bill. Another amendment in the Bill that could be made more effective is that provided in clause 159 relating to the provision of meal rooms.

Earlier we have sought to make it obligatory on factory owners to provide meal rooms where more than 20 persons are employed. This is in accordance with the practice that already operates in modern factories, but I notice in the Bill that this provision relates to an employer who engages 50 employees or more: however, the Chief Inspector may insist upon a separate meal room if he considers it desirable. Once again, the improvement is not as much as we on this side believe to be in the best interests of the efficiency and of the comfort of factory employees, but it is a step in the right direction and therefore receives our support.

Why should it be necessary for an industry to employ 50 or more persons before meal rooms are provided? Surely many industries supply such facilities for fewer than 20 employees. Why should not the best reasonable accommodation be provided instead of asking employees to eat at benches with their backs to machinery? Years ago people did not have bathrooms with showers, but our standards have improved. People who work in modern factories enjoy reasonable conditions. They can wear tidy clothes to work, change into work clothes, shower after they have finished their work, change into their good clothes and return home. Why should not the same facilities be provided in all factories? It would be interesting to examine the conditions under which our public servants work, and to see whether they have adequate dining room and canteen facilities. The Government should ensure that proper meal room facilities are provided where more than 50 public servants are employed.

Even though many desirable amendments have been omitted, this Bill improves the existing legislation. Whilst we may desire to suggest further amendments as improvements, we may run the risk of meeting with your displeasure, Mr. Speaker, as you have already supported us on a second reading for industrial legislation this session, and there is no need for me to say what occurred on the third reading within a few minutes of your first ruling on that occasion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, rather than take the chance on endeavouring to obtain your support for any desirable amendments to be included in this Bill, we have decided to proceed without the suggested improvements by way of amendments that would be our normal procedure.

Let me assure you, Sir, that at the first opportunity that presents itself, we will seek further improvements to the Code. There is no doubt in our minds as to the desirability of these amendments, but whether they will be submitted during your term as Speaker of the House is problematical. However, you can take this for granted: the Labor Party will never be satisfied with the Industrial Code until provision is made to give to those persons who are employed in industry, particularly primary production, the right to apply to the court for an award covering their occupation.

In case there may be any misunderstanding, let me make it perfectly clear that an amendment of this description does not mean making an award for conditions, but only extending to the citizens of this State who may be engaged in industry their constitutional rights to obtain an award to cover their calling. Undoubtedly, as Speaker, Sir, you are well aware of this factor and, if I may say so, particularly because of your association with the wheatgrowers. Even that organization is offered a protection, as a Bill for an Act relating to the stabilization of the wheat industry is to be ratified by this Parliament. Of course, if it came to the need for a casting vote on this measure, there would be no doubt which way it would go. Let me assure the House of this, and I repeat it for the edification of the Government: we shall not be satisfied with the Industrial Code until those people engaged in industry are given the right of an approach to the court for the making of an award to cater for their respective occupations, particularly those engaged in primary industry. As an agreement was reached between the United Trades and Labour Council, the Labor Party and the Parliamentary Labor Party, I shall support the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this Bill. I looked forward to its being introduced this session, and I welcome it.

Mr. Riches: You would be better outside!

Mr. COUMBE: Obviously the honourable member has not recovered from his recent trip. If he will give me a go, I shall accord him the same courtesy in due course. As I say, I have looked forward to this Bill's introduction here, and I welcome it. My view is that we should in this type of legislation make every possible provision for the best conditions we can get for our working people. Having said that, I expected that the Leader of the Opposition would welcome this Bill, as he claims to represent a large section of the industrial workers in South Australia. Over the last two years we have heard the Leader and other members of his Party ask when this legislation was to be introduced and what progress was being made in its drafting. Now that it is before us, I should have thought he would welcome it. Instead, he damned it with faint praise and at the end of his speech he reluctantly agreed to accept it, finishing with a rather obvious tirade of abuse or threats about what would happen.

I want to deal with this Bill because I think it is worthy of being treated seriously. In my view, it is a significant contribution to the industrial legislation of this State. It is a major Bill (and I believe all members on this side of the House so regard it) because it affects industrial relationships and conditions in our factories, and a surprisingly large number of working people in this State. It covers almost all aspects of employer-employee relationships. To get some idea of the size of the Bill, it is amazing to realize that the original Bill, when introduced in 1920, had 377 clauses, plus six schedules and a set of rules. Many amendments have been made over the years between 1920 and 1961.

The amending legislation before the House tonight is a mighty effort in itself because it contains 165 clauses. Of course, there is a schedule of amendments already made to the Code. The Bill falls into two broad sections, the first dealing with awards, court determinations and pay, and the second with working conditions and safety and building requirements under the Act. Only one part of this Bill applies to all employees in the State. Some sections of the Act do not apply because they are overridden by certain Commonwealth awards, and some sections apply to all employees. As far as I can see—and the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) is more conversant with this than I am—it is the first serious attempt since 1920 to amend this Act.

Mr. McKee: It has taken a long time, hasn't it?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but now we have it we shall have to support it. The member for Port Pirie would not be quite so happy in opposing it. I suppose he is going to support it?

Mr. McKee: Half a loaf is better than none.

Mr. COUMBE: As I say, it is the first serious attempt since 1920 to amend the Code on this scale. What is really being done is that we are cutting out much dead wood and many of the obsolete provisions and introducing some worthwhile amendments. It is what one would call a major overhaul.

Mr. McKee: Not very major.

Mr. COUMBE: It is essentially a Committee Bill: with this number of clauses it must be. I do not propose to deal with many clauses now. It will be better to deal with them when the House goes into Committee, but, in cutting out these clauses that I regard as dead wood, obsolete, and couched in old Victorian terms that are now out-dated, we shall get legislation of a more modern aspect, as we understand it today. That, I firmly believe, is more in keeping with our enlightened thinking today about factory conditions compared with what it was when the original Bill was introduced in 1920. Today, it is agreed by both sides that the outlook is different from that of 1920. I am the first to welcome this change. That is one reason why tonight I welcome this Bill. It is the result of perhaps more than two years' discussions between both parties, the employers and the employees—on the one hand, the Chamber of Manufactures and the Employers' Federation and, on the other hand, the Trades and Labour Council—each putting forward its own point of view. I surmise that some of those views may be almost identical on some aspects, yet in some respects they may be diametrically opposed. In this Bill there were, I think, many matters that were agreed upon unanimously by both parties.

Mr. Jennings: They could not be unanimous otherwise.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. I believe that there could well be—from the back bench, I cannot hear the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: You are not supposed to hear the honourable member. Continue with the debate.

Mr. COUMBE: The important thing to remember is that this Bill is the result of a series of conferences over two years; it was agreed upon by both parties. My surmise is—and the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) would probably know more about this than I would—

Mr. McKee: Hear, hear!

Mr. COUMBE: — that there were many points of view and many clauses on which both parties were not in agreement; but the important thing is that some compromise was arrived at. If no compromise had been arrived at, we should probably not have had before us now this Bill containing some important provisions.

Mr. McKee: If there had been no compromise, you would never have had it. It is getting near election time.

Mr. COUMBE: If this compromise had not been arrived at, some of the provisions that the honourable member may be pleased to see in this Bill would not be here, and that is the plain truth of it. I believe that both sides gave way on certain aspects. In my opinion the Bill is not perfect, not by a long way. I would be the first to admit that. It is my belief that some aspects put forward by the Trades and Labour Council were not acceptable to the employer organizations, just as probably some that were put forward by the employer organizations were not acceptable to the Trades and Labour Council. Although this is not a perfect Bill it contains some important provisions which we should accept at this stage because they are the result of conferences and are a valuable compromise. As a result, I firmly believe they are a significant and a very valuable improvement to our industrial laws. Some of the provisions that were arrived at with some unanimity may have been minor and probably procedural ones, whereas contentious matters probably were fairly substantial ones. The Bill contains some very important provisions, and I do not think any member could find anything to oppose. I suggest we should all support the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: You would not expect it to be perfect, because this Government is a most imperfect one.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member is beating the air a little. I pointed out that the Bill was the result of decisions reached at conferences, and the honourable member is perfectly well aware of that, too.

Mr. Lawn: I am saying that no imperfect Government could introduce a perfect Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: There is no perfect Government, and certainly no Government of which the member for Adelaide was a member could be perfect.

Mr. Lawn: We would be pretty nearly perfect!

The SPEAKER: Order! There are no clauses in this Bill relating to the honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. COUMBE: Some of the clauses are procedural ones, dealing with courts' determinations and awards. These clauses apply only to some of the employees in this State, those under Commonwealth awards being covered in a different way. However, the clauses dealing with working conditions cover all employees and are significantly important, and I welcome the way in which some of those clauses have been rephrased. Some of the old clauses were worded rather negatively, but they are now expressed in a more positive way, requiring compliance by an

employer with certain conditions that may be imposed and required by an inspector, who can issue an order upon the employer. In my opinion, this provision in the Bill is expressed in a most positive way.

It is also significant that the penalties have been brought up to date. Some of the old penalties were a little archaic, and could well be laughed at. Today we find that the penalties for non-compliance with a court order are fairly severe, some of them being as high as £50 to £150. The Leader of the Opposition in his speech pre-supposed that I would comment on some of the clauses relating to safety provisions. I am sure that honourable members will appreciate that I have supported any moves made in this House for the introduction of safety provisions. I do not think any member will deny that it is absolutely essential to provide every possible safety precaution in a factory.

Mr. Langley: I suppose you would license electricians?

Mr. COUMBE: I am glad that the honourable member raised this matter. The Leader said a moment ago that there should be at least two men working on an electrical appliance or machine in a factory. I wonder what the member for Unley thinks of that. Do two of his employees always work together on an electrical appliance or machine? The modern electrical appliances and machines that we have today are extremely safe. I admit that any fool can get himself electrocuted, but I think most people will admit that the modern machines are much safer than they were in 1920. The average machine in a factory is much safer than some of the shoddy appliances that housewives use in their homes. In many instances housewives run greater risks of electrical faults than do the men in the factories, and I do not think any honourable member would deny that. I have seen many housewives, including my own wife, working a mixing type of appliance; those women could quite conceivably experience an electrical fault, but I do not suggest that those who are in their kitchens should be accompanied always by one other person.

Mr. Ryan: The Leader never said that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: There is no provision in the Bill for housewives.

Mr. COUMBE: I was drawing a parallel. We should be realistic about this. Members opposite who have any first-hand knowledge of this matter know that if there were any danger with any machine the first thing that would happen would be that a factory inspector would come and inspect it, and if he thought there was some danger he would issue an order that the employer had to comply with certain regulations, such as putting guards on it. If the employer did not comply with those regulations he would be issued with a court order to do so. Appropriate penalties are provided. If by some chance there still could be some danger with a machine after the guards had been fitted, I am sure that that machine would be operated very carefully. I do not think a man would be left in an isolated place to work that machine on his own, if there was a possibility of some danger arising from it. I say that quite reservedly, because some years ago I saw some unsafe and dangerous conditions under which I for one would not have cared to work. The safety conditions in factories today are pretty good, although possibly somebody could point out conditions here and there that are not safe; but these are exceptions to the rule. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) would be the first to admit that safety regulations now applying to his old trade are fairly good.

Mr. Lawn: Would you agree that a linesman who is working on an electric light pole should have a mate below?

Mr. COUMBE: Those people usually have mates.

Mr. Lawn: Do you agree that it is right that they should?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know that I understand the full implication of the question. A man ascending a power line pole with a belt attached should have somebody around the place.

Mr. Lawn: Do you agree with it?

Mr. COUMBE: On broad principles, I think that is right.

Mr. Lawn: Tell the member for Rocky River, because I have heard him criticize it in this House.

Mr. COUMBE: I cannot see the validity of the point the honourable member raises, because every time I have seen a man working on a pole with a strap attached there have always been other men nearby.

Mr. Jennings: Are you supporting the Bill?

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Enfield has at last awakened. I am sorry I disturbed him, but if he had listened to what I said earlier he would be in no shadow of doubt now. The provisions concerning juvenile labour, youth labour and female labour are set out in clearer terms than previously. There is no

ambiguity now and the penalties here are severe. These provisions have been tightened up, which is one aspect I welcome.

This Bill is one that I have looked forward to for some time. I think that two years ago some of these clauses were last discussed in detail and at that time the Code was referred to the committee. If we look at this Bill and the number of the clauses in it I think we can appreciate the importance of referring the matter to a committee. There are so many clauses in the original Bill and so many aspects of this type of legislation that have been touched upon that it would be extremely difficult for this House to adequately deal with such a measure and give the necessary time to it.

We could be several weeks debating all these clauses, and we would probably not achieve the result that is obtained in this Bill, which has come forward with the recommendation of an expert committee of men who are versed at first-hand in industry and commerce, and represent both sides. They have come forward with valuable contributions although I am not sure that I agree with one or two; I am the first to say that. Basically, however, I agree with the Bill. I want to see it dealt with as rapidly as possible and I should like to see its improved conditions passed on to those to whom it will apply. I am sure that the honourable member for Port Pirie and his colleagues will support this Bill and I hope they agree with the views I have expressed. Not only do I second and support these provisions: I welcome them.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I, too, support the second reading of the Bill and I point out, as has previously been pointed out by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Torrens, that it has been introduced as the result of a series of conferences that lasted two years. It is of a compromise character and, although it has been accepted by the parties concerned, we on this side of the House have certain reservations. We are committed to support the Bill because we appreciate that an agreement has been made between the parties, despite the different viewpoints expressed in the conferences. This means that probably all the parties were not satisfied; one would be fortunate indeed if there were unanimity on such questions. Although a person is committed to the Bill and supports it, he may not have been able to study it in detail, and therefore must generalize.

Unfortunately, the Bill that was first distributed among members with explanatory notes was withdrawn from circulation. It was redrafted because of certain corrections considered necessary by those associated with the conferences. In the Bill now before us (and not the original one distributed to members) there have been certain inconsequential alterations but, unfortunately, the explanatory notes associated with the original issue do not accompany this Bill. True, there was a certain view in the Trades and Labour Council opposed to the acceptance of this Bill, and lengthy discussion took place on it, but it was adopted by a considerable majority and, therefore, we of the Labor Party are committed to accept it.

That does not necessarily mean that we are in accord with its every provision any more than that members opposite will entirely agree with it. They are better able to accept it than Labor members are because from time to time, in fact ever since the Industrial Code was first enacted, we have tried to amend it. The honourable member for Torrens said that the Code dated back to 1920, and that is perfectly true. However, I remind him that in 1922 the Government of the day intended to abolish the Industrial Code although it had operated for only a couple of years.

Mr. Coumbe: I was not here then.

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, but I was. One of the biggest demonstrations ever held in Adelaide to my knowledge was the one against the abolition of the Industrial Code. I think Mr. Barwell (later Sir Henry Barwell) was the Premier at the time. I believe one could not move on North Terrace because of the crowd demonstrating in front of Parliament House, and some members of Parliament were rather fearful of what might happen. As a result of that demonstration the Government did not proceed with its intention, the Code has remained ever since, and there has been no amendment of any consequence. True, the Bill contains improvements from a trade union point of view, but by the same token Opposition members think some points have been conceded to the employers.

I am concerned with the penal provisions that have been extended. As a movement we are definitely opposed to these provisions. We appreciate that there must be some and only once in South Australia in the last 10 or 15 years has a union been fined a substantial sum for any breach of the Code. That fine amounted to £75 plus £130 costs.

I am also concerned with the possibility that may arise in the future of the State Industrial Court's taking advantage of any penal provisions in the Code. It is conceded that, except for the instances I have mentioned, it has not taken advantage. In the last 13 years, and particularly in the last three or four years, various penalties have been imposed on the trade union movement by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court for contempt of court because unions have not carried out directions of Conciliation Commissioners or decisions of courts. Some of these fines have been terrific, and have almost crippled the unions. Members must appreciate the bitterness this sort of thing creates in the minds of members of trade unions. Since 1950 the Commonwealth Arbitration Court has inflicted fines amounting to £30,800, plus £33,223 12s. 1d. in costs, on trade unions working under Commonwealth awards. Last November my union had a penalty of £1,300, with £504 costs, imposed on it because it did not abide by the decision of a Conciliation Commissioner. I could give further details, but I do not want to weary the House by going into details about this sort of thing; I want only to point out that penalty provisions can be drastic and can create considerable unrest in an industry to the detriment of all concerned. Therefore, fines should be imposed only with the greatest reluctance on the part of the authority that has the power to impose them.

Under this Bill, penalties have been further increased. I agree with the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) that many have been increased to meet modern conditions, and that fines of £5 on employers should be increased to £50 because of the changed value of money. However, if members compare the fines that can be inflicted on the employer with those that can be inflicted on the employee, they will find they are out of balance. A fine should be greater on the employer than on the employee, yet in some cases the fine is £50 on each. We as a movement are pledged to remove penal clauses wherever possible from our industrial legislation, but we could not do it on this occasion even if we were free to do it. As pointed out by the Leader, it is doubtful whether we would get your support, Mr. Speaker. We will not be able to do that until we have a majority in this House and, although I will not be here when we have, I am looking forward to the future in the interests of the people I have represented for so long.

The employment of girls under 16 years of age is a retrograde step. Girls under 16 can now be employed on all classes of work, except only in a few instances, whereas previously they could not be employed until over 16. My Party considers that girls under 16 should not be employed, and that the provision in the Bill is a retrograde step. Probably this has been agreed on because the school-leaving age is now 15, and there has been a compromise.

One of the worst features of this legislation is that not sufficient provision is made for policing awards and determinations. I suppose I have had as much experience on wages boards as any man in this State. I am still a member of one board, of which I have been a member for 40 years next year, and because of my experience I claim to know something about the working of wages boards. I subscribe, and I have always subscribed, to the system of wages boards. The more we get away from courts the easier it is to encourage a better relationship between employer and employee because there is a better chance that the two sides will meet and express their views, and they will, if possible, reach an agreement. I have been associated with boards other than the one I have mentioned, but I have served longest on that board. The industry with which I have been associated has had collective agreements. There are six sections in that industry, three of which work under private agreements that have no force of law behind them. One of these agreements has been working for 46 years, yet it has never been registered in the State or Commonwealth court. I think the only disputes in the 46 years have been in one of the three sections—lasting a week on one occasion and four days on another. I stress that people can get together and reach agreement without any force of law being involved.

The other three sections of this industry work under State awards for the country and wages board determinations for the metropolitan area, but each section meets the employers in conference before it goes to the court or the wages board. Agreement is then virtually reached, and it is presented to the court for ratification. That is an instance of how people can get together and eliminate legal processes. I believe that few others work along similar lines. Men employed at the abattoirs work along similar lines, and I believe tramway employees, and some others that do not come immediately to mind, may also do so. These awards and determinations are based mainly on collective agreements. Other industries are not so fortunate and are compelled to go to the court to get what they believe is justice in wages and working conditions.

I believe one point that troubles most unions in relation to recalcitrant employers is the lack of policing of awards and determinations. I could take members to places in the metropolitan area where Code provisions are not complied with. Although complaints have been made from time to time to the department, there have been, in many instances, excuses put forward for what has happened. Although the employers have been told to abide by the Code, they have, wherever possible, evaded it. That should not be the position. I do not blame the department because I believe it is the result of a shortage of inspectors. The Government should appoint more of them, so that there can be a proper policing of awards and determinations. It is unfair to expect unions to police them. The Bill provides for a penalty if an employee commits a breach, but often it is committed under duress. I mean that if an employee reports a matter to his union he runs the risk of losing his job. The alternative is for him to remain quiet about the matter and so keep his job. Later, when he leaves that job he gets the union to make a claim on his behalf. In one instance a claim was submitted on behalf of two hotel employees. The amount concerned was about £700, which included overtime money that had not been paid for about 12 months. There was no chance of getting the money under the Code, but as a result of other action it was obtained. The only penalty the union could inflict on the employees was a fine of £10, yet they got £700 in back pay. It is said there should be no provision for such a penalty, but I think there should be. If a union gets an award and an employee commits a breach as the result of an understanding with the employer, he should be fined, but the employer should be fined a greater amount.

I think the court could be constituted differently. It should be along the lines of the Board of Industry. In earlier days this board dealt with the living wage, and when inquiries were held the court was always cluttered up with vegetables, groceries, etc., as exhibits in support of the employees' case. That sort of thing has been eliminated because of the Government's decision to tie our living wage to the Commonwealth basic wage. If the court comprised a representative of the employers, a representative of the employees and the President of the Industrial Court we would have a good set-up. It would be similar to the court in Western Australia.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You mean that those three would constitute the court?

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, but I believe an alteration of the system is being considered in Western Australia in order to effect an improvement. Such a court would be similar to our wages board, but on a higher plane. As I say, objections can be raised to this Bill, but we believe also that it contains some advantages. As a result of the agreement reached, the Opposition will support the second reading and no amendments will be moved in Committee. However, that does not take from the Labor Party the right during next session, or some other session, to amend the Code as it thinks fit.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of principal Act, section 5."

Mr. FRED WALSH: I express my approval of this clause. One of its amendments is in accordance with an assurance given to me by the Premier in connection with community hotels. Earlier I complained that they were excluded from the provisions of the Code. It was said that the only way to alter the position was to have a motion carried by both Houses of Parliament, but that was not done. I spoke to the Premier again, and now, as the result of the discussions, the matter is included in the clause. The position of community hotels is now the same as that of clubs and similar bodies.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Amendment of principal Act, section 60."

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister say whether this amendment simplifies the administration of the Act, or is it giving the administration to an officer of the Crown instead of to the Minister as has been done in the past?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): It simplifies the administration, the duty being performed by the Secretary of the department instead of by the Minister.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (37 to 165), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 30, at 2 p.m.